15 EVACUATION PROCEDURE (Agenda Item 1)

The Chair, Cllr Ian Blair, drew attention to the evacuation procedure as set out in the agenda papers.

16 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Agenda Item 2)

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Judy Adams, Clare Fardell, Gareth Manson, Eve Orpen and Gloria Stephen.

17 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST UNDER THE LOCALISM ACT 2011 (Agenda Item 3)

There were no declarations of interest.

18 MINUTES (Agenda Item 4)

Resolved: That, the minutes of the meeting held on 17 May 2017 be confirmed as a correct record and signed as such by the Chair.
19 CHAIR’S ANNOUNCEMENTS (Agenda Item 5)

The Chair presented the past chair’s badge to Councillor Erica Williams. Councillor Williams presented a cheque for £3730.xx to Avon Valley Railway and Wild Place Project for funds raised during Councillor Williams term of office.

Roger Eynon and Tony Marsden, representing Avon Valley Railway thanked Councillor Williams for the support they had received and encouraged those present to visit the railway and experience the work being undertaken by the team.

Richard Rollings accepted the cheque on behalf of Wild Place Project. He gave thanks for the funds raised and advised members the Giraffe house was now open and was home to three giraffes. Mr Rollings spoke of the work undertaken at Wild Place Project and encouraged everyone to visit.

Councillor Williams returned to her seat in the chamber. The Chair then welcomed representatives of Off the Record and Borderlands, his chosen charities for the year, to introduce the work each charity undertook.

Karen Black, Operations Director at Off the Record explained the charity served the needs of young people in Bristol and South Gloucestershire by providing support around emotional and mental wellbeing. The charity was more than 50 years old and had seen an expansion of services in the past 10 years.

Members heard that the charity provides targeted services to specific groups of young people including LGBTQ, BME and a resilience lab program. The resilience lab programme consisted of five individual sessions aimed at helping young people look after themselves. It was delivered at the Armadillo Café, Yate and could be delivered in other locations. Off the Record looked forward to working with the Chair of Council in the coming year.

Reverend Richard McKay and Mohammad Hammad representing Borderlands spoke about the work undertaken by the charity. Reverend McKay advised the charity sought to provide support to sanctuary seekers and to challenge the narrative about asylum seekers and refugees. Borderlands offered drop in sessions where sanctuary seekers were offered help to build English language skills, signposted to services and provided with a safe space within which to socialise and build networks. Last year a mentoring scheme began which has so far helped around 90 refugees including 5 families within South Gloucestershire.

Members heard from Mohammad Hammad a sanctuary seeker who came to the United Kingdom from Sudan in 2014 and had used Borderlands services, about the assistance he received in learning to speak English and about how welcoming and encouraging Borderlands had been to him.
ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC (Agenda Item 6)

The Chair advised at the start of this item that Agenda Item 9 – Debate on the Hatchet Road Bus Lane Petition would be moved up the agenda and considered following this agenda item.

Andrew Shore a local resident addressed Council on the future of the Public Transport Forum. Mr Shore expressed disappointment that several planned meetings of the forum had been stood down and commented it appeared to have been left to drift at a time when there are lots of relevant public transport topics to be considered. Mr Shore questioned the need to stand down the meeting during the pre-election period.

Mr Shore urged the Council to reinstate the Public Transport Forum to run at least once every four months and requested meetings be scheduled to share information about proposed bus service changes ahead of those changes taking effect.

It was agreed that the matters raised would be referred to the Director of Environment and Community Services.

Christina Biggs representing Friend of Suburban Bristol Railways addressed Council on local rail issues. Miss Biggs introduced the FOSBR manifesto focusing on areas of most relevance for South Gloucestershire. Members were urged to lobby the Combined Authority to include the reopening of the Thornbury line as part of Metrowest Phase 3. Concerns were raised that the footbridge at Pilning Station had still not been replaced and that Network Rail had advised a GRIP process would need to be undertaken to replace the footbridge. In closing Miss Biggs supported the comments of Mr Shore around the Public Transport Forum and advised rolling the forum into the WECA structures would be a positive step.

It was agreed that the matters raised would be referred to the Director of Environment and Community Services.

