



**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF
BRISTOL CITY COUNCIL
HELD ON 14TH OCTOBER 2008 AT 6.00 P.M.**

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

Also in attendance:

Alderman Chalmers, Alderman Dodd, Alderman Mrs Fey and Alderman Pyle.

CNL

39.10/08 LORD MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The following announcements were received and noted by Council:

(i) Alderman Bert Hillman

It was announced that Alderman Hillman had died and his funeral had taken place the previous month. The Meeting stood in silence for a short time.

(ii) Councillor Tony Potter

Councillor Potter was welcomed to his first Council Meeting.

(iii) Sunday Service

All Members were invited to the Service that was taking place on the following Sunday

(iv) Bristol City Council "tie pin" badges

Corporate Communications were thanked for providing each Member with a "tie pin" badge.

CNL

40.10/08 ANNOUNCEMENTS

In accordance with CPR2.1(2)(iv) the following announcements were made:

(i) Councillor Helen Holland – Leader of Council

"Icelandic banks – Bristol City Council's exposure

As reported last week, 116 Councils are known to have had deposits in Icelandic banks. Bristol City Council has loans totalling £8M to Landsbanki and Glitnir bank. The Glitnir bank loan was due to be repaid last Wednesday. The Landsbanki loan is due to be repaid in March.

This is clearly a very serious situation. However, it is too early to say what the long-term implications are. It is premature to view the money as 'lost'. Both banks continue to operate, and are restructuring their affairs. I anticipate that it may be some time before we are clear about the eventual outcome. At this stage, it is too early to predict what the eventual outcome will be.

I can, however, confirm that there is no immediate threat to the Council's operations, and that the Council is actively working with the LGA and the government to resolve this issue as quickly as possible. Following discussions between the Icelandic authorities and the British government, I understand that the LGA will be meeting Treasury officials tomorrow.

These loans were made as part of the Council's normal borrowing and lending activity and were consistent with the policies of previous administrations.

Cllr Margaret Eaton, Chair of the LGA, said today, "This isn't the time for a blame game. This is an unprecedented situation, the extent of which could not have been foreseen", and I trust that we can address this issue in a mature cross-party way, avoiding cheap local party political point-scoring which undermines the confidence of residents and businesses. (Full LGA Current Statement attached)

The Council has an extensive loan portfolio, and lending is diversified, to spread risk. The Council uses external advisers and credit rating agencies to keep our counterparty list under review. In the current, unprecedented conditions I am grateful to the Resources Scrutiny Commission, which, on Friday, resolved to establish a group to review the Council's Treasury Management policy and strategy. I understand that the LGA has today called for an inquiry, led by the Financial Services Authority, into the work of the credit rating agencies."

(ii) Councillor Mark Bradshaw – Cabinet Member for Sustainable Development

“Grove Wood

My Lord Mayor

I wish to make a short statement following consultation with Rosalie Walker and relevant officers.

I should like to thank those members of the public who have submitted statements highlighting concerns about the management of Grove Wood and its future use. And the many people who have contacted the council or have registered with the e-petition.

The wholesale removal of trees from Grove Wood would be unacceptable and there is a clear need for an estate management regime which has the support of local residents and provides for a long term sustainable future for the woodland.

Decisions about tree protection orders or planning matters are for the appropriate development control committee and I understand that a report on tpo powers will be considered by the S&E Committee on 29th October.

In the meantime, Rosalie and myself would be willing to facilitate a meeting between local residents, the landowner, local members and relevant officers to explore the potential for reaching agreement on a sustainable and viable estate management arrangement.

As a green capital, we take our stewardship of the natural environment very seriously and this statement should be seen in that context.”

Councillor Comer then moved that Standing Orders be suspended to allow a 10 minutes debate on this subject. Councillor Bailey seconded this and it was agreed.

Following the debate Councillor Bradshaw summed up and it was

RESOLVED - that both Announcements be noted.

**CNL
41.10/08 MINUTES - 9TH SEPTEMBER 2008**

RESOLVED - that the minutes of the meeting of Council held on 9th September 2008 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Lord Mayor.

**CNL
42.10/08 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

The following declarations were received and noted:

Councillor Brain works for the Home Office.

Councillor Hopkins is a governor of Knowle Park Primary School.

Councillor Kent has stepchildren who attend one of the potentially affected schools in relation to the Primary Review.

**CNL
43.10/08 REPRESENTATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC**

(a) Petitions

(1) Christine Williams – Grove Wood

Christine Williams presented a petition to Council containing 1,110 signatures. Council agreed that it be referred to the Cabinet Member for Sustainable Development.

(2) Janet Rees – Filwood Park

Janet Rees presented a petition to Council containing 475 signatures. Council agreed that it be referred to the Cabinet Member for Culture and Healthy Communities.

(3) Marion Andrews and Jermel Anderson – Kamal Barkarkhan

Marion Andrews and Jermel Anderson presented a petition to Council containing 1,290 signatures. Council agreed that it be referred to the Leader of Council.

(4) Anita Pearce – Iminster Primary School

Anita Pearce presented a petition to Council containing 159 signatures. Council agreed that it

be referred to the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Cohesion and Raising Achievement.

(b) Statements

(1) Paul Smith – Grove Wood

Council received a statement from Paul Smith and it was agreed that it be referred to the Cabinet Member for Sustainable Development.

(2) Steve Micklewright – Grove Wood

Council received a statement from Steve Micklewright and it was agreed that it be referred to the Cabinet Member for Sustainable Development.

(3) Martyn Whitelock – Grove Wood

Council received a statement from Martyn Whitelock and it was agreed that it be referred to the Cabinet Member for Sustainable Development.

(4) Sue Drake – Grove Wood

Council received a statement from Sue Drake and it was agreed that it be referred to the Cabinet Member for Sustainable Development.

(5) Andrew Skuse – Grove Wood

Council received a statement from Andrew Skuse and it was agreed that it be referred to the Cabinet Member for Sustainable Development.

(6) Ivor Needs – Grove Woods

Council received a statement from Ivor Needs and it was agreed that it be referred to the Cabinet Member for Sustainable Development.

(7) Hilary Jones – Grove Wood

Council received a statement from Hilary Jones

and it was agreed that it be referred to the Cabinet Member for Sustainable Development.

(8) Hilary Stewart – Grove Wood

Council received a statement from Hilary Stewart and it was agreed that it be referred to the Cabinet Member for Sustainable Development.

(9) Christine Williams – Grove Wood

Council received a statement from Christine Williams and it was agreed that it be referred to the Cabinet Member for Sustainable Development.

(10) Ryan James – Grove Wood

Council received a statement from Ryan James and it was agreed that it be referred to the Cabinet Member for Sustainable Development.

(11) A Hill – Grove Wood

Council received a statement from A Hill and it was agreed that it be referred to the Cabinet Member for Sustainable Development.

(12) Ceri Triskel – Grove Wood

Council received a statement from Ceri Triskel and it was agreed that it be referred to the Cabinet Member for Sustainable Development.

(13) Debbie and Andy Robertson – Grove Wood

Council received a statement from Debbie and Andy Robertson and it was agreed that it be referred to the Cabinet Member for Sustainable Development.

(14) Richard Taylor Jones – Grove Wood

Council received a statement from Richard Taylor-Jones and it was agreed that it be referred to the Cabinet Member for Sustainable Development.

(15) David Moore – Grove Wood

Council received a statement from David Moore and it was agreed that it be referred to the Cabinet Member for Sustainable Development.

