

# **Minutes of the Extraordinary Joint meeting – West of England Combined Authority Committee and West of England Joint Committee Tuesday, 21 September 2021**

## **West of England Combined Authority Committee - members present:**

Metro Mayor Dan Norris, West of England Combined Authority  
Councillor Toby Savage, Leader, South Gloucestershire Council  
Councillor Craig Cheney, substituting for Mayor Marvin Rees, Bristol City Council  
Councillor Kevin Guy, Leader, Bath & North East Somerset Council  
Richard Bonner, Chair, West of England Local Enterprise Partnership (non-voting member)

## **West of England Joint Committee - members present:**

Metro Mayor Dan Norris, West of England Combined Authority  
Councillor Toby Savage, Leader, South Gloucestershire Council  
Councillor Craig Cheney, substituting for Mayor Marvin Rees, Bristol City Council  
Councillor Kevin Guy, Leader, Bath & North East Somerset Council  
Councillor Donald Davies, Leader, North Somerset Council  
Richard Bonner, Chair, West of England Local Enterprise Partnership (non-voting member)

<p><b>1</b></p>	<p><b>WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS</b></p> <p>The Chair welcomed attendees to the meeting and introduced the members of the committees. He also welcomed Richard Bonner, recently elected as the new Chair of the West of England Local Enterprise Partnership Board, to his first meeting.</p> <p>The Chair thanked Watermore Primary School for hosting this meeting. A brief presentation was received from pupils of the school.</p>
<p><b>2</b></p>	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b></p> <p>Apologies were received from Mayor Marvin Rees (Councillor Craig Cheney substituting).</p> <p>It was also noted that Councillor Winston Duguid, Chair-designate of the Combined Authority Overview and Scrutiny Committee was unable to attend this meeting; Councillor Huw James was in attendance to present comments on behalf of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee (see item 6).</p>
<p><b>3</b></p>	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</b></p> <p>There were no declarations of interest.</p>
<p><b>4</b></p>	<p><b>ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC - QUESTIONS; STATEMENTS; PETITIONS</b></p> <p>The Chair advised that 9 questions had been submitted in advance of this meeting on the following subjects:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Nigel Shipley - Motion on Bristol airport expansion</li> <li>2. Tarisha Finnegan-Clarke - Motion on Bristol airport expansion</li> <li>3. Mary Collett - Motion on Bristol airport expansion</li> <li>4. Jackie Head - Motion on Bristol airport expansion</li> <li>5. Richard Baxter - Motion on Bristol airport expansion</li> <li>6. David Redgewell - Principles for a refreshed climate emergency ambition</li> <li>7. Councillor Martin Fodor - Principles for a refreshed climate emergency ambition and Green Recovery Fund</li> <li>8. David Tudgey - Principles for a refreshed climate emergency ambition and Green Recovery Fund</li> <li>9. Councillor Ani Stafford-Townsend - Green Recovery Fund</li> </ol> <p>The Chair then confirmed that written replies had been sent to all questioners in advance of the meeting. The questions and replies had been circulated to committee members and were available to view on the Combined Authority web site.</p> <p>The Chair then advised that 24 statements had been received in advance of the meeting. The statements had been circulated to committee members and were available to view on the Combined Authority web site. The statements received were on the following subjects (statements were presented by those in attendance; statement 21 was read aloud at the meeting by the Director of Legal Services at the request of the person who had submitted the statement, who was unable to attend the meeting in person):</p>

