

DISCLAIMER

The attached minutes are DRAFT minutes. Whilst every effort has been made to ensure the accuracy of the information, statements and decisions recorded in them, their status will remain that of a draft until such time as they are confirmed as a correct record at the subsequent meeting.



**Bishopston, Cotham And Redland
Neighbourhood Partnership
7.00pm on Monday 24 March 2014
At Claremont Room, Redland Green School**

Present:

Ward Councillors

Councillors Radice (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

Simon Baines, Business Representative
Nick Clark, Local Resident (in the Chair for the Neighbourhood Partnership
items)
Jenny Hoadley, The Bishopston Society
Martin Fodor, Sustainable Bishopston
Roger Gimson, Sustainable Redland
Lesley Welch, Equalities Adviser

Bristol City Council Officers

Andrew McGrath, Area Co-ordinator
Mark Sperduty, Area Manager – Highways and Traffic Management
Robert Grieve, Principal Officer (North Area), Highways and Traffic
Management
John Toy, Residents Parking – Stakeholder Liaison
Matt Sugden, Flood Risk Technician
M Liu, Flood Risk Team
Jeremy Livitt, Democratic Services Section

**Other Attendees who signed the Attendance List or made Public Forum
Statements (organisation represented where indicated)**

Alex Smedhurst
Paul Townsend
Anne White
Tricia Roweth (In Place of Professor Penelope Harnett – Statement on
Cotham and Redland RPZ)
Zanna Wheeler

Clive Stevens (Statements on Flood Risk Management and the Trees Sub-Group)
Monica Lougee
Ian Fleming
Val McLennan
Steve Clarke (Statement on Cotham and Redland RPZ)
Max Headley (Statement on behalf of 62 Redland residents concerning Cotham and Redland RPZ)

Apologies for Absence

Councillor Neil Harrison

Liz Kew, Bristol Neighbourhood Watch Network

Alison Bromilow, Redland and Cotham Amenities Society

42 Welcome, Introductions and Apologies for Absence (Agenda Item 1)

At the request of the Chair, all members of the Neighbourhood Partnership introduced themselves.

Apologies for absence were noted (see above).

43 Minutes – Neighbourhood Partnership (including Neighbourhood Committee) – Monday 20th January 2014

The following alterations to the Minutes were agreed:

- (1) that the resolution for Minute Number 30 be altered to read “ **that the Neighbourhood Committee resolved to give Sustainable Redland and Sustainable Bishopston separate seats on the Neighbourhood Partnership so that they could have a representative each. The Neighbourhood Partnership then welcomed Roger Gimson and Martin Fodor as the relevant representatives selected by their respective groups;**
- (2) that the second and third lines of the paragraph in Minute Number 33 be altered as follows: “ **helping fund raise to the Cotham Hill Street Party which had been organised by his employers**”;
- (3) That “Cranbrook Road” in the second bullet point of Minute Number 34 (Statement 4) be altered to “**Gloucester Road**”
- (4) That, in respect of Bullet Point 6 of Minute Number 34 (Statement 4), the word “cares” be altered to read “**cars**” and the following additional wording be inserted after the word purchases “ **but it would cause a reduction in donations to 10% of the businesses**”
- (5) That 25th June 2014 in Minute Number 35 (Item 2) be altered to “**23rd June 2014**”

Resolved - that the minutes of the meeting held on 20 January 2014 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair

subject to the above alterations (Jeremy Livitt to make necessary alterations)

44 Declarations of Interest (Agenda Item 3)

The following declarations of interest were made:

- (1) David Willingham – Agenda Item 6 as a resident of Springfield Avenue
- (2) Simon Baines – Items relating to Cotham Hill as a manager of a business on Cotham Hill
- (3) Nick Clark – as a resident in Cranbrook Road who could be affected by the introduction of the RPZ
- (4) Sylvia Townsend – as a resident of a street in Redland which could be affected by the introduction of the RPZ

45 Public Forum (Agenda Item 4)

Statement Number 5: Trees Forum – Clive Stevens confirmed that no new trees had yet been planted since the last meeting. He would pursue this matter with the relevant officers.

It was agreed that the following statement from Vassili Papastavrou should be included in the Minutes of the meeting:

1. Street trees.

It is great that we have been able to replace some of the missing street trees in our area. So that the backlog does not build up again, when trees are to be removed in the future, the process should include provision for their replacement. In addition, if any trees are funded by the Neighbourhood Partnership, there should be consultation and local involvement regarding the species/variety to be chosen.

2. Park trees.

Vassili would like to congratulate John Tarlton for his patience over a two year period and eventual success in getting trees planted on Redland Green. However, the cost per tree of £330 is astronomical and cannot be justified - where this money goes needs to be investigated.