Olga Taylor representing the Pilning Station Action Group addressed Council on Pilning Train Station. Ms Taylor urged Council to support some ‘quick wins’ which would make the station more usable and increase passenger numbers. These included pressing Great Western Rail to schedule a Monday to Friday morning train to allow commuting into Bristol for work and the provision of a third train in the mid-afternoon.

It was suggested that improvements to the station such as the reinstatement of platform lighting and the footbridge would allow the station to be better utilised in future.

It was agreed that the matters raised would be referred to the Director of Environment and Community Services.
Dave Redgewell representing South West Transportation Network addressed Council on transportation issues. He commented investment was needed along the whole of the Yate bus corridor to upgrade services. The new Stagecoach contract was welcomed. Concerns were raised over the proposal for temporary bridges at Parkway Station and members were urged to object.

It was agreed that the matters raised would be referred to the Director of Environment and Community Services.

Jennifer Vaughn a resident of Stoke Gifford addressed Council on the Gipsy Patch Lane roadwork proposals. Members heard it was proposed to widen the railway bridge, lower the road under the bridge and to widen Gipsy Patch Lane from the Hatchet Road. Concerns were raised over the impact of the proposals on the health of residents, the impact on the environment as trees would need to be removed and the loss of habitat for local wildlife.

Mrs Vaughn commented her property and those of neighbours were protected from some noise and pollution from Gipsy Patch Lane due to the tree corridor which runs along the road. With the widening of the road, Gipsy Patch Lane would be almost immediately outside of their properties and this would have a negative impact. In closing Mrs Vaughn urged members to reconsider proposals.

It was agreed that the matters raise would be referred to the Director of Environment and Community Services.

Darryl Collins a local resident addressed Council on the Policy, Sites and Places Plan. Mr Collins advised the inclusion of Elm Park, Filton within the PSP and the proposal for road widening had been a shock to local residents. Earlier PSP’s had included Elm Park as an important Town Green and residents had not been notified this status had changed. Further Elm Park had been registered with Fields in Trust since 2012.

Mr Collins explained the proposed road widening would mean the loss of 212 trees, a large number of those being mature trees and two hedgerows as well as the local skate park, a cycle speedway track, an outdoor fitness gym, a woodland art train and the community garden and orchard. Grave concerns were expressed about the lack of consultation on the proposals and Mr Collins urged the Council to reconsider its plan.

It was agreed the comments made would be referred to the Director of Environment and Community Services.

Sue Bandcroft a resident of Stoke Gifford addressed Council on Hatchet Road Bus Lane. Mrs Bandcroft recounted the numerous occasions on which the bus lane proposal had been considered by the Council. She commented residents had made their views clear and it was time the Council listened to the community. Members heard how the layby option would be cheaper to deliver than a bus lane.
Mrs Bandcroft explained Hatchet Road was a main arterial route for a large area and although the Stoke Gifford link road when opened would reduce traffic, she was unable to see how a bus lane on one side of the road would alleviate the current traffic problems.

It was agreed that the comments made would be considered as part of the member debate on agenda item 9.

Susan Kelly a resident of Stoke Gifford addressed Council on the Hatchet Road Bus Lane. Mrs Kelly advised she was a regular bus user and hoped the Metrobus project would be a success. However, she was unable to support the proposals for Hatchet Road and felt it was unrealistic to expect public to abandon cars in favour of the bus, especially where home and work commitments didn’t allow a straightforward commute and that the scheme should be considered complementary to other transport options.

Mrs Kelly was supportive of the layby option and against the current bus lane scheme for Hatchet Road. She expressed the view that it was vandalism to destroy well established trees and hedgerows and the bus lane would have a negative impact on the environment and the wellbeing of locals who would have less public amenity space to enjoy. In closing, Mrs Kelly echoed the comments of other speakers and urged members to listen to the local community.

It was agreed that the comments made would be considered as part of the member debate on agenda item 9.

James Buckingham a resident of Stoke Gifford addressed Council on the Hatchet Road Bus Lane. Mr Buckingham expressed dismay at the decision to approve a bus lane and argued it was made on flawed science and logic. He commented appendix A of the decision report failed to make the case for the bus lane option, the layby option was modelled with result presented and it appeared the decision had been made on the general benefits of bus lanes, not the specifics of the area. Further Mr Buckingham commented he could find no evidence of weighting the various criteria and advised it would be difficult to properly assess the various options without this. In closing members were asked to listen to residents and reconsider the decision.