(16) Ian Llewellyn – Grove Wood

Council received a statement from Ian Llewellyn and it was agreed that it be referred to the Cabinet Member for Sustainable Development.

(17) Cheryl Hawkins – Grove Wood

Council received a statement from Cheryl Hawkins and it was agreed that it be referred to the Cabinet Member for Sustainable Development.

(18) Liv Kennard – Grove Wood

Council received a statement from Liv Kennard and it was agreed that it be referred to the Cabinet Member for Sustainable Development.

(19) Nicola James – Grove Wood

Council received a statement from Nicola James and it was agreed that it be referred to the Cabinet Member for Sustainable Development.

(20) Denise Britt – Filwood Park

Council received a statement from Denise Britt and it was agreed that it be referred to the Cabinet Member for Culture and Healthy Communities.

(21) Maureen Cole – Filwood Park

Council received a statement from Maureen Cole and it was agreed that it be referred to the Cabinet Member for Culture and Healthy Communities.

(22) John Pearce – Filwood Park

Council received a statement from John Pearce and it was agreed that it be referred to the Cabinet Member for Culture and Healthy Communities.

(23) Dean Denning – Filwood Park

Council received a statement from Dean Denning and it was agreed that it be referred to the Cabinet Member for Culture and Healthy Communities.

(24) Shaun Bailey – Filwood Park

Council received a statement from Shaun Bailey and it was agreed that it be referred to the Cabinet Member for Culture and Healthy Communities.

(25) John Knuckley – Filwood Park

Council received a statement from John Knuckley and it was agreed that it be referred to the Cabinet Member for Culture and Healthy Communities.

(26) Ken Suckling – Filwood Park

Council received a statement from Ken Suckling and it was agreed that it be referred to the Cabinet Member for Culture and Healthy Communities.

(27) Glenn Vowles – Filwood Park

Council received a statement from Glenn Vowles and it was agreed that it be referred to the Cabinet Member for Culture and Healthy Communities.

(28) John Harper – Filwood Park

Council received a statement from John Harper and it was agreed that it be referred to the Cabinet Member for Culture and Healthy Communities.

(29) Sarah Pearce – Filwood Park

Council received a statement from Sarah Pearce and it was agreed that it be referred to the Cabinet Member for Culture and Healthy Communities.

(30) Jenny Woode – Filwood Park

Council received a statement from Jenny Woode and it was agreed that it be referred to the Cabinet Member for Culture and Healthy Communities.

(31) Lilian Nyahunzvi – Filwood Park

Council received a statement from Lilian Nyahunzvi and it was agreed that it be referred to the Cabinet Member for Culture and Healthy Communities.

(32) B Bimha – Filwood Park

Council received a statement from B Bimha and it was agreed that it be referred to the Cabinet Member for Culture and Healthy Communities.

(33) Fraser Bridgeford – Filwood Park

Council received a statement from Fraser Bridgeford and it was agreed that it be referred to the Cabinet Member for Culture and Healthy Communities.

(34) Gwinear Lloyd – Sefton Park

Council received a statement from Gwinear Lloyd and it was agreed that it be referred to the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Cohesion and Raising Achievement.

(35) Karen Cook – Sefton Park

Council received a statement from Karen Cook and it was agreed that it be referred to the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Cohesion and Raising Achievement.

(36) Robyn Coetzee – Sefton Park

Council received a statement from Robyn Coetzee and it was agreed that it be referred to the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Cohesion and Raising Achievement.

(37) Nicola Rogers – Sefton Park

Council received a statement from Nicola Rogers and it was agreed that it be referred to the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Cohesion and Raising Achievement.

(38) Fiona O’Kane – Sefton Park

Council received a statement from Fiona O’Kane and it was agreed that it be referred to the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Cohesion and Raising Achievement.

(39) Daniella Radice – Sefton Park

Council received a statement from Daniella Radice and it was agreed that it be referred to the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Cohesion and Raising Achievement.

(40) Sarah Ubhi – Sefton Park

Council received a statement from Sarah Ubhi and it was agreed that it be referred to the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Cohesion and Raising Achievement.

(41) Toni Burrows – Sefton Park

Council received a statement from Toni Burrows and it was agreed that it be referred to the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Cohesion and Raising Achievement.

(42) Diane Herrod – Sefton Park

Council received a statement from Diane Herrod and it was agreed that it be referred to the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Cohesion and Raising Achievement.

(43) Julia Richmond – Sefton Park

Council received a statement from Julia Richmond

and it was agreed that it be referred to the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Cohesion and Raising Achievement.

(44) Gurchetan Shoker – Sefton Park

Council received a statement from Gurchetan Shoker and it was agreed that it be referred to the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Cohesion and Raising Achievement.

(45) Merriel Waggoner – Sefton Park

Council received a statement from Merriel Waggoner and it was agreed that it be referred to the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Cohesion and Raising Achievement.

(46) Glenys Mills – Sefton Park

Council received a statement from Glenys Mills and it was agreed that it be referred to the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Cohesion and Raising Achievement.

(47) Sean Burrows – Sefton Park

Council received a statement from Sean Burrows and it was agreed that it be referred to the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Cohesion and Raising Achievement.

(48) Conor Wilson – Sefton Park

Council received a statement from Conor Wilson and it was agreed that it be referred to the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Cohesion and Raising Achievement.

(49) Joel Stokes – Sefton Park

Council received a statement from Joel Stokes and it was agreed that it be referred to the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Cohesion and Raising Achievement.

(50) Bruce Austen – Sefton Park

Council received a statement from Bruce Austen and it was agreed that it be referred to the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Cohesion and Raising Achievement.

(51) Valerie Russell Emmott – Sefton Park

Council received a statement from Valerie Russell Emmott and it was agreed that it be referred to the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Cohesion and Raising Achievement.

(52) Mike Landen – Stockwood Green Primary

Council received a statement from Mike Landen and it was agreed that it be referred to the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Cohesion and Raising Achievement.

(53) Raj Arora – Stockwood Green Primary

Council received a statement from Raj Arora and it was agreed that it be referred to the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Cohesion and Raising Achievement.

(54) Clare Gundry – St George Primary

Council received a statement from Clare Gundry and it was agreed that it be referred to the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Cohesion and Raising Achievement.

(55) Tony Halloran – St Pius X Primary

Council received a statement from Tony Halloran and it was agreed that it be referred to the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Cohesion and Raising Achievement.

(56) Dick North – Primary Review

Council received a statement from Dick North and it was agreed that it be referred to the Deputy

Leader and Cabinet Member for Cohesion and Raising Achievement.

(57) Anita Pearce – Iminster Primary

Council received a statement from Anita Pearce and it was agreed that it be referred to the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Cohesion and Raising Achievement.

(58) Kevin Pearce – Newquay Road

Council received a statement from Kevin Pearce and it was agreed that it be referred to the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Cohesion and Raising Achievement.

(59) Colston Gwyther – Iminster Primary

Council received a statement from Colston Gwyther and it was agreed that it be referred to the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Cohesion and Raising Achievement.

(60) Pip Sheard – Regional Spatial Strategy

Council received a statement from Pip Sheard and it was agreed that it be referred to the Cabinet Member for Sustainable Development.

(61) Clemence Watt – Hebron Church

Council received a statement from Clemence watt and it was agreed that it be referred to the Chair of the Development Control (South & East) Committee.

(62) Derek Hawkins – Affordable Housing

Council received a statement from Derek Hawkins and it was agreed that it be referred to the Cabinet Member for Homes and Streetscene.