Action: that officers ensure that all necessary action is taken arising from this statement – Andrew McGrath.

Statement Number 1: Cotham and Redland RPZ – Steve Clarke

Statement Number 2: Cotham and Redland RPZ – Max Headley (on behalf of 62 Redland residents)

Statement Number 3: Cotham and Redland RPZ – Tricia Roweth (on behalf of Professor Penelope Harnett)

During discussion of these statements, the following points were made by those making the statements, members of the Neighbourhood Partnership and officers:

- (1) There was a very strong and definite commitment from Bristol City Council to introduce both schemes as soon as possible
- (2) There was a need to ensure that both schemes went operational at the same time
- (3) Whilst Edgecumbe Road was only a small area, it was particularly seriously affected. It was important to ensure that the situation was not made any worse. Both zones needed to be brought in as soon as possible. The situation was not of the making of residents – it was caused by previous Council decisions
- (4) There had never been an agreement that both schemes would operate together, although they would be contiguous and on the same tranche. It was acknowledged that Redland was an imposed scheme but delaying the Cotham North scheme was unacceptable since there had already been a delay of 18 months due to the Mayor's decision to accelerate certain schemes and delay others
- (5) There were legal duties that the Council was required to make as part of the introduction of both schemes which could result in reconsultation of the whole process if these were not done properly
- (6) There were 3 options for the Redland scheme (1) to proceed as advertised (2) proceed with minor amendments (3) not to proceed. Any significant amendments could delay the scheme
- (7) The likely timescale for implementation was 2/3 weeks and would be as concurrent as possible with the Redland scheme
- (8) Contractors were not yet appointed – any contractor's estimated time for completion of the work would not be known until the appointment had taken place
- (9) Each scheme was very time-consuming to implement – there had been more changes to the original Redland scheme than the Cotham one
- (10) The process was being carried out by the Service Director of Transport (Peter Mann) in consultation with the relevant Assistant Mayor
- (11) An analysis was required of the impact of the timings of the schemes on the ability of the Council to maintain its Equality Duty in respect of issues like dropped kerbs and a calculation of the displacement of parking to other zones. Officers confirmed that monitoring would be carried out to assess likely displacement. However, an analysis before its implementation might prove of little value since previous experience showed that residents were likely

to adapt to these types of changes and predictions would become meaningless

- (12) Other issues needed to be taken into account – for example, the recent granting of Planning permission to build a playground at Redland Junior School (Independent) including its recent decision to become co-educational, leading to more children and more cars on the site
- (13) Retailers on Cotham Hill needed to know as soon as possible if parking meters would be placed on the site and if these would apply on Saturdays. It was noted that one business had already indicated that, if this issue was not addressed, they would lose business and be unable to afford to employ additional staff. This would impact Chandos Road, Zetland Road as well as at the bottom of Cranbrook Road. Officers acknowledged that the current scheme was for 9am to 5pm on Mondays to Fridays but indicated that this process required further consultation

ACTION: that officers investigate and takes any necessary action – John Toy

In response to a request from the Neighbourhood Partnership Chair, officers gave an undertaking to advise as soon as possible on progress following the confirmation of the contractor for the Redland scheme and the timescale for the works being completed. **Action: John Toy**

Statement 4 – Flood Risk Management – Clive Stevens

This statement was taken in conjunction with Agenda Item 7.

46 Area Co-ordinator's Report (Agenda Item 5)

The Partnership received a report of the Area Co-ordinator and discussed the following issues:

- (1) The venues for the next 2 Neighbourhood Partnership meetings had been confirmed
- (2) The Area Co-ordinator tabled an update report setting out proposals for next steps following the Neighbourhood Partnership Reviews **Action: Andrew McGrath to distribute by e-mail to all Neighbourhood Partnership members**
- (3) The funding may now include CIL which could be a substantial sum of money and would be available for developments within the BCR area. Funding was already in operation in other parts of the city and was becoming quite significant;
- (4) Whilst some London boroughs use Neighbourhood Committees as Development Control Committees, this could lead to problems in other ways – for example, Councillors being perceived as supporting developments which would benefit their own wards

