

**BISHOPSTON, COTHAM AND REDLAND
NEIGHBOURHOOD PARTNERSHIP**

**MONDAY 24TH JUNE 2013
TABLED DOCUMENTS**

**TO ALL MEMBERS OF BISHOPSTON COTHAM AND REDLAND
NEIGHBOURHOOD PARTNERSHIP, INCLUDING:**

| No. | SUBJECT | Page |
|------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|
| 1. | Item 2 – Membership Constitution | 1 |
| 2. | Item 6 _ Public Forum | 5 |
| 3. | Item 8 – Residents’ Parking Schemes | 19 |
| 4 | Item 9 – Wellbeing Funding | 25 |

This page is intentionally blank.

TABLED DOCUMENT NO. 1

Decision by the 6 Councillors about proposed amendments to the Membership Constitution.

Please consider and vote on each of the four suggested amendments.

Regarding Community Group Representatives:

1) That there is the position of traders/business rep. on the NP (we have a candidate for this – to be voted in later by NP if this clause is approved).

2) A Neighbourhood Watch Rep (as requested by Bristol NHW)

Note: Both of the above are community group reps and eventually the community group themselves will be responsible for a democratic process for electing their rep.

Regarding the rules around appointed residents:

3) That the role can be 3 years extended from the not 2 years currently

4) That there is no block on appointed residents being re-appointed after the 2 or 3 years (depends on decision above) should the NP wish to do so.

This page is intentionally blank.

**BISHOPSTON, COTHAM AND REDLAND
NEIGHBOURHOOD PARTNERSHIP**

**MONDAY 24TH JUNE 2013
PUBLIC FORUM STATEMENTS/PETITIONS**

**TO ALL MEMBERS OF BISHOPSTON COTHAM AND REDLAND
NEIGHBOURHOOD PARTNERSHIP, INCLUDING:**

WARD COUNCILLORS:

Councillors Hance, Harrison, Negus, Townsend, Radice and Willingham

OFFICERS:

Andrew McGrath, Area Co-Ordinator

RECORDS: Minute Book and DSO

| AGENDA ITEM NO | SUBJECT | NAME | NO. |
|---------------------------|--|--|------------|
| NA | New/upgraded play area for Redland Green | Jane Powell | 1 |
| NA | " | John Waldron, Secretary of Redland | 2 |
| NA | Field next to the Good Shepherd Church | Lesley Kinsley (Good Shepherd Neighbourhood Watch) | 3 |
| 8 | Residents' Parking Zones | Kevin Chidgey | 4 |
| 8 | " | Professor Laxton | 5 |
| NA | Waste Collection | Clive Stevens | 6 |

This page is intentionally blank.

STATEMENT NO. 1

Dear Chair, I am concerned that whilst I was given 2 forms to complete about my interest in the play scheme and in vague terms asked my opinion (via a representative coming to Redland Green playgroup on a Tuesday playgroup), I have not been shown any schemes and asked to choose.

Would you ask what criteria, process and likely scheme is to be or has been chosen please?

This is important to me as I go to Redland Green with my 2 year old daughter at least twice a week and the play space could be greatly improved.

Jane Powell - Cotham ward resident

STATEMENT NO. 2

Clive - Unfortunately I shall be away on business on Monday night and other RGCG committee members may also be unable to attend the forthcoming NP meeting. We would be grateful if you could give our apologies to the meeting and arrange for this statement to be read out.

Redland Green: Capital Stimulus

Redland Green Community Group is grateful for the survey so far undertaken by the Council's Neighbourhood Engagement Team to establish the community's priorities for expenditure. We understand that this will be within the remit of the Parks Capital Stimulus previously agreed by the NP. In addition RGCG members have carried out a survey of user needs within the children's playground itself; the results of which have been made available to the Council's officers. We also appreciate the recent opportunity to discuss the condition of the play equipment with the Council's Project and Play Officers.

There is however growing concern about the lack of information about the Council's survey, the programme for future decisions and, importantly, the process for further community consultation. In the interests of genuine participation, Redland Green Community Group wishes to invite the Council's officers to a public meeting at which these issues can be raised. In the meantime we would welcome an assurance that no work will be undertaken on design or construction until the allocation of funds has been agreed.

John Waldron

Secretary of Redland

STATEMENT NO. 3

Public statement to the Neighbourhood Partnership from Bishopston home owners/tenants backing on to the field about to be developed next to the Good Shepherd Church

Home owners and tenants in those parts of Bishop Road and Kings Drive backing on to the above field co-operated closely over a period of several years to co-ordinate written objections to two planning applications made to build (i) 8 houses and (ii) 4 houses on this site.

