



**BISHOPSTON, COTHAM AND REDLAND
NEIGHBOURHOOD COMMITTEE
7PM MONDAY 25TH MARCH 2013
AT COLSTON'S PRIMARY SCHOOL, GROVE PARK
COTHAM, BRISTOL**

PRESENT:

Ward Councillors

Councillors Knott (in the Chair for the Neighbourhood Committee items) and Willingham (Bishopston Ward)
Councillor Negus (Cotham Ward)
Councillors Hance and Townsend (Redland Ward)

Members of the Partnership

Alison Bromilow, Redland and Cotham Amenities Society
Nick Clark, Local Resident
Jenny Hoadley, The Bishopston Society
Liz Kew, Local Resident
Clive Stevens, Redland and Cotham Amenities Society (in the Chair for the Neighbourhood Partnership items)
Hamish Wills, Sustainable Redland

Bristol City Council Officers

Mark Spurduty, Area Manager
Mark Gundry, Project Manager
Andrew McGrath, Area Co-ordinator
Lucy Fleming, Democratic Services Officer

1. WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS AND APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Harrison and Inspector Rundle.

2. MINUTES - BISHOPSTON, COTHAM AND REDLAND NEIGHBOURHOOD PARTNERSHIP – 21ST JANUARY 2013

2.1 The minutes from the meeting on 21st January 2013 were agreed to be a correct record. Members noted the tabled action sheet summarising the status of tasks allocated at the last meeting, a copy of which is available in the minute book and on Bristol City Council's website at the following link;

[Committee Papers](#)

2.2 AGREED - The minutes from the meeting on 21st January 2013 were agreed to be a correct record.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Although there was no legal requirement for Neighbourhood Partnership (NP) Members to declare interests, in order to maintain transparency Bishopston, Cotham and Redland (BCR) NP had adopted such a policy. Liz Kew went on to declare that she was a member of the BCR Street Scene Group that had applied for Wellbeing funding.

4. PUBLIC FORUM

The NP received 5 items of public forum business, copies of which are available in the minute book.

4.1 Members considered the statement from Vassili Papastavrou in relation to the ongoing debate regarding protection of the ancient trees on Redland Green. During the ensuing discussion the following comments were made;

- Bristol City Council did not generally apply Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) to trees on its own land.
- Tree Preservation Orders provided some security but they did not guarantee protection in the long term because they could be (and occasionally were) removed by one of the City Council's Development Control Committees.
- Consideration would need to be given to whether placing TPOs on the trees would set a precedent for other trees on Council owned land, which would put a significant strain on resources.
- TPOs might not be necessary because the trees would be automatically protected if they provided habitat for endangered species.

4.2 After some discussion it was agreed that Councillor Hance, Mr Papastavrou and Jeff Collard would meet to decide upon the best way to take the matter forward and report back to the next meeting.

ACTION: COUNCILLOR HANCE

4.3 The NP went on to discuss the statement seeking NP support for both applications from Sustainable Redland for contributions from the Local Sustainable Transport Fund. Members were informed that a similar application would be submitted by Sustainable Bishopston and agreed to add their support to all three bids.

ACTION: ANDREW MCGRATH/HAMISH WILLS/LIZ KEW

4.4 It was agreed that the statement regarding traffic arrangements at Beaufort Road would be considered as part of the discussion in relation to agenda item no. 5.

4.5 Members received two statements raising concerns about the play park at Horfield Common and agreed to take them in conjunction with agenda item no. 8.

5. DEVOLVED TRANSPORT SCHEMES 2013-14

5.1 The NP considered a report from Gareth Vaughan Williams, Area Manager, Highways, Transport and Traffic Management (agenda item no. 5) setting out devolved transport schemes for 2013/14.

5.2 Members noted the public forum statement in relation to traffic arrangements at Beaufort Road. Officers confirmed that the Horfield and Lockleaze NP had agreed to champion the proposal since Beaufort Road was located within their area.

5.3 The NP went on to consider the report. The following key issues were noted during the discussion that took place between officers and Members:-

5.4 Carriageway surface dressing

- The proposed scheme for carriageway surface dressing at Cranbrook Road had been selected following technical assessment of the streets in the BCR NP area. The NP had in the past requested that officers provide a recommendation since Members did not have the technical knowledge to enable them to make an informed judgement.
- It was agreed that Mark Sperduty would enquire about the surface dressing of Trelawney Road due to concerns raised by Councillor Negus about the quality of the workmanship.

ACTION: MARK SPERDUTY

- Bristol City Council should make continued efforts to co-ordinate utilities works within the city to minimise disruption. Enforcement action should be taken when road surfaces were not properly reinstated.
- Officers endeavoured to repair as many potholes as possible. A recent study had found that Bristol was 11th best in the country in terms of repairing potholes.

