



**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF
BRISTOL CITY COUNCIL
HELD ON 15TH JANUARY 2008 AT 2.00 P.M.**

- | | |
|---|----------------------------|
| P The Lord Mayor Councillor R A Griffey (Chair) | P Councillor C D Jackson |
| P Councillor P Abraham | P Councillor B Janke |
| P Councillor L A Alexander | P Councillor J Jethwa |
| P Councillor E J Bagley | P Councillor T R Kent |
| P Councillor M Bailey | P Councillor M Kerry |
| A Councillor J Bees | P Councillor D Kitson |
| P Councillor S D Beynon | P Councillor B A Knott |
| P Councillor C N Bolton | P Councillor B M Lewis |
| P Councillor M Bradshaw | P Councillor J Lovell |
| P Councillor M R Brain | P Councillor P Main |
| P Councillor F Breckels | P Councillor A R Malik |
| P Councillor D H Brown | A Councillor S Marshall |
| P Councillor C Champion-Smith | P Councillor R McDermott |
| P Councillor F Choudhury | A Councillor D H R Morris |
| A Councillor J Clark | A Councillor A E Murphy |
| P Councillor M Cole | P Councillor J E Norman |
| P Councillor S R Comer | P Councillor S O' Donnell |
| P Councillor S Cook | P Councillor B Payne |
| A Councillor T R Cook | P Councillor D S Pickup |
| P Councillor S M G Crew | A Councillor M H Popham |
| A Councillor N P Daniels | P Councillor B Price |
| P Councillor C Davies | P Councillor C Price |
| P Councillor J E Deasy | P Councillor J M Price |
| P Councillor R S Eddy | P Councillor K M Quartley |
| P Councillor S Emmett | P Councillor Dr J C Rogers |
| P Councillor A P Fox | P Colin J Smith |
| P Councillor M J Golding | P Jenny Smith |
| P Councillor G R Gollop | P Councillor R Stone |
| P Councillor J Goulandris | P Councillor M Sykes |
| P Councillor P Hammond | P Councillor S J Townsend |
| P Councillor N R Harrison | P Councillor R Walker |
| P Councillor A H Havvock | P Councillor M D Weston |
| P Councillor H Holland | P Councillor J C White |
| P Councillor G Hopkins | P Councillor A Woodman |
| A Councillor B P Hugill | P Councillor Dr M Wright |

Also in attendance:

Alderman Chalmers, Alderman Crispin, Alderman Derek Fey, Alderman Joyce Fey, Alderman Gillard, Alderman Hebblethwaite, Alderman Moore,

Alderman Pyle, Alderman Roberts and Alderman Withers.

CNL

72.1/08 LORD MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Lord Mayor asked that the following announcements be noted by Council:

(a) New Year's Honours List

On behalf of the Council he congratulated everyone who had received an honour.

(b) Bill Martin

On behalf of the Council he congratulated Bill Martin on his receipt of an honorary law degree from Bristol University.

(c) George McWatters

He announced the death of George McWatters who had served on the Council as a Member of the Citizens Party. The meeting then stood in silence for a short time.

CNL

73.1/08 URGENT BUSINESS

There was no urgent business.

CNL

74.1/08 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were none.

SECTION A – THE STATE OF THE CITY

In relation to this section of the Meeting the Lord Mayor announced that he would allow up to 1 hour 30 minutes for representations from residents and Members of Council.

CNL

75.1/08 REPRESENTATIONS FROM LOCAL RESIDENTS ON THE STATE OF THE CITY

(a) Petitions

There were none.

(b) Statements

(i) Steve Knowlson – State of the City, Various Issues

Council received a statement from Steve Knowlson and it was agreed that it be referred to the appropriate Executive Members.

(ii) Lily Griffiths - State of the City, Various Issues

Council received a statement from Lily Griffiths and it was agreed that it be referred to the appropriate Executive Members.

(ii) Mrs A Essex - State of the City, Various Issues

Council received a statement from Mrs A Essex and it was agreed that it be referred to the appropriate Executive Members.

(iv) Jeremy Gardner - State of the City, Various Issues

Council received a statement from Jeremy Gardner and it was agreed that it be referred to the appropriate Executive Members.

(v) Patrick Hulme - State of the City, Various Issues

Council received a statement from Patrick Hulme and it was agreed that it be referred to the appropriate Executive Members.

(vi) Heath Wardle - State of the City, Various Issues

Council received a statement from Heath Wardle and it was agreed that it be referred to the appropriate Executive Members.

(vii) Michael Evans - State of the City, Various Issues

Council received a statement from Michael Evans and it was agreed that it be referred to the appropriate Executive Members.

(viii) Dale Pienaar - State of the City, Various Issues

Council received a statement from Dale Pienaar and it

was agreed that it be referred to the appropriate Executive Members.

(ix) Hartcliffe and Community Partnership - State of the City, Various Issues

Council received a statement from the Hartcliffe and Community Partnership and it was agreed that it be referred to the appropriate Executive Members.

(x) Wilf Mound - State of the City, Pedestrians and Supermarket Bags

Council received a statement from the Wilf Mound and it was agreed that the Pedestrians issue be referred to the appropriate Executive Member and the Supermarket Bags issue be taken into account when the issue was debated later in the Meeting.

(xi) Julie Boston - State of the City, Public Transport

Council received a statement from the Julie Boston and it was agreed that it be referred to the appropriate Executive Member.

(xii) Lucy Horton - State of the City, Various Issues

Council received a statement from Lucy Horton and it was agreed that it be referred to the appropriate Executive Members.

(xiii) Nicolette Vincent - State of the City, Air Quality

Council received a statement from Nicolette Vincent and it was agreed that it be referred to the appropriate Executive Member.

(xiv) Robin Clapp - State of the City, Marksbury Road Library

Council received a statement from Robin Clapp and it was agreed that it be referred to the appropriate Executive Member.

(xv) Cath Slade - State of the City, Marksbury Road Library

Council received a statement from Cath Slade and it was

agreed that it be referred to the appropriate Executive Member.

(xvi) Alison Bromilow – State of the City, Parks and Green Spaces

Council received a statement from Alison Bromilow and it was agreed that it be referred to the appropriate Executive Member.

(xvii) Alan Aburrow - State of the City, Parks and Green Spaces

Council received a statement from Alan Aburrow and it was agreed that it be referred to the appropriate Executive Member.

(xviii) Delphine Lydall - State of the City, Conference Centre

Council received a statement from Delphine Lydall and it was agreed that it be referred to the appropriate Executive Member.

(xix) Kim Hicks - State of the City, Bristol Old Vic

Council received a statement from Kim Hicks and it was agreed that it be referred to the appropriate Executive Member.

(xx) June Jeffreys - State of the City, The Theatre Royal

Council received a statement from June Jeffreys and it was agreed that it be referred to the appropriate Executive Member.

(xxi) Cameron Dunn - State of the City, Parking

Council received a statement from Cameron Dunn and it was agreed that it be referred to the appropriate Executive Member.

(xxii) Cameron Dunn - State of the City, Planning

Council received a statement from Cameron Dunn and it was agreed that it be referred to the appropriate

Executive Member.

(xxiii) Rowena Hayward - State of the City, Residential Care Homes

Council received a statement from Rowena Hayward and it was agreed that it be referred to the appropriate Executive Member.

(xxiv) R T Handford - State of the City, Residential Care Homes

Council received a statement from R T Handford and it was agreed that it be referred to the appropriate Executive Member.

(xxv) R and C Handford - State of the City, Residential Care Homes

Council received a statement from R and C Handford and it was agreed that it be referred to the appropriate Executive Member.

(xxvi) Dr S Hutton - State of the City, Residential Care Homes

Council received a statement from Dr S Hutton and it was agreed that it be referred to the appropriate Executive Member.

(xxvii) Mrs P E J Jefferis - State of the City, Residential Care Homes

Council received a statement from Mrs P E J Jefferis and it was agreed that it be referred to the appropriate Executive Member.

(xxviii) Barbara Hughes - State of the City, Residential Care Homes

Council received a statement from Barbara Hughes and it was agreed that it be referred to the appropriate Executive Member.

(xxix) T Hughes - State of the City, Residential Care Homes

Council received a statement from T Hughes and it was agreed that it be referred to the appropriate Executive

Member.

(xxx)M J Edwards - State of the City, Residential Care Homes

Council received a statement from M J Edwards and it was agreed that it be referred to the appropriate Executive Member.

(xxxi)Mrs J A Stenner - State of the City, Residential Care Homes

Council received a statement from Mrs J A Stenner and it was agreed that it be referred to the appropriate Executive Member.