Both these applications were rejected for planning permission but a further application for two houses was granted planning permission in 2007 (07/00842/F).

This was given a time extension in 2010 (2010 (10/01495/R) as the land was still for sale.

We, the above mentioned residents made strong representations throughout all three applications to preserve the visual and natural amenity of the site with particular attention to the trees on the site boundaries.

From the text of the permission we were led to believe that trees on the boundaries would not be removed and, if they were, would be replaced by size and species specified by the Local Authority

'If any retained tree is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, another tree shall be planted at the same place and that tree shall be of such size and species, and shall be planted at such time, as may be specified in writing by the Local Planning Authority

Reason: In the interests of retaining the green aspect of the site in the interests of visual amenity and nature conservation.'

The land was sold recently to two families who are each building a house on the site.

However, the time extension granted in 2010 was due to run out on 01 June this year.

Several neighbours backing on to the field were approached by one of the families developing the site on Bank Holiday Saturday 25 May, informing them that diggers would be moving in at 8.30am on Tuesday 28 May to dig trenches and concrete fill these and that several trees were likely to be lost in the process.

We made our alarm very obvious to the owner (i) about the manner in which we were being informed and (ii) about the potential loss of trees.

He was immovable.

Representations from several neighbours were made to the Planning Team by phone from 8.30am onwards on Tuesday. Conversations were inconclusive and left us feeling that the approved drawings overrode all other planning information and thus that the trees are not safe.

No trenches were dug on the Tuesday and trenches were eventually dug at the other end of the field over a period of about two days.

No work has been carried out since.

We remain alarmed about the potential loss of our natural and visual amenity. Despite making representations to the Planning Team and the Neighbourhood Partnership Team, we are finding it difficult to obtain useful responses to our emails and phone calls. We are very appreciative of the support of Clive Stevens in trying to get an answer on our behalf, but the answer returned to him was that a beech tree on a neighbouring piece of land was not worthy of a TPO, that a TPO would not ensure its conservation anyway and the tree boundary was alarmingly described by the Tree Officer as a hedge when it is full of mature and productive plum trees (all well over 30 years old). This sort of response is certainly not something we would expect from a European Green Capital Award City! We are, however, appreciative of the fact that the owner is now looking at redesigning his garage foundations to avoid damaging the beech tree, but we have, as yet, received no assurances that this will indeed be the case.

We have accepted that Planning permission has been given and that the development will go ahead, particularly as a couple of trenches have been dug and concreted.

However we are extremely disappointed that the views of neighbouring residents, many of whom have lived here for over 25 years, are considered to be of little or no importance and not worthy of a useful response

We feel that more effort should be made to directly consult residents, particularly in order to make them feel that their views are being taken into account.

We are not opposing the build of two houses, thus house building targets are not under threat here. Preserving the natural boundary (not chopping it down and replanting with a hedge) is not difficult and would benefit all neighbours including the two new residents who are developing the land as they are overlooked by all our houses.

We would appreciate the support of the Neighbourhood Partnership in helping us obtain support from the Planning Team and feedback from them to assure the residents that every effort is being made to take their views into account in interpreting the text of the Planning Permission - particularly that relating to size and species and timing of replacement. This is in order to ensure that we suffer no loss of visual amenity, that the trees are preserved where possible, particularly the beech tree and, should this not be the case, that they are replaced by trees of the same size with immediate effect.

Lesley Kinsley

Statement by Westbury Park Community Association concerning the proposed Redland Residential Parking Zone

On 20th June the Sustainable Development and Transport Commission considered the proposed Residential Parking Schemes (RPS) including the RPS report that will be considered by Cabinet on 27th June.

The Scrutiny Commission supported schemes proceeding (or "accelerated" to use the Mayor's phrase) in the six phase 1 zones including the Redland zone. The Commission were also of the view that the proposed new round of improved consultation should be undertaken in the remaining zones (to include an assessment of whether these areas wanted residential parking).

It was claimed at the Scrutiny Committee that residents in all the six phase 1 zones wanted resident parking and that this justified pressing ahead in these zones. This two stage approach is also advocated in the Cabinet report with a "compressed delivery timescale" being proposed for the six phase 1 zones (para. 39).