(63) Helen Pillinger - SWRSS

Council received a statement from Helen Pillinger

and it was agreed that it be referred to the Cabinet Member for Sustainable Development.

(64) Jeremy Birch – Regional Spatial Strategy

Council received a statement from Jeremy Birch and it was agreed that it be referred to the Cabinet Member for Sustainable Development.

During this item Councillor Bailey moved an extension of time of 20 minutes. Councillor Goulandris seconded this motion and it was agreed.

Colin Smith later moved a further extension of time of 5 minutes. Councillor Bailey seconded this motion and it was agreed.

(c) Questions

RQ1 MR P GOODWIN TO ASK COUNCILLOR M BRADSHAW, CABINET MEMBER FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

WEST OF ENGLAND WASTE MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

Q1. Will the Outline Business Case for the PFI bid by the three remaining West of England partners for Phase 3 of the Draft Waste Strategy include mitigation measures for excess climate change gases arising from the choice of incineration as reference technology, or will those costs be externalised?

A1 The OBC addresses the costs of carbon and this is being factored into the overall cost model

The evaluation criteria for evaluating the tenders will, subject to stakeholder engagement, establish the emphasis which stakeholders wish to place on global warming potential.

Q2. Given that the West of England PFI bid is just one among many for a fixed national pot of PFI credits, can you tell us

(A) whether there is a Plan B in case the bid application is unsuccessful, and

(B) if so, what the preferred technologies are if the PFI

bid should fail?

- A2
- (A) An unsuccessful bid would mean that we do not secure the PFI credits which have been calculated at a value of £84m of capital contribution to the reference project. Therefore Plan B is an additional cost to the taxpayer equivalent to having to fund £84m capital.
 - (B) As I have continually stated there is not a preferred technology. This will only be determined once tenders have been received and have been evaluated against the criteria, which have yet to be determined in liaison with stakeholders.

RQ2 MR P GOODWIN TO ASK COUNCILLOR M BRADSHAW, CABINET MEMBER FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Strategic Transport Authority

Will BCC be objecting to the Secretary of State's threat to drop the recommendation for a Greater Bristol Public Transport Authority (adopted by this council as policy) from the Regional Spatial Strategy?

Can I refer you to the report to Cabinet on the 25th September agreeing the Council's response to the RSS. The Draft Regional Spatial Strategy Examination in Public Panel recommended that consideration should be given to the establishment of a Passenger Transport Authority (PTA) for the wider Bristol City Region. The Secretary of State's comments on the Panel's recommendation was that this was unnecessary, as the forthcoming Local Transport Bill will give the power to Local Authorities who wish to work collectively to establish a Joint Transport Authority.

Meanwhile Bristol has worked hard with our partners in the neighbouring authorities to strengthen governance arrangements for transport and these have already paid off with investment by government of £42 million in the Greater Bristol Bus Network. The Council has previously resolved to support proposals for Integrated Transport Authorities (replacing PTAs) in responding to consultation on the Local Transport Bill. The Council does not consider the Secretary of State's recommendation to undermine this ambition, as these powers will be more appropriately placed in the Local

Transport Bill. We remain confident that nothing stated in the RSS would prevent the possible formation of a strategic transport body for the sub-region if that was agreed by all partners.

RQ3 MR P GOODWIN TO ASK COUNCILLOR M BRADSHAW, CABINET MEMBER FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Temple Meads Multimodal Transport Interchange

Q1. Would you agree that all destinations in Bristol should be accessible from within or outside the city by public transport with no more than one change en route?

A1 The term 'South Bristol Link Road' has not specifically been replaced by 'transport outcome'. I understand the latter term as used in the Secretary of State's Proposed Changes to the Regional Spatial Strategy to include a range of measures across the sub-region that might include targeted infrastructure.

(A) The latter term is used in the Revised West of England Policy HMA 1 where it is stated:-

Action should be taken to:

- tackle congestion on the corridors between Yate and Bristol and between Weston-super-Mare and Bristol and reduce use of the M4 and M5 for local journeys.
- Improve access for all to and from South Bristol and to provide for orbital movement, supporting regeneration and employment growth.

And this action should comprise -

- demand management measures
- sustainable travel measures; and
- if necessary, targeted new infrastructure investment to unlock pinch points.

I therefore do not see any reason to make specific reference to the consultants' recommendation, but you will be aware that the Cabinet have taken the view at their

recent meeting that this general reference to 'transport outcomes' does not adequately express the need for appropriate investment in transport in order to support the sustainable growth of the city and the wider sub-region.

(B) We are working closely with North Somerset Council to ensure that growth in the Ashton Vale area will meet the highest possible standards of sustainability, including its accessibility by public transport, walking and cycling.

Q2. With public consultation due very soon on the two potential 'transport outcomes' between Hengrove and Ashton Vale, and between Ashton Vale and Temple Meads (Rapid Transit),

(A) Would you agree that the benefits of the two public transport proposals together may be significantly more than the sum of their parts, especially in terms of the regeneration of South Bristol?

(B) if so, how that can be factored in to the consultations and the weighing up of the different options?

A2. Both proposals are part of a strategic sub-regional well-connected and integrated network, all of which has been identified as being needed to support sustainable growth and change in the West of England, the vision for which includes regeneration in South Bristol. There will be the opportunity to input and discuss this during the consultation, but the detailed conclusion about costs and benefits will need further technical analysis.

RQ4 MR P GOODWIN TO ASK COUNCILLOR M BRADSHAW, CABINET MEMBER FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

'Transport Outcomes' in South Bristol

Q1. Would you agree that all destinations in Bristol should be accessible from within or outside the city by public transport with no more than one change en route?

A1 It is highly desirable that public transport journeys should be

possible with the smallest number of changes. However, it is not always feasible or cost effective to make all destinations accessible with no more than one change. You will be aware that experiencing European cities shows that changes at hubs and by mode are feasible with good interchange and signage and ticketing.

Q2. Do you support the concept of what SWRDA describes as a 'state of the art transport hub' at Temple Meads to 'provide a seamless transport interchange integrating the rail services with buses, taxis, airport coaches, cycling, the river bus and rail parking'?

A2 Yes, we want to massively improve Temple Meads interchange and a number of studies have been commissioned by various interests to help understand how this might be achieved. I have met Network Rail to discuss the outline proposals and the Council will work in supporting a range of partners in fulfilling this objective. We also want to examine the scope for other interchange opportunities in our city.

Q3. Would you agree that the development site immediately northwest of the station, currently used for parking, represents the best, perhaps the only, opportunity to provide such an interchange?

A3 Not necessarily. As referred to under answer A2 above studies have considered various arrangements for an interchange. I am aware that there are alternative proposals for development around the Temple Meads and Temple Quay area, which include this area.

Q4. Is the council doing anything to bring the key players (the three First transport companies, Network Rail, SWRDA) together to develop plans for such an interchange?

A4 Yes, the Council has worked with Network Rail, SWRDA and other interests to develop an Area Development Framework (ADF) for the Temple Meads area. This has included consideration of interchange arrangements. I, together with BCC officers, will maintain this dialogue and encouragement.

**CNL
44.10/08 PRIMARY SCHOOL REVIEW**

The Council considered a report of Cabinet (agenda item no. 7B) considering the recommendations of the Primary Review and opportunity to make a difference to primary education in Bristol.

Councillor Hammond introduced the report, summarised it for Members and moved it.

Councillor Pickup seconded the report.