It was agreed that the comments made would be considered as part of the member debate on agenda item 9.

Lesley Cox a local resident addressed Council on the Hatchet Road Bus Lane. Ms Cox urged members to reconsider their decision on the bus lane as it would lead to a depletion of natural resources and would make the area more hazardous.

It was agreed that the comments made would be considered as part of the member debate on agenda item 9.
Councillor Ruth Davis asked if the protocol which used to apply to motions remained valid as opposition groups had received the motion for this item at extremely short notice. Councillor Pat Rooney agreed with Councillor Davis that the lack of protocol was concerning, particularly as group leaders had received correspondence reminding them of motion protocols and the need to share information in a timely manner to allow for good meeting management.

The Monitoring Officer responded the proposed motion was in order and was allowed in order to shape debate. The relevant part of the constitution was standing order 148. The Monitoring Officer advised he would be willing to meet with group leaders outside of the meeting to agree a protocol moving forward.

A report outlining the petitioner’s reasons for the petition had been circulated to all members alongside the Council agenda.

Mr Paul Tanner, lead petitioner introduced the petition and the reasons for it to Council. Members saw a short video providing aerial footage along Hatchet Road and the proposed bus lane. Points highlighted by Mr Tanner during his introduction included:

- The action group believed laybys could be a less intrusive option than the bus lane and would save over £1.25 million compared to the bus lane option.
- If reducing journey times was a priority then the bus lane option would not deliver significant change. Modelling showed laybys would achieve a greater saving in journey time.
- Considerable damage would be caused to the local environment under the bus lane option. Layby’s could be accommodated using small areas of land around the sites of retained bus stops. This would minimise the destruction of mature trees and hedgerows.
- Concerns were raised over the intrusion and health impacts on residents in the homes adjacent to Hatchet Road.
- There were numerous inconsistencies in the reports presented to ECS committee and recommendations had been based on a lack of evidence.
- The Hatchet Road Action Group urged members to agree to a full review of issue.

Debate on the petition opened.

Councillor Colin Hunt highlighted the importance of the Metrobus project in addressing congestion across the West of England. He advised the project would bring a number of benefits including an easier commute to places like Aztec West, the UWE and the Science Park at Emersons Green and using the new bus lanes would allow those travelling by public transport to bypass congestion in Stoke Gifford, Bradley Stoke and other areas with high traffic.
Councillor Hunt advised the Metrobus extension would have stops along the entire route and would not simply be a shuttle between Parkway Station and The Mall, Cribbs Causeway. He detailed several changes which had been made to the proposals following consultation such as using mature hedgerows rather than saplings, investing money in Forty Acres/Meade Park to offset losing some parkland and reducing the width of the bus lane from 4.5m to 3m to minimise the land take required.

Councillor Hunt acknowledged the strongly held views of local residents and advised he wanted to continue the conversation with officers, review the options available and bring a report to Cabinet to consider whether the scheme could be delivered in a different way.

Councillor Colin Hunt proposed and Councillor Matthew Riddle seconded the following motion:

‘Council requests that transport officers re-examine plans for Hatchet Road, investigate whether the CPME Scheme can be delivered in a different way, and prepares a paper to bring to a public Cabinet meeting for this issue to be discussed further taking into account early indications of changes from the Stoke Gifford Link Road, with the previously agreed proposal for the Hatchet Road Bus Lane as the default position’.

Councillor Brian Allinson speaking in support of the petitioners expressed disappointment at the need for a debate and felt that residents views should have been taken into account far earlier in the process. Members heard how residents and local councillors had raised concerns about the proposed bus lane as far back as 2015, had attended numerous meetings on the issue and had made their views clear during the consultation. Councillor Allinson queried the point in undertaking consultation exercises when no notice was taken of the results.

He commented the replacement planting proposed would be unacceptable and it would take more than a generation for trees to reach the maturity of those being removed. In closing Councillor Allinson advised residents felt ignored and as a result the standing of the Council had been diminished.

