



**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF
BRISTOL CITY COUNCIL
HELD ON 12TH SEPTEMBER 2006 AT 6.00 P.M.**

- | | | | |
|---|--|---|--------------------------------------|
| P | The Lord Mayor Councillor Peter Abraham (in the Chair) | P | Councillor Sean Emmett |
| P | Councillor Lesley Ann Alexander | P | Councillor Ashley Peter Fox |
| P | Councillor Emma Jayne Bagley | P | Councillor Geoffrey Richard Gollop |
| A | Councillor Mark Bailey | P | Councillor John Goulandris |
| P | Councillor John Bees | P | Councillor Royston Alan Griffey |
| P | Councillor Peter Begley | A | Councillor Peter Hammond |
| P | Councillor Charles Nicholas Bolton | P | Councillor Alfred Henry Havvock |
| P | Councillor Mark Bradshaw | P | Councillor Helen Holland |
| P | Councillor Mark Royston Brain | P | Councillor Gareth Hopkins |
| P | Councillor Dr. Dennis H. Brown | P | Councillor Brenda P Hugill |
| P | Councillor Clare Campion-Smith | P | Councillor Christopher David Jackson |
| A | Councillor Jos Clark | P | Councillor Barbara Janke |
| P | Councillor Muriel Cole | P | Councillor Geoff Jones |
| P | Councillor Steven Robert Comer | P | Councillor Timothy Rodney Kent |
| P | Councillor Simon Cook | P | Councillor Martin Kerry |
| P | Councillor Terence Roger Cook | P | Councillor John Kiely |
| P | Councillor Ian Robert Cooper | P | Councillor David Kitson |
| A | Councillor Peter J. Crispin | P | Councillor Beverley Arthur Knott |
| P | Councillor Noreen Patricia Daniels | P | Councillor Barbara Madeleine Lewis |
| P | Councillor Christopher Davies | A | Councillor Jack LoPresti |
| P | Councillor John E. Deasy | P | Councillor Peter Main |
| P | Councillor Barrington Dodd | P | Councillor Abdul Raof Malik |
| P | Councillor Richard Stephen Eddy | P | Councillor Shirley Marshall |
| P | Councillor Evelyn Mary Elworthy | | |

P Councillor David Henry Robert
Morris
P Councillor Albert Edward Murphy
P Councillor Jackie E. Norman
P Councillor Sue O'Donnell
A Councillor Bill Payne
P Councillor Derek Stephen Pickup
P Councillor Brian Price
P Councillor Charles Price
P Councillor Judith Margaret Price
P Councillor Kevin Michael Quartley
P Councillor Graham R Robertson
P Councillor Jon Charles Rogers

P Councillor Linda Ruth Salter
A Councillor Margaret Shovelton
A Jenny Smith
P Councillor Ron Stone
P Councillor Mary Sykes
P Councillor Sylvia Jeanne
Townsend
P Councillor Rosalie Walker
P Councillor Mark David Weston
P Councillor Anne White
P Councillor James Charles White
P Councillor Mark Michael
Wright

Also in attendance:

Alderman John McLaren
Alderman Joyce Fey

CNL

30.9/06 LORD MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Lord Mayor made reference to the following announcements:

(a) Mayor of Hanover

It was announced that Stephan Weil had been appointed as the new mayor of Hanover, and would be in office for 8 years from the beginning of November 2006, replacing Herbert Schmarsteig.

(b) Bristol in Bloom

It was noted that Bristol had received an award as part of Bristol in Bloom, and the Lord Mayor congratulated all those who worked in achieving the award.

(c) Councillor Mark Bradshaw

The Lord Mayor on behalf of Council congratulated Councillor Mark Bradshaw following his Civil Partnership on 8th September 2006.

(d) Run for Life

The Lord Mayor congratulated Councillor Kevin Quartley on completing in the 'Run for Life', who raised money on behalf of prostate cancer.

**CNL
31.9/0**

MINUTES - 20TH JUNE 2006

RESOLVED - that the minutes of the meeting of Council held on 20th September 2006 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Lord Mayor.

**CNL
32.9/06**

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Mark Bradshaw declared an interest in respect of Agenda Item 9 - Motion C on the agenda

**CNL
33.9/06**

REPRESENTATIONS FROM LOCAL RESIDENTS

(a) Petitions

(i) *Simon Crew - protest against the increased cost of Green Bins.*

Council agreed that this petition be referred to the Executive Member for Sustainable Environment and Community Safety, for consideration and response.

(ii) Harasharan Kaur - Building of tram, metro-rail or underground rail system.

Council agreed that this petition be referred to the Executive Member for Transport and Development Control, for consideration and response.

(iii) Peter Goodwin - improving South Bristol without the Ring Road.

Council agreed that this petition be referred to the Executive Member for Transport and Development Control, for consideration and response.

(b) Statements

(i) Anne Crabtree - Balloon Festival

Council agreed that these questions be referred to the next meeting of Full Council.

(ii) Anne Crabtree - Disabled Transport to the Balloon Festival

Council agreed that this statement be referred to the Executive Member for Transport and Development Control and Executive Member for Health Promotion, Young People and Leisure, for consideration and response.

(iii) Jerry Birch - Bristol Airport Expansion

Council agreed that this statement be referred to the Executive Member for Capital Projects and Regeneration, for consideration and response.

(iv) Nick Shearing - Bristol Balloon Festival

Council agreed that this statement be referred to the Executive Member for Transport and Development Control and Executive Member for Health Promotion, Young People and Leisure, for consideration and response.

(c) Questions

No questions were submitted for consideration from residents for this meeting.

CNL

34.9/06

REPRESENTATIONS FROM MEMBERS OF COUNCIL

(a) Petitions

(i) *Councillor Judith Price - Request for a pedestrian crossing at Long Cross Lay-by, Lawrence Weston*

Council agreed that this petition be referred to the Executive Member for Transport and Development Control, for consideration and response.

(ii) *Councillor David Morris - request for urgent action on anti-social behaviour in public open space at the rear of Maple Close, Harrington Road and Gillebank Close.*

Council agreed that this petition be referred to the Executive Member for Sustainable Environment and Community Safety, for consideration and response.

(iii) *Councillor Royston Griffey - Derelict garages, Hartcliffe.*

Council agreed that this petition be referred to the Executive Member for Sustainable Environment and Community Safety, for consideration and response.

(b) Statements

The Council noted a statement from Councillor Albert Murphy - Misuse of Licensed Taxi Plates.

(c) Questions

A. COUNCILLOR WESTON TO ASK EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY SAFETY

Pest Control

Q1. Can the Executive Member advise me on how many requests Pest Control received last year?

A1 Pest control received a total of 3,146 requests for treatment for rats in 2005/06, compared with 3,054 in 2004/05.

Q2. Do Pest Control have an estimate for the number of rats in Bristol?

A2 There are no figures as to the population of rats in Bristol or any other city. It is impossible to provide those type of statistics, some experts quote a figure of 20 million rats in the UK, but this figure cannot be substantiated.

Q3 Given the probability that some Bristol residents will not use the food caddy, has the Executive Member consulted Pest Control on the impact that fortnightly refuse collections will have on the rat population in Bristol?

A3 The key to this question is the public being responsible making sure that they use all waste receptacles in a responsible way i.e. making sure that all lids are securely locked or in place, requesting damaged bins to be replaced, clean up all spillages immediately, clean out waste bins from time to time, report any non collection of waste bins immediately. Rats will have greater difficulty in getting into waste bins providing they are managed properly, than breaking into black sacks.

In actual fact we have a reliable estimate of 80-85% actually using the kitchen bins. Yes, I have spoken to pest control regarding the new services. We have also spoken to colleagues in Somerset who introduced this scheme last year. There was an identifiable decrease in vermin problems. This is due to the fact that the kitchen bins seal the food away. There was previously a problem with vermin breaking into black sacks to get at food.

Q4 If there is an explosion in the rat population, what contingency plans have been laid to deal with the situation?

A4 Pest Control Services have been dealing with an increase in the rat population for the past six year. Nationally there has been a year on year increase which Bristol has also endured. Officers have been monitoring the situation closely, if the rat population continues to increase year on year then additional resources will be required to ensure that public health is maintained throughout the City.

Rat problems stem from 2 main areas:-

Irresponsible disposal of waste by residents and some businesses. This has been a problem in some small areas of Bristol for many years, Our new enforcement team is currently targeting these pockets and will add a new element to the education. Residents and businesses will be offered help and assistance but if they fail to comply and continue to be a nuisance to their neighbours they will be penalised.

With respect to trade waste, in the last three weeks, over 130 premises have been visited, originally approximately 96% did not have satisfactory waste transfer notes.

Letters were sent and officers are now revisiting all premises.

This action has turned the situation round and 60% now have satisfactory documentation and arrangements, and the remaining 40% have received £300 fixed penalty notices.

Dropping of food in the streets mainly from late night takeaways. I am glad to say that Bristol, because of the excellent record of Clean and Green, has been participating as a leader in an ENAMS campaign to reduce the problem. As part of this we have been putting out numbers of specially designed bins that feature in the base a rat poisoning system.

In addition I am glad to bring to the members attention the fact that we have completely revamped the street cleaning service which as well as improving frequency in many areas, changes the days to follow the waste and recycling collections and gives a more appropriate service to busy commercial areas around the city. We have been able to afford the many improvements in service because of the massive boost to our finances with better recycling.

Q5 Should incidents of rat infestation increase, will the Executive Member consider reverting back to weekly refuse collections on the grounds of public health?

A5 No! At a cost of £900,000 a year and a reduction in recycling which itself would add further cost of course not. This would be a shocking waste of taxpayers money and would have no positive public health benefit. In fact as we would not be able to afford the extra street cleaning and enforcement team the effect would be negative. If this is a local Conservative policy I look forward to seeing the cost in your budget. I cannot imagine that blue-green Dave? will be impressed.

B. COUNCILLOR GOULANDRIS TO ASK EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT AND DEVELOPMENT CONTROL

Planning Process

Q1. Can the Executive Member explain why the planning process failed to assess adequately the impact of the Ashley Waste Recycling Centre in Petherbridge Way on the quality of the life of local residents?

A1. I have been informed by senior officers that a judgement was made about the level of potential impact that the proposed use would have on the amenities of the nearest local residents. The case officer report pointed out that “....(it) would not involve as intensive or disruptive use of the building as would be the case with a Waste Transfer or Disposal Station”. There were three reasons for this conclusion being reached.

(i) The information describing the proposed use made it seem relatively low key. A supporting letter indicated the work would take place inside the building, and said “The site will provide the facility to recycle:- wood, metal, plastic, cardboard, stone and soil etc. The process will involve a number of employees picking out the recyclable items and placing them into separate large bins. The remainder of the waste, unable to be recycled in any way, will be loaded into a separate area to be taken to a licensed landfill site’

(ii) The distance to the nearest residential property is around 100metres.

(iii) The site is in a “busy” commercial location, being close to the B & Q store, Muller Road Bus depot, Muller Road itself and a main railway line.

Q2. Please can the Executive Member advise me on how many letters were sent to residents, telling them of the planning application?

A2. The decision was taken not to notify adjoining residential neighbours on the basis that the site was in a largely commercial area around 100m from the nearest residential properties. The notification that was undertaken was to place two site notices (one on Petherton Rd, one on Muller Rd) and a Press Advert. No third party comments were received.