Councillor Champion-Smith then moved the following amendment:

(The words struck through are to be removed and the words underlined are to be added.)

RECOMMENDATION

That the Council:

a) notes the key principles within established policy (Cabinet decision of 25 October 2008, CAB 19.10/07 refers) for the Primary Review – to reduce surplus places, support improvement in standards, provide extra places where needed and to improve overall value for money;

b) notes the submission of the Primary Strategy for Change approved by Cabinet on 29 May 2008 (CAB 4.5/08 refers) embodying the principles of the Primary Review;

c) notes the approval by Cabinet on 25 September 2008 (CAB 21.9/08 refers) of revised proposals in line with decisions CAB 19 . 10/07 and CAB 4.5/08;

d) notes that these Cabinet decisions around the Primary Review have proceeded fortuitously without recourse to ‘call in’ by any member of Council in the knowledge that the Primary Review would be debated in full Council on 14th October;

e) notes the cross party support given by reservations raised at the meeting of the Children’s Services Scrutiny Commission on 1 September 2008 to over the principles informing the Primary Review and the emerging final proposals In particular, the opposition expressed towards the

rationale behind the proposed closures, which appears contrary to Government guidance that such action should be reserved for the poorest performing schools.

~~f) advises Cabinet to proceed with closure proposals involving St. George CofE VC Primary School, Stockwood Green Primary School and St. Pius X Catholic Primary School in a way consistent with the Primary Review and paragraphs a) to e) above which have received the support of Cabinet and Scrutiny.~~

f) advises Cabinet to consider the closure proposals involving St. George CofE VC Primary School, Stockwood Green Primary School and St. Pius X Catholic Primary School having regard to the following specific factors:

in the case of St George CofE VC Primary School, future plans for the school should be in the context of a city centre strategy for primary education which considers:

i) the failure to identify a site for the rebuilding of Hotwells Primary School and the likelihood that any new site will be south of the river;

ii) an environmental audit of the sites of St Michael on the Mount Primary School and St George Primary School;

iii) an assessment of how far children will have to travel to their nearest school and the difficulty of that journey;

iv) changes in school age population in the central area;

in the case of Stockwood Green Primary School:

i) the lack of provision of reception places in the area. Council notes that the phase 2 proposal to amalgamate Avon Primary and Avonmouth Primary has been withdrawn because it will not provide sufficient reception places in the area.

in the case of St Pius X Primary School:

its move from special measures, on which Council congratulates the school;

the growing popularity of the school with local parents.

Council believes that, with results and attendance on a steep upward trajectory, the school may well, in just a few years time, be outperforming other schools in the area.

the capacity for expansion of School of Christ the King

g) Requests the Cabinet urgently to re-examine the flawed premises and principles underlying several of the Primary Review proposals and, specifically, reconsiders whether the educational interests of the communities served by St George's CE Primary, St Pius X RC Primary and Stockwood Green are best served by the post-consultation recommendations to close.

The amended recommendation would then read:

RECOMMENDATION

That the Council:

a) notes the key principles within established policy (Cabinet decision of 25 October 2008, CAB 19.10/07 refers) for the Primary Review – to reduce surplus places, support improvement in standards, provide extra places where needed and to improve overall value for money;

b) notes the submission of the Primary Strategy for Change approved by Cabinet on 29 May 2008 (CAB 4.5/08 refers) embodying the principles of the Primary Review;

c) notes the approval by Cabinet on 25 September 2008 (CAB 21.9/08 refers) of revised proposals in line with decisions CAB 19 . 10/07 and CAB 4.5/08;

d) notes that these Cabinet decisions around the Primary Review have proceeded fortuitously without recourse to 'call in' by any member of Council in the knowledge that the Primary Review would be debated in full Council on 14th October;

e) notes the reservations raised at the meeting of the Children's Services Scrutiny Commission on 1 September 2008 over the principles informing the Primary Review and the emerging final proposals ; In particular, the opposition expressed towards the rationale behind the proposed closures, which appears contrary to Government guidance

that such action should be reserved for the poorest performing schools.

f) advises Cabinet to consider the closure proposals involving St. George CofE VC Primary School, Stockwood Green Primary School and St. Pius X Catholic Primary School having regard to the following specific factors:

in the case of St George CofE VC Primary School, future plans for the school should be in the context of a city centre strategy for primary education which considers:

i) the failure to identify a site for the rebuilding of Hotwells Primary School and the likelihood that any new site will be south of the river;

ii) an environmental audit of the sites of St Michael on the Mount Primary School and St George Primary School;

iii) an assessment of how far children will have to travel to their nearest school and the difficulty of that journey;

iv) changes in school age population in the central area;

in the case of Stockwood Green Primary School:

i) the lack of provision of reception places in the area. Council notes that the phase 2 proposal to amalgamate Avon Primary and Avonmouth Primary has been withdrawn because it will not provide sufficient reception places in the area.

in the case of St Pius X Primary School:

its move from special measures, on which Council congratulates the school;

the growing popularity of the school with local parents.

Council believes that, with results and attendance on a steep upward trajectory, the school may well, in just a few years time, be outperforming other schools in the area.

the capacity for expansion of School of Christ the King

g) Requests the Cabinet urgently to re-examine the flawed premises and principles underlying several of the Primary

Review proposals and, specifically, reconsiders whether the educational interests of the communities served by St George's CE Primary, St Pius X RC Primary and Stockwood Green are best served by the post-consultation recommendations to close.

Councillor Goulandris seconded the amendment.

Following a debate the Lord Mayor stated that he considered that there had been sufficient debate on the issue.

Councillor Hammond summed up stating that his Group would accept the amendment moved by Councillor Champion-Smith.

The amendment moved by Councillor Champion-Smith was then put to the vote and **AGREED**.

The report moved by Councillor Hammond as amended by Councillor Champion-Smith was then put to the vote and **AGREED**.

It was therefore

RESOLVED - (i) that Council notes the key principles within established policy (Cabinet decision of 25 October 2008, CAB 19.10/07 refers) for the Primary Review – to reduce surplus places, support improvement in standards, provide extra places where needed and to improve overall value for money;

(ii) that Council notes the submission of the Primary Strategy for Change approved by Cabinet on 29 May 2008 (CAB 4.5/08 refers) embodying the principles of the Primary Review;

(iii) that Council notes the approval by Cabinet on 25 September 2008 (CAB 21.9/08 refers) of revised proposals in line with decisions CAB 19 . 10/07 and CAB 4.5/08;

(iv) that Council notes that these Cabinet

decisions around the Primary Review have proceeded fortuitously without recourse to ‘call in’ by any member of Council in the knowledge that the Primary Review would be debated in full Council on 14th October;

(v) that Council notes the reservations raised at the meeting of the Children’s Services Scrutiny Commission on 1 September 2008 over the principles informing the Primary Review and the emerging final proposals ; in particular, the opposition expressed towards the rationale behind the proposed closures, which appears contrary to Government guidance that such action should be reserved for the poorest performing schools.