(xxxii)Susan Hitchins - State of the City, Residential Care Homes

Council received a statement from Susan Hitchins and it was agreed that it be referred to the appropriate Executive Member.

(xxxiii)Mr S V Weeks - State of the City, Transport Issues

Council received a statement from Mr S V Weeks and it was agreed that it be referred to the appropriate Executive Member.

(xxxiv)Philip Morris - State of the City, A420 Showcase Bus Route

Council received a statement from Philip Morris and it was agreed that it be referred to the appropriate Executive Member.

(xxxv)Jerry Hicks - State of the City, Various Issues

Council received a statement from Jerry Hicks and it was agreed that it be referred to the appropriate Executive Members.

(a) Petitions

There were none.

(b) Statements

(i) Councillor Stone – State of the City, Planted Environment and Street Trees

Council received a statement from Councillor Stone and it was agreed that it be noted and taken into account during the debate on The City's Future.

(ii) Councillor Brain - State of the City, Various Issues

Council received a statement from Councillor Brain and it was agreed that it be noted and taken into account during the debate on The City's Future.

(iii) Colin Smith - State of the City, Various Issues

Council received a statement from Colin Smith and it was agreed that it be noted and taken into account during the debate on The City's Future.

(iv) Councillor Hopkins – State of the City, Waste Issues

Council received a statement from Councillor Hopkins and it was agreed that it be referred to the appropriate Executive Member.

(v) Councillor Hopkins – State of the City, Bristol Parks

Council received a statement from Councillor Hopkins and it was agreed that it be referred to the appropriate Executive Member.

(vi) Councillor Campion-Smith - State of the City, Parks and Green Spaces

Council received a statement from Councillor Campion-Smith and it was agreed that it be referred to the appropriate Executive Member.

(vii) Councillor Dr Wright - State of the City, Political Integrity and Probity

Council received a statement from Councillor Dr Wright and it was agreed that it be referred to the Leader of Council.

The Head of Legal Services cautioned Members about what they say or write as using “inappropriate” words in relation to other Members of Council could place the Council in a difficult position.

(viii) Councillor Dr Rogers - State of the City, Various Issues

Council received a statement from Councillor Dr Rogers and it was agreed that it be referred to the appropriate Executive Members.

**CNL
77.1/08**

THE CITY’S FUTURE – THE EMERGING PRIORITIES FOR THE NEXT THREE YEARS

The Council considered a report of the Leader of the Council (agenda item no. 6) setting out the Cabinet’s initial thinking about emerging priorities for the Council in working towards delivering the city’s future and contributing to the delivery of the revised Bristol Partnership Sustainable Community Strategy.

Council discussed these issues in its “state of the city debate” in order that members’ views could be taken in account in work on the four key priorities for the authority covering the coming three years.

Councillor Holland introduced the report and summarised it for Members highlighting the priorities and the means to achieve them.

Councillor Comer responded on behalf his Group stating what they saw as the priorities for Council.

Councillor Eddy then put forward the views and priorities for his Group.

Other Members of the Council were then invited to put forward their views and following a lengthy debate it was moved by Councillor Holland, seconded by Councillor Hammond and

RESOLVED - (i) that the report be approved; and

(ii) that the views of Council be taken into account when drafting the Corporate Plan.

SECTION B – ORDINARY COUNCIL BUSINESS

CNL

78.1/08 MINUTES – EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF COUNCIL – 4TH DECEMBER 2007

RESOLVED - that the minutes of the extraordinary meeting of Council held on 4th December 2007 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Lord Mayor.

CNL

79.1/08 MINUTES – ORDINARY MEETING OF COUNCIL – 4TH DECEMBER 2007

Councillor Hopkins – Personal Explanation

With the permission of the Lord Mayor Councillor Hopkins made a personal explanation.

Drawing Members attention to MQ4, he stated that the answer given to Q9 amounted to an allegation that he deliberately misled the Resources Scrutiny Commission

The Head of Legal Services then stated that the Council should not have published the answer as it was potentially defamatory and on behalf of the Council apologised to Councillor Hopkins for its publication. He read out a note from the Director of Neighbourhood and Housing Services, to Councillor Hopkins, which said, "I confirm for the record at the Resources Scrutiny Commission meeting, that you had not been told of the disparity when you were Executive Member."

RESOLVED - that the minutes of the ordinary meeting of Council held on 4th December 2007 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Lord Mayor.

CNL

80.1/08 REPRESENTATIONS FROM LOCAL RESIDENTS

(a) Petitions

(i) Anne Crabtree – Save the Planet, Not Filling Landfill

with Plastic

Anne Crabtree presented a petition to Council containing 24 signatures. Council agreed that it be referred to the relevant Executive Member.

(ii) Matthew Symonds – Ashton Park Primary School Kitchen

Matthew Symonds presented a petition to Council containing 186 signatures. Council agreed that it be referred to the relevant Executive Member.

(b) Statements

(i) Anne Crabtree – Plastic Bags and Landfill Sites

Council received a statement from Anne Crabtree and it was agreed that it be referred to the appropriate Executive Member.

(ii) Nick Shearing – Carbon Footprint, Plastic Bags and Landfill Sites

Council received a statement from Nick Shearing and it was agreed that it be referred to the appropriate Executive Member.

(iii) Tess Green – Carton Recycling

Council received a statement from Tess Green and it was agreed that it be referred to the appropriate Executive Member.

(iv) Jan Jones – Community Transport

Council received a statement from Jan Jones and it was agreed that it be referred to the appropriate Executive Member.

(v) Toby Hannon – Plastic Bags

Council received a statement from Toby Hannon and it was agreed that it be noted and taken into account when the Motion on Supermarket Bags was debated later in the Meeting.

(vi) Alex Loftus – Development Levy

Not considered as the Motion it referred to was withdrawn.

(vii) Dr Ian Baker - Plastic Bags

Council received a statement from Dr Ian Baker and it was agreed that it be noted and taken into account when the Motion on Supermarket Bags was debated later in the Meeting.

(viii) Sue Sadler - Plastic Bags

Council received a statement from Sue Sadler and it was agreed that it be noted and taken into account when the Motion on Supermarket Bags was debated later in the Meeting.

(ix) Mike Robbins – Hartcliffe and Withywood Areas

Council received a statement from Mike Robbins and it was agreed that it be referred to the appropriate Executive Member.

(xi) Derek and Sandra Moore – New Fosseway School

Council received a statement from Derek and Sandra Moore, and it was agreed that it be referred to the appropriate Executive Member.

(xii) Christine Simons - Allotments

Council received a statement from Christine Simons and it was agreed that it be referred to the appropriate Executive Member.

(c) Questions

RQ1 MR R HALL TO ASK COUNCILLOR M BRADSHAW, EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR ACCESS AND ENVIRONMENT

PHASES 1 & 2 OF SOUTH BRISTOL LINK ROAD (formerly known as South Bristol Ring Road)

Q1 Does the public consultation on the South Bristol Link Road due for the summer of 2008 involve

- a) **A leaflet through doors in the main affected areas, e.g. Long Ashton, Bedminster Down, Highridge, Bishopsworth, Withywood and Hartcliffe.**
- b) **Public meetings and if so where**
- c) **A vote by Bristol City Councillors**
- d) **A vote by North Somerset District Councillors.**

A1 It has not yet been decided, but we are committed to full public consultation and involvement of elected members.

Q2 What is the timetable for each of the above

A2 This has not yet been decided.

Q3 Are the other partners in the West of England Partnership, which has produced the Joint Local Transport Plan, namely South Gloucestershire and BANES Councils, involved in the decision making process or is this down to Bristol & North Somerset only?

A3 Decisions on transport schemes are taken within authorities, but there are joint project boards of such schemes, which have influence, and as you would expect, bilateral contact and discussions between neighbouring authorities.

Q4 As under new Government guidelines,10% of construction costs,50% of preparation costs and 50% of any cost increase between construction and completion of the road's two stages are not met by the Government but have to be paid from local sources, have Bristol CC and North Somerset DC identified which budgets this money will come from?

A4 In principle, it is understood where Bristol's funds would have to come from, but it is premature to have detailed proposals. The point you make is well understood.

RQ2 PETER GOODWIN TO COUNCILLOR M BRADSHAW, EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR ACCESS AND ENVIRONMENT.

SOUTH BRISTOL LINK ROAD

I was advised by officers at the recent West of England Joint Transport Forum, that Phases 1 & 2 of the proposed South Bristol Link (Ring) Road are currently being evaluated in preparation for a funding bid.