The Association strongly contest the claim or inference that residents in the Redland zone have decided that they want a resident parking scheme. This claim appears to be based on the fact that residents in part of the zone – the area south of Redland Green – expressed strong support for a scheme when consulted under the previous Council administration and that local councillors are pushing for this to be implemented as quickly as possible. The consultation did not extend north of Redland Green so views expressed at this time were not representative of the whole of the more recently defined Redland zone which covers a much larger area.

The views of residents in the northern part of the Redland zone have not been canvassed for their views other than under the totally inadequate three week "consultation " exercise conducted by the Council in May 2013. The inadequacy of this consultation exercise was rightly criticised at the Council meeting on June 18th and has led to calls for a new much improved round of consultation to be put in place for other areas.

Should the Cabinet decide on pushing ahead with its RPZ proposals for the whole of the Redland zone an estimated 4,000 residents and 120 businesses in the area north of Redland Green (which largely comprises Westbury Park) will, unlike the residents of Bishopston, St. Andrews, etc., be denied the opportunity to be properly consulted on a key and seemingly irreversible policy that will affect their lives and livelihoods for years to come. The Association believe this to be discriminatory and detrimental to the residents and businesses of Westbury Park (which covers the whole area north of Redland Green).

We urge our local councillors and the Cabinet to address this prospective injustice - possibly redefining boundaries so that the area south of Redland Green Road is included in the phase 1 Cotham North zone while the revised Redland zone is excluded from the phase 1 roll out programme. An alternative option is for the Redland zone to be split in two with the area south of Redland Green Road being included as a separate zone in phase 1 and the northern part of the currently proposed Redland zone – a sizeable area in its own right – becoming a separate zone to be included in the new round of consultation now being advocated. In both of these scenarios Redland Green would become the outer RPZ boundary – at least until further consultation takes place and the views of residents and businesses taken on board before a final decision is made.

We should stress that Westbury Park Community Association is not against residential parking per se (although many local residents and businesses have expressed concerns about the scheme design as it has been presented to date). Our view is that all local residents and businesses must be properly consulted and listened to before a decision is made and this has not yet happened in Westbury Park. Were the whole of the Redland zone to be rushed through under phase 1 residents and businesses will be deprived of this opportunity.

The Association look forward to working with the Mayor to reach a solution that achieves broader strategic objectives and has the support of the local community but more time and a much improved consultation framework is needed to achieve this.

Kevin Chidgey
Chairman, Westbury Park Community Association
20th June 2013

>>>

Re. Bishopston, Cotham and Redland Neighbourhood Partnership Meeting
Meeting, Monday 24th June

On behalf of Westbury Park Community Association I would like to ask the following questions at the Bishopston, Cotham and Redland Neighbourhood Partnership meeting on Monday, 24th June.

1 Do the Neighbourhood Partnership and the two Redland councillors accept, as the Mayor and full City Council have done, that the three week consultation exercise recently carried out on the residential parking scheme was inadequate and flawed ?

2 With regard to the Redland zone do the Neighbourhood Partnership and Redland Councillors agree that unlike in the area or parts of the area south of Redland Green residents and businesses in the Westbury Park area / the northern part of the Redland zone have never (prior to the flawed May 2013

consultation exercise) been consulted or expressed a firm view about whether or not they want to have a residential parking scheme?

3 The Mayor has recently announced that he is initiating a much improved consultation round to capture the views of residents and businesses in those zones not included in phase 1 including Bishopston, St. Andrews and Horfield. Do the Neighbourhood Partnership and our local councillors agree that residents and businesses in Westbury Park / the area north of Redland Green must also be afforded the same opportunity to express their views?

4 Following on from consideration of these questions and in the knowledge that local ward councillors are being asked by the Mayor to advise on which areas should progress under a "compressed delivery timescale" (paragraph 39 of the report to Cabinet refers) will the Neighbourhood Partnership and our two Redland councillors request the Mayor to exclude Westbury Park / the area north of Redland Green from the planned phase 1 roll out of residential parking schemes to allow more time and opportunity for residents and businesses in this area to be properly consulted on residential parking proposals?

Kevin Chidgey
Chairman, Westbury Park Community Association
21st June 2013

Question for Bishopston, Cotham and Redland Neighbourhood Partnership Meeting 24 June 2013

My question is:

Will the Partnership support a request to the Council for serious consideration to be given to a 1-hour parking restriction for those areas where Residents' Parking Schemes are to be consulted upon.

This is to replace the proposed 9am to 5pm currently being proposed.

I set out in the attached the overall advantages of this modification.