(vi) that Council advises Cabinet to consider the closure proposals involving St. George C of E VC Primary School, Stockwood Green Primary School and St. Pius X Catholic Primary School having regard to the following specific factors:

a) in the case of St George C of E VC Primary School, future plans for the school should be in the context of a city centre strategy for primary education which considers:

i) the failure to identify a site for the rebuilding of Hotwells Primary School and the likelihood that any new site will be south of the river;

ii) an environmental audit of the sites of St Michael on the Mount Primary School and St George Primary School;

iii) an assessment of how far children will have to travel to their nearest school and the difficulty of that journey;

iv) changes in school age population in the central area;

b) in the case of Stockwood Green Primary School:

i) the lack of provision of reception places in the area. Council notes that the phase 2 proposal to amalgamate Avon Primary and Avonmouth Primary has been withdrawn because it will not provide sufficient reception places in the area.

c) in the case of St Pius X Primary School:

i) its move from special measures, on which Council congratulates the school;

ii) the growing popularity of the school with local parents. Council believes that, with results and attendance on a steep upward trajectory, the school may well, in just a few years time, be outperforming other schools in the area;

iii) the capacity for expansion of School of Christ the King; and

(vii) that Council requests the Cabinet urgently to re-examine the flawed premises and principles underlying several of the Primary Review proposals and, specifically, reconsiders whether the educational interests of the communities served by St George's CE Primary, St Pius X RC Primary and Stockwood Green are best served by the post-consultation recommendations to close.

CNL

45.10/08 REPRESENTATIONS FROM MEMBERS OF COUNCIL

(a) Petitions

(1) Councillor Steve Comer – Anti Social Behaviour

Councillor Comer presented a petition to Council containing 11 signatures. Council agreed that it be referred to the Cabinet Member for Care, Tackling Deprivation and Crime.

(2) Colin Smith – Hebron Court

Colin Smith presented a petition to Council containing 118 signatures. Council agreed that it be referred to the Chair of the Development Control (South & East) Committee.

(3) Councillor Kevin Quartley – New Crossing, Bedminster Down

Councillor Quartley presented a petition to Council containing 360 signatures. Council agreed that it be referred to the Cabinet Member for Sustainable Development.

(4) Councillor Fabian Breckels – Furber Road

Councillor Breckels presented a petition to Council containing 195 signatures. Council agreed that it be referred to the Cabinet Member for Sustainable Development.

(b) Statements

(1) Councillor Ron Stone – Gambia and Avon Fire Services in Partnership

Council received a statement from Councillor Stone and it was agreed that it be referred to the Lord Mayor.

(2) Councillor Geoff Gollop – Icelandic Banking Sector

Council received a statement from Councillor Gollop and it was agreed that it be referred to the Cabinet Member for Transformation and Resources.

(3) Clare Champion-Smith – Youth Services

Council received a statement from Councillor Champion-Smith and it was agreed that it be referred to the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Cohesion and Raising Achievement.

(4) Councillor Tim Kent – Icelandic Investments

Council received a statement from Councillor Kent and it was agreed that it be referred to the Cabinet Member for Transformation and Resources.

(5) Councillors Dennis Brown and Clare Champion-Smith – Publicly Accessible, Bus Route U5

Council received a statement from Councillors Brown and Champion-Smith and it was agreed that it be referred to the Cabinet Member for Sustainable Development.

(6) Councillor Dr Mark Wright – Proposed Primary School Closures

Council received a statement from Councillor Dr Wright and it was agreed that it be referred to the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Cohesion and Raising Achievement.

(c) Questions

MQ1

COUNCILLOR A FOX TO ASK COUNCILLOR M BRADSHAW, CABINET MEMBER FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

REMODELLING OF BLACKBOY HILL ROAD JUNCTION

On 22nd July 2008, I put questions to you at Full Council regarding the proposed remodelling of the junction at the top of Blackboy Hill. In supplementary questions I asked whether you would publish the evidence upon which the decision was based. I also requested details of the effect of the proposed changes on the flow of traffic during the morning peak. You agreed to provide these.

In my email to you of 23rd July I wrote asking you to confirm whether the decision itself was taken by you or delegated to an Officer.

Q1. Please can you explain why, as of 24th September, I had still not received any of the information requested?

A1 The information was sent on 26th September. The delay was due to officers preparing for the commissioning of the traffic control centre and preparing for the opening of Cabot Circus.

Q2. Do you remain convinced that the scheme to remodel the junction is a good use of taxpayers' money?

A2 The initial proposal was subject to rigorous economic appraisal by DfT as part of the Greater Bristol Bus Network major scheme bid. However, officers are also looking at alternative schemes to ensure the most effective scheme in terms of promoting safety, reducing congestion and value for money is built. This review exercise is being undertaken on all GBBN corridors.

Q3. Do you continue to believe that the scheme to remodel the junction will improve traffic flow both in the morning and in the afternoon?

A3 Yes. The work will only be undertaken on that basis and will be further informed by the work outlined in A2.

MQ2 COUNCILLOR A FOX TO ASK COUNCILLOR M BRADSHAW, CABINET MEMBER FOR SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT CONGESTION CHARGING

I note with interest that an article in the "Builder and Engineer" (dated Monday, 22nd September 2008) states the following:-

"Cllr Helen Holland had announced at the Labour Party Conference that Bristol City Council has become the latest to confirm that it is to submit a bid for Transport Innovation Fund (TIF) money to ease congestion in the city.

It is said to be preparing a joint bid with Bath. As part of

the package both cities will introduce a congestion charge.

The news comes as Manchester's bid heads towards a referendum in which the congestion charge element of the proposal is likely to be rejected. This would ensure the TIF money would be withdrawn.

News of Bristol's bid was confirmed to the magazine NCE by the leader of Bristol City Council (BCC) Helen Holland at the Labour Party Conference in Manchester.

The bid would be for up to £1.4bn in government money to improve public transport, and BCC to impose a congestion charging scheme."

Q1. Was the Executive Member aware of this decision before it was announced?

A1 You are portraying the comments made by the Leader of Council as some radical departure from the current position. Perhaps you need reminding of the various debates in this House, when we have discussed how to obtain the funding to bring about a step change transformation in Bristol's public transport system. The initial proposal to develop a joint bid is therefore common knowledge and I refer you to the West of England Partnership document "Our Future Transport" which has been on the website since Oct 2007.

Q2. Why was the announcement made to a fringe meeting of the Labour Party Conference instead of to this Council?

A2 No announcement was made and this council has been kept up to date with the development of a possible TIF bid. I welcome any opportunity that anyone has to promote at the highest level the good work that is being undertaken with our partners in the West of England to deliver real transport improvements.

Q3. Does the Executive Member propose to hold a referendum in the City on the merits of introducing a congestion charge?

A3 As the proposals are developed we will consult widely at appropriate times, as we did, for example, during the preparation and approval process for the Joint Local

Transport Plan. I think your plan (if you have one) is to condemn Bristol to a position where radical change is impossible because we have been unable to attract the necessary funding to the sub-region.

Q4. If so, when?

A4 See A3.

MQ3 COUNCILLOR C SMITH TO ASK COUNCILLOR H HOLLAND, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

“A leading member of the Liberal Democrat Party in Bristol City Council was recently heard to claim that at last Full Council (9th September 2008) the other 2 parties ‘walked out’ during the debate on the Waste Strategy.

Q1 Is this true and do you recall it?

A1 I’m shocked and sadly not surprised that a Liberal Democrat party member should invent statements like this which clearly are not true. Fortunately we now have evidence on the webcast if anyone is foolish enough to believe this claim.

MQ4 COUNCILLOR C SMITH TO ASK COUNCILLOR M BRADSHAW, CABINET MEMBER FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Impact of Delayed Bid for PFI Tax Credits

"In a recent report (BBC News 25/9/08), the Audit Commission has warned local councils that they face millions of pounds of fines if they do not meet EU landfill targets.