Can you advise:

- Q1** Whether the traffic models used will be in the public domain, and if so, to whom enquiries should be addressed?
- A1 The models are currently being developed by consultants. It is not envisaged that the models themselves will be in the public domain. Reports of modelling work (e.g. local model validation report) will however be in the public domain once available.
- Q2** Whether the evaluation of the need for Phases 1 & 2 will take into account the needs of residents moving into the 'urban extension' of Bristol beyond Ashton Gate, between the A38 and the A370?
- A2 Scheme appraisal will consider forecast future needs, including residential development.
- Q3** How the use of private cars by residents in that 'sustainable' development is expected to compare with that in neighbouring, longer established, communities, and whether any difference will be taken into account in the modelling?
- A3 This element of the appraisal has not yet been started.
- Q4** Whether any evaluation will assume that an efficient bus rapid transit system, as envisaged in the Joint Local Transport Plan, will be available to the same community from the start?
- A4 Forecast future development of the transport system will include bus rapid transit and the potential impact of reliable transport choices available to the communities involved.
- Q5** Whether there will be any invitation to the public to offer alternative suggestions before the bid is prepared?
- A5 *Yes, public consultation before a bid would include presentation of a non road building option and the public would be invited to offer suggestions and comment. There have already been consultation exercises in conjunction with both the Greater Bristol Strategic Transport Study and the Local Development Framework. The process we envisage will place emphasis on full public engagement.*
- Q6** Whether there is any timetable for political decisions within Bristol prior to submitting a bid?

A6 No. The detail is yet to be decided.

**RQ3 PETER GOODWIN TO ASK COUNCILLOR M BRADSHAW,
EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR ACCESS AND ENVIRONMENT.**

WEST OF ENGLAND JOINT WASTE STRATEGY

Can you tell us:

Q1. Has the West of England "Member Project Board" which oversees development of the Joint Waste Strategy yet taken (or is it likely to take) a view on the draft waste strategy? In particular, is it happy with the proposal to put a PFI funded incinerator at the heart of plans to deal with residual waste into the 2040s?

A1 Yes, after careful consideration, a PFI-funded EfW plant is seen as the best solution to the problem of treating 200,000 tpa of residual waste in the long term. The strategy also supports the development of recycling and composting to at least a 50% target, emphasising the importance of maximising waste reduction and recycling in each of the partnering authorities (Phase 1), together with the development of an interim solution to divert biological waste from landfill during the period to 2015 (Phase 2).

Q2. If and when the current draft is referred to the individual West of England councils for comment, what options are available to each council to recommend a rethink, and how would such a proposal impact on the timetable for decision-making?

A2 The individual council scrutiny groups have been invited to comment upon the preferred strategy. In doing so they need to take account of the implications arising from any changes they may wish to explore, particularly in regard to costs and risk, both in the short term and long term. In line with the current programme, in order for the Partnership to benefit from Government support to the project, an Outline Business Case needs to be submitted to Defra by October 2008. Each council will be able to call upon its legal and finance officers to provide advice and guidance.

**RQ4 PETER GOODWIN TO ASK COUNCILLOR H HOLLAND,
LEADER OF THE COUNCIL**

QUESTIONS TO COUNCIL FROM LOCAL RESIDENTS

Bearing in mind the report from the 'Bristol Blogger' on December 5th:

Q1. To what extent has it been the practice of those officers who advise Executive Members, to inquire and report about the political interests and affiliations of people who address questions to Members privately or in fora such as this?

A1 I am sorry if this has caused offence. There is no such policy.

Q2. Has the practice now ceased?

A2 Labour Councillors do not ask for this information.

RQ5 MR W COOMBES TO ASK COUNCILLOR R WALKER, EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR HEALTH AND LEISURE

LIBRARY SERVICES IN SOUTH BRISTOL

Q1 Is the Council aware that despite its systematic running down over a number of years, the library hosts after school craft clubs for infant and junior schoolchildren, 2 children's reading clubs, an adult reading group, a pre-school story time and craft session with singing, visits each week from up to 180 Reception and KS1 children from nearby Parson Street school and a weekly senior citizens group? Lettings are provided for MACA, Slimming World and the local Women's Institute. Does the Council realise the Knowle library is not reachable from this area by public transport, that Bedminster library would not be a practical alternative for visits by reception and KS1 pupils and that Marksbury Road library is the only community building in this area?"

A1 The published budget is a Draft Budget and is out to consultation. So, of course, we expect comments on our proposals to come back. I have received a number of questions and representations regarding Marksbury Road Library. I have met people who object to the proposed closure and have listened to their arguments. I have visited the Library and talked to the staff and users there.

The Cabinet's final Budget proposals will be tabled by Cabinet on February 4th. I will continue to take those concerns to Cabinet colleagues between now and that meeting.

RQ6 MS R HOBBS TO ASK COUNCILLOR R WALKER, EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR HEALTH AND LEISURE

PROPOSED CLOSURE OF MARKSBURY ROAD LIBRARY

Q1 'Does the Council still support its stated policy of promoting vibrant local communities and walkable facilities and what value does the Council put on maintaining community libraries? The educational, adult learning role and cultural value of small branches can often be much greater than medium ones and this is capable of further expansion by closer work with schools and small groups. '

A1 The published budget is a Draft Budget and is out to consultation. So, of course, we expect comments on our proposals to come back. I have received a number of questions and representations regarding Marksbury Road Library. I have met people who object to the proposed closure and have listened to their arguments. I have visited the Library and talked to the staff and users there.

The Cabinet's final Budget proposals will be tabled by Cabinet on February 4th. I will continue to take those concerns to Cabinet colleagues between now and that meeting.

RQ7 MS S FAVILLE TO ASK COUNCILLOR R WALKER, EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR HEALTH AND LEISURE

PROPOSED CLOSURE OF MARKSBURY ROAD LIBRARY

Q1 Given the importance that Bristol City Council correctly places upon raising educational attainment and achievement standards, is it not inconsistent to close Marksbury Road library during the government's "Year of Reading", when so many young people use it as a gateway to the wider library service?

A1 See answer to Q2

Q2 Will Councillors show consistency in supporting our young people in every way they can and therefore withdraw this damaging proposal from its draft budget?

A2

A1 & A2 The published budget is a Draft Budget and is out to consultation. So, of course, we expect comments on our proposals to come back.

I have received a number of questions and representations regarding Marksbury Road Library. I have met people who object to the proposed closure and have listened to their arguments. I have visited the Library and talked to the staff and users there.

The Cabinet's final Budget proposals will be tabled by Cabinet on February 4th. I will continue to take those concerns to Cabinet colleagues between now and that meeting.

RQ8 ROBIN CLAPP TO ASK COUNCILLOR R WALKER, EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR HEALTH AND LEISURE

PROPOSED CLOSURE OF MARKSBURY ROAD LIBRARY

Q1 The statistics that have been used to justify the closure of Marksbury Road library are seriously flawed and are not based upon like for like comparisons. Is the Council aware that the library is closed on Tuesdays, Thursdays and Saturday afternoons, only staying open until 19.30 on Monday evenings?

A1 I am reviewing the statistical information with officers.

Q2 Is it not reasonable to suggest that were hours to be extended and the Library Service were to invest in promoting this, the library would be used more frequently and the net cost to taxpayers would correspondingly fall to broadly similar levels to Bedminster?

A2 This will also be reviewed by the Officers and myself.

Q3 Moreover, why has Marksbury Road not been given permission to stock music and film DVDs, computer games, and even jigsaw puzzles, thus ensuring it cannot compete in offering the range of services that library users require?

A3 The published budget is a Draft Budget and is out to consultation. So, of course, we expect comments on our proposals to come back. I have received a number of questions and representations regarding Marksbury Road Library. I have met people who object to the proposed closure and have listened to their arguments. I have visited the Library and talked to the staff and users there.

The Cabinet's final Budget proposals will be tabled by Cabinet on February 4th. I will continue to take those concerns to Cabinet colleagues between now and that meeting.

REPRESENTATIONS FROM MEMBERS OF COUNCIL

(a) Petitions

- (i) Councillor Pickup – Parks and Open Spaces**
Councillor Pickup presented a petition to Council containing 24 signatures. Council agreed that it be referred to the relevant Executive Member.

(b) Statements

(i) Councillor Bagley – Data protection

Council received a statement from Councillor Bagley and it was agreed that it be referred to the appropriate Executive Member.

(ii) Councillor Comer – Timing of Cabinet Meetings

Council received a statement from Councillor Comer and it was agreed that it be referred to the Leader of the Council.

(iii) Councillor Bolton – Safety Issues, Philip Street, Bedminster

Council received a statement from Councillor Bolton and it was agreed that it be referred to the appropriate Executive Member.

(iv) Councillor Dr Rogers – Home Care Future Reports

Council received a statement from Councillor Dr Rogers and it was agreed that it be referred to the Leader of the Council/appropriate Executive Member.