1. Nigel Shipley - Motion on Bristol airport expansion
2. Jacqueline Walkden - Motion on Bristol airport expansion
3. David Redgewell - Principles for a refreshed climate emergency ambition
4. Rob Porteous - Motion on Bristol airport expansion
5. Richard Prior - Motion on Bristol airport expansion
6. Peter Travis - Principles for a refreshed climate emergency ambition
7. Bill Roberts - Motion on Bristol airport expansion
8. Marcus Grant - Motion on Bristol airport expansion
9. Martin Garrett - Principles for a refreshed climate emergency ambition
10. Tony Jones - Motion on Bristol airport expansion
11. Janet Grimes - Motion on Bristol airport expansion
12. Ollie Lax - Motion on Bristol airport expansion
13. Claire Gronow - Principles for a refreshed climate emergency ambition
14. Caroline New - Motion on Bristol airport expansion
15. Cllr Tristan Clark - Principles for a refreshed climate emergency ambition
16. Jerome Thomas - Principles for a refreshed climate emergency ambition
17. Stephen Clarke - Motion on Bristol airport expansion
18. Mike Birkin - Principles for a refreshed climate emergency ambition
19. Dr Tessa Cook - Motion on Bristol airport expansion
20. Richard Baxter - Motion on Bristol airport expansion
21. Jackie Head - Motion on Bristol airport expansion
22. Councillor Martin Fodor - Motion on Bristol airport expansion; Principles for a refreshed climate emergency ambition; and Green Recovery Fund
23. David Tudgey - Principles for a refreshed climate emergency ambition
24. Katrina Billings - Principles for a refreshed climate emergency ambition

**5 COMMENTS FROM THE CHAIR OF THE WEST OF ENGLAND LOCAL ENTERPRISE PARTNERSHIP**

Richard Bonner, Chair of the Local Enterprise Partnership Board commented as follows:

\* He welcomed this meeting which acknowledged the increasing urgency presented by the climate emergency.

\* He fully supported the principles for a refreshed climate and biodiversity strategy and action plan and the proposed investment into a £20m Green Recovery Fund to support initiatives to reduce carbon emissions, protect the environment and create green jobs.

\* It would be important to support the aerospace industry in their efforts to decarbonise, e.g. through the Jet Zero initiative.

\* There is a clear need to take action now - by working together, there is a better chance of achieving the outcomes that will help the journey to net zero by 2030.

\* The proposed regional climate board will provide focus and momentum across the region and ensure work is joined up. He fully supported the proposals for the creation of the board and welcomed the inclusion of business representatives. The Local Enterprise Partnership Board was keen to work closely with the new Climate Board and he was keen to ensure membership included Local Enterprise Partnership Board members with relevant expertise; two new members were being recruited to lead this work for the Local Enterprise Partnership Board, recognising the importance of the work to be done.

\* The Local Enterprise Partnership Board was very supportive of the creation of a new

environment director post at the Combined Authority. There was already a substantive programme of activity in this area and it was important to secure the right person to lead this work, bring it together and take it to the next stage.

\* The Local Enterprise Partnership Board was keen to work with Mayors and Leaders and others to secure this region as the place that leads the world on innovations to reduce carbon emissions.

**6 COMMENTS FROM THE COMBINED AUTHORITY'S OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

The Chair advised that the Combined Authority's Overview and Scrutiny Committee had submitted written comments following on from their meeting held on 20 September. These comments had been circulated in advance of the meeting and were available to view on the Combined Authority web site.

Councillor Huw James presented the comments, highlighting the following points:

**a. Metro Mayor's attendance at Scrutiny:**

The Metro Mayor's attendance at the meeting was welcomed and scrutiny members looked forward to future positive and ongoing engagement with the Metro Mayor.

**b. Principles for a refreshed climate emergency ambition (item 8):**

Scrutiny members noted and welcomed the fact that tackling the climate emergency was a key priority for the Metro Mayor and strongly supported the revised principles as set out in the report, recognising also the public appetite for fast, urgent action.

The committee also supported the proposal to create an interim Environment Director to drive forward the refreshed ambition with a view to recruiting to this post on a permanent basis in the medium term.

Members welcomed the broad representation proposed in terms of the membership of the Climate Board and the collaborative partnership approach to be taken. The committee also wished to strongly request that a scrutiny member was given observer status on this Board, in line with the arrangements being made for scrutiny member observers to attend the other Combined Authority Boards.

Members particularly welcomed the clarity of the target that in order to meet the 2030 net zero carbon ambitions, a cut of 464kt of CO<sub>2</sub> needs to be achieved each year (10% of today's total) - this set the huge scale of the challenge ahead and demonstrates the region's ambition. It would be essential to continue collaborative work with the unitary authorities to establish clear, measurable targets within the Climate and Biodiversity strategy/action plan, which were agreed by all authorities and with robust progress checks and reporting in place; there must be clear lines of accountability for the delivery of each action.