- (5) A mechanism to prioritise carefully would need to be introduced if the proposal for removing ring fencing of funding for developments was introduced in order to avoid running out of available funding before the end of each financial year
- (6) A review of Neighbourhood Partnerships was scheduled to come to the Neighbourhood and Communities Scrutiny Commission later in 2014
- (7) Councillors would be invited to attend a proposed series of meetings in April 2014 to discuss the outcome of the review at which Service Directors and Assistant Managers would be present
- (8) Section 106 Developments – concern was expressed that only £4,500 would be available for site tree planting arising out of the Redland House Development
- (9) Potential traffic problems arising out of the Cricket Ground application needed to be addressed – it was noted that parking restrictions in this area were progressing
- (10) Details of funding arising out of non-devolved applications which might impact on other schemes or be useful to Neighbourhood Applications should be made available to the Neighbourhood Partnership ie £26,000 from the central “pot” from the Cricket Club Development for educational purposes 1km from the site or £4,000 for the provision of sports pitches at 146/148 Gloucester Road **Action: Andrew McGrath to include details of both devolved and non-devolved applications in future**
- (11) Scout Hut (arising out of the City of Bristol College Site Application) – funding for this facility had now been transferred and was available
- (12) The Neighbourhood Festival had been scheduled to take place on Saturday 10th May – Stephen Williams MP would be attending the Super Forum. Publicity was in place for this event
- (13) Councillor Radice stated that a meeting to discuss the Ardagh had been set up for Tuesday 25th March and indicated that she would point out the urgent need for a plan to address the current situation at the site

The Neighbourhood Committee then discussed proposals for expenditure of Section 106 totalling £83,632.24 of funding to install a new children’s play area on the land known as Muller House Open Space.

Upon being put to the vote, it was moved by Councillor Radice, seconded by Councillor Willingham and **agreed** (5 in favour, 0 against) that this funding be approved.

The Area Co-ordinator confirmed that there was no decision required by the Neighbourhood Committee in respect of Well

Being schemes and that the request for a decision in Recommendation 5 should, therefore, be ignored.

Resolved by the Neighbourhood Partnership:

- (1) That the updates from the last round of Forums be noted;**
- (2) That the latest meeting schedule be updated;**
- (3) That the latest update on the Neighbourhood Partnership be noted;**
- (4) That the update on the Neighbourhood Partnership's devolved budgets and services be noted;**
- (5) That the latest Well Being figures be noted;**
- (6) That the update on the BCR Community Festival be noted; and**
- (7) That the brief updates regarding playground developments be noted**
- (8) That the Area Co-ordinator takes action required in Bullet Points (2) and (10) of the Minute above as indicated**

Resolved by the Neighbourhood Committee: that £83,632.24 be approved as Section 106 funding for the installation of a new children's play area on the land known as Muller House Open Space.

Action: Andrew McGrath

47. Devolved Transport Budgets For 2014/15 (Agenda Item 6)

The report was introduced by Mark Sperduty.

The Neighbourhood Committee considered options for proposals for Carriageway Surface Dressing and Footway Maintenance Schemes and details of Local Traffic Schemes.

Carriageway Surface Dressing (CSD) – The CSD for 2013/14 that had been carried out had been very poor but this was now being addressed by officers. Upon being put to the vote, it was **agreed**, moved by Councillor Hance, seconded by Councillor Willingham (voting 5 for, 0 against) that the proposed CSD schemes be approved.

Footway Maintenance Schemes (FMS) – It was noted that F1 (Cotham Brow) had been dug up by the Water Board as part of works they carried out who should be required to ensure it was put right at the end of these works. **Action: Mark Sperduty to investigate what action can be taken.**

Upon being put to the vote, it was **agreed**, moved by Councillor Willingham, seconded by Councillor Townsend (voting 4 for, 0 against, 1 abstention - Negus) that schemes F1, F2, F4 and F7 be approved and it was **agreed**, moved by Councillor Willingham, seconded by Councillor Negus (voting 5 for, 0 against) that F3 and F5 should be approved if funding becomes available.

Local Traffic Schemes (LTS) – The following points were noted:

- (1) There had been a £100,000 cut in the budget and 5 staff had taken voluntary severance
- (2) There was a proposal to reduce the number of schemes to 1 per year – it would not be possible to deliver the number of schemes that had been possible in the past. It would not affect any outstanding schemes
- (3) Chapel Green Lane, Lower Redland Road – it was noted that the proposed parking bays arising out of the RPZ would go through the junction – this issue would need to be addressed by officers
- (4) Officers would carry out a desk top study of all schemes as required. It was noted that James Coleman (UWE) was carrying out a project on this
- (5) Research on night-time noise had shown that a ban on traffic exceeding 7.5 tonnes reduced noise levels by 7 decibels, amounting to a three quarters reduction in noise. This should be considered for roads that were subject to heavy usage (“A” roads such as Ralph Road and Filton Avenue but also “B” roads such as Coldharbour Road). It was noted that a report on this issue was scheduled on the Work Programme to come to the SD&T Scrutiny Commission

Resolved by the Neighbourhood Committee: that

- (1) Officers investigate what action can be taken with the Water Board in respect of F1**
- (2) all the following CSD schemes set out in the report (SD1, SD2, SD3 and SD4) be approved**
- (3) the following FMS schemes be approved (F1, F2, F4 and F7) with F3 and F5 to be approved in the event that funding becomes available**
- (4) that progress on outstanding Local Traffic schemes be noted.**

Action: Mark Sperduty

48. Flood Risk Report (Agenda Item 7)

The report was introduced by Matt Sugden. He drew members' attention to a set of leaflets on this issue which had been produced and also to a map setting indicating works, study extents and flood risks within BCR NP area.