(c) Questions

**MQ1 COUNCILLOR R EDDY TO ASK COUNCILLOR D PICKUP,
EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE**

CHARITABLE WORK IN SCHOOLS

Q1. Is the Executive Member familiar with the excellent charitable

work undertaken by “Operation Christmas Child”?

A1 I am unable to answer any of these questions at this time because the question was changed at the eleventh hour. If the question is put formally at the next Council meeting I will be happy to answer it fully.

Q2. Is the Executive Member aware that for the last few years the annual 'shoe-box' appeal regularly encounters the opposition of a vocal minority, culminating in the recent issuing of a guidance note to schools which could easily be interpreted as an attempt to undermine this charity's efforts?

A2 See answer 1.

Q3. Can the Executive Member confirm whether or not the City Council recently received any complaints regarding this charity and, if so, the nature of these concerns and from whom they originated?

A3 See Answer 1.

Q4. Can the Executive Member give an assurance that, henceforth, any further attempts to threaten, hinder or scupper this worthwhile cause, or indeed the work of similar charitable organisations, will not be entertained by this Council?

A4 See Answer 1.

(The Executive Member later confirmed that he would provide Councillor Eddy with an answer by e-mail.)

MQ2 COUNCILLOR L ALEXANDER TO ASK COUNCILLOR J PRICE, EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR NEIGHBOURHOODS

ENFORCEMENT ACTION

Q1. Can the Executive Member confirm the current Council policy regarding the taking of enforcement action against those who flagrantly fly-tip or persistently litter our streets?

A1 I can confirm that the policy has not changed. Our aim is to achieve compliance rather than having to enforce, in accordance with national guidance such as the Hampton review. We engage, educate and encourage compliance, but take robust and effective enforcement action in all cases where it is proportionate to do so.

Q2. Is the Executive Member aware that in a recent national survey of local authorities (published in The Daily Telegraph), Bristol only recorded a paltry 35 fines last year in comparison with the City of Cardiff's fining of 397 offenders?

A2 To clarify, The Daily Telegraph only asked for Fixed Penalty Notices that were served in relation to domestic fly-tipping or side waste. We believe we answered this accurately, however the question was ambiguous and some other authorities provided different information.

For instance, Cardiff has informed us that they included FPNs for littering with items such as cigarettes and chewing gum. We only included littering FPNs served for fly-tipping single sacks of waste, which is appropriate for small-scale fly-tipping. Larger fly-tips go straight to prosecution.

Cardiff also issue instant FPNs for littering for side waste and for waste put out on the wrong day. In Bristol, we use the appropriate legislation relating to domestic waste put out for collection (section 46 of the Environmental Protection Act). Under this legislation, FPNs can only be served on those householders who put out side waste or waste on the wrong day after they have had notice served on them under section 46. The fine for those in breach is £100.

Overall, since October 2006, 127 Fixed Penalty Notices were served for waste and street scene offences including domestic waste, commercial waste, fly-tipping and littering. All unpaid FPNs and larger-scale fly-tipping cases have been referred for prosecution. Of these 38 cases, 12 were successful, none were unsuccessful and 26 are currently pending prosecution. The most recent case, on 4th January, resulted in a fine of £1000 and £112 in costs for failing to pay the £75 FPN for dumping a black bag of domestic waste at a supermarket recycling site. Surveillance and enforcement at these sites is ongoing.

Q3. Can the Executive Member explain this disparity?

A3 See above.

Q4. When is this situation of apparent enforcement passivity on the Council's part likely to change or be improved?

A4 I hope that my earlier answers demonstrate that enforcement is in no way passive, however there is always room for improvement and you will be aware of the recommendations that the Citizens' Jury

made. These are being actioned, in addition to streamlining services through the “Waste on Land” project, involving integrated enforcement on all land types.

We are stepping up enforcement of side waste in February, with Sita reporting all cases of side waste from two pilot rounds to us, all such householders will be sent a warning letter, followed by a formal Section 46 notice if repeated and a fine of £100 for any subsequent breach of the notice. This will be expanded to all rounds thereafter.

MQ3 COUNCILLOR G HOPKINS TO ASK COUNCILLOR M BRADSHAW, EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR ACCESS AND ENVIRONMENT

Waste Strategy

Q1 Why when the only option presented in the Joint West of England waste strategy stage 3 is a 200,000 tons per annum mass burn incinerator are you insisting to the media that several options are being considered and if this is true what are they?

A1 Seven options were originally considered as part of the Technical Appraisal completed in 2006 for the consultation phase 2. Further studies have been carried out on these options in terms of their environmental impact using the WRATE model and the top three performing options, Advanced Thermal Treatment (ATT), “mass burn” Energy from Waste (EfW) and Mechanical Biological Treatment (MBT), were considered further for a detailed cost analysis. Ernst and Young insisted they were not able to analyse the ATT option due to its financial and technological risk and therefore only EfW and MBT were considered for detailed cost analysis. The statement is therefore correct with the consultant concluding EfW was the best option to go forward on environmental, cost and risk grounds.

Q2 In para 7.1 of the 18/12 joint waste report it states that building a large incinerator (330 000 tons) would “remove the opportunity for new technologies (eg compact power) to prove themselves and would act as a disincentive to further waste reduction reuse and recycling”.

Does he not understand that these points are absolutely correct and also apply to the slightly smaller plant that he plans to build?

- A2 The predicted 330,000 tpa takes account of projected changes in waste arisings to 2020, coupled with a 50% recycling and composting rate. Taking 200,000 tpa out of the total still leaves over 120,000 tpa to deal with. This provides an opportunity to adopt new technologies once they are proven and bankable.
- Q3 The forecast for the total amount of waste for the W.O.E. has been dramatically reduced during the last year mainly as a result of the 10% (20,000 tons) drop in waste arising in Bristol. There is clearly more that can and should be done in Bristol and with other W.O.E. councils now starting to follow the lead given by Bristol over the last 2 years does he not realise that it is folly to sign a 28year P.F.I. deal in 2008 that is likely to be overcapacity?**
- A3 Phase 3 of the strategy is deliberately undersized by at least 120,000 tpa to allow for the possibility of further waste reduction and improved recycling/composting to reduce the quantities of residual waste that remains for treatment.
- Q4 Why when ATT was measured by our advisors as being more cost effective than mass burn have you chosen only to present edited figures (11.5 of report) for landfill BMT and mass burn?**
- A4 Consultants advised us that they were unable to carry out cost modelling of this option due to the inherent risks associated with the technology both in technical and financial terms. They advised us not to proceed with this option at this stage until further assurances can be given by technology providers that the technologies offered could provide a solution for Partnership at an acceptable level of risk.
- Q5 The figures in 11.5 seem to include over £1,000,000,000 for LATS savings but without explanation or detail. Given that it is in the UK government interests as well as councils such as Bristol to improve the LATS scheme was this wise?**
- A5 The figure illustrates the point that the Partnership authorities need to find a timely solution to the problem of residual waste treatment. To do nothing or to linger over the approval of the Strategy is not in their interests of any of the authorities financially.
- Q6 Why is it that the presented figures are skewed by allowing for a huge P.F.I. credit for mass burn but not for any other method and how much is this figure?**

A6 The table considers the different procurement options and illustrates the benefit to the Partnership of obtaining PFI credits. PFI credits have been factored into both BMT and EfW. BMT (£78m revenue support) has significantly less PFI support than EfW (£141m), as it is calculated on relevant capital costs, which are lower for BMT.

Q7 Can you confirm that

- i. Compact power has a cleaner emission profile than mass burn (as confirmed by the environment agency) and that a study carried out for this council and BANES by the South West of England Environmental Trust showed that small scale was preferable to 1 large facility and in particular compact power.**
- ii. ATT (compact power) qualifies for credits for renewable energy but mass burn does not.**

A7 i) The study carried out by WS Atkins showed that the emissions profile for both the small scale plant and EfW both presented an insignificant risk to human health. ATT was very slightly better but the difference was small and inconclusive in terms of the error margins allowed for in the study. The consultants concluded that the decision on which technology to adopt should be made on other factors such as cost, risk and transport.

ii) EfW technology now also qualifies for Renewable Obligation Certificates if it is combined with a good quality combined heat and power scheme. If it does not have a CHP element it receives ROCs on a lower sliding scale according to the efficiency of the plant.

Q8 The Lib Dem administration of 2005-2007 helped to obtain a £5m Defra grant for compact power scheme. Can you explain why this administration has failed to help them to make progress?

A8 My understanding is that Compact Power submitted a bid for Defra support having already secured a project with the City Council on commercial terms. The reasons why Compact Power has not pursued their original project with us is unclear. It is not through any lack of support by the current administration or officers. We are led to understand the delay in bringing the Defra supported project to fruition is due to delays in completing the necessary due-diligence between Defra, Compact Power and its funders. This has been beyond the control of the Council.