Councillor Pat Hockey agreed with the comments of Councillor Hunt on the necessity of the Metrobus scheme and accepted that there were occasions when the natural landscape needed to be changed in order to achieve the aim of better transportation. However, Councillor Hockey advised the currently agreed scheme did not appear to achieve aims. She added it seemed absurd to put Metrobus along a dedicated bus lane when it wouldn’t achieve shorter transit times or credibility.

Councillor Hockey advised her preferred option would have been to use Winterbourne Road to join up with Metrobus phase 1 works. In closing Councillor Hockey reminded members that if they determined to rethink the
proposals they needed to ensure the public could be reassured a proper reconsideration of the issues would take place.

Councillor Pat Hockey proposed and Councillor Dave Hockey seconded an amendment so that the motion read:

‘Council requests that transport officers re-examine plans for the route of the Metro Bus from the Hatchett Road Roundabout to Parkway Station, investigate whether the CPME Scheme can be delivered in a different way, and prepares a paper to bring to a public Cabinet meeting in the Autumn for this issue to be discussed further which will lead to these proposals going out for further consultation’.

The meeting was adjourned at 8.50pm to allow time for members to consider the amendment. Councillor Katherine Morris left the meeting during the adjournment and did not return.

The meeting reconvened at 9.05pm.

Councillor Matthew Riddle advised he supported the amendment. Upon being put to the vote the amendment was unanimously carried. Debate returned to the substantive motion.

Councillor Ian Boulton proposed and Councillor Kim Scudamore seconded an amendment to the motion so that it read:

‘Council requests that transport officers re-examine plans for Hatchet Road, investigate how the CPME Scheme can be delivered in a different way, and prepare a paper to bring to a public Cabinet meeting in the Autumn for this issue to be discussed further, with a clear request to the Executive Member to pursue and endorse the bus laybys option in place of the southbound bus lane option’.

Councillor Kim Scudamore commented there was no harm in admitting a mistake had been made and then reconsidering the issue. He felt the evidence considered by the Environment and Community Services Committee in relation to the bus lane and alternative options had not been fully considered and there was still an opportunity to think again.

Councillor Matthew Riddle questioned if all members had enough information about the topic and issues to debate the amendment.

The Monitoring Officer responded that on balance the amendment could be debated.

Councillor Colin Hunt advised he would be unable to support the amendment. It had been agreed to ask officers to undertake more work on the options and for members to reconsider the issues. Councillor Hunt was of the view the amendment would tie his hands and limit the options which could be considered moving forward.
Councillor John Davis commented he was unable to support the amendment. Members of the public had spoken about the need to take a scientific approach and to properly weigh the options. This amendment wouldn’t allow a proper reconsideration of the whole issue.

Councillor Keith Cranney spoke of his sadness that residents had not been listened to earlier in the process, when they had made their views clear on numerous occasions. He advised there was a lack of knowledge on the part of officers about the specific circumstances of the area. Councillor Cranney commented reconsidering the issue was an opportunity to provide greater transparency and highlighted the importance of coming to a good decision based on solid evidence.

Councillor Ruth Davis advised she would be unable to support the amendment. Councillor Davis commented it was important to investigate and cost all options available including the option of laybys. The importance of proper scrutiny of the revised information was highlighted.

Councillor Ian Boulton clarified the purpose of the amendment was not to limit consideration to the layby option, but to ensure that it was one of the options fully considered. He noted in the past the Council had made mistakes with consultation and had ignored residents’ views. He commented residents and members had given evidence about the layby option and around the consultation process which hadn’t been refuted.

Upon being put to the vote with 15 in favour and 50 against the motion fell.

Debate returned to the substantive motion and upon being put to the vote with 51 in favour, 0 against and 14 abstentions it was resolved that:

Council requests that transport officers re-examine plans for the route of the Metro Bus from the Hatchett Road Roundabout to Parkway Station, investigate whether the CPME Scheme can be delivered in a different way, and prepares a paper to bring to a public Cabinet meeting in the Autumn for this issue to be discussed further which will lead to these proposals going out for further consultation.

22 PETITIONS (Agenda Item 7)

There were no petitions submitted to this meeting of the Council.

23 QUESTIONS (Agenda Item 8)

The following questions were asked and answers provided.