During discussion, the following points were made:

- (1) Local Authorities were now the lead Authorities with responsibility for managing local flood risk (ie a Lead Local Flood Authority) following the Flood and Water Management Act (2010) which included co-ordination of risk management, promotion of sustainable development and of local sources
- (2) The drain clearing programme had been carried out in conjunction with the Highways Maintenance service. Almost every gully in the city had now been cleared. Officers were now identifying high risk areas and those areas which were vulnerable to flooding
- (3) Work was taking place with the Environment Agency to improve relationships with Network Rail – it was noted that there had been problems with flooding at the junction of Sheldon Road and Muller Road arising out of excess water flowing in the Railway bridge under Muller Road
- (4) Cranbrook is the only existing open water course in the BCR NP area. The risk to the allotments off Cranbrook Road had been mitigated by the use of storage tanks
- (5) In accordance with Flood Risk Management rules which Bristol City Council had to comply with, flood risk could not be increased to 3rd parties. For example, it was now illegal to pave a driveway with impermeable surfacing
- (6) Climate change projections were a significant part of the team's work and operating up to 100 years in the future. Strategy would examine the local strategic risk but not in detail
- (7) Targets for brownfield developments were for 20% less run offs

Resolved – that the report be noted.

49 Street Scene Update (Agenda Item 8)

Andrew McGrath introduced this report in the absence of Liz Kew. Officers agreed to expand Item 1 of the Action Plan of the Bristol City Council Walking Strategy to emphasise the importance of making walking more enjoyable.

In respect of Safer Streets for pedestrians and cyclists, it was noted that the walking strategy needed to take note of cyclists' needs and vice versa – for example, consideration should be given to the greater

provision of bicycle stands to improve pavements for pedestrians along Gloucester Road.

The Committee noted that Gloucester Road Street Traders Association were aware that they needed to take more responsibility in respect of the Street Scene Group.

The Neighbourhood Partnership moved and agreed the recommendations contained in the report as follows:

- (a) - moved by Councillor Hance, seconded by Councillor Radice
- (b) - moved by Councillor Hance, seconded by Councillor Townsend
- (c) - moved by Councillor Hance, seconded by Councillor Townsend
- (d) - moved by Councillor Townsend, seconded by Councillor Hance

Resolved by the Neighbourhood Partnership –

- (1) that the contents of the report be noted;**
- (2) that the draft Bishopston, Cotham and Redland (BCR) walking strategy based on the Bristol City Council (BCC) Walking Strategy (2011) be adopted in principle;**
- (3) that members of the NP and members of the NP sub-groups be asked to comment, contribute and endorse the draft working document by 17 April 2014;**
- (4) that the Street Scene Group's function and structure be reviewed after the reorganisation of BCC is completed be agreed; and**
- (5) that an officer be tasked with leading and administering the BCR Street Scene Group or its successor once the BCC reorganisation is complete.**

Action: Liz Kew/Andrew McGrath

50 Neighbourhood Working Priorities Update (Agenda Item 9)

In the absence of Hayley Ash, this report was presented by Andrew McGrath. He referred to Paragraph 3 of the report which sets out options to engage students in the forum/local democracy process.

The following actions were agreed arising out of the discussion:

- (1) Invitations should be extended to the Presidents of the 2 Student Unions and the 2 Youth Mayors to be involved in the process;

- (2) The Neighbourhood Working Co-ordinator to be requested to attend informal meetings of the NP as required to ensure the process operates more smoothly in future

Resolved by the Neighbourhood Partnership –

- (1) that the update on the priorities be noted; and
- (2) that the actions set out in Bullet Points (1) and (2) of the Minute be implemented.

Action: Andrew McGrath/Hayley Ash

51 Any Other Business (Agenda Item 10)

The NP placed on record their thanks to Sylvia Townsend and to David Willingham for the service they had given to the BCR NP in their capacity as local Councillors. They also placed on record their congratulations to Liz Kew for being awarded the Lord Mayor's medal.

52 Date of Next Meeting

It was noted that the next meeting of the Bishopston Cotham Redland Neighbourhood Partnership was scheduled for **7.00pm on Monday 23 June 2014 in the Claremont Room, Redland Green School.**

(The meeting ended at 9.30pm)

CHAIR