Prof. Duncan Laxen

Residents Parking Scheme for Bristol – an Alternative

This documents sets out the current proposal for the Residents Parking Scheme in Redland and other areas of Bristol, and then sets out an option that would be less painful for residents and shop keepers. It is predicated on the assumption that a scheme goes ahead, but should not be taken to represent support for a scheme per se in all areas.

Current Proposal

Restricted parking 9am to 5pm (8 hours)

Advantages:

- Stops all day parking by commuters.

Disadvantages:

- Stops casual parking for whole day.
- Makes it harder for people to visit friends during the day, for instance for 30 minutes, without using up vouchers, with the added disadvantage of having to walk to the house to get the voucher then back to the car.
- Means special requirements needed for shops for the whole day.
- Parking patrols needed for full day, so less warden time on shopping streets like Whiteladies Road and Gloucester Road.

Alternative Option

Restricted parking 11am to 12am (1 hour)

Advantages:

- Stops all day parking by commuters. Cannot be circumvented (as claimed by Bristol Council) as people cannot just move their car (it cannot be parked anywhere in that area for that hour).
- Allows local people and visitors to park unhindered for all but one hour of the day, so easier for residents and their visitors, and for shops and pubs and cafes, e.g. a family with toddlers might choose to invite friends with toddlers to visit and they all come by car, which can be timed to avoid the restricted parking hour. People can visit a pub or cafe for lunch without having to find a meter.
- Parking patrols only needed for one hour a day, and thus have more time for shopping streets and normal parking infringements. Should be a cost saving.
- If friends come to stay and want to leave at 10am or arrive at 4pm they can do this without using up a voucher.
- Fewer parking pay stations (some will still be needed near to shops and offices for the controlled one hour).

Disadvantages:

- No disadvantages have been identified.

Prepared by Prof. Duncan Laxen

STATEMENT NO. 6

Dear Chair

I just don't believe it. According to a sticker from MayGurney that was put on our bin this morning it was over full (the lid wouldn't shut). So the excess has been left in the bin waiting two weeks for collection. That means it will be even more full in two weeks' time. So should I order a bigger bin at public expense when we only need it occasionally or do I need to drive the waste down to Avonmouth to the tip there. Or should someone tell MayGurney the point about recycling is that it is environmentally the right thing to minimise use of natural resources and having an overfull bin (which I added to this morning so the foxes wouldn't get at it) uses less resources rather than ordering a bigger bin or driving to Avonmouth which are both environmentally the wrong thing to do (Or perhaps I should take the bus – anyone know which number goes from Redland to Avonmouth?).

I expect the NP to write a letter to the Mayor as he now appears to take every decision around here and ask him to bang some common sense into the Council (please).

From – Clive Stevens, Redland Resident and one of Liz's Street Champions

Sorry...

MAY GURNEY
in partnership with



We were unable to empty your **Black Wheelie Bin** today, for one of the following reasons;

- Your bin lid was not shut. We have put your excess waste back inside your bin
- You put extra bags of rubbish beside your bin. We have put these back inside your bin
- Your bin was too heavy to move
- Your bin contained an item which we cannot collect, such as rubble or paint
- Bag collections only - you put out more bags than we can collect.

Please help to reduce rubbish for landfill by recycling as much as you can. All bins and boxes need to be put at the edge of your property by 7am.

For more information on what items go in which container please look at the back of your collection calendar or visit www.bristol.gov.uk/recycling

Thank you for your help.



Regarding Agenda Item 8.

The Neighbourhood Partnership's Statement to Transport Scrutiny.

Note: The 18 page report referred to in the statement to Scrutiny is the same report going to Cabinet on Thursday. The NP has the opportunity to put in a written (not verbal) statement to Cabinet. If it wishes to take up this offer the statement must be in by noon on Wed 26th June.

**Public Statement to Sustainable Development and Transport Scrutiny
Commission for 20th June 2013**

**From Bishopston, Cotham and Redland (BCR) Neighbourhood Partnership –
Chair, Clive Stevens**

Dear Chair and Committee,

I have digested the 18 page report (for cabinet) which was posted on the Scrutiny webpage at approx. 4pm on Tuesday. This is written Wednesday morning to hit the deadline. I plan to attend and make a short verbal statement as well.