Questions to the Leader of the Council

Question 1 of 2017/18 asked by Councillor Pat Rooney
What representations has the Leader made to relax the 1% cap on public pay rises, and if none will he now do so?

Answer:

No representations have been made. The Council is part of a national employers group that negotiate on our behalf.

Supplementary Question

As Leader of the Council do you believe that the public sector should be subject to a 1% pay cap?

Answer

It is important to look at parity when considering public and private sector pay. The government also needs to think about the reducing the budget deficit when making decisions. Although the Conservative/Lib Dem coalition government worked to reduce the deficit, as a country we are still living beyond our means.

If the 1% pay cap was broken, government would need to increase the funding provided to Local Authorities to pay for the increase. In South Gloucestershire each 1% increase in salaries would cost the Council between £850,000 - £900,000 per year.

Question 2 of 2017/18 asked by Councillor Adam Monk

Following the recent letter from the Chief Executive to the Education Secretary requesting a meeting, what further action is the Leader taking to secure the meeting and achieve the better funding so desperately needed by our schools?

Answer:

The Leader of the Council had contacted the three South Gloucestershire MPs to ask them to help arrange a meeting.

In light of the positive news on school funding announced on Monday time will now be taken to understand the effect on our local school budgets.

Supplementary Question

Have you as Leader shifted your position on school funding since the last meeting?

Answer
As Leader of the Council I have always championed the case for better funding for South Gloucestershire. There are two pieces to the school funding argument; firstly the amount of the national ‘slice of cake’ received and secondly the relatively low funding received by South Gloucestershire in relation to other areas. I am pleased we have a listening government and the announcement on Monday means an increase in funding to £4800 per pupil, which is a significant improvement.

**Question 3 of 2017/18 asked by Councillor Ian Scott**

In light of the DUP deal, where Theresa May is giving Northern Ireland a Billion pounds over the next 2 years in comparison to the fact it will take over 30 years for the West of England deal to be given a Billion pounds, what demands will the Leader of Council make for fair funding for the West of England as our taxpayers are funding these deals as this sub region is a net contributor to the British economy?

**Answer:**

The Leader of the Council will take every opportunity that arises to press for more funding for the West of England.

**Supplementary Question**

Do you agree with the Conservative Leader of Bolton Council that the DUP deal is “shabby”?

**Answer**

I wouldn’t use those words. Northern Ireland has historically suffered underfunding and the deal with the DUP will help and preserve the peace and help mend the fabric of the community. It is right for the government to increase spending to ensure that peace holds.

**Questions to the Cabinet Member for Communities and Tourism**

**Question 4 of 2017/18 asked by Councillor Kim Scudamore**

What percentage of South Gloucestershire households had their waste and recycling bins collected on the scheduled day during the first two weeks of the revised waste collection programme? Is the Cabinet Member satisfied with that performance? What percentage correct collection are we now achieving?

**Answer:**

On a weekly basis, we undertake 199,500 collections, of which 110,000 are recycling collections from households. In May 2017 before the service change, 1458 items were reported as missed, of which 1096 were recycling.
As a % of collections this is 0.5%¹ of recycling collections in May 2017. We are aware of some issues arising from the service change and will continue to strive to get this number even lower.

The new weekly recycling service started on the 19 June 2017. Due to the hot weather, the introduction of new vehicles, new tipping procedures and new routes we were unable to complete all rounds during the first week. We estimate that 95% of properties were collected on the right day. We received 2,641 waste related calls of which 1,248 were to report missed collection during the first week.

During the second week we completed all rounds and estimate that 97% of properties were collected on the right day. We received 2,251 waste related calls into the contact centre of which 1,077 were to report missed bins. Collections continued to improve as crews got to grips with the new vehicles, procedures and rounds. In week three we received 813 calls to report missed bins and 523 in week four.

It is not unusual to experience a degree of disruption when introducing waste service changes, and due to the scale of the operation the numbers can appear high but as a % of total collections are very low. In the past four weeks, we have 5,974 missed collection tickets raised on Mayrise from the contact centre and members of the public self-serving on-line. This is 0.7%² of the total 798,000 collections undertaken. Of these 3,608 were recycling which is 0.8%³ of all recycling collections.

In comparison to previous large scale waste changes, the performance is slightly better. In June 2014, the last reroute changes, the contact centre took 10,748 waste related calls compared to 8,305 in June 2017 and missed bin rates were around 1%.
Supplementary Question

From the information you have, are the rounds being completed within the time expected?

Answer

I am pleased with the results after four weeks and would like to thank the operators who have been working hard to implement the changes and also the client section of the Council who have been providing support, particularly during the recent spell of warm weather.

At the beginning of the change there was some confusion as quite a lot of operators carry routes in their head; they are not always written down. Knowledge building is ongoing and we are improving the time taken to complete rounds.

Question 5 of 2017/18 asked by Councillor Andy Perkins

The recent changes to bin and recycling collections involved collection crews covering areas new to them. This appears to have been a contributory factor to the missed collections experienced by residents in Kingswood that your changes have brought about. How is it that something as simple as knowledge of what locations are due for collection on any one particular day can fail to be transferred to new crews?

Answer:

When making these scales of changes to the service, we must adjust routes to balance work load, vehicle capacity and rota new staff. At the start of new collections, crews are given paper copies of the new routes with roads highlighted and a list of roads to complete with property numbers. The crews follow these routes, liaising with supervisors throughout the day who monitor progress.

It is inevitable that occasionally locations do not get collected as crews carry a lot of knowledge about individual properties and roads that is not always passed on. The crews believe in good faith that they have completed the road not realising that there are other properties.

Where ever possible we do try to share information about routes but due to the scale of the operation this is not always possible for every road.

Supplementary Question

Is there not a good case to argue that for a period of time a dedicated query line be set up to deal with issues arising when changes are made?
Answer

The number of staff in the Councils corporate contact centre was increased to provide additional capacity throughout implementation of route changes.

Questions to the Cabinet Member for Schools, Skills and Employment

Question 6 of 2017/18 asked by Councillor Adam Monk

Was the Cabinet Member and the department surprised by the outcome of the Ofsted inspection which identified ‘a culture of complacency and low expectations’ at Marlwood School and placed it in special measures? What school improvement support had the department given to Marlwood prior to Ofsted arriving?

Answer:

The department and I were very disappointed with the outcome of the Ofsted inspection. This outcome was not expected by the school, its Multi-Academy Trust (MAT) or the Regional Schools Commissioner (RSC).

As part of answering this Council Question, I think it’s helpful to set out the respective roles of the RSC and the Local Authority:

The extract below outlines the lines of accountability for underperforming academies:

RSC Core Functions

Intervening with under-performing academies and free schools to ensure that high quality support is commissioned to improve them quickly

Tackling educational underperformance in academies and free schools
The RSC is responsible for holding academy trusts to account where academies or free schools are underperforming. In cases where formal intervention measures are required, RSCs will take action to address underperformance and bring about rapid improvement. This may include commissioning appropriate support, issuing a pre-warning notice or warning notice or by terminating the academy’s funding agreement, and identifying a new sponsor to take on responsibility for the academy where this is necessary.

Intervening in academies where governance is inadequate

The RSC is responsible for taking action in relation to academies where governance is inadequate. Governance of the academy trust will be of concern where the governing body lacks the capacity to deliver any of its core functions. Where the primary issue is one of financial management and
compliance with the funding agreement, the EFA will have overall decision-making responsibility. When responding to issues of inadequate governance, the RSC must ensure discussions are held with the EFA, and others, to ensure that all issues about the trust are considered (e.g. issues of inadequate financial management) and that appropriate action is taken.

Taking action against poorly performing sponsors and multi-academy trusts

Where a RSC has concerns about a sponsor or MAT in terms of educational performance, financial management or governance, there is a range of support and intervention measures they can take. The RSC will reassess MATs at key milestones throughout the academic year (such as following exam results) and at key stages of their growth to consider their capacity to support and enable the academies within their MAT to improve. RSC powers of intervention are set out in the Education and Adoption Act 2016, Schools Causing Concern guidance and in individual academy funding agreements

The Local Authority's responsibilities for school improvement are as follows:

The Education Act 2011 recognised that there is a significant strategic role for Local Authorities. This role is set out under three headings:

• Champion for Parents and Families
• Supporting Vulnerable Children
• Champion for Educational Excellence

5.3 In addition, the Local Authority retains specific duties related to school improvement under the Education Act 1996 (EA) and the Education and Inspection Act 2006 (E&IA). These include a general responsibility to maintain schools (EA 1996, Section 13) and a duty to use this responsibility to promote high standards (EA 1996, Section 13A) and fulfilment of potential in relation to their education functions through:

a) promoting high standards,
b) ensuring fair access to opportunity for education and training
c) promoting the fulfilment of learning potential by every person to whom the subsection applies.

6.1 Local authorities do not have any powers of intervention in relation to academy schools. However, the local authority does retain a legal responsibility for performance across South Gloucestershire. The local authority is expected to act as a strategic commissioner for all schools. The local authority is expected to act within the confines of its responsibilities if it does have concerns about the performance of an academy.

Extracts from the School Improvement Policy September 2016

With regard to the department’s historic dealings with Marlwood School, these are:
• The school’s provision for disadvantaged pupils was reviewed in October 2016 through the Education Partnership Board. The report identified strengths and made a number of recommendations to challenge and improve practice. This external scrutiny was commissioned by the school.

• The school has purchased School Improvement Adviser support via Integra. (The Council’s Education, Learning and Skills (ELS) service do not have access to the reports regenerated, Integra share them with the school as the commissioner). This external scrutiny was commissioned by the school.

• The school has taken part in a peer scrutiny exercise through the Education Partnership. The session took place on 11th May 2017. This external scrutiny was commissioned by the school. In addition to this, the school has committed to a peer review in the autumn term.

• The Head of ELS met with the CEO twice prior to the Ofsted inspection (autumn and spring term), the CEO recognised the challenges faced by the school following the 2016 results. Self-evaluation judged the school to be on the requiring improvement/good borderline.

• The Head of ELS had met with representatives from the RSC office on several occasions to discuss concerns about a number of South Gloucestershire schools, including Marlwood. The RSC carried out an annual visit to the Trust. The RSC does not share the reports with the Council.

Although the 2016 outcomes were concerning, assurances had been provided to ELS that the school had improved across the academic year.

The new Local School Standards Board (LSSB) will meet for the first time in September and takes over from the Education Partnership Board. Representatives from the RSC Office and Ofsted will be on the LSSB. In addition to this, the Cabinet Member, Director of CAH, Head of ELS and representatives from all MATs and all phases will sit on the LSSB. As all schools will be accountable to the LSSB, all risks will be identified jointly and the support and challenge will be coordinated and monitored through the LSSB.

**Supplementary Question**

As Executive Member are you confident the LSSB will be successful at raising school standards, and if so, why?

**Answer**

In the past efforts at improvement had failed due to a lack of buy-in from all elements within the system. This time the initiative is from the Regional Schools Commission and Ofstead so there will be more involvement and buy-in, coupled with a dedicated portfolio focus. Success is achievable, but
we should not underestimate the amount of work required or difficulties which will be encountered in striving for improvement.

**Question 7 of 2017/18 asked by Councillor Adam Monk**

What will the Cabinet Member do to ensure that the department informs other councillors of important news such as the recent Marlwood inspection so that they do not have to find out about it from the media?

**Answer:**

I agree that wherever possible members should not have to find out important news from the media.

Following the recent change to the Cabinet model, I have asked officers to ensure that future Ofsted reports are circulated to members upon publication.

**Supplementary Question**

Are you willing to commit to a timeframe within which to provide an update?

**Answer**

I will discuss with the School Standards Board and if collectively, we feel able to do so then we will set timeframes and make them available to members and the public.

---

**24 ANNUAL REPORT ON THE TREASURY MANAGEMENT SERVICE AND PRUDENTIAL INDICATORS 2016/17 (Agenda Item 10)**

Councillor Nick Barrett proposed, Councillor Roger Avenin seconded and upon being put to the vote is was unanimously resolved:

That Council approve the Annual Report on the treasury management service, including the actual prudential indicators for 2016/17 contained within Appendix 1.