Q9 Had Labour and Tory Councillors not voted on 4/12/07 against a commitment for this council to continue waste reduction and

make an early move to 50% recycling we would be ahead of landfill targets until at least the second target year of 2013 so why do you propose to sign up for a 28 year P.F.I. in 2008?

A9 On 4th December the Council did in fact resolve to strive for continued waste reduction and 50% recycling rate together with zero percentage of untreated landfill by 2020. Implicit in any waste strategy which meets the needs of Government is to plan for 20+ years including meeting LATS targets in 2020. The strategy will achieve this. Defra will require that evidence is also provided which will result in the national waste recycling/composting/recovery targets being met before awarding any support to the project.

Q10 Given the options of MBT and compact power why does Bristol as opposed to the W.O.E. need an incinerator?

A10 The City Council has agreed at this stage to work in Partnership with the other West of England authorities to find a solution to the treatment of residual waste. The EfW plant has been proposed as the best option to meet the Partnership's stated requirements. If at any stage the partnership decides not to go ahead, then an alternative strategy for the City Council as an individual authority would need to be considered.

Q11 One of the Defra requirements for the waste partnership is a clear statement on the 3Rs. Our 3 neighbours have clear development plans why, even if you are extending the timetable for improving recycling from 2008 to 2020 do we have no new developments and are we keeping "a watching brief"?

A11 As you will be aware, Bristol is currently the highest performing major city in the UK. Despite this, it is acknowledged that further improvements should be secured, provided they meet the Council's value-for-money criteria.

Q12 Why do you risk the break up of the West of England Partnership by changing strategy to one that does not command public or stakeholder support?

A12 The majority of those who responded to the questionnaire issued as part of the Phase 2 consultation supported the preferred technology solution of thermal treatment. This technology was appraised against environmental, financial and socio-economic criteria and against the Environment Agency's WRATE tool and out-performed all others.

MQ4 COUNCILLOR C CAMPION-SMITH TO ASK COUNCILLOR H HOLLAND, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

OLD VIC THEATRE

I note and welcome the all-party concern about the future of the Old Vic and the desire to keep this theatre performing for the people of Bristol

Q1 In my statement to Council on 4th December on the future funding of the Old Vic, I requested that the Leader should write to the Chair of the Arts Council England. Did she write, what was the response and what are her views on the response?

A1 This statement was referred by Council to the Exec Member for Health and Leisure.

Q2 What representation has she made to the Labour Secretary of State for Culture, Media & Sport, James Purnell, about the future of the Old Vic?

A2 Cllr Campion-Smith will appreciate that since she asked this written question there has been ongoing dialogue that has been taking place at Director level with the Arts Council England at both Regional and National level, and a similar dialogue with senior civil servants in the Department of Culture, Media and Sport, on the future of the Bristol Old Vic over recent months.

The Party Group Leaders and the Executive Members have been updated regularly by the Director of Culture and Leisure, and were aware at the time of the last Council that the Arts Council's concerns were with the governance and management direction of the theatre and it's planned refurbishment programme. To that end the City Council was satisfied with the recommendation of the Arts Council that it would ring fence capital and revenue funding for the Bristol Old Vic on the condition that the problems with governance and management were resolved.

I met with Dick Penny, the Old Vic Board's new Chair Designate before Christmas to discuss the position of the Old Vic and we agreed that nothing would be gained, at that time, by writing to the Chairman of the Arts Council or the Secretary of State. A formal decision on funding is not due to be taken by the Arts Council until the end of January once a new submission has been made by the Bristol Old Vic. That is clearly the time when the City Council should write in support of the Old Vic Theatre's case for continued funding.

Q3 Can the Leader assure me that the Council will maintain its full grant to the BOV next year, as in previous years?

A3 The Director of Culture and Leisure has already provided a letter of comfort to the Chair Designate and to Alderman Barry Dodd, the Council's representative on the Old Vic Board, (to which I gave approval – subject to the Budget being agreed in February) confirming that the City Council has budgeted for the allocation of the full grant in this year and also in 2008/09, subject to agreement (along with ACE) being reached with Dick Penny and the new Board how it will be spent.

**MQ5 COUNCILLOR DR M WRIGHT TO ASK COUNCILLOR H HOLLAND, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL
*POLITICAL PROBITY***

The Leader will recall the Budget council meeting of 2007, where she proposed a motion stating that a Council Tax collection surplus *“either demonstrates gross incompetence or it reveals an active manipulation of the figures by this Administration”*.

Q1 In the light of a similar surplus this year, collected under her own administration, can she explain to the Council which one of those two options - “gross incompetence” or “manipulation of the figures” - her administration has been engaging in?

A1 Neither. The surplus on the collection fund arises from underestimates made by the previous Liberal Democrat administration. Despite inheriting this situation with unrealistic budgets leading to potential overspends, for example in Waste and Adult Community Care, this Labour Administration is, by good political management, reducing these overspends by the end of this municipal year and also propose making additional investment in priority services which residents, communities and businesses have told us are the ones they wish to see.

Q2 If the Leader declines to admit to either of those scenarios, will she now publicly withdraw the accusation of that budget Motion, which was an outrageous slur on both the Liberal Democrat administration of the time, and the Council Officers who worked on the budget?

A2 No. The Liberal Democrats really ought to own up to their ineptitude in proposing their flawed Budget at this time last year.

Q3 Does the Leader believe that public statements and pronouncements made by political parties during election periods should be taken seriously?

A3 Of course.

MQ6 COUNCILLOR DR M WRIGHT TO ASK COUNCILLOR J BEES, EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR SUPPORT SERVICES

COUNCIL TAX

Cllr Bees will recall the Council meeting of 19th June 2007, when in answers to questions he said that he would be “examining closely” the forecast of the number of properties in Bristol and the forecast of the number of discounts and exemptions, in order to ensure that there was no Council Tax collection surplus this year.

Q1 In the light of the above, can the Exec Member explain what changes he has made this year to the forecast of the number of properties in Bristol, and what effect it has had on the Council Tax collection surplus?

A1 The surplus on the Collection Fund arises from a difference between the assumptions about numbers of properties, discounts/exemptions, levels of collection, etc., and the actual position. No amount of examination or forecasting on my part will affect that. The Director’s estimate of the 2007/08 position is that there will be a surplus, in part because the actual number of properties is slightly higher than was estimated last year but mostly because the rate of collection is higher than estimated, both for current year council tax and for arrears from previous years.

I have, however, examined the forecasts for 2008/09 very closely, with the intention that the budget for that year should be set on a basis that does not generate a surplus. The tax base for 2008/09 is 131,384 Band D equivalent properties, up from 128,524. This includes an increase of 2,979 properties between October 2006 and October 2007 (the dates of the annual returns to DCLG) and estimates of completion dates for a further 2,967 properties under construction or which have received planning permission. There has also been a small further reduction in the number of discounts and exemptions.

Given the uncertain state of the property market, there is of course a risk that this rate of completions will not be sustained. However, having examined detailed schedules of information from Development Control, the Property Department and the local tax section, I believe that the figure of 131,384 is a reasonable basis for setting the council tax for 2008/09.

Q2 Can the Exec Member explain what changes he has made this year to the forecast of the number of discounts and exemptions, and what effect it has had on the Council Tax collection surplus?

A2 See A1.

Q3 In that June meeting, The Exec Member stated clearly that he agreed that *“any surplus of Council Tax collected in 07/08 should be used entirely to reduce the estimated Council Tax rise of 4% as stated in the Medium Term Financial Plan.”* The Conservatives agreed with him, while the Liberal Democrats and his Director of Finance argued that this was financially irresponsible and headline-seeking populism. Does he now accept that his Director of Finance and the Liberal Democrats were correct?

A3 At the Budget meeting in March 2007 the Liberal Democrat Administration assured us that the budget they had set would not produce a surplus on the council tax collection fund. They also assured us that they had accurately assessed the level of council tax that would be collected and the number of new properties that would come on to the valuation list in that year. Like many of the other predictions in the budget both of these were inaccurate, and as predicted by myself a healthy surplus has occurred on the council tax collection fund.

When the Labour Administration took over towards the end of first quarter of May 2007 we found projected overspendings of £3.5m. Throughout this year we have worked with staff and officers to contain this overspending and this is likely to be achieved by year end.

However, there are underlying deficiencies in the current budget. These need to be filled and this Administration is proposing a budget that will do that for next year.

The Director of Finance and the Liberal Democrat Administration were incorrect in their assessment of the levels of council tax that would be collected in 2007/2008.