Q1 What will be the impact on Bristol taxpayers of the Liberal Democrat campaign being orchestrated by Cllr Hopkins (formerly Executive Member for Rubbish) intended to wreck the carefully balanced and considered West of England Waste Strategy in stopping or delaying its bid for PFI Tax Credits?"

A1 The West of England Joint Waste Strategy is designed to protect the authorities from the risk of substantial LATS penalties.

The latest estimates of the financial benefit of securing

DEFRA's support, through PFI credits, is £114M over the life of the project, as compared with alternative ways of procuring treatment capacity.

The Audit Commission makes clear the dire extent of financial risk should local councils ignore the need to divert household waste from landfill as a matter of urgency. Their report 'Well Disposed: Responding to the Waste Challenge' (September 2008) sets out a number of key questions aimed at councillors, including 'What are the risks that any new waste treatment facilities we need will not be ready on time? What will be the consequences if they are not? How are we managing those risks?' The Joint Waste Management Strategy is designed to address these and other questions. Surprisingly, the Liberal Democrats continue to ignore this consistent advice being received by Bristol and other councils across the country and so they are putting Bristol's council taxpayers at risk.

MQ5 COUNCILLOR C BOLTON TO ASK COUNCILLOR M BRADSHAW, CABINET MEMBER FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES ACT

The Sustainable Communities Act 2007 aims specifically to 'promote the sustainability of local communities'. It has been described as a measure which - in theory, at least - could be used halt the decline of local jobs or businesses, stop the closure of the local Post Office, police station, small shop, pub, doctors surgery, dentist, hospital etc, increase or improve the level of affordable housing, local bus service or cause action to be taken on climate change.

It does this because 'the Secretary of State must invite local authorities to make proposals which they consider would contribute to promoting the sustainability of local communities'.

Local authorities have to 'before making any proposal... to establish or recognise a panel of representatives of local persons and consult it about the proposal'

According to the Local Works website (<http://www.localworks.org/node/3>), 'this October central

government will invite local authorities (including county councils) to 'opt in' to the Sustainable Communities Act process. If they do not do this then their local communities (you!) will not be able to use the Act at all.'. The Local Government Association seems to doubt the need to opt in to the Act (<http://www.lga.gov.uk/lga/core/page.do?pagelid=1007116>).

Q1. Does the Executive member support the aims of the Sustainable Communities Act?

A1 Yes, I do. The aim of this legislation, promoted by the Labour Government, is to promote sustainability of local communities. 'Sustainability' is defined in the Act in very broad terms, and can cover anything which could improve the economic, social, or environmental well being of the area, or promote participation in civic or political activity. Sustainability is at the heart of our Local Area Agreement, the emerging City Strategy, the Corporate Plan and Local Development Framework.

Local authorities are not under a legal duty to participate or promote the act but its aim is to encourage local communities to come forward with ideas and proposals to promote the sustainability of their local area. Ultimately anyone can suggest a proposal, via their council. The expectation is that most proposals will come from community organisations, local branches of national organisations, parish and town councils, neighbourhood forums, residents and tenants associations, local strategic partnerships and other partnership bodies.

Proposals could be developed by the Council itself, who would need to discuss any ideas with local panels and try to reach agreement. Ideas could be generated through the development of sustainable community strategies and local area agreements. Proposals could advocate changes to the law, and changes to which body provides particular public services. From October 2008 onwards, the LGA, as 'Selector' under the Act, will receive, consider and short-list proposals made under the Act.

The LGA held a conference today, the 14th October, to launch the provisions of the Sustainable Communities Act 2007 and invitations to make proposals must be issued by the

Secretary of State by the 23rd October 2008. There will then be at least a six-month period for the development of proposals locally and submission to the Selector, allowing for the requirement for community engagement. Further information on the process to be followed will be published alongside the invitation.

Q2. Will he, himself, or collectively through the Cabinet, ensure that the Act is implemented in Bristol, and that Bristol participates in the Act?

A2 Following the invitation to make proposals and the process to be followed the Council will need to consider how this might be taken forward in Bristol. I intend to discuss the matter with my Cabinet colleagues as the legislation is far reaching and covers other Executive Member portfolios.

Q3. Will he ask officers to brief councillors (possibly through the Sustainable Development and Transport commission), neighbourhood partnerships and other local groups on both the Acts existence and ways to make use of it for improved 'bottom up' democracy?

A3 Discussions with members will be part of the consideration of the proposals within the Act, and I would particularly welcome positive engagement from Scrutiny members.

MQ6 COUNCILLOR C BOLTON TO ASK COUNCILLOR M BRADSHAW, CABINET MEMBER FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Local shops and high streets v Cabot Circus

Q1. Approximately how much money has been spent in terms of council officer time/money in support of the Cabot Circus development?

A1 Officer time and support can be divided into:

1) Non-discretionary statutory duties such as dealing with planning applications, highway adoption, licensing, building control etc. Planning fees paid by developers are set at a level to cover the majority of the work to assess their applications

2) A significant amount of project work has also been on

going over the last 10 years or so to help support city centre and Broadmead regeneration by securing the expansion through Cabot Circus. A project officer within Property Services and within Planning Services have been the main staff input to the project over this period, averaging approximately 60% of their time. A small budget was used initially (pre 2000) to fund such items as the early stages of consultation. Most of the project costs after 2000 (including the Council's) were then picked up by the developer, including officer and consultant's costs. For a project that has brought in approximately £500m of direct investment many thousands of jobs through the construction phase and four thousand jobs now, plus an unquantified amount of indirect economic activity, there has been a relatively small amount of capital or revenue expenditure borne by the council.

Q2. How does this compare with the level of support/expenditure given to supporting local high streets?

A2 As in the answer to question 1 this is difficult to quantify. For example last year's Retail Study, jointly commissioned by Planning and Regeneration to identify issues with retail centres throughout the city, was completed at a cost of about £145,000. Follow up work to the Retail Study identified an extensive range of support to our local high streets by various services within the City Council, from the Green & Clean teams and local car parks to the re-furbishment of libraries, in centres such as Crow Lane, Greystoke Ave and St George, and Legible City signage in Easton and Lawrence Hill. Other examples include support over many years for Stokes Croft, through the Conservation programme, and more recently support for an enterprise manager. There was very significant council input to the regeneration of Symes Avenue over the last 10 years or so. In summary our support for other local centres covers a wide range of council services and initiatives, including ongoing interventions and regulatory measures which help support local retail.

Q3. Now that Cabot Circus has been completed, can we expect to see an increased level of support for local high streets?

A3 In the three weeks since Cabot Circus opened with more than a million visitors, it is clear that the city centre's position as an

economic centre has been strengthened substantially

What major regeneration has shown in other cities is that to have thriving neighbourhoods you need a strong economic heart. The Retail Study Progress Report is due to be published shortly, detailing the services and activities being delivered in response to issues identified by the Retail Study and the consultation on its findings. This will also identify new activities to be undertaken, both by the City Council and its partners. One particular new activity will be the piloting of a place management approach to improving retail centres identified as needing additional support in the Retail Study. This approach will be lead by a Street Management Group, bringing together a number of council services, which will have an indicative budget of £700,000 for initial activities this year.

Q4. Does the Executive member approve of the increasing numbers of supermarkets opening on local high streets within Bristol?

A4 There is no planning control over the change from one retailer to another in premises that are already in use as a shop. If planning permission is sought for a supermarket within a high street location then our policy is to support the principle of this location as opposed to an out of centre location but where this reinforces a local centre. Planning regulations do not allow planning authorities to favour a particular retailer or type of retailing format because they all fall within the same use class.