Here are our points:

1) BCR NP supports the idea of residents' parking in principle. We think the current scheme (even as outlined in this Cabinet report) is unworkable for some of our residents and businesses. We would like it noted that the whole process as to how the city has got to where it is on this topic has been unbelievably poor and started to go wrong well before the Mayor was elected. It has sped up since and is still poor but going faster. This has caused much distress to many businesses and residents and consequently our councillors who do their job because they care. So one question we would like you to work out please: The Mayor publicly tells us one thing, but Highway's officers tell us many things are not negotiable. Either the Mayor is briefing his officers differently to his public statements or the officers are not carrying out his directions?

2) The definition of car commuters has been discussed in length in our NP. We see two types:

Firstly people driving in from further out, parking in Cotham and Redland and then making their way by foot, bike or bus to the centre. This is to be actively discouraged. There are other modes of transport and plans to introduce more. Their parked cars clog up our area and reduce its vitality.

The second type of commuters, are people from outside our area who come in to our neighbourhood to do activities here like working and/or shopping. We welcome them, they are part of our community, they bring in wealth, skills and supply us with services. Of course we would prefer if more of them used other modes of transport instead of the car and welcome a gradual encouragement for them to do that. We know the bus connections to us are poor and some of the people have heavy loads to carry in e.g. teachers. We don't want these people or their businesses to be penalised but encouraged.

We see the current scheme as proposed to cabinet as treating both types of commuters as the same and that is wrong.

3) Now to the report you have in front of you and areas we would like you to question Highways Officers (direct ideally please rather than via the Mayor). We refer you to the clause (paragraph) in the Cabinet report at each case. If you think the point is relevant please ask it.

3.1) Cabinet report para. 2 – Kingsdown. Have the 10 negative responses been analysed? What has been learned and applied Bristolwide? We would expect all residents (except a couple we know of) to like it, there are few shops, no schools and it is not representative of other areas. Cotham South is having its 6 month review now. BCR NP raised £150 of private money to leaflet every house, flat, shop and business in the zone on June 1st asking them to reply to the Council's questionnaire (and to copy Councillors in). Feedback from Cotham S is overwhelmingly positive but we know there are some major problems mainly around some businesses, schools and nurseries. So a massive approval doesn't mean it is working for everyone and especially for that second group of commuters who we regard as part of our community. Highway's officers have told us that Cotham South feedback is just for fine tuning Cotham S and won't be considered as setting the context for the wider roll out. If this is still the case then that thinking is plainly irrational.

3.2) para 10 – air quality. Lack of evidence. Buses when full are 6 times less polluting than a car. When a third full and the car has 2 people in the amount of pollutant per passenger mile is equal. What studies have been done to show which bus routes actually reduce pollution. Obviously some do and some don't. The point here is about lack of evidence driving decisions. Improving the air quality by running cleaner buses is the answer but doesn't appear in the paper.

3.3) para 11 – for us, this benefit is self-evident and can be seen in Cotham S and Kingsdown schemes. We do query the benefit of reducing circulating traffic as it is ill defined. Do the officers mean people circulating to park at peak times or throughout the day. If the latter we would question this and ask for evidence that it is a problem.

It might be in shopping areas? Or outside schools in the afternoon but where is the evidence?

3.4) para 12 – our point is not about Blue badge holders but about parking outside our houses. In the future more of us will have electric cars and the ability to park them outside the house to charge them cheaply will be a benefit. This is not considered in the paper. Maybe it won't be allowed? We think it is important that provision for electric cars is considered?

3.5) paras 15 to 19 – This presents part of the “bigger picture”. Please note most of this improves transport for people from the outskirts to the centre. It doesn't improve so much the ability for teachers for example to get into Redland or Cotham. This will require other solutions. That is why we think local school, nurseries and businesses should be encouraged gradually to reduce car use. Not threatened with closure which is what the current allowance (2 permits) is tantamount to.

3.6.) para 26 – we see that the new “concessions” are seen as a minimum operating criteria. There are other points we raised in our 10 point plan we presented to Highways Officers on June 4th to which we have had no reply (except that the date of the Cotham S feedback is 2 weeks late).