Q3 Were the Noise Pollution Team consulted as would be normal procedure and, if so, what was their advice to planners?

A3 Pollution Control Team were not notified of the application.

Q4 Does the Executive Member recognise the similarity in the planning process failures here with the debacle over the waste transfer station in St. Phillips?

A4 There are some similarities to what I assume you mean is the Abacus facility relocated to St Phillips. The decision to conditionally approve that scheme was made by the DC (South) Committee in December 2004 with the full involvement of Pollution Control and interested parties.

Q5 Given the scale of these planning process failures and the likely financial/reputational costs to Bristol City Council and its council tax payers, what steps have been taken to discipline the senior planning officers responsible?

A5 The circumstances of this case continue to be reviewed by senior managers.

Given the nature of the judgement, and the manner in which it occurred, and the ongoing nature of the

investigation, it is not considered at this stage that 'disciplining' senior planning officers is an appropriate response.

Q6 Is the Executive Member aware that SGS, the Council's ISO 9000 auditors, are conducting an investigation into the Planning Department's fiasco re the Ashley Waste Recycling Centre, but apparently do not intend to brief him on their findings?

A6 I am now aware that a complaint from a member of the public has been received by SGS. I understand that they are not intending to investigate separately, but will do so as part of their bi-annual process audit, programmed for 3rd October 2006. In the context of that complaint, SGS have stated that they will look at the processing of the application in line with our quality management procedures. They will look to ensure that the situation has been analysed and any necessary corrective or preventative action taken. I will be fully informed of the outcome.

Q7 Does the Executive Member agree that as such the findings and recommendations of such an audit should be made available to him and other elected members on request?

A7 I will be fully informed of the outcome and will be pleased to advise other interested members accordingly.

Q8 Will the Executive Member provide his personal assurance that he will insist that SGS provide him with a full and detailed briefing?

A8 I will be fully informed of the outcome. The form of any briefing will depend on whether SGS consider there are still significant outstanding issues to address.

C. COUNCILLOR EDDY TO ASK THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR HOUSING AND ADULT SOCIAL SERVICES

Travellers at Fortfield Road/Asda Fields

- Q1. Please will the Executive Member supply the estimated cost of managing and repairing the damage caused by the travellers who established an illegal encampment at Fortfield Road/Asda Fields in July 2006?**
- Q2. What steps were taken to recoup these costs and/or take effective legal action against these travellers prior to their removal?**
- Q3 Does the Executive Member believe that their conduct at Fortfield Road/Asda Field did anything to dispel the public perception of travellers criticised in the Council's recently produced 'myths and facts' publication (at the cost of £5,000 to the taxpayer)?**
- Q4 Does the Executive Member agree with the Head of Environmental Services (at the Neighbourhood and Housing Services Celebration of Success on 13 July 200, which he and I attended) that the new permanent traveller site at South Liberty Lane will boast accommodation standards “that the Bristol Marriott (Royal) Hotel would die for”?**
- Q5 Does the Executive Member feel that such sentiments are appropriate when almost 20,000 Bristolians languish on the Council's housing list and he is reneging upon the previous all-Party pledge to the City's prefab-dwellers?**

D. COUNCILLOR KENT TO ASK THE CHAIR OF THE AUDIT COMMITTEE.

Organic Waste

Q1. Would he care to explain why a parliamentary question from his colleague, Kerry McCarthy, elicited the response from Minister Ben Bradshaw comparing us unfavorably with Newport on recycling, that they (Newport) have abandoned and are redesigning their service due to large amounts of contamination of organic collections?

A1. I cannot for the life of me see the relevance of these questions to Chair of the Audit Committee. The purview of the committee is to examine the consequences of Bristol City Council's policy in action largely in terms of how council tax is spent and whether the expenditure was good value for money. I share the Lord Mayor's doubts about Council Questions sometimes "not being directed towards the relevant member" and judge that this is a prime example of such a case.

Q2. Does he think that the fact that Newport were attempting to collect organic waste in freely distributed wheelie bins was significant in this failure?

A2. See response to Question 1

Q3. Would he care to comment on the assessment of the processor who said that the failure was directly linked to the wheeled bins and commented that in neighbouring Monmouthshire where they used kitchen caddies there was no problem?

A3. See response to Question 1

Q4. Does he accept that the Bristol system has shown itself to be well designed in that it is heavily bought into, produces good recycling rates and is crucially a good quality product and is therefore superior to that of Newport?

A4. See response to Question 1

Q5. Is Councillor Bees aware that previously Liberal Democrat run council Bolton which had won many awards for recycling has just been taken over by Labour who have reverted from fortnightly residential collections to weekly?

A5. See response to Question 1

Q6. Is he aware that the Liberal Democrat administration there produced an improvement in recycling rates from 14% to over 30%, a similar improvement to Bristol, and that this is now likely to go into reverse?

A6. See response to Question 1

Q7. Does he approve of this move, should it be introduced to Bristol, and if so what would be the additional cost to taxpayers of collections.

A7. See response to Question 1

Q8. What does he estimate the cost to be for an equivalent move in terms of increased waste and reduced recycling?

A8. See response to Question 1

E. COUNCILLOR ROGERS TO ASK THE CHAIR OF AUDIT COMMITTEE

Green Waste Collections

Q1. During the summer of 2003 a 'free' collection of green waste was trailed in selected areas. Can he tell us which areas and why these were selected?

A1. I am concerned that the Council has proceeded with a policy which has not followed their Cabinet decision of 24th November which clearly agreed to a FORTNIGHTLY collection and not a WEEKLY collection of green waste and cardboard which has now been implemented. The

Recommendation to Cabinet below:

"That approval is given to:

Restructuring waste collection and recycling services to deliver to 150,000 households

- *a weekly kitchen waste collection alongside the existing collection of dry recyclables*
- *a fortnightly chargeable green garden waste collection which can also be used to recycle cardboard; and*
- *a fortnightly residual waste collection"*

The Executive Member completely disregarded the decision taken by the Liberal Democrat Cabinet. For an Executive Member to act without proper authority is an issue worthy of investigation.

2. As a result the Green Waste Collection scheme appears to have been rolled out at a cost to the householder of nearly TWICE as much as they should be paying – had the Cabinet decision been followed. Even a cursory glance suggests that if you collect green waste twice as often as planned and need to buy extra collection vehicles the service is likely to cost twice as much. This too warrants investigation.
3. The original Cabinet decision envisaged a separate green waste/cardboard collection service fortnightly which I believe could have been run at a much cheaper cost, because green waste and cardboard need only be composted not treated through an in-vessel facility. Rather than having to cart 7,500 tons of waste 90 miles away through Somerset and Dorset countryside to an “in-vessel” composter – the green waste/cardboard collection could simply have been composted within the city boundaries with fewer vehicles and far fewer diesel- guzzling 90 mile journeys. Such schemes else where are run at no extra cost to council taxpayers, create local jobs and the end product – compost – is sold back to local householders keen on gardening. This, too, bears investigation as the original Cabinet decision provided for the simple composter solution. Why that decision was deviated from – and not brought back to Cabinet as a revised decision – is clearly a case which should be investigated further. Accordingly I am happy to announce today that the Audit Committee will closely examine the financial implications, and the decision-making process, which has led to a wholly different recycling service for green waste and cardboard being implemented.

Q2. When was the decision for this to take place taken and by whom?

A2. See response to question 1

Q3. Who was the responsible Executive Member when the trial took place?

A3. See response to question 1

Q4. How much was collected?

A4. See response to question 1

Q5. What was the cost per ton?

A5. See response to question 1

Q6. Does Councillor Bees remember the waste strategy being approved by Cabinet in November 2005?

A6. See response to question 1

Q7. What aspects of this scheme did he protest about?

A7. See response to question 1

Q8. Can he explain his public comments earlier this year that the 'Liberal Democrats' had kept quiet about the new arrangements?

A8. See response to question 1

Q9. Can you tell us how much organic waste has been collected over the last four weeks under the current scheme?

A9 See response to question 1

Q10 What has been the (a) total cost of this; and (b) cost per ton?

A10. See response to question 1

Q11 What has been the (a) total cost to this authority; and (b) cost per tonne to this authority?

A11 See response to question 1

Q12 Would he wish to comment on the comparison of value for money on the previous free garden waste scheme and the current Liberal Democrats waste and optional garden waste scheme?

A12 See response to question 1

Q13 What would be the total cost to taxpayers of supplying green bins to the 150,000 houses entitled to participate?

A13 See response to question 1

Q14 What would the annual revenue cost of dealing with all of these bins?

A14 See response to question 1

Q15 What is his estimate of the additional organic waste capture and on what is this based

A15 See response to question 1

Q16 What is the marginal cost per ton?

A16 See response to question 1

Q17 Councillor Bees voted to provide free compost bins to all households in the new scheme. What would be the capital cost of this and how much would this cost the average 'Band D' taxpayer?

A17 See response to question 1

F. COUNCILLOR WRIGHT TO ASK CHAIR OF AUDIT COMMITTEE

Plastic Recycling Costs

Q1. Can the Committee Chair disclose the average tonnage per week of plastic recycling by this authority over the three financial years upto April 2005, and the collection cost per ton.

A1. There is no point asking these questions of the Chair of the Audit Committee as this information would be available from the Executive Member for Environment and Community Safety.

But the officers have supplied the table below and in the interests of providing clearer information, I reproduce it:

PLASTIC RECYCLING

Month	Tonnage	No. of sites	Cost per tonne
February	24.230	11 Recresco	£337.99
March	24.905	17 Recresco	£415.65
April	24.690	18 Recresco	£243.89
May	29.290	24 Recresco	£391.20
June	32.000	24 Recresco	£427.90

July	46.873	27 Recresco	£377.21
------	--------	-------------	---------

Note – we now have 32 sites installed around the city.

Disposing of this plastic material to landfill would cost £41 per tonne plus collection costs (these would be minimal if it were collected and mingled with other residual waste and compacted).

You'll see from the above that the cost to landfill is £41 per tonne whereas the average cost for recycling is £365.64 per tonne. But, given that there is huge demand from the citizens of Bristol for plastic bottle recycling, I believe it is a justifiable cost in the interests of encouraging a recycling culture – giving positive reinforcement to Bristolians keen on a greener cleaner city.

Q2. Can he disclose the average tonnage recycled per week other the most recent six months, and the collection cost per ton?

A2. See response to question 1

Q3. What is the estimated cost of adding plastic bottle collections; the estimated tonnage collection; and therefore the cost per ton?

A3. See response to question 1

Q4. What would be the additional yearly cost to 'Band D' Council taxpayers in Bristol of this extra expense, and does he regard this as a worthwhile addition of good value to the Council taxpayer?

A4. See response to question 1

Q5 In the light of these numbers, are he and his party still calling for plastic collection at the doorstep?

A5 See response to question 1

G. COUNCILLOR EMMETT TO ASK THE CHAIR OF THE AUDIT COMMITTEE

Bulky Waste

Q1. Does he recall that the decision to introduce bulky waste charges was taken during the period of the rainbow Cabinet?

A1. See response to Question F1

Q2. What would be the cost of scrapping these charges?

A2. See response to Question F1

Q3. Does he support Party colleagues who are saying that these charges should be scrapped?