Q5. Does the Executive member support the opening of the Tesco's Metro opening on North Street?

A5 The decision to allow a Tesco Metro in North St was taken by the Development Control committee in 2007 taking into account policy in the Local Plan. The site was previously in use for retail purposes and in the adopted Local Plan a secondary retail frontage within Bedminster local centre. The fact that Tesco was the intended retailer was not something that could be taken into account by DC members in that decision.

Q6. Will the council include policies in its local development framework, which give preference to small-scale independent traders over large-scale

national/multinational chains?

A6 The LDF Core Strategy Preferred Options supports the role of local and district centres which serve local communities. Supporting such centres and focusing development in them can provide opportunities for smaller and independent businesses to thrive. However, national planning policy does not allow for decisions on retail development to be made on the basis of business ownership. The Council has recently urged the Government to do more in its Planning Policy Statement 6 to support a diverse retail sector with a strong representation of independent outlets.

MQ7 COUNCILLOR S COOK TO ASK COUNCILLOR J BEES, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSFORMATION AND RESOURCES

Q1 Will the Executive Member please confirm that he is refusing to put into the Capital Programme what he describes as the ‘relatively small amount’ of £340,000 for the progression of Stages 2 and 3 of the Colston Hall project to RIBA Stage D?

A1 As reported on numerous occasions, there is no scope to add discretionary expenditure to the Capital Programme at this stage.

Q2 Why did he say at Cabinet that the Council ‘would be expected to spend somewhere in the region of £30m on the building out of this project?’

A2 There have been a number of estimates of the full cost of stages 2 and 3, and a number of speculations as to the extent of assistance from partners. I believe that completion of the project will require a very substantial financial contribution from the City Council.

Q3 Would he agree that People, Places and Spaces, the new cultural infrastructure strategy for the South West published by Culture South West identifies 5 key projects: that one of these is the Colston Hall – specifically the ‘completion of phases two and three to create an internationally significant concert hall for symphonic and other musical performance.’ And that it goes on to say that these 5 projects ‘are beyond the

remit of a single agency and require collaboration to bring to fruition...and can only be realised through multiple cross sector collaboration and investment.'

A3 Yes.

Q4 Would he agree that the implication of this is that the Council would receive considerable external grant aid for the Colston Hall project and thus that his assertion that the Council would have to find another £30m is very unlikely?

A4 There is a big difference between a statement that a project 'can only be realised through multiple cross sector collaboration and investment' and being confident that multi-million pound contributions will actually be forthcoming.

Q5 Will he now commit to providing this funding so that the message that will go out to the South West Regional Development Agency, the Government Office for the South West, the Arts Council and the other nine agencies signed up to People, Places and Spaces is that the Council is committed to this project and is determined to see it completed within the next ten to fifteen years?

A5 See page 1.

Q6 Would he agree that if he doesn't then the excellent Design Team for this project will have to be stood down early in the New Year and thus will not be able to progress the project beyond Phase 1 currently in construction?

A6 I anticipate that the professional practices that make up the Design Team will still be available in the future.

MQ8 COUNCILLOR B JANKE TO ASK COUNCILLOR J BEES, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSFORMATION AND RESOURCES

Filwood Park

Q1 Would the Executive Member say how much the Council received from the sale of Filwood Park?

A1 £4M.

Q2 Would the Executive Member provide details of how the local community was consulted?

A2 Consultation included attendance at residents' meetings and advertising in the Evening Post and in the locality.

The transaction was a sale to a partner organisation, English Partnerships. It was not a development proposal: development proposals will go through the normal process in due course.

Q3 Could the Executive Member provide an explanation of how this sale affects the Area Green Space plan?

A3 The area is well served by green space.

Q4 Will the executive Member give assurances that 70% of this sum will be spent on parks and green spaces to benefit local residents?

A4 The receipt is being used to finance regeneration work in the local area.

This preceded the adoption of the Parks and Green Spaces Strategy.

Colin Smith moved an extension of time of 5 minutes for the part of the meeting relating to the consideration of Reports from the Executive so that the next item could be considered. This was seconded and agreed.

CNL

46.10/08

**BRISTOL LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK -
STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT**

The Council considered a report of Cabinet (agenda item no. 7A) setting out the Bristol Local Development Framework - Statement of Community Involvement.

Councillor Bradshaw introduced this report, summarised it for Members and moved it.

Colin Smith seconded the report.

After a debate Councillor Bradshaw summed up and on being put to the vote it was

RESOLVED - that the Statement of Community Involvement (appendix A to the report) be adopted as part of the statutory Bristol Development Framework following its examination by a Planning Inspector in July 2008.

**CNL
47.10/08**

REPORT OF THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING WORKING GROUP

The Council considered a report of the Affordable Housing Working Group (agenda item no. 8A) considering and endorsing the report of the Scrutiny Working Group.

Councillor Eddy introduced this report, summarised it for Members and moved it.

Councillor Popham seconded the report.

After a debate Councillor Eddy summed up and on being put to the vote it was

RESOLVED - that the report of the Scrutiny Working Group be endorsed and the recommendations forwarded to the relevant Executive Members (Homes and Streetscene, Sustainable Development and Transformation and Resources) for consideration and action.

**CNL
48.10/08**

POLLING STATIONS AND POLLING DISTRICT REVIEW IN BISHOPSWORTH

The Council considered a report of the Head of Legal Services (agenda item no. 9A) setting out details of the review of polling station and polling district in Bishopsworth.

Councillor Eddy moved the report.

Councillor Holland seconded the report.

It was put to the vote and

RESOLVED - that following the review of polling

**stations and polling districts in
Bishopsworth Ward that:**

- (1) it be noted that the Returning Officer is proposing to move the polling station at Zion Methodist Church to Cheddar Grove Primary School; and**
- (2) the boundary between polling districts BHA and BHB is realigned to take Cheddar Grove Primary School and adjacent streets into the latter.**

CNL

49.10/08

**CHANGES TO CONSTITUTION - DELEGATION
FUNCTIONS**

The Council considered a report of the Head of Legal Services (agenda item no. 9B) setting out changes to the constitution - delegation functions.

Councillor Holland moved the report.

Councillor Hammond seconded the report.

It was put to the vote and

- RESOLVED -**
- (1) that the Leader's new scheme of delegation of executive functions be noted; and**
 - (2) that non-executive licensing functions be delegated to the Neighbourhoods directorate when the licensing team moves to that directorate from the City Development directorate.**

CNL

50.10/08

MOTIONS

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

“Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS)

Council strongly supports many of the objections made by neighbouring Authorities and others to the proposed changes that the Secretary of State for the Department of Communities and Local Government proposes to make to the draft Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS).

In particular, Council considers the latest increase in Bristol’s proposed housing target (to 36,500 new homes by 2026) as unrealistic and unworkable, especially given the time-scale involved and the current state of the housing market.

Council reiterates its commitment to sustainable and balanced housing growth but considers the Labour Government’s arbitrary increase in volume would have severe consequences for our quality of life, infrastructure and the land available for leisure and employment use. Council is particularly concerned at the Secretary of State’s amendments place significantly less emphasis on redeveloping brownfield sites, appears to encourage unrestrained urban sprawl and will result in the erosion of the Green Belt.

Council is also dismayed that previous sections of the RSS dealing with locally devolved sustainability policies and transport initiatives - such as the creation of a strategic transport authority covering the sub-region - have been deleted by the Secretary of State.