Councillor Knott took the chair so that the Neighbourhood Committee (NC) could make the spending decision. Councillor Hance proposed that the recommendation to conduct carriageway surface dressing at Cranbrook Road be accepted and was seconded by Councillor Townsend. On being put to the vote there was unanimous support.

Clive Stevens took the Chair.

5.5 Footway maintenance schemes

The NP noted the proposal that footways maintenance schemes be delayed until later in the year.

5.6 Local Traffic schemes

- Members considered the decision of senior Council officers to pause decision-making on local traffic schemes until later in the year. They expressed disappointment at the continued shortage of officer resources and agreed that the Chair would write to the Mayor to alert him of the situation.

ACTION: CLIVE STEVENS

- The NP discussed the strategy for ensuring that a new set of local traffic schemes be prepared so that work could commence as soon as the resources were in place. It was agreed that the matter would be discussed at the NP's next informal meeting. One suggestion was that local residents be invited to join Councillors Hance and Willingham on the reconstituted Highways Sub Group.

ACTION: FI HANCE AND DAVID WILLINGHAM

- Members were assured that priority schemes, such as accident prevention measures, would continue to be funded through the Road Safety Budget.
- Officers confirmed that resurfacing works at North Road would take place once the planned gas works had been completed.

5.7 The Neighbourhood Committee RESOLVED that:-

The 2013/14 work programme for carriageway surface dressing at Cranbrook Road be approved.

5.8 The Neighbourhood Partnership noted;

- 1) That a decision had been made that footway schemes be delayed until later in the year; and**
- 2) The local traffic schemes that would be delivered in the BCR NP area in 2013/14; and**
- 3) That a pause in decision making of 12 months was needed in order to deliver this year's work programme. It was agreed that the Chair would write to the Mayor to express dissatisfaction at the continued shortage of officer resources.**

6. COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL) REPORT

6.1 As the report included a decision that could only be made by the Neighbourhood Committee, Councillor Knott took the chair for the item.

6.2 The Neighbourhood Committee considered a report of Jim Cliffe, Planning Obligations Manager, (agenda item no. 6) relating to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). It was noted that the NP would receive 15% of all CIL receipts with the remainder of contributions being assigned to major strategic infrastructure schemes. The NP received confirmation that Full Council had approved many of those schemes prior to the Mayoral election.

6.3 Members commented that generally they could not support Neighbourhood Development Plans because the BCR NP area lacked opportunities for new building schemes.

6.4 Councillor Knott moved the officers' recommendation and was seconded by Councillor Negus. On being put to the vote there was unanimous support.

6.5 The Neighbourhood Committee RESOLVED that:-

From 1st January 2013 Bishopston, Cotham and Redland Neighbourhood Committee accepts responsibility for decisions over Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) spend.

6.6 Clive Stevens took the Chair.

7. AREA CO-ORDINATOR'S REPORT

7.1 The Partnership received a report of the Area Co-ordinator. The salient points that arose during the ensuing discussion could be summarised as follows;

7.2 Parking in cycle lanes and vehicles travelling in the wrong directions down one-way streets should be tackled more effectively. The NP were advised that the City Council did not currently have the powers to use CCTV to enforce those infringements, which was frustrating for all. It was agreed that officers would give consideration to introducing more mandatory cycle lanes that were operational during the same times and days as parking and loading restrictions, which could be done when applying Traffic Regulation Orders for other matters.

ACTION: MARK SPERDUTY

7.3 The Mayor had recently announced accelerated introduction of Residents' Parking Schemes (RPSs) in the 'doughnut' around the city centre. The following matters were discussed;

- The NP agreed that enhanced communication with local residents was required and were concerned to hear that there would only be 1 round of consultation, when 2 was the accepted norm.
- Redland and Cotham North RPS was due to be in place by November 2013, which had been brought forward from spring 2014 following pressure from local ward Members.
- There was agreement that a 'one size fits all' approach could not be applied for RPSs and that it was crucial that a thorough review be conducted 6 months after implementation.
- Councillor Townsend stressed the importance of taking a pragmatic approach to ensure that businesses and people employed in the area were not disadvantaged by the RPSs and would therefore favour introduction of 'community parking zones.' Members agreed that flexibility was key to making the schemes a success.
- In view of the strength of feeling in relation to RPSs it was agreed that the matter be discussed further at a dedicated Super Forum meeting (*see also minute number 10.1*).

ACTION: ANDREW MCGRATH

7.4 Members were reminded of the request to provide feedback on the collective response to the Neighbourhood Partnership review that was currently underway. To date less than half of the NP had responded.

ACTION: ALL (WHO HAVE NOT RESPONDED)

7.5 Three Neighbourhood Working teams would shortly be established to assist with projects across multiple partnership areas. It was agreed

that a report to update the NP on progress would be brought to the next meeting.