These are (8 points as we see 2 are being implemented):

- i) Some businesses require more than 5 permits for customers. Take a car repair garage without a forecourt for example. There are 2 garages in Cotham S both have forecourts. The two in Cotham N don't and have about 10 customers each day who drop their cars off and collect at night. They would need 10 permits and additionally a more practical system as people are likely to accidentally drive off with the customer permit still in their cars. We have suggested a “day ticket” scheme. Hairdressers (yes some hairdos take over 3 hours – we have checked) need the same. What about hotels and parking for their guests as they walk or take the bus around our city?
- ii) Business permits for employees, already stated this needs to be more flexible and an encouragement to less car use but not a threat.
- iii) Start time flexibility. 9.30 or 10.00am have both been suggested. We are told this is non-negotiable and must stay at 9am. Why? No adequate reason has been given.
- iv) Local amenities (parks, bowls clubs allotments). Old persons may need to drive their grand- children to the park or mums taking with twins. If they live in another zone they will now have to pay to use a free facility. This hasn't been addressed in the equalities report (see later)
- v) Charities and community organisations are neither businesses nor residents. We are told they get no permits. This is plainly ridiculous but typical of the nonsense from Highways officers that we are having to batter down? We need help from the Scrutiny Committee and Mayor please to get things like this properly considered.

vi) We understand that people living in private roads or having driveways will be able to apply for one permit per household. This seems appropriate but is not in the paper before you today.

vii) Consideration of the parking needs of temporary residents like students (or trainee doctors or young professionals on a secondment). A practical solution needs to be worked out as all three groups exist in Cotham and Redland. Currently they are coping because they can park in Cotham North or Redland (outside the zones they live in) !

viii) Clarity on future costs and increases. We see the proposed charges in Appendix 2, will these be increased over time and by how much, what is the strategy? It is too tempting for officers to see this as a revenue earner and thus reduce pressures on their budget without controls.

3.7) paras 27 to 30 – we approve of these amendments but as you can see from above, we need more please.

3.8) paras 29 to 35 - we approve of the reduced prices for businesses. Please note at #31 the officers talk about pricing by value. That's a business approach and is valid, but when a monopoly provider like a council starts talking about pricing by value it rings alarm bells. If unchecked it allows monopoly type high pricing and the need for regulation as per the water and energy companies. One control would be to set up an independent (of Highways at least) review of prices each year to ensure the power is not being abused.

3.9) para 39 – our councillors welcome the ability to consider the process for Cotham and Redland and await contact.

3.10) para 40 to 42 – whilst this is progress we submit that this is a flawed consultation process because (as we discovered at recent meetings) having residents and businesses come to meetings to discuss the actual facts (and not the fiction) and to work together to find a local solution is highly constructive. This could occur after writing to every property to invite them to such meetings to understand the scheme and debate solutions. More could be said on this if Scrutiny Committee you agree.

3.11) para 47 – whilst we appreciate the effort of an individually tailored incentive package, the current scheme offers 2 parking permits (and 5 for customers) for some businesses, schools, nurseries etc that is equivalent to threatening to shut them down; hardly a good start to bringing the people with you?

3.12) risk management box. On the very first box it states “Initial design will take local needs into account”. As this is not happening we submit the current risk is not low, it is high. For example with the current allowance some nurseries may have to move out of our area and then we will get in our cars with our kids, drive out to Henleaze drop them off and come home confident that we can find a parking space!

3.13). Equalities Act – there are issues we are sure around indirect discrimination of old people and young people and pregnant mothers. Until we have seen the assessment we can't comment further. Indeed the report says "it is acknowledged that we have limited information about the potential equalities impacts of the scheme". We argue that some of the impact will be on people that live outside Redland and Cotham and thus won't be able to comment in the statutory consultation.

3.14) Eco impact – we would like to see the evidence especially regarding circulating traffic during the day (as mentioned earlier at 3.3)

3.15) Finance – it is acknowledged that the pre-stat consultation will delay the schemes by 4 months to finish May 2015. Yet the broad brush revenue still shows £1,734k in 2014/15. Most schemes will have been in for 6 months and some not at all. Although not directly affecting BCR residents we are tax payers too and would regret having to pay more on Council Tax to fund this gap.

3.16) Later on (the page before the end) there is guidance about consultation in general. This hasn't been followed.

Well its 11.15 am and this has to be in by midday so you will be pleased to know we have to stop here. We hope you can see there is still a great deal that Scrutiny can help to improve this currently unworkable scheme. I listened to the debate at full Council the other night and three of our Councillors spoke passionately about outstanding issues. Amazingly after all this we still support the principle, it's just the operation and the not being listened to that has driven our Councillors mad and hence this NP statement.

So, Scrutiny Commission, our residents, businesses and thus our community depend on you doing a good job on Thursday. Please, we beseech you, do leave no stone unturned.

Thank you and yours faithfully – Clive Stevens, Chair BCR NP

This page is intentionally blank.

Regarding Agenda item #9

Due to an administrative error this grant application was missed off the list. It is being published here to allow the NP to give its views on whether it is worthy of a grant. If yes then a report will be published 2 weeks in advance of an extraordinary NC meeting to formally approve the grant.