Q4 In answer to another question in that meeting, the Exec Member wrote: *“For the future, though, the Labour Group believes that the Council's finances should not depend on surpluses arising from underestimates of council tax income.”* Yet the current draft budget does exactly that. Is it fair to assume that the current Labour administration did not expect to still be running the Council by the time that budget setting came?

A4 No.

Q5 Despite opposition from Finance officers and Liberal Democrats, Full Council adopted as policy the Labour plan to use any collection surplus to reduce Council Tax in 08/09.

Does the Exec Member realise that if the current Labour administration ignores not just Council financial policy, but its own proposed Council financial policy, it will be impossible to take the Labour Party seriously regarding any future pronouncements of policy?

A5 The Labour Administration is proposing a draft budget to the citizens of Bristol and the other members of the Council, which complies with the City Council's financial policy. We have produced a consultation newspaper explaining the budget, which has been sent to every household, and we are actively involved with Scrutiny Commissions in their examination of this draft budget. This draft budget sticks to the guidelines laid down in the Medium Term Financial Plan, including a 4% increase in the council tax. We believe that this expenditure is justified and will bring real improvements for the citizens of Bristol.

MQ7 COUNCILLOR DR M WRIGHT TO ASK COUNCILLOR M BRADSHAW, EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR ACCESS AND ENVIRONMENT

RESIDENTS' PARKING

Q1 In the December Council meeting, MQ14, Answer 7 the Exec Member stated that the costings proposed for the Residents' Parking scheme were "indicative", which was why they didn't include the costs of financing loans. This is a very worrying attitude to take regarding what could be very significant costs impacting on the 08/09 draft budget. Having had an extra month to work out the costs of financing, can he now present them to the Council?

A1 It would be premature and inappropriate to do so.

Q2 Is the Exec Member aware that every increase in the cost of permits translates into a decrease in the amount of residents supporting such schemes?

A2 It is acknowledged that the views of residents may be influenced by the cost of permits, but in order to meet administrative and enforcement costs, a fee is required. Further discussions are underway on the level of likely fees.

Q3 Is he aware how much harder he has made it for those of us who support such schemes to persuade our constituents to support them in the consultation?

A3 The views of residents will be influenced by a number of factors, including the inconvenience that they suffer as a result of the parking pressures currently experienced. As an advocate of measures to tackle parking pressures, he will understand the need

for targeted action, but also incentives for both residents and commuters.

Q4 The Exec Member has resolutely avoided answering all questions regarding which areas will be the first to undergo consultation for pilot schemes. He must know the answer to this question. Given that the Labour administration promised “openness and transparency”, will he now let us know those areas that are front-runners to be considered?

A4 The decision on where to develop early adoption areas will be based on the results of the public consultation exercise. I know he is keen for areas within his ward to become early adopters. However, officers are working on the project management aspects and we are committed to a phased approach.

**MQ8 COUNCILLOR DR M WRIGHT TO ASK COUNCILLOR J BEES, EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR SUPPORT SERVICES
DRAFT BUDGET**

Q1 The Exec Member has been trying to portray the Council's revenue finances as in a dire strait, when in fact he has been lucky enough to preside over one of the most fortunate series of cash windfalls in recent years. The largest of these windfalls, which has received little attention so far, is the news that the local NHS PCT will be picking up the bill for an extra £2m of health care funding. This huge outlay of money by the PCT will have a significant effect. Can the Exec member outline when he first learnt of this major change and which Council services will now be funded by the PCT?

A1 The impact on the Council's budget arises from a change in October 2007 in national policy defining criteria for continuing health care that is the responsibility of the health service. All PCTs have been assessing the financial implications of these changes, and are also now reviewing the needs and eligibility or otherwise of relevant individuals for continuing health care, within the new criteria. The effects on local authority social care budgets are significant and this was included in the package of draft budget proposals brought forward by the Director of Adult Community Care for discussion with the Cabinet in October.

Q2 Can he also explain what was the rationale for this major change, and state whether this new funding arrangement will continue indefinitely, and whether this will have any implications for the finances of the PCT - which are already stretched?

A2 As indicated, these are national policy changes affecting all PCTs. I understand that individual PCT's financial planning assumptions must take account of the new policy.

Q3 The Government has announced measures for local Councils to promote recycling, including the possibility of charging for certain side-waste. However, the Government has stated that these charges must be revenue neutral. The draft budget appears to contain such measures, but they are not revenue neutral. Can the Exec Member explain why he thinks the Council will not be open to legal challenge on this matter?

A3 The proposal is to implement a charging regime as part of the Council's overall approach to recycling. As I think all members are now aware, the overall package results in a significant net cost – it is not 'revenue neutral', but is certainly not net revenue generating.

Q4 The draft budget appears to contain news of 52 job losses among Council staff. Can the Exec member confirm this?

A4 There are indeed some reductions in personnel establishments, which will in most cases be achieved by normal staff turnover, and there are also some increases, reflecting the net growth in spending and improvements to services in the draft budget.

MQ9 COUNCILLOR M BAILEY TO ASK COUNCILLOR R WALKER, EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR HEALTH AND LEISURE

MARKSBURY ROAD LIBRARY

Q1 Labour's Schools Secretary, Ed Balls, has declared 2008 “ the year of the book” and has said that he wants to encourage more parents to read to their children. How does this fit in with the Labour's Administration proposal to close Marksbury Road Library?

A1 See response to Q5

Q2 Is she aware that nearly 200 pupils from the local primary school use this library every week? It is not practical for the school to take them to other libraries such as Knowle or the Bedminster Library. What does she suggest the school and these children do when her Administration closes this valuable resource?

A2 See response to Q5

Q3 This library is situated in one of the less well off parts of Bedminster and provides access to books and computers for

children and families who may well not have these facilities in their own homes. What does she suggest these families do when the library closes?

A3 See response to Q5

Q4 This library is one of the last remaining community facilities in this area and is used by many community groups and pensioner's organisations. Where does she suggest that these groups meet if the library closes?

A4 See response to Q5

Q5 Does she agree with hindsight that this is an ill-conceived proposal that will only further disadvantage some of the already most deprived families in South Bristol, rob the local school of a valuable resource and deprive the local community of one of the last remaining facilities. For these reasons will she agree to withdraw this proposal from the Labour Budget and lift the threat of closure from Marksbury Road Library?

A5 A1, A2, A3, A4 & A5

The published budget is a Draft Budget and is out to consultation. So, of course, we expect comments on our proposals to come back. I have received a number of questions and representations regarding Marksbury Road Library. I have met people who object to the proposed closure and have listened to their arguments. I have visited the Library and talked to the staff and users there.

The Cabinet's final Budget proposals will be tabled by Cabinet on February 4th. I will continue to take those concerns to Cabinet colleagues between now and that meeting.

MQ10 COUNCILLOR D BROWN TO ASK COUNCILLOR M BRADSHAW, EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR ACCESS AND ENVIRONMENT

CITIZENS' PANEL

At the 15th November Cabinet meeting I made a statement in connection with the item dealing with the possible introduction of Residents' Parking Schemes. Because no replies were forthcoming to the questions contained in my statement, I submitted a series of direct questions to the 4th December Council Meeting (attached) to which you responded, as shown in the minutes of that meeting, in a vague, imprecise and highly generalised fashion.

Having implied that you intend to progress Residents' Parking in the City, the public will wish to have clear answers to the questions I posed earlier. In the absence of an opportunity to ask supplementary questions at the December Council meeting, I believe the public would like to have clear answers to the following questions.

Q1 Have the questions you intend to ask the Citizens' Panel now been formulated by either officers or yourself?

A1 The questions are currently being finalised.

Q2 When will this consultation of the Citizens' Panel be initiated?

A2 The next Citizens' Panel will take place in February 2008.

Q3 When will the Citizens' Panel be asked to report?

A3 The February Citizens' Panel will report in March 2008.

Q4 Do you intend to ask residents the same questions as the Citizens' Panel and, if not, why not?

A4 No. The consultation audiences are different, and the questions will seek to draw out different issues.

Q5 In answer to the question (Question 2) "If these groups differ in their conclusions, which group's decisions will take precedence – Citizens' Panel or residents?" you replied "We will have to wait and see what they say". Your answer appears to imply that you either have a preconceived and preferred answer, and may be willing to override residents' wishes on the basis of the Panel's response, or have not the faintest idea what to do if the Panel and residents' views differ. Please clarify

**(a) which of these interpretations is correct,
(b) whether you could explain your response more fully now, or
(c) explain why you are proposing to undertake consultations without sufficient forethought?**

A5 We will judge our response to the consultations once they have been undertaken.