A3. See response to Question F1

Q4. If so why was no proposal put in last years budget and will his Party be making a proposal this year?

A4. See response to Question F1

Q5. If no proposal is forthcoming does he feel it is entirely honest for colleagues of his to say in leaflets and letters they are against the charges and want them removed?

A5. See response to Question F1

H. COUNCILLOR HOPKINS TO ASK THE CHAIR OF QUALITY OF LIFE SCRUTINY COMMISSION

Q1 Does he agree with this administrations policy of taking on extra graffiti removers to get rid of tags quicker?

A1 "Cllr Hopkins, in his capacity as Executive Member for the Environment & Community Safety, should be well aware that his questions fall within the purview of his

own brief and not that of the Chairman of the Quality of Life Scrutiny Commission, which scrutinises Adult Social Care, Housing and Culture & Leisure Services."

Q2 Does he agree with this administrations policy of prosecution for taggers traced?

A2 See response to question 1

Q3 Does he support our policy of working with residents to solve problems such as in Happy Lane St Werburghs?

A3 See response to question 1

Q4 Does he support our use of community payback schemes to help remove graffiti?

A4 See response to question 1

Q5 Does he agree with the views of his member Councillor Murphy that this Council should spend taxpayers money on removing the Banksy artwork from the side of a building near this Council House?

A5 See response to question 1.

Q6 Does he agree with the remark from his colleague that the 93% of people who voted for its retention in a local BBC TV poll and the 93% who voted on line at Bristol were manufactured figures that meant nothing?

A6 See response to question 1.

Q7 Does he believe that Councillor Murphy belongs in the new 'hug a hoody' Conservatives or is he just out of touch with Bristol residents views?

A7 See response to question 1

I. COUNCILLOR ROGERS TO ASK THE CHAIR OF QUALITY OF LIFE SCRUTINY COMMISSION

Code of Conduct/Standards Committee

Q1. Why does the Council have a Code of Conduct?

A1 All Members of Council must abide by the national Code of Local Government Conduct and, of course, by the law of the realm. It is a grave scandal that not all of Cllr Roger's Liberal Democrat colleagues, both past and present, feel so constrained and I look forward to addressing this behaviour in the course of any supplementary questions.

Q2. As Chair of Quality of Life Commission, do you value the Code of Conduct?

A2 See response to question 1

Q3. Do you value the Standards Committee?

A3 See response to question 1

Q4. Do you value the Law in this country?

A4 See response to question 1

Q5. Can you confirm that you have persistently failed to turn up to meetings of the Standards Committee, that the Standards Committee have asked that you attend in your role as Conservative Group Leader?

A5 See response to question 1

Q6. Do you consider the Standards Committee to be a "joke"?

A6 See response to question 1

Q7. Do you consider that your attitude and behaviour conflicts with your proper responsibilities as a Commission Chair?

A7 See response to question 1

J. COUNCILLOR KENT TO ASK THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

Medium Term Financial Plan - Recycling

Q1. Can the Executive Member please tell us what plans had been put into the 'Medium Term Financial Plan' by the previous administration to cover the cost of environmental fines under landfill tax and what fines did we face?

A1 The MTFP for 2005 – 2008 included growth of £0.5M per annum to meet the cost of annual increases in landfill tax. However, the Council has a legal obligation to meet its annual landfill allowances, which stipulate the maximum permitted amount of biodegradable municipal waste it can landfill from 2005/06 onwards. At the same time the Council needs to improve its recycling/composting performance to 27% (the Government's target for Bristol for 2007/08).

If the Council does not achieve the recycling/composting target, or exceeds the maximum permitted amount of biodegradable municipal waste, fines could be applied by Government.

Assessments based on performance as at November 2005 indicated that by 2007/08 the Council would be in a position of having to either buy additional allowances under the Landfill Allowance Trading Scheme, or paying the anticipated £150 per tonne fine. The potential fines were £140M up to 2020.

The N&HS MTFP now includes growth of £1M per annum to be invested in waste management. This 2006/07, this is funding the introduction of organic collections, additional opening hours of household waste recycling centres, expansion of plastic recycling banks and the compact power development project.

These measures are expected to mitigate the impact of LATS fines in the medium term, until 2010/11. The estimate of total potential fines to 2020 has fallen to £49m if no further action is taken. This is clearly still a substantial figure, so further action will be needed. Work is being undertaken with the neighbouring unitary authorities to develop arrangements for the longer term.

Q2. What is the latest estimate of these penalties that we face and what has been the cost of achieving this charge?

A2. Penalties

DEFRA has indicated that fines of £150 per tonne will be applied should a Council exceed their allowances under LATS.

However a more likely scenario is that the Council would purchase additional allowances under the LATS scheme. Trading so far has been at around £20 per tonne.

Original estimates on the impact of the EU landfill directive predicted that Bristol, if continued with existing waste operation services would face potential fines totalling £140M to 2020.

Current estimates, on the new organic collection and disposal methods indicate that the total potential fines are now £49M to 2020.

Cost of the change

The cost of this change has been an additional £1M per annum on the current waste management base budget. Please see question 1 for details of what services have been increased / developed to mitigate the potential LATS fines.

Q3. What would be the total cost and cost to the average 'Band D' taxpayer of:

- (a) implementing the 'free' green bin scheme;**
- (b) free composter;**
- (c) Doorstep plastic collection;**
- (d) returning to weekly residual bin collection;**
- (e) scrapping charges for bulky waste collections proposed or 'campaigned for' by the opposition.**

A3. (a) Providing a garden waste (including cardboard) collection service to all customers receiving the new services:

	£000
Provision of 77,500 wheeled bins at £16.50 each (assuming a participation of 50%) spread over five years as per kitchen waste bins	255
Delivery of 77,500 wheeled bins	40
Collection from 77,500 properties (1200 properties per vehicle per day, £110K per vehicle) per annum	1,421
Transport and disposal of garden waste by in-vessel composting at £62 per tonne for 11505 tonnes (assuming 65% capture based on black box, and 04/05 overall tonnage of 104122)	713
Less avoided landfill disposal charges at £41 per tonne for 11505 tonnes	(471)
Net Cost per annum for five years	1,958

This doesn't take in to account any avoided fines or costs under the LATS arrangement, nor any resulting increase in overall municipal waste collected (due to collecting garden waste that was previously composted at home).

Annual cost for average band D taxpayer: £16

- (b) Compost bins currently cost £14 each. To provide all households on the new service with a compost bin, given the same assumptions above (50% takeup), would cost **£1,125K**. This includes delivery costs of approximately £40K, and does not allow for any price reduction which may well apply for such a large purchase.

Cost for average band D taxpayer: £9.

- (c) To collect plastic from the kerb using current methodology has been costed at about £2M.

Annual cost for average band D taxpayer: £16

- (d) In the short term, reverting to weekly residual bin collections whilst retaining the rest of the new services would require an additional 10-12 refuse compactor vehicles and crew. These cost £110K each, giving a total additional cost of between £1,110K - £1,320K.

This does not allow for any impact on participation in the new services or overall waste reduction – inevitably Council would be sending more waste to landfill, which would both increase costs for landfill disposal charges, and in the long term would expose Council to further fines or costs under the LATS allowance system.

Annual cost for average band D taxpayer: £9 - £11

- (e) The budget for bulky waste collections is currently £100K per annum. Prior to the charges being introduced in late 2004, the budget was £375K and predicted to be overspent by at least £175K (£550K in total). This would mean at least an additional £450K would be required, and that does not allow for any growth in costs or in demand for the service.

Annual cost for average band D taxpayer: at least £4

Q4. Having not taken action and carried on at the previous 12% recycling rate inherited?

A4. See answers above.

Q5. How would the taxpayer be affected in forthcoming years?

A5. The 12% recycling rate was before the 'same day' changes were introduced. This achieved a total 10,000 tonnes per annum diversion from landfill, which would add a further £10M to total fines to 2020 (£150M total).

K. COUNCILLOR EMMETT TO ASK THE CHAIR OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Timing of Meetings

Q1. As a group of Councillors do we want to be as diverse as possible?

A1 Yes

Q2. Does this include having people who are in full-time employment, or studying?

A2 Yes; I work full time, as do many other councillors

Q3. Are members of the public encouraged to attend scrutiny commissions?

A3 The Scrutiny Commissions are open to the public. Attendance varies depending on the topic(s) being debated.

Q4. Would it make sense for all scrutiny commissions to take place at a time when as many residents as possible can attend?

A4 Yes, but residents will be freely available at different times, depending on personal commitments

Q5. What proportion of all scrutiny commission meetings in 2006-7 are scheduled to commence (a) between 9.00 a.m. and 5.00 p.m. and (b) after 5.00 p.m.

A5

Q6. Why do the vast majority of scrutiny commissions take place during the daytime?

A6 The times of SC meetings are determined by the Scrutiny Commission members

Q7. Doesn't this dramatically discourage residents in full time employment from being able to attend and participate?

A7 I would envisage that such factors are taken into account when individual Scrutiny Commissions determine their meeting dates and times.

Q8. Doesn't it also make it difficult for councillors in full time employment to attend, as they can only take so many days off work to perform their public duties?

A8 Members know that there will be a time commitment when standing for Council and this must be taken into account when they are allocated commission or committee posts through the Group Whips.

Q9. Do you therefore think that the practice of day time meetings should continue across all scrutiny commissions, or should OSM ensure a balance of at least 50%, if not all, scrutiny commissions are held in the evening?

A9 "OSM itself has a mixture of start times - 2.00pm, 3.30pm and 5.30pm. However, it is for each individual commission to determine when and at which time they wish to meet, taking into account the personal availability of their own members and co-optees."

Q10. What action do you propose to take to achieve a fair balance between morning, afternoon and evening meetings?

A10 "In my opening remarks at the first OSM meeting, I gave a clear steer that Scrutiny Commissions should take into account the views and personal availability of Members and the public when determining their

programme of meetings."

L. COUNCILLOR BOLTON TO ASK THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT AND DEVELOPMENT CONTROL

South Bristol Ring Road

Q1. In view of the fact that the very little detail of the South Bristol Ring Road was given in the Joint Local Transport Plan and that the Council had no real option but to accept the JLTP in its entirety, does the Executive member have plans to discuss the South Bristol Ring Road as a separate agenda item in Full Council?

A1 Cabinet and then Full Council have each twice in a little over a year approved the principle of preparing and submitting bids to government to fund the ring road as part of a wider package of measures to address transport issues throughout the Greater Bristol area. These meetings were held to approve the Provisional Joint Local Transport Plan in July 2005 and the Final Plan in March this year; similar approvals were obtained from Council meetings held at the same time in the three surrounding unitary authorities. As with all such reports, opportunities for alterations existed. None were proposed. Further reports at appropriate times will of course be brought forward to Cabinet as necessary.

Q2. Will the costs of preparing a bid for government funding for a South Bristol Ring Road require a budget commitment from the West of England councils, and Bristol in particular?

A2 Yes

Q3. If so, have any estimates been made of what that budget would be?

A3 Estimates of the total cost of preparation of a bid or bids for the first phases of the scheme are being prepared at present. Costs would initially be shared primarily between Bristol and North Somerset Councils. Some of this investment is recoverable from government once full approval for the scheme is obtained.

Q4 Will you undertake to give individual notice to those Members who express an interest, when any such budget allocation is to be made?