Noting that the new Climate and Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan will be delivered in Spring 2022, members requested that a progress update is specifically brought to Scrutiny in January 2022 to allow an opportunity to comment and input to this critically important plan. Members were particularly keen to see momentum build through urgently identifying and delivering tangible 'quick wins' in parallel with the

development of the new strategy and action plan.

c. Green Recovery Fund (item 9):

Scrutiny members broadly welcomed and supported this report and the recommendation to earmark (from the existing Combined Authority Investment Fund) headroom of £20m for a Green Recovery Fund. This amount should be seen as a start and any avenues of increasing the amount through match funding or otherwise should be explored. Scrutiny members would like to be kept fully informed as the detailed plans for the drawdown of this fund to support specific actions are developed and were also concerned that the appraisal methods used to guide investment decisions should be fit for purpose and would welcome an independent expert viability assessment.

The Chair thanked Councillor James for presenting these comments.

**7 MOTION SUBMITTED FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE WEST OF ENGLAND JOINT COMMITTEE**

**Motion – Bristol Airport expansion**

The Chair moved the following motion for consideration by the West of England Joint Committee:

'The Joint Committee recognises:

- There is a climate and biodiversity emergency.
- The West of England has ambition net zero targets for 2030.
- The proposed expansion of Bristol Airport is one of the biggest carbon decisions in the region for the coming decade.
- The pandemic has significantly reduced air travel with a 75.6% drop in passenger numbers in 2020.
- Bristol Airport's role as an employer in the region and the need for a just transition to a greener economy that does not leave workers worse-off.
- Bristol City Council and Bath and North East Somerset Council opposition to current airport expansion and North Somerset Council's decision to refuse planning permission to expand beyond 10 million passengers a year.

The Joint Committee resolves:

- To oppose the latest plans to expand Bristol Airport.'

In moving the motion, the Chair added that in his view, it was time for moral leadership to be shown on this issue, in line with public opinion. He reflected that 11 years ago, when he was a government environment minister responsible for climate change adaptation, he had been advised that Great Britain was the second biggest producer of CO2 emissions in the history of the world. Given this context, he was proud of the region's ambitious 2030 net zero carbon target and was determined to do everything possible to achieve it, recognising that this was a very tough challenge requiring a 10 per cent reduction each year in CO2 emissions.

The motion was seconded by Councillor Guy. In seconding the motion, Councillor Guy added that it was important to be clear about how the region can support the aerospace industry to become greener. It was unrealistic to think 'overnight' that

people would stop flying, so therefore it was critical for the authorities to do their utmost to encourage the aerospace industry to be as green as possible, as quickly as possible. He reminded the committee that Bath and North East Somerset Council opposed the latest plans to expand Bristol Airport and welcomed this motion which moved the Combined Authority's position towards that footing. Referring to Bristol Airport's plans and actions to reduce its carbon footprint, it was unrealistic for the Airport to expect to achieve this at the same time that it was seeking to expand passenger numbers.

Councillor Savage then moved the following amendment to the motion:

*The motion to be reworded as follows:*

'The Joint Committee recognises:

- There is a climate and biodiversity emergency.
- The West of England has ambition net zero targets for 2030.
- The proposed expansion of Bristol Airport is one of the biggest carbon decisions in the region for the coming decade.
- The pandemic has significantly reduced air travel with a 75.6% drop in passenger numbers in 2020 and is expected to recover although to an unknown level.
- Bristol Airport's role as an employer in the region and the need for a just transition to a greener economy that does not leave workers worse-off.
- The importance of the wider aerospace centre of excellence at Filton and its major contribution to our economy, skills base and industrial heritage.
- Ongoing efforts being pioneered locally by industry to decarbonise aviation, including through the Jet Zero initiative.
- Bristol City Council and Bath and North East Somerset Council opposition to current airport expansion and North Somerset Council's decision to refuse planning permission to expand beyond 10 million passengers a year.

Further recognises:

- The Combined Authority's role as Transport Authority to improve sustainable and decarbonised travel options to and from the Airport.