Q6 In response to further questions (numbers 5, 6, 7 and 8), you appeared to imply that you had, at the time I asked my questions, not thought how you would conduct a survey of

residents' opinions. As you must surely by now have had time to think about how to consult residents, please either (a) give answers to my earlier questions or (b) explain why you are unprepared to provide responses to my purely procedural questions until after you have received answers from residents.

A6 Please allow me to give answers to your previous questions (numbers 5, 6, 7 and 8).

5. Before implementing any scheme, what percentage of the residential population do you consider will need to reply in order for the response to be accepted as "representative"?

I don't intend to define a percentage, but will await the responses.

6. Do you intend to accept the responses of local residents on the basis of a simple majority in favour of the questions asked or would a pre-defined percentage be accepted?

It is not possible to say at this stage.

7. In either case, will you only accept answers from (i) Council Tax payers or (ii) all residents, including those in Houses of Multiple Occupation, who may not pay Council Tax?

It is premature to answer this question.

8. In either case, will you only accept answers from (a) car owners or (b) car users?

All residents within the inner and outer rings will be consulted.

Q7 As the introduction of any Residents' Parking Zone will have financial implications, what provision for this additional work have you included in next years budget?

A7 Appropriate revenue and capital provisions are being made for work on the scheme.

Q8 If no funding provision for this work is included in next years budget, is this because you either (a) do not intend to initiate this work during this year or the next financial year or (b) would do this work at the expense of other routine, but

necessary, work?

A8 Not applicable, see A7.

Q9 In answer to my Question 10, on converting gardens to parking spaces, you stated, “there are planning restriction that can be applied”. Please can you explain what these are and where and when they can be applied?

A9 Certain types of development can be carried out without the need for planning permission. This is known as ‘permitted development’ and covers a wide range of minor developments that can be undertaken within the curtilage of a dwelling house, including paving over front gardens. In some circumstances, authorities may wish to prevent people from exercising these rights in order to retain control on the way in which the development is carried out. This is done by means of a direction under Article 4 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 Order (Statutory Instrument 1995, No. 418).

Q10 Question 15 was “Please detail which areas will be consulted first (and why), when will they be consulted, when decisions to proceed will be made, and when might the scheme be introduced?” and received the nonsensical answer “The expected costs of the various consultation exercises are being developed as part of scheme and business case development”. Please provide a clear answer to this direct question, without reference to other documents.

A10 The scheme will be as defined in the recent report with any adjustments to the principles based on the assessment of the Citizens Panel data. These will be collated during March 2008.

The whole of the indicated inner and outer rings will then be consulted to assess the interest in a residents parking scheme in their area. The responses from this initial consultation will be used to define local areas for early adoption within the inner ring. This will be during early summer 2008. These ‘early adopter’ zones will be designed with further local consultation during the rest of 2008 with a view to legal advertising and possible implementation during early 2009.

I have to add that he is as usual focusing on the very detailed aspects without looking at the wider picture – that we must take effective action to tackle uncontrolled parking. He will also understand, and hopefully welcome, the progress that we have

made since forming the Administration in May 2007.

**MQ11 COUNCILLOR A FOX TO ASK COUNCILLOR R WALKER,
EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR HEALTH AND LEISURE**

TEENAGE PREGNANCIES

Q1 What was the rate of teenage pregnancies in Bristol in 1998?

A1 51.0 per 1000 female population aged 15-17

Q2 What was the rate of teenage pregnancies in Bristol in 2007?

A2 We do not yet have 2007 figures. We expect these in Feb 2009. The latest figures are for 2005. The rate in 2005 was 50.9 per 1000. We expect 2006 rates in February this year.

Q3 How much money has central and local government spent in Bristol since 1st May 1997 on reducing the rate of teenage pregnancies?

A3 Central Government has given Bristol a teenage pregnancy implementation grant since 2002. It was 120k in 2002 and 127k in 2003. Since 2004 it has been 162K a year. In 2006 Bristol also received Neighbourhood Renewal funding to support the schools outreach project. This amounted to 400k over 2 years.

Q4 How does this record compare to the other core cities?

A4

City	1998 rate	2005 rate	2005 number	% change	Implementation grant 2007-2008
Bristol	51.0	50.9	344	-0.2	162k
Birmingham	58.3	52.5	1095	-12.1	644k
Leeds	50.4	49.2	683	-2.6	448k
Liverpool	57.9	47.2	415	-18.4	352k
Manchester	61.3	71.9	591	17.3	471k
Newcastle	52.8	54.4	257	3.0	171k
Nottingham	74.4	71.7	364	-4.0	295k
Sheffield	50.5	51.7	478	2.3	344k

**MQ12 COUNCILLOR A FOX TO ASK COUNCILLOR D PICKUP,
EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE**

ASSULTS ON TEACHERS IN BRISTOL SCHOOLS

Q1 Please can you provide the most up-to-date figures available on the number of teachers assaulted in Bristol's schools?

A1 In 2005/06 there were 110 physical assaults on adults by secondary school pupils. This fell to 72 in 2006/07 we are confident this figure will fall further in 2007/08.

Q2 How does this compare to other core cities?

A2 The average number of assaults on adults in all core cities is 131. The highest number was 229, the lowest 44.

Q3 What steps is the Executive Member taking to reduce the number of assaults on teachers?

A3 It is important to emphasise that there is no excuse for physical or verbal assault against staff working in Bristol schools.

We are working with our schools to ensure that their acceptable behaviour plans are in place and that pupils are aware of their individual responsibilities and behaviours.

We are working closely with our trade unions and professional associations to reduce violence and where appropriate set up support for any member of staff who has been subject to an assault.

MQ13 COUNCILLOR A FOX TO ASK COUNCILLOR J PRICE, EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR NEIGHBOURHOODS

Dangerous Dogs

Q1 Is the Executive Member satisfied that the Council's dog wardens have sufficient resources to control dangerous dogs?

A1 Since the tragedy in Merseyside in Jan 2007, Bristol's dog warden service has dealt with over 60 cases involving Pit Bull Terrier type dogs (banned breeds) under Section 1 of the Dangerous Dogs Act 1991. We respond the same day following requests for assistance, which is a high level of service provision. These cases can be time-consuming due to the amount of work involved in obtaining witness statements. It is difficult to quantify the time involved as each case is different. Whilst this additional work has increased pressure on the service, we are confident at this time that resources are met within existing budgets.

Q2 Can the Executive Member confirm that there are no resource

constraints on Officers' decisions to detain dangerous dogs pending a decision to prosecute the owner?

A2 I can confirm that there are no resource constraints on officers' decisions to detain dangerous dogs pending a decision to prosecute the owner. There are appropriate kennelling contracts in place.

Q3 Can the Executive Member confirm that there are no resource constraints on Officers' decisions to prosecute the owners of dangerous dogs where that is appropriate?

A3 I can confirm that there are no resource constraints on officers' decisions to prosecute the owners of dangerous dogs where appropriate.

CNL

82.1/08

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT IN THE SECTION 106 PROCESS

The Council considered a report of the Physical Environment Scrutiny Commission (agenda item no. 10) summarising the findings and recommendations of the Physical Environment Scrutiny Commission in relation to improving councillor and community engagement in the Section 106 Process.

Councillor Hopkins introduced this report and summarised it for Members.

Councillor Lewis spoke in support of the report.

It was then moved by Councillor Hopkins, seconded by Colin Smith and

RESOLVED - that the actions set out in paragraph 12 to the report be agreed and implemented.

At this point Councillor Bailey moved that the length of the Meeting be extended by 15 minutes. This was seconded and agreed.

CNL

83.1/08

MOTIONS

A. Councillor Janke moved the motion standing in her name on the Council agenda, namely:

“SUPERMARKET BAGS

Council welcomes the work of London Councils in initiating legislation for a levy to be paid on all bags currently provided free by supermarkets. The Bill, as currently proposed, is based on a London-wide campaign, which has gathered wide support across London. Council also welcomes schemes already introduced in Modbury and Brighton to end the use of free plastic bags.

As part of the our Green Capital campaign, Council resolves to take a lead in reducing free bag provision by launching a Bristol-wide campaign to gain voluntary agreement between the Council, business and other interested parties to end the practice of providing free plastic bags within the City.

Council calls on the Leader, the Chair of the Bristol Partnership and all other interested groups to write to local MPs and Parliament calling for the introduction of legislation enabling councils outside London to introduce such a levy.”

Councillor Woodman seconded the motion.