A4 Members will be informed through the usual channels as part of the budget preparation process.

M. COUNCILLOR GOLLOP TO ASK THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR SUSTAINABLE ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY SAFETY

Recycling

Q1 Please can you tell me the weekly tonnages sent for composting since the new recycling scheme started?

A1 Week commencing:

5 th June	61.62
12 th June	83.54
19 th June	82.66
26 th June	86.24
3 rd July	79.38
10 th July	80.42
17 th July	82.14
24 th July	72.40
31 st July	73.72
7 th August	360.54
14 th August	400.66
21 st August	414.80

Q2 What are the weekly projected tonnages in the Council budget for the same period?

A2 The financial models for the new services was based on 80 tonnes of organic waste being collected each day, or 400 tonnes per week.

Q3 What is the cost per ton of this process?

A3 The financial model, based on a full year of the new services, indicates an additional overall cost of £160k. If 400 tonnes is collected per day as predicted, this is an additional cost of £8 per tonne. This does not include any assumptions regarding costs or income from LATS.

There is not yet have enough information to give an actual cost per tonne. The financial model will be reworked following the first full month of the new services across the city, as it is based on a number of assumptions (such as 30,000 households taking up the chargeable garden waste collection service, and collecting minimum amounts of organic waste and recycling).

Q4 What was the budget cost per ton?

A4 See answer to question 3 above

Q5 How many return journeys per week are required to process the current tonnage?

A5 Currently two or three trips per day are made, equating to 14 – 21 one-way trips per week (the vehicles are used for other purposes on their return to Bristol).

Q6 What is the level of CO2 emissions per journey?

A6 230.48 kg of CO2 per one-way journey.

This is dwarfed by the environmental saving made from composting the organic waste, rather than dumping it in

landfill.

N. COUNCILLOR KENT TO ASK THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR SUSTAINABLE ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY SAFETY

Green Waste Collection

Q1. Is Councillor Hopkins aware that several Labour Councils charge for the collection of green waste?

A1 I am aware that many Labour Councils offer no green waste collection service at all as of course was the case in Bristol under Labour. A significant percentage of those that do, charge, including that of the Environment Minister, David Milliband.

Q2. Is the Councillor aware that we are the only Council to provide a weekly green waste collection in the former Avon area?

A2 Yes and we are certainly the only one to provide a kitchen waste service which especially in urban areas is a larger and more vital task.

Q3. Is Councillor Hopkins aware that Labour Councillors have made false claims in that green waste recycling is free in Bath and Nailsea? In fact residents in Bath are charged for a fortnightly collection service and residents in the town centre of Nailsea have no green waste collection service at all?

A3 I am aware that North Somerset Council provided a garden waste sack collection service over only part of their area and this did not include many urban areas including most of Nailsea. I also understand that there have been some difficulties in supplying resident's demands.

I am aware that the Bath scheme is a charged for scheme. Residents are charged a fee per sack,

which includes cost of sack and disposal.

We will as planned be adding this sack option to the range of services offered to residents within weeks. This means that those with large gardens with significant volumes of waste over a period will be best served by the green bin service and those with smaller amounts can opt for the sack service. Residents can of course still take their garden waste to recycling centres which was the only option offered by the previous administration.

In giving information about the service provided by other councils in the former Avon area I of course intend no criticism of their service. In fact it is fair to say that until we took over the administration they were all far in advance of Bristol. I am glad to say that Bristol is now leading the way and do not be surprised if neighbouring councils start to copy our system.

Q4. Will Councillor Hopkins urge the Labour Councillors to publish a retraction of the false information that they have sent to Bristol households?

A4 It should hardly come as a surprise to Councillor Kent that his Labour opponents put out misleading information. It is clear on this subject that having failed for years to grasp the nettle and take effective action on waste and recycling they along with the Tory party are left with little alternative to their rather pathetic tactics of attempting to spread confusion.

The excellent response of the Bristol public to our schemes shows how badly Labour has underestimated Bristol residents. Labour seem to judge everybody by their own low standards. I urge Councillor Kent not to descend to their level.

O. COUNCILLOR O'DONNELL TO ASK THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

Nuclear Waste

Q1: How many trains travel through my ward (Temple Meads, Lawrence Hill railway and Stapleton Road railway stations) carrying nuclear waste every week?

A1 Direct Rail Services LTD are the transporters of Nuclear Waste in the UK. For reasons of safety and security, they will not disclose the numbers of trains carrying nuclear waste that pass through the council area and we cannot obtain them. However, from information obtained from Greenpeace it is believed that up to two trains pass through Bristol a week, either on Mondays, Tuesdays or Thursdays.

Q2: How long are these trains expected to keep running through this densely populated area?

A2 These trains carry nuclear waste from Hinckley A and Hinckley B, in Somerset on route to Crewe. Although Hinckley A is almost finally decommissioned, Hinckley B has a longer life and has yet to start decommissioning. It is therefore believed that the transportation of the waste will continue until at least 2012. An exact date and whether the transportation routes will remain the same is not information that can be obtained.

Q3: If there was an accident or terrorist attack what are the evacuation plans?

A3 Any incident arising from an accident or terrorist attack would be co-ordinated by the Avon and Somerset Police, with support from Avon Fire and Rescue Service, Great Western Ambulance NHS Trust and other Category 1 and 2 responders, Any evacuation if required would be co-ordinated by this multi-agency group.

The Council has a role in providing support in any evacuation. Including transportation, the opening of evacuation and rest centres, welfare support and advice to those evacuated with additional emphasis

being placed in support of the vulnerable in the community.

Response plans to deal with persons evacuated have been tested in recent months. A recent example being the evacuation of elderly residents from the council run Baynton House earlier this year. In the Broadmead Bomb incident, plans were quickly put into place for the evacuation of up 11,000 people.

In addition the Emergency services regularly train under the RADSAFE programme to cope with any accident involving nuclear material

Q4: After what period of time would residents be allowed back into their homes?

A4 Each emergency brings its own set of circumstances. It is not possible to determine a set period of time before any person evacuated would be allowed back.

Following any such Incident, a Health Advisory Team (HAT) would be formed comprising of members from the Health service, Environment office, Emergency services and Local Authority (and others depending on the circumstances), who would determine when it would be safe for people to return to their Homes, this is a generic approach and applies whether or not the waste material is hazardous or otherwise

Q5: As the Government are planning even more nuclear power generation at the existing Nuclear power stations, do you know what these will mean to the train frequency and any safety plans?

A5 The Governments review on the energy issue has yet to be completed and any planned increase in Nuclear Installations that would directly or indirectly affect Bristol have yet to be disclosed.

Q6: Do you share my concern over the transportation of nuclear waste through Bristol?

A6 Yes. Any release of radioactivity may have serious consequences for our community. It is therefore important that risk assessments, emergency preparedness, monitoring and statutory inspections are vigorously maintained. Furthermore I believe the Government should urgently undertake an assessment of how the current risk can be reduced through measures such as increased trackside security and the use of routes that do not pass through population centres such as in Bristol.

My Party rejects the need for new generation of nuclear power stations, which would create more waste. In a non-nuclear future, there would be no dangerous waste to transport in the first place.

P. COUNCILLOR EDDY TO ASK THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

Council Administration

Q1. I note from the Liberal Democrat written questions submitted to this Council meeting that your Members are now aping the sycophantic behaviour of Tony Blair's back-bench lackeys. What other New Labour practices are you proposing to impose on your colleagues to mask the plain inadequacies of this Liberal Democrat Administration?

A1 Given the record of Labour in Bristol, I have no intend of following their example.

Q2. I am sure that Members of Council will have noticed that Liberal Democrat back-benchers, when not fawning over their own Executive Members, are actively seeking the advice and wisdom of Opposition Scrutiny Chairmen. Does this reflect the complete dearth of knowledge and ideas within the present Administration or is it an early indication that you are proposing to throw in the towel and entrust the City to more competent hands?

A2 It is neither. I am surprised that you do not think that Scrutiny Chairs should be held to account.

Q. COUNCILLOR FOX TO ASK THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR SUSTAINABLE ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY SAFETY

Green Bins and Chip Monitoring

Q1. Was the Executive Member aware of the scope of the 'chip 'n' bin' technology currently being introduced into the new green waste bins?

A1 I personally requested that chips be put into the green bins that we are supplying to residents. This enables us to protect their property.

Q2. Can the Executive Member confirm whether or not these householders were informed of the potential wider use of these monitoring chips?

A2 The wording of this question is prejudicial. These are not monitoring chips.

Q3. Does the Executive Member agree with me that any non-disclosure of such a use represents a failure to be open and honest with Bristol householders?

A3 We are protecting resident's property. I am afraid that the failure to be honest with Bristol householders rests with his own party and his friends in the Labour group.

Q4. Can the Executive Member confirm whether the City Council has any plans to catalogue the types of waste deposited in the non-recyclable household refuse bins?

A4 We have been monitoring the content of bins for several years. This is done by physical examination of sample of bins and nothing to do with the chips.

Councillor Fox unfortunately is only confirming his complete ignorance of the subject by this question. Without good knowledge of the make up of the waste

stream effective systems and plans cannot be put into place.

I can only assume that complete ignorance displayed here is one of the explanations for the complete failure of his own local party leader to progress recycling and waste issues for the 18 months he was in charge locally. I cannot imagine that Blue/Green Dave will be impressed.

R. COUNCILLOR EDDY TO ASK THE DEPUTY LEADER AND EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR CENTRAL SERVICES AND CUSTOMER EXCELLENCE

Older People

Q1. Can the Executive Member confirm this Lib Dem Administration's commitment to promote the interests of older people?

A1 Yes, I can re-affirm that commitment.

Q2. Is the Executive Member aware that Bristol City Council is the only unitary authority within the former Avon area which insists upon compulsorily retiring polling clerks at the age of 70?

A2 This is not the case, the position in the three neighbouring unitary authorities is as follows:

Bath & North East Somerset

Have no upper age limit and make no health checks on staff employed at elections.

North Somerset

No one employed over the age of 70.

South Gloucestershire

New policy to be implemented for May 2007 local elections. Previous policy had an upper age limit of 75 years. This is now being reduced to 70.

Under current HR policies Bristol City Council could employ polling clerks older than 70 under the 'hard to fill posts' criteria, but I am aware of no request from Legal and Democratic Services to do so.

Q3. Does the Executive Member not agree with me that the loss of such staff (who remain fit and healthy) represents a waste of valuable experience and expertise and could well be challenged under new anti-age discrimination legislation?

A3 The Human Resources Committee on 14th September 2006 will be considering age discrimination issues. A change in the maximum retirement age for Bristol City Council employees to 75 is one of the recommendations to be discussed. If approved the revised policy would apply from 1st October 2006, and polling clerks would of course be included in any such change.

S. COUNCILLOR ALEXANDER TO ASK THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR SUSTAINABLE ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY SAFETY

Recycling & Rubbish Collection

Q1. Does the Executive Member share my concern that since the introduction of the new collection & recycling rotas has left many parts of the city looking like a third world shanty town?

A1 I must recommend to Councillor Alexander that she actually visit a third world shantytown. Perhaps after that she might not come up with quite such ridiculous questions. The vast majority of Bristol residents have adapted brilliantly to the new system as they did last year when we brought in improvements. This has resulted in Bristol becoming a national leader instead of continuing with the embarrassingly poor performance of the past under Labour administrations and when the waste management was neglected by Councillor Eddy.

A small number of residents have failed to adapt, but of course the problems were always there and a small

number of people have always acted irresponsibly. I am disappointed but not unfortunately surprised that Conservative and Labour members attempt to give this poor and anti social behaviour an alibi by attempting to blame the new recycling service.

In fact we are now rapidly expanding the enforcement and education service under waste management and are using a joined up approach to tackling the problem. Early results from the integrated environment improvement team operating in Stapleton Road area have confirmed that for years businesses have been breaking the law by dumping the black rubbish sacks in surrounding streets. They are now signing up to waste contracts, which are rapidly reducing the problem. In addition problem properties are being individually visited and offered the option of prosecution or starting to behave in an acceptable manner. We are increasing the inspection of fly tipped rubbish and prosecutions will follow. We are also increasing the use of CCTV for hot spots.

I notice that Councillor Alexander, and indeed all of her conservative colleagues failed to respond to the invitation from waste officers to identify any problem areas and properties. There will shortly be a communication going to all households to thank them for their co-operation, confirm results and asking residents to identify any problems.

I realise that the complete failure of her local leader to take any action while he was in charge must be severe source of embarrassment, but I trust now she will start to take a rather more responsible attitude and actively back our effective action rather than trying to excuse bad behaviour.

Q2. Can the Executive Member advise me on what action is being taken to deal with the rubbish problems associated with properties with multiple occupants?

A2 In addition to the measures outlined in the previous answer we are with our integrated approach to enforcement including the full use of new powers or licensing of HMOs.

Q3. Can the Executive Member confirm whether or not there has been an increase in fly-tipping as a result of the new waste collection regime?

A3 As with last years charges there was temporary 1 – 2 weeks increase in recording fly tipping as dumping of black bags in streets was previously not recorded as fly tipping and now is. As a result of better enforcement we are now not only recording incidents and removing the problem, but also taking effective action to prevent the problem reoccurring. This applies to both commercial and 'domestic' dumping.

Q4. What additional budget has been set aside to deal with this problem?

A4 As a result of the excellent recycling results we have freed up a significant amount of resources that otherwise have been spent on environmental fines to spend on improving enforcement and street cleaning. We are now tackling long neglected problems.

T. COUNCILLOR LEWIS TO ASK THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR HEALTH, PROMOTION, YOUNG PEOPLE & LEISURE

New South Bristol Hospital

Q1. Can the Executive Member advise me as to what effects the change of status (to a Independent Sector Treatment Centre) will have on the new South Bristol Hospital in Hengrove?

A1 The announcement of an Independent Sector Treatment Centre (ISTC) at Hengrove does not effect the size, scale or timing of the hospital overall The plans for South Bristol Community Hospital have always envisaged that several different organisations

would run services at the hospital including the PCT, UBHT, Social Services and where relevant independent sector partners.

As has always been envisaged and stated the building will be built by LIFTCo and leased by the PCT. The PCT can then sub-lease areas to the operators of clinical services as required. The announcement of the ISTC only relates to the day surgery with related outpatients and some of the diagnostic testing that will be done at the hospital.

The hospital will also still include rehab beds, a walk-in minor injury unit and the majority of the outpatients. These services are not part of the ISTC contract and the size and scale of these services (e.g. number of beds) is not affected by the decision to include and IS provider. All of the services including the day surgery will be exclusively for NHS patients and funded by NHS money and there is no question of the hospital or its services (including the day surgery) being required to treat private patients.

By linking the day surgery at the new hospital with this bigger contract for surgical services in Avon, Gloucestershire and Wiltshire which is placed by the Secretary of State the PCT benefits from an economy of scale and this helps to secure the rest of South Bristol Hospital Development and the local services that this will bring.

Q2. Will this change the fundamental character of treatment provision at the hospital as originally conceived?

A2 No there is no change to the character or range of treatments to be offered relative to that originally conceived.

Q3. Can the Executive Member confirm exactly what surgical procedures will now be carried out at this hospital in the light of this development?

A3 A full list of adult day surgical procedures as originally envisaged.

Please note. These questions refer to the Community Hospital to be built on Hengrove Park which is and will remain the responsibility of the PCT. As the councillor will be aware I am the Executive Member for Leisure, Young People and Health Promotion. As such I am responsible for matters within that portfolio which the **Council** is responsible for. As a matter of courtesy, the Director of Adult Social Services has assisted me in answering these questions as far as she is able. But Councillor Lewis will appreciate that I really cannot answer any supplementary questions which fall within the responsibility of the PCT rather than the Council. If she has further questions, she might like to raise them at the next meeting of the Health Scrutiny Commission – with permission of the Chair – where the PCT is represented.

U. COUNCILLOR BOLTON TO ASK THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

Nuclear Issues

Q1. Does the Executive share Green Party concerns over the recent comments made by the prime minister, apparently supporting a new generation of nuclear power stations and also the apparent support given by the Labour government to a new generation of nuclear power stations (in its energy review)?

A1 See answer 0 / A4

Q2. Does the Executive share Green party concerns over remarks made by prime-minister-in-waiting Brown over upgrading Britain's nuclear weapons system, at a cost of billions to the tax payer?

A2 See answer 0 / A4

Q3. Is the Executive aware that had the Romans had nuclear power, we would be dealing with its waste?

A3 Yes – my Party has a set of e-postcards that illustrate how nuclear waste remains for around 100,000 years – back to when man lived in caves. I will try and send you one.

Q4. Will the Executive investigate the possibility of Bristol City Council joining the association of Nuclear Free Local Authorities?

A4 This is something I am already looking into and appreciate your expression of support.

V. COUNCILLOR HAMMOND TO ASK THE DEPUTY LEADER AND EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR CENTRAL SERVICES AND CUSTOMER EXCELLENCE

Electoral Issues

Q1. Would you agree with me that encouraging citizens to register as electors is an essential first step to engagement in the democratic process?

A1 Yes

Q2. Would you agree that the sending of confirmatory letters in January this year to all households, where elections were due to take place in May, was a contributory factor, increasing turnout from 34% in 2003 (the last local-only elections) to 39% this year?

A2 This is not a valid comparison. The nature of the electoral cycle in Bristol means that not all the same wards were up for election in 2003 and 2006. However, a valid comparison can be made in 12 wards which did have elections in both years and this is shown below:

Ward	t/o % 2003	t/o % 2006	Comparison
Bedminster	36.84%	37.43%	0.59%
Bishopsworth	39.77%	34.41%	-5.36%
Brislington East	33.92%	37.48%	3.56%
Brislington West	35.79%	34.05%	-1.74%
Filwood	29.50%	31.73%	2.23%
Hartcliffe	29.24%	34.62%	5.38%
Hengrove	35.26%	34.19%	-1.07%
Knowle	39.78%	37.81%	-1.97%
Southville	39.58%	43.19%	3.61%
Stockwood	41.09%	37.39%	-3.70%
Whitchurch Park	33.31%	39.97%	6.66%
Windmill Hill	38.56%	40.65%	2.09%
	432.64%	442.92%	
Average turnout in 12 wards	36.05%	36.91%	0.86%

Source: Bristol City Council Web Site

As can be seen, the average turnout in the wards which had elections in both years increased by under 1%, but there were significant variations in particular wards.

The sending of confirmatory letters may have had a very marginal effect on increasing turnout, but the turnout figures suggest that local ward factors were of far greater significance.

- Q3. Do you agree therefore, that reducing the 2006/7 budget for electoral services by £39,000, leading to there being no money allocated for:-**
- a) carrying out the annual register update in January 2007**
 - b) publicity**
 - c) a free phone telephone number represents a demonstrable contempt for the democratic process?**

A3 No I do not.

Whilst it is true that the City Council itself no longer takes out press and other advertising, the Electoral Commission ran an extensive publicity campaign in the run up to the 2006 elections. To have run a separate advertising campaign would have been an unnecessary duplication of effort and not cost effective for the City

Council.

The new '0870' number supplied by the Electoral Commission is charged at local call rate.

- Q4. Given the provisions of the new Electoral Administration Act, please indicate the costs of**
- a) carrying out the door to door canvas, where electors fail to return their registration form sent out in early autumn (visiting an estimated 40,000 properties who fail to return their registration forms each year)?**
 - b) providing the 24hr, 7 day free phone service**
 - c) re-instating the publicity carried out previously, e.g banners on Council buildings, posters displayed on buses and bus shelters, etc.**

A4 a) The Council is recruiting approximately 150 canvassers to carry out door to door calls to those properties where no form is returned. We will be paying £1 for each successful visit or 50 pence where the canvasser has to post the form through the letterbox after two unsuccessful visits. Based on last years figures we anticipate having to call on approximately 45,000 properties. Therefore, if that figure was correct the cost would be anything between £22,500 and £45,000. This cost is being met by Central Government as it was on their instruction that all Local Authorities have to go back to personal canvassing.

b) The 24 hour 7 day freephone service is provided by a company called Electoral Reform Services. The initial set up cost was £300 (£250 in subsequent years) and calls are charged on a sliding scale as follows:

1 - 20,000 calls	25 pence each
20,001 - 40,000 calls	22 pence each
40,001 - 60,000 calls	20 pence each
60,000+ calls	16 pence each

These call costs are offset against the savings made from pre paid second class return envelopes not being used (23 pence).

17,310 households registered via the freephone service in the first 6 days of its operation

We don't expect to save much money (if any) but it shouldn't prove any more expensive than an all postal reply service.

c) These are the actual publicity costs incurred last year:

	£
Bus advertising	4,039
Council House banner	1,786
Artwork for Broadmead screen	250
Posters for libraries	396
Poster for Adshel sites	720
BEP statutory notice	225

Q5. How will this be funded?

A5 As you will have seen from the previous answers, the personal canvass is to be funded by Central Government, the freephone number will be funded by Royal Mail postage savings and the publicity carried out previously won't be funded by anything because it isn't being done.

W. COUNCILLOR SALTER TO ASK THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR HEALTH PROMOTION, YOUNG PEOPLE & LEISURE

Libraries

Q1. Would the Executive Member confirm that the future of the Central Library in Deanery Road is secure?

A1 Yes.

Q2. Could he explain why, as the Exec Member responsible for Libraries, he took no part in the publicity surrounding the 100th anniversary celebrations of the Central Library?

A2 This is not correct. Although I was unable to attend some of the celebrations due to prior commitments, I was present at the reception for the launch of Anthony Beeson's excellent book on the Central Library, which was very much a part of the 100th anniversary celebrations. I was also quoted in the press and gave radio interviews expressing my enthusiasm for the Central Library building.

With respect, I really do not think you should make incorrect – and rather personal – allegations without checking your facts first.

Q3. As announcements about improvements to other libraries have been made - suggesting that the planned review of Library services has been completed – why has there been no information about the Central Library following this review?

A3 Considerable renovations have been made to the Central Library in the recent past as you yourself have been quick to point out. It was therefore not deemed appropriate for any further funding to be committed to it under the current programme when so many of our other library buildings need work after years of neglect by earlier Labour administrations.

The review you refer to has not yet been completed. The Select Committee has yet to report.

Q4. In spite of the “gagging order” issued to staff at the end of July – rumors are still rife that the Central Library will be moved from Deanery Road to the new Broadmead Shopping centre – is this under consideration?

A4 I have no idea what you mean by a 'gagging order.' The Director of Culture and Leisure reminded departmental employees of their obligations under the Code of Conduct following a number of incidents, particularly the dissemination of internal emails without permission.

I am not aware of any rumors with regard to the moving of the Central Library, which is not being considered by the Liberal Democrat administration.

X. COUNCILLOR BRAIN TO ASK THE DEPUTY LEADER AND EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR CENTRAL SERVICES AND CUSTOMER EXCELLENCE

Question withdrawn.

Y. COUNCILLOR HAMMOND TO ASK THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR SUSTAINABLE ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY SAFETY

New Refuse Collection Arrangements

Q1. Can you confirm that certain Bristol households, such as Houses in Multiple Occupation, flats, etc are currently excluded from the revised 'city-wide' refuse and recycling arrangements launched at the beginning of August.

A1 I note with interest that Councillor Hammond has now recognised the positive public reaction to the new recycling services and the desire of all residents to do their bit. It is a pity that when they had their chance his own administration failed so miserably to provide a service.

The new service has been the most successful in any British city and it is our intention to expand the service to as many properties as is practical as quickly as resources allow. We will not be, over the next few years, penalised by the LATS scheme and we will in fact be net sellers of landfill permits. As well as the resources that this generates I am glad to announce that we have been approached by W. R. A. P to progress organic collections

in flats. This will carry with it significant funding so that Bristol residents will get improved service without taxpayers bearing the full cost.

This is systematic of the change in attitudes towards Bristol City Council. We are now regarded as innovative, progressive, capable and an organisation that is good to do business with.

I hope that Councillor Hammond will give full backing to this further expansion of service, but unfortunately past experience suggests that another bout of whinging can be expected. Congratulations to the Officers in the department doing such an excellent job would be appropriate but these seem to be alien to his nature.

Q2. Can you please identify totals per ward for such properties?

A2 See answer 1.

Q3. Can you confirm that all of these properties are to be visited and assessed for including in the new recycling scheme?

A3 See answer 1.

Q4. Could you give costings for this exercise in:
a. Officer time and administration
b. Preparing plans/designs for any new facilities required

A4 See answer 1.

Q5. What funding for the above is:
a. Currently contained in the 2006/7 Budget
b. Proposed for future years, and

A5 See answer 1.

Q6. What additional unbudgeted funding will be required this year and next?

A6 See answer 1.

Q7. What sources of funding do you propose?

A7 See answer 1.

Q8. What additional costs will be necessary to expand the Service in terms of:

- a. Vehicles
- b. Personnel
- c. Fuel and consumables
- d. Other costs

A8 See answer 1.

Q9. And how will this be financed?

A9 See answer 1.

Q10. When will these properties receive the same services that the remainder of Bristol receives?

A10 See answer 1.

Z. COUNCILLOR T COOK TO ASK THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR CHILDREN

Child Protection & Pornography

Q1. Can you confirm that current Liberal Democrat policy nationally is to permit 16 year olds to visit sex shops and see explicit pornography? (*Liberal Democrat Spring conference – Southport 2004*)

A1 Yes

Q2. Do you, and the rest of your Liberal Democrat Cabinet colleagues support this policy?

A2 Not personally, no. As for the rest of the Cabinet you'd have to ask them.

Q3. Or do you support Steve Webb, Liberal Democrat MP in opposing this move.

A3 Unlike the Labour party, Liberal Democrats are welcome to have their own point of view on matters.

Q4. How do you views support your position as the politician in Bristol charged with protecting children and young people in and out of education from pornography and other forms of abuse?

A4 I am unsure what views you refer to. I am totally committed to the safety and well being of all children and young people in this authority.

Q5. Has your department concluded its investigation into how the children and Young People Service bulletin board had links to child pornography web sites. (Western Daily Press 19 June 2006)

A5 There were no links on the Children and Young People Service bulletin board to child pornography web sites.

The Council concluded its investigation in days and I then wrote on 20 June 2006 to the MP who had brought the matter to our attention.

For the information of Members who may not be familiar with this:-

We were alerted on 15 June 2006 that a Bristol City Council website appeared to contain links to pornographic material. The Message or Bulletin Board had been in existence for some 3 years and was used by a wide range of people, including head teachers, teachers and others interested in educational matters to share experience and good practice in matters to do with Information Technology in schools. The Message Board was immediately closed down since when further access to it has not been possible.

Anyone who wanted to become a "member" of the message board, with the ability to contribute text had to register their details and their interests. Only those with a clear local

educational interest were progressed from “registration” to “membership”.

Of the 150 or so who registered their details, 10 included in their details innocuous-looking details which turned out to be links to pornographic sites; but none of these 10 were approved to become “members”, with the result that they were not able to contribute to any Message Board discussions, or circulate any offensive material.

I can confirm that there was no pornography or other such questionable material on this Bristol City Council site; and that none of those whose proposals for membership included links to sites that turned out to be offensive, were approved for membership.

Q6. Have your officers identified who was responsible for allowing this to happen.

A6 The city Council has a national reputation for leading in developing the use of the internet and eGovernment. The internet is largely unregulated and inevitably this can attract undesirable activity and there are many examples throughout the private and public sector where web sites have been compromised. The Council takes robust measures to protect its web site and other electronic facilities from hackers and other undesirable and unauthorised activity. There remains however some small residual risk. To eliminate this risk entirely would mean that we would effectively have to close the web site entirely or impose security and access restrictions which would render it unuseable.

Officers are satisfied that although in this case undesirable links were posted on the Message Board, this was dealt with quickly and effectively – see answer to question 7 -. Policies for use of message boards have been reviewed and monitoring strengthened.

Q7. What action has been taken in respect of those responsible?

A7 See answer to question 6.

Q8. What action have you taken to ensure that there can be no repetition of this incident?

A8 The Message board site was closed down immediately and remained closed.

We do not run any other such sites.

Officers alerted the two other local authorities where similar intrusions to websites had happened.

Officers have subsequently updated the "Acceptable User Policy" and are organising an event with Avon and Somerset Police, to raise awareness of such problems.

Council staff took part in a training session on dealing with such problems at Police HQ on 21 August.

Q9. Given the obvious difficulty the Liberal Democrat Party has both nationally and locally on this issue will you be advising your Party locally on rigorous measures needed to ensure that institutions, their officials, and their political leaders take every necessary step to reassure the public, and parents in particular that their children are protected.

A9 There is no difficulty on this issue. The Council is taking every step possible, in conjunction with the Police and the Child Exploitation and Online Protection Centre to ensure that our practices stay up to date.

AA. COUNCILLOR SALTER TO ASK THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR HOUSING AND ADULT SOCIAL SERVICES

Area Housing Offices

Q1. Will the Executive Member confirm that there are Cabinet proposals to close three more Area Housing Offices in Ashley, Bedminster and Easton. What has prompted these closure proposals?

A1 There are no plans to close the above three offices, the cabinet report to which she refers entitled "Customer Interface Review" dated 27th July 2006 maps out a strategic vision for improved face to face contact (amongst a range of other customer access improvements) but it is only a 'review' document. The core guiding principles set out in the report are:

1. A web site offering an increasing range of information and transactional services;
2. Citywide self service and information points, including supported facilities at libraries;
3. A Customer Contact Centre (the Customer Service Centre or CSC);
4. One stop shops spread evenly across the Council area;
5. Effective arrangements for dealing with written communications (back office and/or call centre);
6. The Council House;
7. Service specific council facilities;
8. Shared use surgery type facilities.

Q2. How many people visit these AHOs? Please give numbers for each office, the type of enquiry and how many need interpretation services.

A2 Easton average callers per week. 400; Bedminster average callers per week 557; and Ashley average callers per week 700.

Q3. Does he support these proposals – particularly the closure of Easton AHO which is well used by his own constituents?

A3 I will only support any proposal for Easton CAP/AHO that improves the accessibility of the service to this part of Bristol. I would refer Cllr Salter to bullet point number 4 in the guiding principles.

Q4. Is the main motive for any further closures the desire to save money?

A4 No, it is to improve the access to customer service for the people of Bristol.

Q5. Does he perceive any loss at all in service quality as a result of these closures?

A5 The whole ethos behind these changes is to improve service quality and having recently met our new customer service employees at an induction day I am confident that we will see real improvement in the customer experience.

Q6. When will you be bringing any proposals forward for consultation?

A6 I understand that through this review agreed by cabinet members views will be sought. But I would also expect the Transforming Housing Project Board (of which you are a member) to be consulted/involved as the housing service is such a key and important stakeholder in any customer service plan.

BB. COUNCILLOR HAMMOND TO ASK THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR SUSTAINABLE ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY SAFETY

Microchipping of Refuse Containers

Q1. Why have the owners of Green waste bins supplied by the Council, not been advised that they contain what the Director of Neighbourhood and Housing Services has described as ‘a built-in microchip with a bar coded reference number’ or bug.

A1 We have made no secret of our efforts to effectively protect resident’s property. The concern of bins going missing has been raised by a number of residents and they have been reassured by our actions.

Q2. If the sole purpose of these microchips is to ‘identify the property that the bin was supplied to’ do you not agree that the time-honoured method of the householder painting a house number and a street on the bin, could have served the same purpose and a lesser cost to the Council.

A2 No

Q3. What plans do you have to microchip black bins, brown good caddies or other receptacles used for collection of recyclable/non-recyclable domestic waste, and for what purpose?

A3 No plans, but of course we must be in a position to respond to government demands. I give you some interesting quotes

Variable charging

- Quotes from Ben Bradshaw, Sir Michael Lyons, Cllr David Sparks OBE & Cllr Sir Sandy Bruce-Lockhart
- Recent info on variable charging: LGA position, opinion poll, example charges

Ben Bradshaw

(Radio Five Live Morning Reports, 08/08/06)

"We need a major step change in our recycling. One of the things we will be considering as part of our review of waste strategy is whether we should introduce a 'polluter pays' principle.

"And that is you pay for the amount of waste that you produce, because in the end as well as recycling we have to try to reduce all and minimise the amount of waste we produce in the first place.

"There's no doubt that whether we use carrots or sticks we're all going to have to do a lot better on recycling.

"People who don't recycle are behaving antisocially and irresponsibly, they are costing their neighbours money through their local council tax. They are contributing to climate change.

"It's time people got real about their responsibilities about managing their waste in an environmentally-friendly and responsible way and we need a step change in Britain if we're going to achieve that."

Sir Michael Lyons

(Chairman of Lyons Inquiry, Acting Chair of Audit Commission, Ex Labour -Cllr, 13/06/06)

"It is a fairness issue. Why should people who don't take recycling very seriously or have a lifestyle that generates a lot of waste be able to do that when their neighbours are being

very careful not to generate waste and putting their energies into recycling?

"I am clear that if people want more services, want to tackle difficult problems such as congestion, environmental sustainability and water quality. . . you can't just tackle those problems and say you don't want to pay more tax.

"We have a charging mechanism already for trade refuse. Domestic waste is taken away by the dustman but if a trade person works for you they have to pay to take away the rubbish. It's already within our experience."