**BISHOPSTON, COTHAM AND REDLAND
NEIGHBOURHOOD PARTNERSHIP**

Application for a grant 2013/2014

Closing dates: 1st May and 6th September 2013

1. Grant Priorities

Your grant must relate to one or more of the following priorities:

- Young people
- Improving the local built environment and street scene
- Trees parks and green spaces
- local traffic and transport
- improving the lives of people living in the neighbourhood,
the priorities for 2012/13 being:
 - neighbourliness
 - local arts where they are likely to appeal to a wide section of the community
 - activities which engage with people facing social disadvantage
 - activities which support carers and the “cared for”
 - schemes to promote food sustainability

Please tick which one(s) would benefit from your activity.

Proposed activity for grant funding (no more than one sentence – details in 5) below)

- Group without a written constitution/set of rules²
- Another legal status (*please specify*).....

X Other (please specify)
Police.....

¹ ***If your organisation has a written constitution (set of rules) please submit a copy with the application.***

² ***If your organisation does not have a written constitution, please complete the questions below:***

a) Do you have a membership? Yes

If Yes

- who are they?
- how many

b) How does your group make decisions? (eg meetings (how often?), are minutes/notes recorded? N/A

c) What arrangements do you have for receiving money and spending money? (eg separate bank account just for the group, two or more signatories?)

On this occasion, it would be suitable for the funds to be transferred internally within Bristol City Council

4. Objectives of your organisation

Please tell us briefly what your organisation does.

Law & Order/Community Policing

When did your organisation start? N/A

5. Details of what you would use the funding for:

Name of the project (*if appropriate*): Cotham Hill CCTV

Details:

Cotham Hill is a busy part of the night-time economy of the NP area. It plays home to a range of bars and restaurants, but it also is a 'walk home' route for people returning from Whiteladies Road and the City Centre, particularly to high-density areas of student housing, like the area around Chandos Road.

As a result of the concentration of people using Cotham Hill who have drunk alcohol, the road itself and surrounding roads (like Hampton Park) suffer from anti-social behaviour. This typically involves night-time noise, vandalism and littering (including vomit and urine), often associated with groups of young people in 'high spirits'. This anti-social behaviour has a significant impact on the quality of life for local residents. They are often woken in the early hours and get up to find their property damaged or the street littered. This has clear impacts in terms of getting healthy amounts of sleep and maintaining good mental and physical health. The area also has been the location for more serious criminal offences, including affray, serious assault, robbery and sexual assault. These issues have frequently been raised with councillors, Council officers and the Police and through the Neighbourhood Forum, and local residents have regularly expressed support for the installation of CCTV on Cotham Hill.

At the moment, there is only CCTV coverage at the junction of Cotham Hill with Whiteladies Road, but this does not penetrate far into the road, and certainly does not cover the areas which generate the most reports of anti-social behaviour. The provision of CCTV would enable perpetrators to be identified and action taken against them, either through Police action or through the disciplinary procedures in place at the two universities.

The project is therefore to meet the costs of equipment and installation for a new camera, to be sited near the junction of Cotham Hill and Hampton Park. A technical assessment of the area has already been carried out and the street has been identified as suitable for this work. Two-thirds of the costs have been committed by the universities and the Neighbourhood Delivery Team, but a further £3,000 is required to meet the estimate from the Council's CCTV team.

Which ward area will benefit the most from your proposal? *(Please refer to the map attached)*

Cotham

Please outline the timescale of when you would use the grant (eg start and finish dates):

Installation by Aug/Sept 2013, in time to be in operation for the new university year

6. Impact of the funding

How will the funding impact on the priority(ies) you indicated in Question 1?

This application strikes to the heart of priorities around neighbourliness. The current situation sees a small minority of individuals causing anti-social behaviour, which undermines neighbour relations in the area, particularly between younger and older people. Giving the Police the ability to identify and engage with this minority will support other local efforts to promote neighbourliness, including home visits and welcome events for new arrivals.

The project will also have a positive impact on young people. Reducing the amount of anti-social behaviour in the area will reduce the negative stereotyping and allow the peaceful majority to coexist more easily with older residents.