Council calls upon the Leader to convey this Authority’s opposition to these changes in the draft RSS, especially the revised and inflated housing numbers which we consider to be undeliverable, unsustainable and unacceptable.”

Councillor Abraham seconded the Motion.

Councillor Bradshaw moved the following amendment:

Paragraph 2

In line 3, after `as' replace `unrealistic and unworkable' with *`deeply challenging.'*

In line 5, after `especially given the timescale involved,' add *`the additional resources needed to assist in delivery.'*

Insert a new paragraph 3 as follows

However, Council recognises the need to provide more affordable housing for the people of Bristol and the city region and supports the need to continue to be ambitious about delivering these homes where they are most needed.

New Paragraph 4 (former paragraph 3)

In line 2, replace `but considers the Labour Government's arbitrary increase in volume would have severe consequences' with *`which should be focused predominantly on existing urban areas, and shares the concerns expressed by the Regional Assembly concerning the implications.'*

Replace everything after `employment' with *`and other uses if this growth is poorly planned and unsupported by infrastructure.'*

Add two new paragraphs after the new paragraph 5:-

However, Council does not view this as a barrier to strengthening governance on such matters within the West of England, which may eventually lead to the formation of an Integrated Transport Authority. It reaffirms its support for such joint working.

Council is opposed to the weakening of measures to promote sustainability, in particular, boosting the generation of renewable energy and encouraging eco-friendly forms of construction. It views this as a potentially damaging step which could confuse the construction industry and scheme promoters.

Final paragraph

Replace all after `this Authority's opposition to,' with:-

`the additional housing numbers over and above the original figures in the draft RSS and the weakening of various sustainability measures set out in the proposed changes. Furthermore, Council supports the need to reassess the capacity to deliver in the region, particularly in terms of public transport and asks the

Leader to emphasise this as a priority for Bristol and the city region.'

Final motion to read:-

REGIONAL SPATIAL STRATEGY (RSS)

“Council strongly supports many of the objections made by neighbouring Authorities and others to the proposed changes that the Secretary of State for the Department of Communities & Local Government proposes to make to the draft Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS).

In particular, Council considers the latest increase in Bristol's proposed housing target (to 36,500 new homes by 2026) as *deeply challenging*, especially given the time-scale involved, *the additional resources needed to assist in delivery* and the current state of the housing market.

However, Council recognises the need to provide more affordable housing for the people of Bristol and the city region and supports the need to continue to be ambitious about delivering these homes where they are most needed.

Council reiterates its commitment to sustainable and balanced housing growth, *which should be focused predominantly on existing urban areas, and shares the concerns expressed by the Regional Assembly concerning the implications* for quality of life, infrastructure and the land available for leisure, employment *and other uses if this growth is poorly planned and unsupported by infrastructure.*

Council is also dismayed that previous sections of the RSS dealing with locally- devolved sustainability policies and transport initiatives - such as the creation of a strategic transport authority covering the sub-region - have been deleted by the Secretary of State.

However, Council does not view this as a barrier to

strengthening governance on such matters within the West of England, which may eventually lead to the formation of an Integrated Transport Authority. It reaffirms its support for such joint working.

Council is opposed to the weakening of measures to promote sustainability, in particular, boosting the generation of renewable energy and encouraging eco-friendly forms of construction. It views this as a potentially damaging step which could confuse the construction industry and scheme promoters.

Council calls upon the Leader to convey this Authority's opposition to *the additional housing numbers over and above the original figures in the draft RSS and the weakening of various sustainability measures set out in the proposed changes. Furthermore, Council supports the need to reassess the capacity to deliver in the region, particularly in terms of public transport and asks the Leader to emphasise this as a priority for Bristol and the city region.*

Councillor Hammond seconded the amendment.

Following a debate Councillor Hammond moved a 5 minutes adjournment of the Meeting. Councillor Eddy seconded this and on being put to the vote it was agreed.

After the adjournment Councillor Bradshaw stated, that with the consent of the house, he proposed to withdraw his amendment. Councillor Hammond indicated that he agreed with this proposal.

Councillor Bradshaw then moved the following amendment by the addition of the two paragraphs in bold:

“Council strongly supports many of the objections made by neighbouring Authorities and others to the proposed changes that the Secretary of State for the Department of Communities & Local Government proposes to make to the draft Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS).

In particular, Council considers the latest increase in Bristol's proposed housing target (to 36,500 new homes by 2026) as unrealistic and unworkable, especially given the time-scale involved and the current state of the housing market.

However, Council recognises the need to provide more affordable housing for the people of Bristol and the city region and supports the need to continue to be ambitious about delivering these homes where they are most needed.

Council reiterates its commitment to sustainable and balanced housing growth but considers the Labour Government's arbitrary increase in volume would have severe consequences for our quality of life, infrastructure and the land available for leisure and employment use. Council is particularly concerned that the Secretary of State's amendments place significantly less emphasis on redeveloping brownfield sites, appears to encourage unrestrained urban sprawl and will result in the erosion of the Green Belt.

Council is also dismayed that previous sections of the RSS dealing with locally- devolved sustainability policies and transport initiatives - such as the creation of a strategic transport authority covering the sub-region - have been deleted by the Secretary of State.

Council is opposed to the weakening of measures to promote sustainability, in particular, boosting the generation of renewable energy and encouraging eco-friendly forms of construction. It views this as a potentially damaging step which could confuse the construction industry and scheme promoters.

Council calls upon the Leader to convey this Authority's opposition to these changes in the draft RSS, especially the revised and inflated housing numbers which we consider to be undeliverable, unsustainable and unacceptable.”

Councillor Hammond seconded the amendment.

The amendment was put to the vote and **AGREED**.

Councillor Eddy's Motion as amended by Councillor Bradshaw was then put to the vote and **AGREED**.

It was therefore

- RESOLVED -**
- (i) that Council strongly supports many of the objections made by neighbouring Authorities and others to the proposed changes that the Secretary of State for the Department of Communities & Local Government proposes to make to the draft Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS);**
 - (ii) that in particular, Council considers the latest increase in Bristol's proposed housing target (to 36,500 new homes by 2026) as unrealistic and unworkable, especially given the time-scale involved and the current state of the housing market;**
 - (iii) that however, Council recognises the need to provide more affordable housing for the people of Bristol and the city region and supports the need to continue to be ambitious about delivering these homes where they are most needed;**
 - (iv) that Council reiterates its commitment to sustainable and balanced housing growth but considers the Labour Government's arbitrary increase in volume would have severe consequences for our quality of life, infrastructure and the land available for leisure and employment use. Council is particularly concerned that the Secretary of State's amendments place significantly less emphasis**

on redeveloping brownfield sites, appears to encourage unrestrained urban sprawl and will result in the erosion of the Green Belt;

(v) that Council is also dismayed that previous sections of the RSS dealing with locally- devolved sustainability policies and transport initiatives - such as the creation of a strategic transport authority covering the sub-region - have been deleted by the Secretary of State;

(vi) that Council is opposed to the weakening of measures to promote sustainability, in particular, boosting the generation of renewable energy and encouraging eco-friendly forms of construction. It views this as a potentially damaging step which could confuse the construction industry and scheme promoters; and

(vii) that Council calls upon the Leader to convey this Authority's opposition to these changes in the draft RSS, especially the revised and inflated housing numbers which we consider to be undeliverable, unsustainable and unacceptable.

(The meeting ended at 10.55 pm.)

LORD MAYOR