Cllr David Sparks OBE

(Chair of the LGA Transport & Regeneration Board, Labour Cllr in Dudley, 21/07/06)

" Councils need to given new powers to charge households directly for the waste they throwaway."

Sir Sandy Bruce-Lockhart

(Chairman of the LGA, Tory Councillor, former Leader of Kent CC, 05/07/06)

"For *decades* people have been used to being able to throw their rubbish away without worrying about the consequences. Those days are now over. The consequences of continuing with the 'disposable society' will leave us, and our children, having to pick up the pieces and the costs.

"There needs to be a radical overhaul of the way in which rubbish is thrown away otherwise there is a real danger that council tax bill will have to rise and the environment will continue to suffer. Local people, businesses and councils all have a vital role to play to protect our countryside before it becomes buried in a mountain of rubbish.

"Local authorities must be given the discretionary powers to help encourage people to take more responsibility for the way they throw their rubbish away. Councils need to be given new powers to charge households directly for the waste they throwaway. Only by offering this power to councils will it be

possible to start meeting our duty to keep our green and pleasant land, green and pleasant."

LGA Position July 2006

The LGA has published a mini manifesto with a four point plan on how people, local government and businesses can crack down on the spiralling levels of unrecycled waste.

These include:

- . Giving councils a power to cut Council Tax and instead charge householders direct for waste management, with reduced rates for less waste: then the polluter pays and behaviour changes
- . Make producer responsibility mean producer responsibility, by ensuring local authorities are fully recompensed for recovering packaging, - WEEE and batteries. Producers / consumers should pay, not the generality of taxpayers. A visible fee should be used where appropriate.

Take strong action on disposable, single-use items to send a message to consumers. . Close the funding gap: the Government's Comprehensive Spending Review 2007 must ensure councils have the funding they need to deliver our obligations under European Directives

Opinion Poll

(Commissioned by LGA from TNS, 2&h July)

- . 77% of people believed recycling should become compulsory
- . 64% of people would prefer a system whereby you pay less tax and instead get charged directly for household rubbish removal, so that the more you recycle the less you would pay
- . 47% of people believe that fines should be levied on those who don't recycle, compared to 46% who did not believe that.

Example charges

Britain spends £2.6 billion on waste collection and disposal, equivalent to £120 per household per year. Half of the cost is recouped through council tax and half through government grants.

The LGA and Friends of the Earth are pressing for variable charges, as in Europe, where the public would be charged according to the weight of non-recyclable rubbish or the amount of bags put out for collection. In some parts of Europe the bag or wheelie bin is weighed automatically as the waste is emptied into the rubbish truck.

Sir Michael Lyons has also had discussions with the Welsh Assembly over its proposals to charge residents per black bag put out for collection.

Charges in Europe

Germany 18p a kilo

Spain 40p a 40-litre sack

Belgium 46-70p a bag

UK 25p-50p (est from Lyons) a kilo

Q4. Given the current National debate around recycling and refuse collect, please advise Council, and the public, what proposals are currently under development in Bristol, to charge Bristol householders for collection of refuse which is currently included in the council Tax.

A4 None. This would be illegal under present legislation. Many members of the public continue to urge us to charge for waste and it obviously seems anomalous to residents unaware of the legislation that we can charge for garden waste but not for other waste. Whilst we agree with the principle of the polluter paying we are very concerned that a government move in this direction could lead us to yet further penalisation of local taxpayers.

Q5. Will you:

a. give a public assurance that, unlike the recent incident, you will keep Bristol's householders fully apprised of changes to refuse collection and recycling.

b. Apologise to Bristol householders for the unnecessary secrecy surrounding changes to Bristol's recycling scheme?

- or is this secrecy to be a continuing feature of the Liberal Democrat administration in Bristol.

A5 Grow up

CC. COUNCILLOR BEES TO ASK THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR SUSTAINABLE ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY SAFETY

Green Bins

Q1. How many households compost their green waste in Bristol?

A1 To date just over 20,000 compost bins have been provided to customers. It is not known how many of these are second/third bins; also there would be some attrition rate as householders move away.

Not every household with a compost bin would use it.

Q2. How many of the households who compost their green waste are among those the council hope will buy a green bin.

A2 It is financially and environmentally preferable that those who currently home compost continue to do so. The garden waste collection is appropriate for those that have too much garden waste to compost at home, material that is difficult to compost at home (hedge clippings, tree pruning etc) or those who do not wish to compost.

Q3. How many green bins have been sold to Bristol householders?

A3 8,500 as at 7 September 2006.

Q4. What is that as a percentage of the 150,000 households who could have a green bin?

A4 5.7%.

Q5. What is the actual target figure for green bin sales if it is not 150,000?

A5 After investigation and negotiation with contractors it was found that we could improve the service to householders from fortnightly to weekly collection of garden and cardboard at no extra cost to the householder.

The numbers that opt in to the garden waste collection service are not a crucial factor as this is designed to be cost neutral and is in effect a tag on to the more crucial kitchen waste service. I note that you have been supplying misleading information to the media on this issue. This is particularly disappointing, as you have chosen to ignore the facts given to you by the responsible officer.

Q6. How many green bins does the Council need to sell at £21 and how many annual green waste collection fees at £29 does the council need for the scheme to pay for itself?

A6 The numbers are not crucial.

Q7. Do you envisage having to increase the annual green waste collection charge?

A7 The only reason the charge would be increased is if our costs increased; eg fuel prices or the processing cost for the waste went up significantly.

Q8. Is that a promise?

A8 We do not seek to make a profit on this service. It is voluntary for residents. All charged services are price sensitive. Given the better than projected returns from the kitchen waste service we do not envisage any cost rises and may well be able to reduce annual charges when we have built our local composter.

Q9. How much will it cost to supply a green biodegradable bag for green waste per household?

A9 BANES subsidised this service. We are likely to charge around £1 per sack including collection.

Q10. If the Council persuades all 150,000 households to take a green bin and pay the annual collection charge – what income would this generate?

A10 We do not want to persuade people to take the service and would prefer them to home compost if possible.

Q11. What is the income figure's equivalent when expressed as an increase in Council Tax?

A11 If 150,000 households took part in the service at £27.60 each, it is likely that the authority would be in a position of net income. However a) it is difficult to see why households with no gardens would ever take part in a chargeable green bin scheme and b) the modelling to calculate the costs at this level has not been undertaken.

Q12. Why is it that garden waste collection operates at no extra charge in South Glos, Barnet, Mid-Bedfordshire, Southampton, Thurrock, Haringey, Dacorum, Watford, Northants, Southwark, Stockport and Tameside – why are their council taxpayers more favoured than Bristol council taxpayers?

A12 Without knowing the details of each individual system, the assumption has to be made that these authorities have identified sufficient budget to fund such a scheme. The cost is borne by the taxpayer whether using the service or not. Many others charge or provide no service.

The operational aspects of the South Gloucestershire scheme is known in detail - a food waste collection is not provided, and the garden waste/brown corrugated cardboard collection is fortnightly. Also South Gloucestershire Council operate an integrated waste management contract with significant amounts of Private Finance Initiative credits - £25M over 25 years.

Q13. Given that the Lib Dem administration feels that council tax is unfair to pensioners – why are there no concessions for pensioners concerning either the cost of the bin or the annual charge?

A13 The subsidy for the garden waste collection scheme is aimed at low-income households. Those on pensions are not necessarily low income households, although they may be on benefits and therefore qualify for the subsidy.

DD. COUNCILLOR SALTER TO ASK THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR SUSTAINABLE ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY SAFETY

Recycling

Q1. When was the Black Box recycling scheme introduced in Bristol?

A1 The black box scheme started during the 1986-87 financial year as a fortnightly service. This was extended to a weekly service in 1998.

Q2. How many tonnes of recyclable material has been collected by the Black Box system since it first started?

A2	Year	Tonnes	Tonnes per month
	1994/95	5000	417
	1995/96	5000	417
	1996/97	7,300	608
	1997/98	12,500	1,042
	1998/99	15,077	1,256
	1999/2000	14,418	1,202
	2000/01	15,223	1,269
	2001/02	15,307	1,276
	2002/03	14,929	1,244
	2003/04	15,590	1,299
	2004/05	16,202	1,350
	2005/06	21,467	1,789

You will notice a dramatic improvement in returns after the charges introduced in June 2005 by this administration.

Q3. How many tonnes of recyclable material is collected by the Black Box system in the current year?

A3 There is a noticeable improvement in the figures recently since the introduction of our new service. This is due to fortnightly residual collections.

Q4. Who was the Executive in Charge of Recycling when the Black Box scheme was introduced?

A4 This was probably introduced by the Health & Environmental Services Committee. Cabinet Services do not keep records this far back and so are unable to advise who chaired this Committee.

There was no executive member but I am happy to confirm that Labour were in charge when this scheme was introduced, but also unfortunately when it was allowed to stagnate and also to fail financially under resource saver. This necessitated a major bail out from Bristol council taxpayers.

EE. COUNCILLOR BRADSHAW TO ASK THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT AND DEVELOPMENT CONTROL

Traffic Safety – Chessels, Bedminster

Q1. What representations has he or his department received concerning traffic safety in the Chessels area of Bedminster?

A1 21 Mar 2003 – Letter received from Dawn Primarolo MP.
10 Jan 2006 - Petition submitted with 237 signatures requesting one-way and traffic calming on Chessel Street. Chief petitioner Cllr Warren.

18 & 24 July 2006 - Letters received querying outcome to petition by Ms Ireland of 150 Chessel Street.

Q2. When did he or his officials last meet local residents to discuss their concerns following the 200-plus-name petition submitted to Council by my predecessor?

A2 Following receipt of the petition no meeting with local residents has taken place. Normal practice is for officers to undertake a site inspection and analysis of reported accidents, prior to advising the Executive Member, and this procedure was followed.

FF. COUNCILLOR BRADSHAW TO ASK THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT AND DEVELOPMENT CONTROL

Development Control Practice

Q1. Does he consider that the Council's practices and policies in relation to enforcement of planning conditions to be satisfactorily robust?

A1 Like you I have had concerns about planning enforcement. This is why the practices and policies in relation to enforcement are currently being reviewed.

Q2. What are his views about the same practices and policies in relation to the long overdue completion of works in Honeywick Close and Bartlett's Bridge, Bedminster, which has been widely reported in the local press?

A2 If you had brought this to my attention earlier I would have sought an explanation from officers, as to why this complex matter had not yet been resolved.

Q3. When did he last meet residents about the safety of Bartlett's Bridge, which is used by large numbers of my constituents every day?

A3 I have not been asked to meet residents about the bridge, and no-one has brought to my attention any safety issues. However, with regard to issues of safety, Network Rail are responsible for the main length of the bridge over the railway line and the developers are responsible for the remaining length of the bridge plus the temporary steps down to ground level. I understand that if complaints regarding safety are made to the Council, the matter is referred to the developers who are aware of their liability.

Q4. What adjustments to development control practices and policies does he envisage to be necessary to prevent a repetition of the Council's long term failure to enforce planning conditions in respect of Bartlett's Bridge and the wider Honeywick Close/Shepton Walk area?

A4 See Question 1.

GG. COUNCILLOR BRADSHAW TO ASK THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT AND DEVELOPMENT CONTROL

Traffic Regulation Orders

Q1. What is his current estimation of the number of TROs waiting to be made, amended or revoked across the City?

A1 The TRO priority database at 1st August 2006, lists 57 active TROs and Statutory Notices (SNs), 51 pending TROs and SNs and 80 currently unprogrammed TROs and SNs.

Q2. How does Bristol compare with the other Core Cities when it comes to handling TRO applications?

A2 We do not currently have Core City data pertaining to TROs to compare. However, we are currently in the process of carrying out a review of BCC's TRO processes, and a benchmarking exercise with other similar authorities forms part of the review.

Q3. Have officers conducted any analysis of the possible connection between delays in implementing TROs and the consequential impact on economic development in the City? If not, why not?

A3 There is a clear understanding of the potential impact on economic development in the city and any TROs vital to the economic health of the city are prioritised for attention and delivery. PFI schools and the Broadmead redevelopment are good examples where additional, external resources were procured to deliver the necessary TROs without delay to the projects.

HH. COUNCILLOR BRADSHAW TO ASK THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR HOUSING & ADULT COMMUNITY CARE

South Liberty Lane Gypsy & Traveller's Site

Q1. Would he join me in congratulating those Council officers and other key interests involved with the successful opening of the site?

A1 Yes they have done an excellent job in:

- obtaining planning consent
- achieving the largest Gypsy Site Refurbishment Grant awarded in 05/06
- ensuring the development was completed to budget, time and specification inspite of the incident of vandalism whilst construction work was underway reviewing the applications and ensuring 6 of the 12 pitches were occupied within 3 days of the handover by the contractors.

Q2. Does he support me in questioning the motives of individuals and groups involved in spreading misinformation about the site and seemingly intent on frustrating community cohesion efforts in Ashton Vale and wider support for minorities across our City ?

A2 Yes. It is disappointing that some people are unable to respect a different way of life and recognise the responsibility of the Council to ensure appropriate housing is available for all of Bristol's communities.

CNL

35.9/06

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PERSON'S PLAN

The Council considered a report of the Cabinet (agenda item no. 7A) approving the Children and Young Persons' Plan 2006-2009.

Councillor Janke moved that the Children and Young

Person's Plan 2006-2009 be approved. This was seconded by Councillor Simon Cook.

RESOLVED - that the Children and Young Persons' Plan 2006-2009 be approved, incorporating the Joint Area Review Action Plan.

**CNL
36.9/06**

**REPORT OF THE MEMBERS' REMUNERATION
INDEPENDENT PANEL**

The Council considered a report of the Chief Executive (agenda item no. 8A) considering the report and recommendations contained in the Members' Remuneration Independent Review Panel.

It was moved and seconded that the recommendations of the Members' Remuneration Independent Review Panel be adopted.

Councillor Pickup then moved the following amendment which was seconded by Councillor Eddy:

“to adopt the recommendations as set out in the report of the Members' Remuneration Independent Review Panel save the Chair of the Audit Committee be included in the SRA group 4 with effect from the establishment of the Committee.”

The amendment was put to the vote and declared CARRIED.

The substantive motion was then put to the vote and declared CARRIED and it was:

RESOLVED - that the recommendations as set out in the report of the Members' Remuneration INdependent Review Panel be adopted save that the Chair of the Audit Committee be included in the SRA group 4 with effect from the establishment of the Committee.

MOTIONS

- A. Councillor Goulandris moved the motion standing in his name on the Council agenda, namely:-

“Council notes with concern a glaring anomaly contained in the provisions of the Licensing Act 2003. The exclusion of elected Members from the statutory definition of 'interested parties' effectively prevents them from making direct representations (made on behalf of their constituents) to the Licensing Authority on the merits/demerits of a licensing application.

Council believes that such an outcome is contrary to the spirit of this legislation which was intended to give local people - often through the medium of their elected representatives - a greater say in licensing decisions.

Councillors - acting in that capacity - should be allowed to make statements as an interested party on licensing applications within their own Ward.

Council instructs the Chair of Licensing and the Public Safety and Protection Committee to write to the Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport to convey its view that the legislation should be amended to remedy this defect at the earliest possible juncture.”

The motion was seconded by Councillor Morris.

Following debate the motion was put to the vote and was declared CARRIED.

RESOLVED - “Council notes with concern a glaring anomaly contained in the provisions of the Licensing Act 2003. The exclusion of elected Members from the statutory definition of 'interested parties' effectively prevents them from making direct representations (made on behalf of their constituents) to the Licensing Authority on the merits/demerits of a licensing application.

Council believes that such an outcome is contrary to the spirit of this legislation which was intended to give local people - often through the medium of their elected representatives - a greater say in licensing decisions.

Councillors - acting in that capacity - should be allowed to make statements as an interested party on licensing applications within their own Ward.

Council instructs the Chair of Licensing and the Public Safety and Protection Committee to write to the Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport to convey its view that the legislation should be amended to remedy this defect at the earliest possible juncture.”

- B.** Councillor Fox moved the motion standing in his name on the Council agenda, namely:-

“Council deplores the concept of 'prejudicial interest' contained within the Code of Conduct for elected Members.

Council recognises that in its operation this damaging doctrine has often acted as a fetter on the ability of Councillors to represent the views of local people on strategic planning and other matters.

Council further regrets the creation of an unelected monitoring body, the Standards Board of England, created under the Local Government Act 2000.

Council call upon the office of the Deputy Prime Minister to review and reform the model code to remove the so-called offence of prejudicial interest.

Council also wishes for Ministers to be made aware of its view that the entirely undemocratic body or bureaucratic quango chosen to enforce the code should be abolished.”

The motion was seconded by Councillor Alexander.

Following debate the motion was put to the vote and was declared CARRIED.

RESOLVED - “Council deplores the concept of 'prejudicial interest' contained within the Code of Conduct for elected Members.

Council recognises that in its operation this damaging doctrine has often acted as a fetter on the ability of Councillors to represent the views of local people on strategic planning and other matters.

Council further regrets the creation of an unelected monitoring body, the Standards Board of England, created under the Local Government Act 2000.

Council call upon the office of the Deputy Prime Minister to review and reform the model code to remove the so-called offence of prejudicial interest.

Council also wishes for Ministers to be made aware of its view that the entirely undemocratic body or bureaucratic quango chosen to enforce the code should be abolished.”

- C. Councillor Bolton moved the motion standing in his name on the Council agenda, namely:-

C

“Bristol City Council, in line with its commitment to the Nottingham Declaration which requires 60% cuts in greenhouse gas emissions by 2050, recognises that significant expansion of aviation will make this target impossible and therefore requests that the Leader of the Council writes to the Airport Authority and other relevant agencies/bodies expressing grave concern and requesting that every reasonable effort is made to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and that the proposal to expand the Airport is reconsidered because of these concerns.

The bodies to be contacted include the Department of Transport, North Somerset Council the Regional Assembly and the South West Regional Development Authority.”

The motion was seconded by the Lord Mayor.

Councillor Wright moved an amendment, the effect of which was to

- insert a new paragraph immediately before the wording of Councillor Bolton's motion as follows - *“This council recognises Bristol International Airport as part of the essential infrastructure of Bristol as a European City and additionally recognises the key role of the airport as a generator of economic growth and high quality employment in the Bristol Sub region, the South West region, and especially its potential for supporting the regeneration of South Bristol”*;
- add the word *“However”* immediately prior to the word *“Bristol”* in the first line of the first paragraph of Councillor Bolton's motion;
- delete the words *“....is reconsidered because of these concerns.”* from the final line of the first paragraph of Councillor Bolton's motion and insert in its place, the following words *“.... must demonstrate that significant and far-reaching improvements in public transport for*

Airport Customers are secured by the Airport. Any plan for expansion should minimise any increase in congestion and noise pollution suffered by the residents in the Bristol Area. The polluter should be held accountable for the pollution generated, which can be achieved by changes to EU taxation policies. In light of rising oil prices, climate change and widespread national concern over airport expansion assessment of the viability and potential benefits of airport expansion in the future should be conducted”

- delete the second paragraph of Councillor Bolton's motion and replace it with “ *Because significant control of aviation pollution is beyond the influence of a single airport, the bodies to be contacted must include the Department of Transport, local MPs, North Somerset Council, the Regional Assembly, South West Regional Development Authority and Bristol International Airport. This will also help to minimise the risk of restrictions to the expansion of Bristol International Airport causing displacement of the problem to other airports”*

The full effect of Councillor Wright's wording read as follows:

“This council recognises Bristol International Airport as part of the essential infrastructure of Bristol as a European City and additionally recognises the key role of the airport as a generator of economic growth and high quality employment in the Bristol Sub region, the South West region, and especially its potential for supporting the regeneration of South Bristol.

However, Bristol City Council, in line with its commitment to the Nottingham declaration which requires 60% cuts in greenhouse gas emissions by 2050, recognises that significant expansion of aviation will make this target impossible and therefore requests that the Leader of Council writes to the Airport Authority and other relevant agencies/bodies expressing serious concern and requesting that every reasonable effort is made to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and that the proposal to expand the airport must demonstrate that significant and far-reaching improvements in public transport for Airport Customers are secured by the Airport. Any plan for

expansion should minimise any increase in congestion and noise pollution suffered by the residents in the Bristol Area. The polluter should be held accountable for the pollution generated, which can be achieved by changes to EU taxation policies. In light of rising oil prices, climate change and widespread national concern over airport expansion assessment of the viability and potential benefits of airport expansion in the future should be conducted.

Because significant control of aviation pollution is beyond the influence of a single airport, the bodies to be contacted must include the Department of Transport, local MPs, North Somerset Council, the Regional Assembly, South West Regional Development Authority and Bristol International Airport. This will also help to minimise the risk of restrictions to the expansion of Bristol International Airport causing displacement of the problem to other airports.

The amendment was seconded by Councillor Holland.

Following a debate the amendment was put to the vote and declared CARRIED.

The substantive motion was then put to the vote and declared CARRIED and it was;

RESOLVED - “This council recognises Bristol International Airport as part of the essential infrastructure of Bristol as a European City and additionally recognises the key role of the airport as a generator of economic growth and high quality employment in the Bristol Sub region, the South West region, and especially its potential for supporting the regeneration of South Bristol.

However, Bristol City Council, in line with its commitment to the Nottingham declaration which

requires 60% cuts in greenhouse gas emissions by 2050, recognises that significant expansion of aviation will make this target impossible and therefore requests that the Leader of Council writes to the Airport Authority and other relevant agencies/bodies expressing serious concern and requesting that every reasonable effort is made to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and that the proposal to expand the airport must demonstrate that significant and far-reaching improvements in public transport for Airport Customers are secured by the Airport. Any plan for expansion should minimise any increase in congestion and noise pollution suffered by the residents in the Bristol Area. The polluter should be held accountable for the pollution generated, which can be achieved by changes to EU taxation policies. In light of rising oil prices, climate change and widespread national concern over airport expansion assessment of the viability and potential benefits of airport expansion in the future should be conducted.

Because significant control of aviation pollution is beyond the influence of a single airport, the bodies to be contacted must include the Department of Transport, local MPs, North Somerset Council, the Regional

Assembly, South West Regional Development Authority and Bristol International Airport. This will also help to minimise the risk of restrictions to the expansion of Bristol International Airport causing displacement of the problem to other airports.

(The meeting ended at 9.10 pm)

LORD MAYOR