Notes with concern:

- The sudden loss of senior WECA officer capability to deliver the step change in public transport improvements needed to serve the Airport.

The Joint Committee resolves:

- To oppose the carbon emissions associated with the additional expansion of Bristol Airport represented in their latest planning application.
- To request that West of England Chief Executives bring a report back to the October 2021 meeting setting out a range of proposals to support the decarbonising of aviation.'

The amendment was seconded by Councillor Davies. In seconding the amendment, Councillor Davies made the point that because North Somerset Council last year

voted to oppose the expansion of the Airport to 12 million passengers a year, and there was an extant planning appeal, he had to be mindful of any statements he made at this meeting given the ongoing appeal inquiry. He was supportive of the amendment but added that it was important to be clear that in the context of the Combined Authority's role as a transport authority, it needs to be recognised that North Somerset Council is a transport authority in its own right.

Voting then took place on the amendment. 3 members voted in favour of the amendment, 1 against, with 1 abstention. Due to the fact that the Chair, as Metro Mayor, had voted against, the amendment fell.

The Chair then moved the following amendment to the original motion:

*The motion to be reworded as follows:*

'The Joint Committee recognises:

- There is a climate and biodiversity emergency.
- The West of England has ambition net zero targets for 2030.
- The proposed expansion of Bristol Airport is one of the biggest carbon decisions in the region for the coming decade.
- The pandemic has significantly reduced air travel with a 75.6% drop in passenger numbers in 2020 and is expected to recover although to an unknown level.
- Bristol Airport's role as an employer in the region and the need for a just transition to a greener economy that does not leave workers worse-off.
- Bristol City Council and Bath and North East Somerset Council opposition to current airport expansion and North Somerset Council's decision to refuse planning permission to expand beyond 10 million passengers a year.
- The importance of the wider aerospace centre of excellence at Filton and its major contribution to our economy, skills base and industrial heritage.
- Ongoing efforts being pioneered locally by industry to decarbonise aviation, including through the Jet Zero initiative.

Further recognises:

- The Combined Authority's role as Transport Authority for its area to improve sustainable and decarbonised travel options to and from the Airport.

The Joint Committee resolves:

- To oppose the latest plans to expand Bristol Airport.
- Supporting North Somerset Council's position in refusing Bristol Airport's latest planning application which is currently the subject of an appeal inquiry and to oppose the additional expansion of Bristol Airport represented in that planning application.
- Opposing the carbon emissions associated with the additional expansion of Bristol Airport represented in their latest planning application.
- To request that West of England Chief Executives bring a report back to the October 2021 meeting setting out a range of proposals to support the decarbonising of aviation.'

The amendment was seconded by Councillor Guy. In seconding the amendment, Councillor Guy commented that it was important to show to the public that the

Combined Authority was opposed to the current Airport expansion plans. He also welcomed the fact that the amendment took on board the point raised earlier at the meeting about supporting the aviation industry to become greener.

In response to a point raised by Councillor Davies, it was noted that, if this amendment was agreed, a report setting out a range of proposals to support the decarbonising of aviation would be submitted to the Joint Committee.

Councillor Savage welcomed this amendment to the original motion and the fact that it took on board some of the key points raised in the earlier amendment. It was important to recognise the region's strong aerospace industry; this needs to thrive but more needs to be done to help the industry in their decarbonising efforts. He was pleased that this was reflected in the amendment including the reference to the Jet Zero initiative. He also welcomed the acknowledgement that the Combined Authority has a role as a transport authority in improving sustainable travel choices as this could affect carbon emissions associated with the Airport. He noted that one aspect of his earlier amendment that was not included in this amendment was the reference to the departure of the Combined Authority's Director of Infrastructure; he wished to place on record that he felt this was a huge loss to the Combined Authority of an officer who had shown ongoing commitment to collaborative and partnership working.

Councillor Savage also noted the explicit reference in the amendment to opposing the latest plans to expand Bristol airport. Whilst not doubting the strength of public feeling on this issue, members should be realistic as to how meaningful it actually was for the committee to oppose the airport expansion, given that the airport was not within the Combined Authority's footprint; the Combined Authority also had no power over the planning decision. Finally, further to his earlier comment, he recognised the importance of a report being brought back on how the aerospace industry's decarbonising efforts could be supported.