**25 CONSTITUTION UPDATE (Agenda Item 11)**

Councillor Matthew Riddle proposed, Councillor Toby Savage seconded and upon being put to the vote it was unanimously resolved to:

1 Approve the amendment to the Constitution by the addition to the delegations of the Director of Environment and Community Services of the following:
“That the Director of Environment and Community Services, in consultation with the Executive Members for Planning Transport and Strategic Environment and Housing Delivery and Public Health, be granted delegated authority to agree the use of funding from the Developers Contribution Fund 6M106 on identified affordable housing schemes, and that each use of this delegation be reported in the next available Capital Monitor report”

2 To give delegated authority to the Monitoring Officer to make amendments to the Summary of Council Bodies, to reflect any changes that occur either as a result of the operation of law or revision to the terms of reference of any of the bodies listed.

26 WEST OF ENGLAND PARTNERSHIP AND REGIONAL ISSUES (Agenda Item 12)

Councillor Matthew Riddle introduced the report to Council.

Clarification was sought on who would be managing the impact of Network Rail works and the temporary closure of stations. Councillor Riddle advised a written update would be provided.

A member asked what involvement the Combined Authority Mayor would have in the review of options for the metrobus work along Hatchet Road. Councillor Riddle responded Metrobus was a historic scheme so was not the responsibility of the Combined Authority.

The Leader of the Council and the Combined Authority Mayor were asked to seek an assurance that the change in the Airbus UK President would not impact on aerospace capabilities and job security in the region. Responding Councillor Riddle advised Brexit issues were being taken seriously and an eye was being kept on all Euro facing business in the region.

Information was sought on the slippage in the Joint Spatial Plan and for a timeframe on its publication. Councillor Riddle advised members would be emailed with the revised timetable.

The importance of the Combined Authority Overview and Scrutiny Committee was highlighted. The frequency of meetings was raised as a concern as was the difficulty in communications between meetings. A request was made for the constituent local authorities to provide their overview and scrutiny members with facilities such as Skype and Conference calling phones to make communication easier.

Confirmation that works on the Bromley Heath Viaduct would be reduced from 52 to 33 weeks was welcomed. A member asked where the funding had come from to allow for the reduction in time and questioned what that might have been spent on had a full funding bid been submitted.
The Chief Executive responded a bid to fully fund the works had been submitted but full funding was not available from the EDF. The reduction in time is being funded through money within the budget which had not been earmarked to specific transportation projects.

Information was requested on how South Gloucestershire could claim funding from the Skills Advisory Board and how do members feed through South Gloucestershire’s needs.

Councillor Riddle responded one advantage of the West of England skills arrangement would be better co-ordination of schemes and the ability to ensure scheme’s joined up. The joint arrangements would also allow better mapping of skills needs and providers across the sub region. Councillor Toby Savage added he had attended the first meeting of the board and had raised the issue of South Gloucestershire’s priority neighbourhoods and advised other board members not to make assumptions about the prosperity of the area.

It was commented it would be important for members to have a clear idea of the work programmes of the combined authorities and the constituent local authorities. This would make it easier to know about the passage of key work policies and plans and allow for members to consider properly and in good time the issues. Councillor Riddle responded it would be good to have a comprehensive work programme available and agreed he would raise this.

The report was received for information.

**27 MOTIONS (Agenda Item 13)**

No motions were submitted to this meeting of Council.

**28 ANY OTHER ITEM THE CHAIR DECIDES IS URGENT (Agenda Item 14)**

There were no urgent items.

**29 EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC (Agenda Item 15)**

Resolved: That the public be excluded during consideration of the following item on the grounds that it is likely, in the view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of proceedings, that if members of the public are present during consideration of exempt item, there will be disclosure to them of exempt information as defined under section 100(1) of the Local Government Act 1972.

**30 CONSIDERATION OF AN EXTENSION OF ABSENCE BEYOND SIX MONTHS (Agenda Item 16)**

Council considered extending the period of absence beyond six months so as to enable a Councillor to continue as a member of this authority.
It was proposed by Councillor Ruth Davis, seconded by Councillor Claire Young and upon being put to the vote it was unanimously resolved:

That in accordance Local Government Act 1972 S85 Council approved an extended period of absence due to a Councillors ill health for the period from 26 August 2017 to 26 February 2018.

The meeting closed at 10.24pm

.................................Chair of the Council