Councillor Alexander then moved the following amendment:

~~"Council welcomes the work of London Councils in initiating legislation for a levy to be paid on all bags currently provided free by supermarkets. The Bill, as currently proposed, is based on a London-wide campaign, which has gathered wide support across London. Council also welcomes schemes already introduced in Modbury and Brighton to end the use of free plastic bags.~~

~~As part of the our Green Capital campaign, Council resolves to take a lead in reducing free bag provision by launching a Bristol-wide campaign to gain voluntary agreement between the Council, business, and other interested parties to end the practice of providing free plastic bags within the City.~~

~~Council calls on the Leader, the Chair of the Bristol Partnership, and all other interested groups to write to local MPs and Parliament calling for the introduction of legislation enabling councils outside London to introduce such a levy."~~

"Council welcomes the opportunity to debate the best way forward in minimising the use of unnecessary plastic carrier

bags.

Council acknowledges the widely differing approach taken in other parts of the world and across the UK in an attempt to address this issue, including the experience of the Irish Republic where a plastic bag levy led to a five-fold increase in the use of plastic.

Council supports an active policy of constructive dialogue with retailers and manufacturers, better education and improved promotion of the need for a more environmentally-friendly approach to plastic bag use. In particular, it applauds the new City Council initiative, in partnership with major supermarkets, to trial outdoor carrier bag recycling banks and looks forward to the expansion of this scheme during the current year.

Nevertheless, such developments do not address the substantive problem of the overall amount of packaging currently relied upon in the delivery of perishable and non-perishable goods to the consumer. Council calls on the Leader to write to the relevant Government Minister urging them to engage in more effective dialogue with manufacturers and retailers to reduce the unsustainable existing levels of packaging. “

Amended motion to read:

“Council welcomes the opportunity to debate the best way forward in minimising the use of unnecessary plastic carrier bags.

Council acknowledges the widely differing approach taken in other parts of the world and across the UK in an attempt to address this issue, including the experience of the Irish Republic where a plastic bag levy led to a five-fold increase in the use of plastic.

Council supports an active policy of constructive dialogue with retailers and manufacturers, better education and improved promotion of the need for a more environmentally-friendly approach to plastic bag use. In particular, it applauds the new City Council initiative, in partnership with major supermarkets, to trial outdoor carrier bag recycling banks and looks forward to the expansion of this scheme during the current year.

Nevertheless, such developments do not address the substantive problem of the overall amount of packaging

currently relied upon in the delivery of perishable and non-perishable goods to the consumer. Council calls on the Leader to write to the relevant Government Minister urging them to engage in more effective dialogue with manufacturers and retailers to reduce the unsustainable existing levels of packaging. “

Councillor Eddy seconded the motion.

Following a debate the amendment moved by Councillor Alexander was put to a vote and **CARRIED**.

It was then

RESOLVED - (i) that Council welcomes the opportunity to debate the best way forward in minimising the use of unnecessary plastic carrier bags;

(ii) that Council acknowledges the widely differing approach taken in other parts of the world and across the UK in an attempt to address this issue, including the experience of the Irish Republic where a plastic bag levy led to a five-fold increase in the use of plastic; and

(iii) that Council supports an active policy of constructive dialogue with retailers and manufacturers, better education and improved promotion of the need for a more environmentally-friendly approach to plastic bag use. In particular, it applauds the new City Council initiative, in partnership with major supermarkets, to trial outdoor carrier bag recycling banks and looks forward to the expansion of this scheme during the current year.

Nevertheless, such developments do not address the substantive problem of the overall amount of packaging currently relied upon in the delivery of perishable and non-perishable goods to the consumer. Council calls on the Leader to write to the relevant Government Minister urging them to engage in more effective

dialogue with manufacturers and retailers to reduce the unsustainable existing levels of packaging.

- B.** Councillor N. Harrison withdrew the motion standing in his name on the Council agenda, namely:

“Sustainable Development – ‘The Merton Rule’

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

“Post Office Closures

This Council believes that Bristol people value the role of local Post Offices in their community and do not wish to see the closure of any more Post Offices in the City.

This Council notes with concern that:

- *Since 1999 under the current Labour Government 61 post offices have closed within the city.*
- *A further 2,500 Post Office closures are planned nationwide.*
- *The urban network of Post Offices will sustain 50% of the planned closures which will result in further reduction in the number of Post Offices within the City.*
- *One in five of the remaining Post Offices in the network are due to be closed, equating to 8 of the remaining 39 Post Offices in Bristol.*
- *During March 2008 the Post Office will map the location of the City’s Post Offices against criteria set by the Government, which will identify a potential closure profile and commencing in May 2008 a six-week ‘public consultation’ will be undertaken on the closure proposals.*
- *The Government have reduced the services available in Post Offices against the wishes of customers.*

- *There is very poor collection service at local sorting offices with most being open for only a few hours in the morning. This is simply not acceptable in today's busy world where a lot of people use Internet shopping and are at work.*

This Council resolves to:

- *Oppose to the Government's Post Office closure programme and respond to the consultation accordingly.*
- *Ask the Chief Executive to investigate ways that this Council can provide services for Bristol people via the network of local Post Offices.*
- *Lobby to increase the opening hours of local sorting offices to provide an evening collection for missed parcels or packages.*
- *Call on our five MPs to lobby the Government to save the Post Office and to report back to this Council on their actions.*
- *To increase the viability of the Post Office network this Council calls on the Government to:*
 - *End the branch closure programme;*
 - *Remove the Royal Mail restrictions on the Post Office to open up further business opportunities for the network;*
 - *Stop removing Government business from Post Offices;*
 - *Carry out a review of which additional Government functions could be carried out through Post Offices; and*
 - *Invest in the Post Office network."*

Councillor Dr Wright seconded the motion.

On being put to the vote it was

- RESOLVED -**
- (i) that Council oppose the Government's Post Office closure programme and respond to the consultation accordingly;**

 - (ii) that the Chief Executive be asked to investigate ways that this Council can provide services for Bristol people via the network of local Post Offices;**

 - (iii) that Council lobby to increase the opening hours of local sorting offices to provide an evening collection for missed parcels or packages;**

 - (iv) that Council call on our five MPs to lobby the Government to save the Post Office and to report back to this Council on their actions; and**

 - (v) that to increase the viability of the Post Office network the Council calls on the Government to:**
 - End the branch closure programme;**

 - Remove the Royal Mail restrictions on the Post Office to open up further business opportunities for the network;**

 - Stop removing Government business from Post Offices;**

 - Carry out a review of which additional Government functions could be carried out through Post Offices; and**

 - Invest in the Post Office network.**

 -

D Councillor Richard Eddy moved the following motion namely:

“Bristol Old Vic”

“Council applauds the exciting vision and ambitions for the Bristol Old Vic recently unveiled by Mr Dick Penny.

Council offers its fulsome support to his and others efforts to get the theatre reopened and provide long-term security so that the Old Vic remains at the heart of the city's thriving arts and culture scene.

Council urges the Arts Council to urgently reconsider its ill-judged decision to suspend annual grant support to the Old Vic. This Authority reaffirms its own £1 million funding pledge to the trustees and calls upon the Arts Council to release the £2 million currently being withheld by them so that essential refurbishment work can be undertaken.

Council recognises that the Old Vic is a genuinely unique and precious regional asset, of national and international repute, in a city which prides itself on its cultural heritage. Consequently, this Authority remains steadfastly committed to doing all in its power to assist in the campaign to save the Bristol Old Vic and requests the Leader of Council write to the Chairman of the Arts Council setting out the Authority's position.”

Councillor Comer seconded the motion.

Councillor Simon Cook spoke in support of the motion but had concerns about the inclusion of the words “ill judged” in it.

Councillor Holland spoke in support of the motion and advised Members that a lot of work was going on behind the scenes.

Councillor Eddy stated that he was happy to amend the motion by dropping the words that concerned Councillor Cook from it.

The motion, as amended, was then put to the vote and it was

RESOLVED - (i) that Council applauds the exciting

vision and ambitions for the Bristol Old Vic recently unveiled by Mr Dick Penny;

(ii) that Council offers its fulsome support to his and others efforts to get the theatre reopened and provide long-term security so that the Old Vic remains at the heart of the city's thriving arts and culture scene;

(iii) that Council urges the Arts Council to urgently reconsider its decision to suspend annual grant support to the Old Vic. This Authority reaffirms its own £1 million funding pledge to the trustees and calls upon the Arts Council to release the £2 million currently being withheld by them so that essential refurbishment work can be undertaken; and

(iv) that Council recognises that the Old Vic is a genuinely unique and precious regional asset, of national and international repute, in a city which prides itself on its cultural heritage. Consequently, this Authority remains steadfastly committed to doing all in its power to assist in the campaign to save the Bristol Old Vic and requests the Leader of Council write to the Chairman of the Arts Council setting out the Authority's position.

(The meeting ended at 7.15 pm.)

LORD MAYOR