ACTION: ANDREW MCGRATH

7.6 Andrew McGrath was asked to ensure that joint work be undertaken with the Henleaze Stoke Bishop and Westbury on Trym NP regarding preparations for the Celebrating Age Festival, since they were very advanced in their arrangements.

ACTION: ANDREW MCGRATH

7.7 The NP was advised that the informal Neighbourhood Partnership meeting on 7th May 2013 would be moved because it was too close to the election.

ACTION: ANDREW MCGRATH

7.8 Members considered the options in relation to a Parks' Tree Plan for the area. The discussion was as follows;

- The NP were entitled to choose one park within its area to benefit from a Tree Plan each year.
- The Horfield and Lockleaze NP had agreed to take responsibility for tree planting for the whole of Horfield Common (a tabled document was circulated to confirm this). Members asked that their thanks be recorded.
- Cotham Gardens did not wish to pursue a Tree Plan at the current time, so Redland Green was the only candidate for the Tree Plan.
- Councillor Townsend moved that the Tree Plan for Redland Green be approved and was seconded by Councillor Hance. On being put to the vote 11 Members were in favour and there was 1 abstention.

7.9 Members considered the resignation of Clive Stevens as Chair of the NP. He was warmly thanked for the contribution he had made and congratulated for helping to transform the NP during the formative stages. However, there was also some objection to his use of the word 'tainted' with respect to local Councillors (see the letter on page 57 of the accompanying papers, which stated 'tainted due to being a politician'). In view of this Clive Stevens withdrew the word 'tainted' and apologised for any offence caused.

7.10 With respect to the selection process for a new NP Chair, Members were advised that common practice at City Council meetings would be for interested parties to be nominated and seconded at the annual meeting. In the event that there be more than one candidate the matter would be decided by majority vote. Following the discussion a vote of thanks to the outgoing chair was moved by Councillor Knott, seconded by Councillor Townsend and given unanimous support.

7.11 As the Wellbeing Fund report included two spending decisions that could only be made by the Neighbourhood Committee, Councillor

Knott took the Chair for the item. Members went on to consider the funding application for the graffiti removal course, as outlined on page 59 of the accompanying papers. The discussion was as follows;

- There had been several expressions of interest with regard to purchasing places on the graffiti removal course. If all 15 places could not be filled by May 2013 the course would be deferred.
- The target course date of May 2013 had been selected to coincide with the Neighbourhoods Festival week.
- Councillor Townsend moved that the application be granted and was seconded by Councillor Hance. On being put to the vote there was unanimous support.

7.12 Members were advised that the Wellbeing report considered at the last meeting had contained two minor inaccuracies with respect to the amounts sought. Councillor Negus proposed that the contributions to Sefton Park Scorpions Football Club and Pied Piper Nursery be amended to £1380 and £450 as outlined in the report. He was seconded by Councillor Townsend. On being put to the vote there was unanimous support.

7.13 Jenny Hoadley was thanked for her continued support of the Wellbeing funding application process.

7.14 The Neighbourhood Committee RESOLVED that:-

- **£1,460 of Wellbeing funding be allocated to BCR Street Scene Group to fund a certified hand removal of graffiti training course for 15 people to be run by Nordic Pioneer; and**
- **That the following funding allocations made at the NC meeting on 21st January 2013 be amended because there had been an inaccuracy within the report;**
 - **Sefton Park Scorpions Football Club - that £1380 be allocated in place of £1360; and**
 - **Pied Piper Nursery – that £450 be allocated in place of £490.**

7.15 The Neighbourhood Partnership AGREED;

1. **To note the updates from the recent Forums**
2. **To note the issues raised at the Forums regarding Resident Parking Schemes, and to consider those issues at a dedicated Superforum meeting.**
3. **To note the current standing of the communications budget**
4. **To note the discussion regarding the current city-wide NP review**
5. **To note the update on the Neighbourhood Working process**
6. **To note the update on the Celebrating Age Festival**

7. To note the latest meetings schedule
8. To note the latest Devolved Services updates
9. To support the Tree Plan for Redland Green for 2013/14
10. To note the latest update on the Winning Whiteladies Project
11. To note the established process for election of chairs
12. To note the latest financial position of the Well Being Fund

8. HORFIELD COMMON PLAYGROUND UPDATE

8.1 The Partnership considered a report of Mark Grundy, Project Manager, Bristol Parks (agenda item 8) regarding Horfield Common Playground.

8.2 Members heard from one resident who had submitted a public forum statement to raise her concerns about the plans to move the play facility to another area of the Common. The Chair allowed a further 5 residents to address the meeting. The points made during the public forum session were as follows;

- Moving the play area could lead to increased anti-social behaviour.
- There were drainage problems at the proposed alternative site.
- The relocation would be expensive and the money would be better spent on providing new equipment.
- Consideration should be given to creating more dog free areas.
- The consultation had been inadequate.

8.3 The Chair asked Mark Grundy to respond to the comments made. The following is a summary of the information he provided;

- The location of play areas was a sensitive issue and it was difficult to balance the needs of local residents. There had been complaints from residents about the current location of the play park, but no figures were available at the current time.
- The guidelines stated that there should be a minimum distance of 30 meters between play parks and residential properties, and if planning permission were sought today for the same location it would not be granted.
- At the initial meeting with local residents, views about the relocation of the play facility had been mixed.
- The site was not as boggy as some residents suggested. The issues of water logging would be addressed by installation of tarmac paths.
- Under the new proposals there would be no net loss in the amount of grass space.
- Visibility of the play area would be improved if it were moved to one of the suggested alternative locations.

- Whilst some residents had raised concerns about the proximity of the car park to the proposed new site on safety grounds, it could be argued that it would be beneficial for disabled children wishing to use the facility.
- Officers had taken the view that it was not necessary to conduct wide consultation, instead opting to concentrate on those residents who lived nearest to the facility.
- One option would be to leave the play park at the existing site but refurbish it, although that would not use all of the funding (of around £110K) that had been set aside for the project.

8.4 Members of the NP went on to share their own views about the matter commenting as follows;

- The location of the play facility was less important than the quality of equipment available.
- The residents who lived directly adjacent to the play site had limited grounds for complaint since the facility had been in place when they moved into their homes.
- Clarification should be provided regarding the source of the guidelines in relation to the acceptable distance between residential properties and play areas. It was agreed that Mark Grundy would provide the details.

ACTION: MARK GUNDRY

- Consideration should be given to changing the shape of the site. An 'L' shape might provide a more acceptable solution.
- It would be appropriate to increase the size of the dog free picnic area, which would be popular with children and adults.
- There would be little point in re-consulting on the current options.
- The NP had limited jurisdiction over the decision so would be unlikely to submit a co-ordinated objection.

8.5 The NP were asked to vote to give their opinion on the proposals and unanimously agreed that more work needed to be done in conjunction with the NP and Friends of Horfield Common to evaluate all the options for the play park, including keeping it where it is. As a result of the concerns raised at the meeting it was agreed that Mark Grundy would prepare a report of options and report back as soon as possible.

ACTION: MARK GUNDRY

8.6 AGREED - that a report of options in relation to the play facility be brought back for further comment as soon as possible.

9. £30k GLOUCESTER ROAD (PROMENADE) PROJECT UPDATE

The Partnership considered a report of Nigel Lapworth, Project Manager providing an update on the Gloucester Road project. It was noted that the scheme would benefit the part of the Gloucester Road to the north of Zetland Road. The NP were advised that consultation regarding the proposals was underway and that works would be completed by the end of the year.

9.1 AGREED - that the report be noted.

10. NEIGHBOURHOODS WEEK AND SUPER-FORUM UPDATE

10.1 The Partnership considered a verbal update from Nick Clark and asked for additional details in a number of areas. The following matters were discussed;

- The Neighbourhoods Festival Week would take place from Saturday 4th to Tuesday 14th May 2013. Events included the Super Forum, sport taster sessions, the May Fair and a Farmers' Market.
- The Mayor would be attending the Super Forum to discuss the future of Neighbourhood Partnerships. It was agreed that one of the breakout sessions during the Super Forum should be used to discuss RPS, prior to the dedicated Forum for RPSs taking place later in the year.

ACTION: NICK CLARK

- The event would be marketed and organisers would wear custom made t-shirts

10.2 AGREED - that the verbal report be noted and that further updates be provided in due course.

11. 20MPH ROLL-OUT UPDATE

Members considered the update regarding roll out of the 20 MPH zones. It was agreed that the suggestion that children be involved in helping to design appropriate signage should be pursued, although care should be taken to avoid over proliferation of street signs.

11.1 AGREED - that the update be noted.

12. BCR NP – NEW STREET TREES - UPDATE

The update was noted.

12.1 AGREED – that the update be noted.

13. NP CONSTITUTION

Members noted the report from Clive Stevens (agenda item 13) on the review of the BCR NP constitution and agreed to discuss the points raised informally outside of the meeting. They were advised that it would be the last meeting for Councillor Knott and Liz Kew (as well as Clive Stevens – see item 7). Councillor Negus thanked Councillor Knott for his support when he was the Executive Member with responsibility for introducing the NPs, and also during the three years that he had served on BCR NP.

13.1 AGREED - that the points raised be considered informally prior to the next meeting.

14. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

It was confirmed that the next meeting of the BCR NP would take place on Monday 24th June 2013 at a venue to be agreed.

(The meeting ended at 9.31pm)

CHAIR