Councillor Davies welcomed the amendment and added that the support of the surrounding authorities for the North Somerset Council decision to refuse the expansion while the planning appeal was underway was hugely uplifting for North Somerset as an authority.

The Chair commented that in his view, the public view on this issue was ahead of politicians and, as per his earlier comment, it was time to demonstrate moral leadership.

Voting then took place on the amendment. 4 members voted in favour of the amendment, none against, with 1 abstention.

The amendment having been carried, the **Joint Committee** then voted on this as the substantive motion (including the amendment) and

**RESOLVED** (4 members voting in favour, none against, with 1 abstention):

**The Joint Committee recognises:**

- **There is a climate and biodiversity emergency.**
- **The West of England has ambition net zero targets for 2030.**



- The proposed expansion of Bristol Airport is one of the biggest carbon decisions in the region for the coming decade.
- The pandemic has significantly reduced air travel with a 75.6% drop in passenger numbers in 2020 and is expected to recover although to an unknown level.
- Bristol Airport's role as an employer in the region and the need for a just transition to a greener economy that does not leave workers worse-off.
- Bristol City Council and Bath and North East Somerset Council opposition to current airport expansion and North Somerset Council's decision to refuse planning permission to expand beyond 10 million passengers a year
- The importance of the wider aerospace centre of excellence at Filton and its major contribution to our economy, skills base and industrial heritage.
- Ongoing efforts being pioneered locally by industry to decarbonise aviation, including through the Jet Zero initiative.

**Further recognises:**

- The Combined Authority's role as Transport Authority for its area to improve sustainable and decarbonised travel options to and from the Airport.

**The Joint Committee resolves:**

- To oppose the latest plans to expand Bristol Airport.
- Supporting North Somerset Council's position in refusing Bristol Airport's latest planning application which is currently the subject of an appeal inquiry and to oppose the additional expansion of Bristol Airport represented in that planning application.
- Opposing the carbon emissions associated with the additional expansion of Bristol Airport represented in their latest planning application.
- To request that West of England Chief Executives bring a report back to the October 2021 meeting setting out a range of proposals to support the decarbonising of aviation.

**8 PRINCIPLES FOR A REFRESHED CLIMATE EMERGENCY AMBITION**

This report was submitted for consideration by the West of England Combined Authority Committee and the West of England Joint Committee (agenda item 8).

The report set out a recommendation for the Combined Authority Committee's consideration and a separate recommendation for the Joint Committee's consideration, as follows:

**Recommendation for the Combined Authority Committee:**

- To approve the creation of an interim Environment Director, with a view to recruiting to this post on a permanent basis in the medium term.

**Recommendation for the Joint Committee:**

- To agree the principles for a revised ambition to address the climate emergency.

At the suggestion of Councillor Davies, the Chair agreed it would be appropriate for the recommendation for the Joint Committee to be considered first.

The Chair then moved the recommendation for the **Joint Committee** as follows:

‘To agree the principles for a revised ambition to address the climate emergency.’

This motion was seconded by Councillor Davies.

Councillor Davies commented that the work now being developed was moving in the right direction; it will be important for the Joint Committee to ambitiously deliver on the new Climate Emergency approach and, given the time lost through reframing the approach, to accelerate delivery even more quickly. He therefore supported the new approach, which must be accompanied by ambitious delivery to achieve net zero by 2030 – it will be important to challenge delivery on an ongoing basis to ensure the ambitious approach is maintained.

Councillor Guy thanked Combined Authority officers for working in collaboration with unitary authority officers in developing this more ambitious and dynamic Climate Emergency approach. As part of this, it will be essential for the Combined Authority to embed climate emergency considerations into transport delivery. He also appreciated the comments submitted by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. To help assist the delivery of the new approach, he felt an amendment was needed to add further wording to the recommendation, to ensure clarity about the role of the new Climate Board in delivering the ambitions and measuring and challenging that delivery and progress.

Councillor Guy then moved the following amendment to the report:

*The recommendation for the Joint Committee to be reworded as follows:*

‘To agree the principles for a revised ambition to address the climate emergency and that a full review of the governance and terms of reference for the new Climate Board should be approved at the next Joint Committee in October 2021.’

The amendment was seconded by Councillor Savage and Councillor Cheney.

Councillor Savage commented that there are lessons to learn in terms of how partnership and collaboration has worked; it will be important to ensure that the Climate Board’s voice, incorporating all the unitary authorities, will be listened to.

Councillor Cheney, noting the above comment, stressed the need to ensure full collaborative working.

Councillor Davies welcomed the proposal, as included in the amendment, to review the detail of the Climate Board’s terms of reference. He suggested it would be appropriate to consider using a term other than ‘Board’ for this new body to avoid any confusion with the roles of the other Combined Authority boards and emphasise its difference. It will be key to involve the voices of business and communities.

The Chair commented that clear targets will be critical in tracking progress on the delivery of outcomes; strong collaboration will be key to that delivery, including wide engagement and involvement across the full spectrum of business, and also with trade unions and voluntary and community groups.

Voting then took place on the amendment. 4 members voted in favour of the amendment, and 1 against. Due to the fact that the Chair, as Metro Mayor, had voted against, the amendment fell.

In response to a question raised by Councillor Davies, the Director of Legal Services confirmed that in line with the constitution, an amendment considered by the Joint Committee 'fell' if it was not supported by the Metro Mayor.

Councillor Savage asked that committee members be sent a written copy of the legal advice on the voting arrangements (as had been supplied to the Chair in advance of the meeting).

The Chair advised that he had voted against the amendment as he did not wish to delay this decision until October, given the committee was being asked to agree and urgently take forward a new climate emergency ambition.

Councillor Savage further commented that he recognised the value of the collaborative work that had taken place across the authorities over the summer in developing the refreshed approach to tackling the climate emergency. It will be important to ensure that robust governance is in place to ensure accountability for the delivery of key actions and that the approach is taken forward collectively.

Councillor Guy commented that the purpose of the amendment previously discussed had not been to delay the new approach; it was important, however, to ensure clarity about the role of the Climate Board to maximise its effectiveness.

The Chair stressed the importance of the authorities working together and collaboratively for the benefit of the region as a whole, and the need to urgently take forward the refreshed climate emergency approach. Effective collaboration would also be critical in relation to bidding for government funds.

Voting then took place on the original recommendation for the **Joint Committee**.

The **Joint Committee**

**RESOLVED** (unanimously)

**- To agree the principles for a revised ambition to address the climate emergency.**

The Chair then moved the recommendation for the **Combined Authority Committee** as follows:

'To approve the creation of an interim Environment Director, with a view to recruiting to this post on a permanent basis in the medium term.'

This motion was not seconded. The motion therefore fell.

Councillor Savage then moved the following new recommendation for consideration by the Combined Authority Committee:

‘Committee notes the importance of having the right resources in place at the right time to drive forward on our ambitious climate change commitments.

**Recommendation for West of England Combined Authority Committee:** That an update report be brought back to the October committee meeting setting out the roles and responsibilities of a new Environment Director post, and its relationship with the Infrastructure Director and the relevant Member Advisory Boards, together with the associated financial implications. That the report sets out options for how this post can be recruited to as quickly as possible, involving all members of the WECA committee in the appointment, on a permanent contract/basis.’

In moving this new recommendation, Councillor Savage commented that employing an interim Director would be an expensive exercise and he was concerned that the current report did not include detailed financial implications on the costs of an interim Director role. He could not at this point support the creation of this interim post and the use of resources for recruitment to this (and a number of other) posts, especially given the wider context that a number of bus services were no longer being supported by the Combined Authority across the region due to financial considerations.

This motion was seconded by Councillor Cheney. Councillor Cheney stressed the importance of all the authorities working together effectively and collaboratively; this should apply in terms of recruiting to a key interim/Director post such as that of the proposed Environment Director.

Councillor Guy expressed his full support for the principle of the proposed Environment Director post, particularly given the need to embed climate emergency considerations into all the Combined Authority’s activities and actions. It was important though, in his view, not to set any precedent, through appointing an interim Director, for how directors are appointed by the Combined Authority. A new Environment Director post must be fully integrated in the context of the role of the new Climate Board.

The Chair commented on the urgent need, in his view, to establish and recruit to the Environment Director post as quickly as possible. The interim Director proposal was not intended to set any precedent for future recruitment practice. In relation to the point raised by Councillor Savage about bus services, the Chair advised that in his view, this was a separate issue – he had written to the Minister of Transport about the challenges faced locally in relation to bus services; this letter had been signed also by several local MPs across the region from a range of political parties.

Voting then took place on the motion to approve the new recommendation, as moved by Councillor Savage. 2 members voted in favour of the motion, 1 against, with 1 abstention. Due to the fact that the Chair, as Metro Mayor, had voted against, the motion fell.

**GREEN RECOVERY FUND**

This report was submitted for consideration by the West of England Joint Committee and the West of England Combined Authority Committee (agenda item 9).

The report set out a recommendation for the Combined Authority Committee's consideration and a separate recommendation for the Joint Committee's consideration, as follows:

**Recommendation for the Combined Authority Committee:**

- To earmark from the existing Combined Authority Investment Fund headroom £20m for a Green Recovery Fund.

**Recommendation for the Joint Committee:**

- To note the fund's objectives and framework.

The Chair moved the recommendation for the **Combined Authority Committee** as follows:

'To earmark from the existing Combined Authority Investment Fund headroom £20m for a Green Recovery Fund.'

In moving the motion, the Chair stressed that this proposal was in line with and would deliver his manifesto commitment to create a Green Recovery Fund of this scale. He emphasised that retrofitting of properties to reduce emissions would be a key element of the proposal. The fund was also designed to lever in additional resources and opportunities. He was determined that the region should be at the 'cutting edge' of green delivery, with the region showing that it was a national leader, well placed to take advantage of government funding opportunities.

This motion was not seconded. The motion therefore fell.

Councillor Guy indicated his support for the principle of a Green Recovery Fund but advised he was not able to second the current proposal. The fund in his view needed to be bolder, more ambitious and at least three times bigger than the £20 million proposed in the report, i.e. at least £60 million.

The Chair commented that the item would be brought back for discussion at the October meeting, adding that officers will explore how the £20 million fund could be increased as he was keen to ensure that the proposal is as ambitious as possible.

Councillor Savage referred to the fact that he had circulated to committee members a potential new recommendation for consideration by the Combined Authority Committee. He indicated that it was not necessary for him to formally move this new recommendation, noting that committee members were in agreement about the need to create a more ambitious Green Recovery Fund. He asked for a verbal assurance from the Metro Mayor that there will be collaboration between the Combined Authority Chief Executive and the unitary authority Chief Executives on the refreshed proposal in advance of the October committee meeting.

In response, the Chair stated that the authorities will need to work very closely together to achieve the ambitions around this fund, including increasing the size of the fund.

Councillor Cheney commented that from Bristol's perspective, there was a lack of clarity in the current report about how the Green Recovery Fund would be financed, including information about how funding this priority may potentially affect the funding of other priorities.

The Chair confirmed that a further report on the Green Recovery Fund would be brought back to the October meeting, linked in with the latest Investment Fund report.

The **Joint Committee** then noted the proposed fund's objectives and framework.

Councillor Davies commented that from the Joint Committee's perspective, it was important to place on record support for Combined Authority committee members' ambitions for the size of the Green Recovery Fund, also noting the importance of clearly identifying the funding sources and any priorities that may no longer be funded as a result of this. He added that if the aim was to demonstrate the scale of ambition, it was incumbent upon the Combined Authority, in conjunction with the constituent councils, to bring forward a report and plan for action for consideration at the October meeting. It was essential to clearly articulate both the ambition and what will be done, and what may not be done because of the priority afforded to the green recovery.

The Chair then closed the meeting at 5.33 pm, and again thanked Watermore Primary School for hosting the meeting.

**Signed:**

**Date:**