Residents in the area have various views on what type of group is responsible for the described behaviour, and which licensed premise they may frequent. To date, it has proved difficult to engage with the individuals responsible for the problem because residents either choose to call Police the following day (rather than disrupting their own sleep further), or because the culprits have melted away into the surrounding streets. CCTV would address both these issues, allowing good descriptions and directions of travel to be obtained for attending Police Officers, as well as providing strong evidence for prosecutions. It would also mean a more efficient deployment of Police resources through early viewing of the scene, thereby contributing to the safety of the entire neighbourhood.

The very existence of the camera will have a deterrent effect on potential offenders, especially if accompanied by 'CCTV operating in this area' signs. Its presence will also remind potential victims of the need to take reasonable crime prevention measures. Footage of crime and disorder could also be used to highlight where crime prevention improvements could be carried out.

How will you demonstrate the impact?

The main measureable will be a decrease in Police incidents recorded for Cotham Hill and the surrounding area. Incidents where CCTV has led to the detention of offenders and successful prosecution will also be recorded.

There will also be a 'soft' demonstration through the number and scale of issues reported at Neighbourhood Forum meetings and to councillors.

Will the grant benefit any particular section of the community?

Yes No

If Yes please specify

The primary benefit will be on older people, who tend to be more sensitive to night-time noise and more intimidated by anti-social behaviour. There will also be a benefit for law-abiding young people (especially women) enjoying the night-time economy, who often also feel intimidated by violence and stigmatised through the actions of a minority.

7. How much money are you asking us for?

£3,000

How much money do you have/expecting to receive from other sources of funding for what you are hoping to do?

£6,000

Are you applying to another Neighbourhood Partnership? Yes

If YES, how much? £

8. Your Resources

a) Please set out a breakdown of the total costs of your project, showing us which items you are asking us to fund and which are being funded from another source

| Item | Cost | Please tick if you are asking for us to fund this item |
|---|--------|--|
| Procurement of camera equipment and works to integrate it into the Council's network of cameras | £9,000 | Yes, in part |

| | | |
|--------------------|--------|--|
| Total Cost: | £9,000 | |
|--------------------|--------|--|

b) Please tell us about any non-cash resources you have managed to attract eg volunteers, donations “in kind”

Both universities have a good working relationship with local Police, and have committed to taking action against students if they are shown to be responsible for any disorder. Residents in the area have also formed a good dialogue with local councillors and Police, allowing regular updates to be given on their perception of the problem through established channels of communication.

9. Long term sustainability

Are you expecting to apply for a similar amount of money for the same reason in 2014/15?

Yes

No

Comment:

Once installed, the camera will simply join the Council’s network and should require no further funding.

If **Yes**, what are your plans for replacing any grant money you might receive from the Partnership in 2013/2014?

10. Financial details of your organisation

Funds should be transferred internally within Bristol City Council.

a) Does your group have a bank/building society account? **Yes** **No**

b) If **Yes**, do cheques need to be countersigned by two or more signatories? **Yes** **No**

If you can answer **Yes** to *both* of the questions above, please complete the details below.

Name of account:

Bank/Building Society:

Branch:

Account No.:

Branch sort Code:

Please go to the "Signatures" Section below

If **No, to a) and /or b)** please complete the following:

As your organisation does not have a bank account or one with no countersigning arrangement by two or more signatories, please give the details of who will receive the grant on your behalf:

Name of the organisation:

If a charity, its registration number:

Address:

Name of Account:

Bank/Building Society:

Branch:

Account No.:

Branch Sort Code:

Please ask the Chair of the Group or the Group's Treasurer or Chief Executive to sign below to confirm that they are willing to receive the grant on your behalf:

I confirm that my group has agreed to receive a Neighbourhood Partnership Grant on behalf of this group.

Name:

Position:

Group/Organisation:

Signed:

Date:

11. How did you hear about the Neighbourhood Partnership Wellbeing Fund?

In *Bishopston Matters*?

In the *Redland and Westbury Park Directory*?

From another applicant to the fund?

Other – please specify: Through NP

SIGNATURES

We declare that the information above is true and accurate.

If we were to be successful, we agree

- to take all reasonable steps to ensure that local people know that this project received financial support from the Partnership
- that in the unlikely event that we are unable to carry out the project as described above, we will return the money to Bristol City Council before March

31st 2014.

Name of person submitting the form:

Signature:

Name: PC 846 James Ray

Date: 11/04/2013

Position in the group or organisation: Beat Manager - Cotham

For organisations with a Management Committee: Signature of the Chair of the Management Committee (or another member of the Management Committee if the Chair is completing this form).

If you are not a formally constituted group this application must be signed by another member of your group:

Signature:

Name:

Date: