



**GREATER BEDMINSTER COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP**  
**7.00 P.M. ON 21<sup>ST</sup> OCTOBER 2013**  
**AT THE SOUTHVILLE CENTRE**

**PRESENT:**

**GBCP Board**

Councillor Green	Southville Ward
Councillor Beynon	Southville Ward
Colin Smith	Bedminster Ward
Ben Barker	Dame Emily Park Project
Alan Pratley	Swiss Drive Neighbourhood Watch
Les Potter	BS3 Churches Together
Anna Bryant	Ashton Gate Triangle NIG
John Vickery	LinkAge, Equalities Rep
Helen Thomas	University of the 3 <sup>rd</sup> Age
Nigel Singer	Windmill Hill City Farm
Ian Collinson	Ian Collinson Planning
Matthew Symonds	Front Garden Competition - co-chair
Stef Brammer	Way Out West – co-chair
Simon Dicken	Bedminster Town Team

**Statutory Sector and Observers**

Nick Christo (NC)	BCC Area Co-ordinator
Samantha Mahony	BCC Democratic Services Officer
Neil Terry	BCC Transport Officer
Caroline Hollies	BCC Neighbourhood Working Coordinator
Emily Smith	BCC Neighbourhood Working Coordinator
Nigel Colston	Avon & Somerset Police
Jim White	Local Resident
Brian Richards	Memories of Bedminster
Rosie Tomlinson	Greville Smythe Bowls Club
Dave Milton	South Bristol Scouts
Bob Hussey	South Bristol Scouts
Lesley Collins	Resident
Chris Pratley	Ashton Vale Resident
Debbie Wills	LINKAGE
Colin Hayden	Bower Ashton Resident
James Coleman	Local Resident
Dick Turpin	Learning Partnership West
Omari Cato	Learning Partnership West
Stephen Wickham	BS3 Planning Group
April Richmond	Local Resident
Roger Allen	BCC Tenant Participation Team

Helen Moody  
Satyen Joshi  
Brent Stephens  
John Gibson  
Chris Miller  
Jackie Smith  
Mike Ginger

Friends of Marksbury Road Library  
Chest Properties  
Gaywood House Surgery  
Clinical Commissioning Group  
Local Resident  
Marksbury Road  
Resident

**Apologies:** Gerry Griffiths, John Potter, Cllr Bradshaw

## 1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Everyone was welcomed to the meeting and asked to introduce themselves.

## 2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillors Beynon and Smith declared that they were members of the South & East Development Control (planning) Committee and would not be voting on the second resolution to the Board.

## 3. HIGHWAYS UPDATE AND FOOTWAYS REPORT

The Community Partnership received a report from the Service Director, Transport Services (Agenda Item No. 3) which set out the highways update and footways report. The Neighbourhood Committee had £42,000 to allocate and were presented with four footways to choose from. Merrywood Road, Ashton Vale Road, Upper Perry Road and Raleigh Road had each been allocated 80 points via a scoring matrix attached as Appendix A.

Officers confirmed that footways were surveyed twice a year and that footway maintenance and improvement was linked to potential local traffic schemes where possible in order to save costs. Points were awarded dependent on the number of reports received and accidents reported and those proposed within the report had scored 10 for that element.

It was proposed that West Street be added to the list as a footway in need for repair. It was reported that the area had grown in population in recent years and the footway provided a hazard to elderly people as well as those with pushchairs and wheelchairs.

The Highways and Traffic Transport Service Officer confirmed that the Committee could make a decision that deviated from the proposed roads recommended in the report. The Democratic Services Officer advised that the Committee should seek to have all the information they require before making a decision and that a new proposal would not have been available to the public five clear working days prior to the meeting.

The Councillors agreed that West Street should be selected as the footway in need of maintenance and made their decision on the basis that officers could return to the next meeting if a further report or decision was required. **(ACTION: SM, NT)**

In response to a query, it was confirmed that no money was available for footway maintenance on West Street out of S106 funds.

### The NEIGHBOURHOOD COMMITTEE RESOLVED

(1) that the 2013/14 work programme for footway maintenance be agreed for

**West Street; and**

**(2) that the progress on local traffic schemes and carriageway surface dressing be noted.**

#### **4. COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES UPDATE**

The Community Partnership received a verbal update on the following community activities (Agenda Item No.4).

Leaflets available from Debbie of **Linkage** provided information to promote the reduction in isolation of older people. If anyone could display some please let her know.

A community campaign to reduce **inconsiderate parking** on footways and around corners had been reinvigorated with fliers available from [mikewginger@outlook.com](mailto:mikewginger@outlook.com) and via the newsletter electronically. Also, a Community Speedwatch group was being formed with six volunteers sought - interested parties should contact Mike.

**Learning Partnership West** were a community interest company that had taken over the youth and play contract. Ideas, comments and suggestions were invited about shaping services for the future to [rturpin@lpw.org.uk](mailto:rturpin@lpw.org.uk) and [ocato@lpw.org.uk](mailto:ocato@lpw.org.uk)

The **Mayor George Ferguson** would visit the NP area on the afternoon of 5<sup>th</sup> November 2013 and an itinerary was being planned with the Neighbourhood Partnership Chairs and local Councillors.

The **Ashton Vale Conference** had been well attended with over 50 residents. A follow up meeting would take place around February time and a newsletter would be produced.

From the end of January, **Residents Parking Zones** consultation and drop in events would start to take place for the Partnership area.

**Childrens Play Equipment** had been installed in the Marksbury Road area and would be arriving imminently in South Street Park.

The **Best of Bedminster Show** had taken place which highlighted the benefit of community events. Events would continue to be communicated through the NEWSLETTER and ideas of other events were invited. It had been suggested that BOB should rotate to different parts of the neighbourhood area each year.

The **Environment Sub Group** were considering the allocation of S106 funds to different parks in the NP area. New members of the group were welcomed and each area would be asked to put forward their ideas for discussion. It was confirmed that accessible play equipment would be part of proposals, as well as facilities for older people.

The partnership received a presentation about the **Clinical Commissioning Group** (a copy of which is appended to these minutes). In response the following comments were made:

- The relationship between the CCG and BCC services needed to be further developed.
- Patients Participation Groups were involved with each GP practice as part of enhanced areas.
- As part of the agreed Health & Wellbeing Strategy, the CCG were responsible for devising required services. It was suggested that the wider determinants of health (eg access to green spaces) should be taken into account and links made with Neighbourhood

Partnership for delivery. It was confirmed that the CCG fed into the governing board and through representation on the HWB.

- The views of the GBCP would be sought re health priorities for the area and information would be distributed in the NEWSLETTER.

## **5. NEIGHBOURHOOD WORKING PRIORITIES**

The Community Partnership received a report from the Neighbourhood Working Co-ordinator (Agenda Item No. 5) that set out the neighbourhood working priorities.

The report proposed that joint council and police resources provide a focus on priorities of the GBCP. A survey of 1400 local residents, a GBCP stall at BOB, an online survey, feedback from local community groups, evidence from officers and quality of life surveys had all been drawn together to inform a list of 18 priorities for the GBCP to influence and effect. The GBCP were invited to identify up to 10 top priorities from the list of 18 for officers to work on, then reporting back and exercising flexibility going forward. The approach had already been piloted in the NP area for some time and this was a development of that approach.

There were concerns about the approach used by BCC and the Police and it was suggested that the approach should be more systemic and that the GBCP had not been involved enough in the process. Members of the Partnership proposed that the 18 priorities could be arranged under four sub-headings and all adopted.

Although all 18 priorities were council or police functions and responsibilities, officers stressed that not everything could get the full concentration of resources and that would only get worse in terms of future budgetary constraints.

It was proposed that the priorities highlighted by those residents canvassed (indicated in bold within the report) should be the ones to concentrate on as the views of members of the community that didn't engage with the community partnership should not be dismissed. It was suggested that the partnership needed to be more open and less negative to new ideas.

Officers clarified that there wasn't a pool of money to allocate to the resources, but more a matter of time to allocate, focus and work on coordination and a joined up approach to target and tackle operational issues on a wider scale.

It was proposed that the GBCP agree the four sub headings proposed, under which all 18 priorities were grouped. Those Sub Headings were: Community Safety, Improvements to the walking and cycling environment, Young People and Greening Greater Bedminster. Within those groupings, the top five identified through the information gathering process including 1400 residents should be the first focus. These were; Anti Social Behaviour, Dog Fouling, Littering, Speeding and Problem/Obstacle parking. At the next meeting officers were asked to return to the Partnership to discuss how those issues were being addressed and how the approach to each could be improved.

Thought would also be given to how to approach the exercise next time to make it specific and relevant to the GBCP area. Volunteers were sought to assist this process going forward particularly from Board members. Ideas would be sought and the expectation would be that Board members assisted with the research and selection process prior to approval at the GBCP meeting.

**That under the sub headings of;** Community Safety, Improvements to the walking and cycling environment, Young People and Greening Greater Bedminster – the top five priorities of; Anti Social Behaviour, Dog Fouling, Littering, Speeding and Problem/Obstacle parking be agreed.

## 6. DEVOLVED SERVICES UPDATE

The community partnership received a report from the Area Environment Officer & Area Coordinator (Agenda Item No.6) which provided an update on devolved services. The report was taken 'as read'.

### The NEIGHBOURHOOD COMMITTEE RESOLVED –

- (1) that the contents of the devolved budgets be noted;
- (2) that the update on the NP review be noted;
- (3) that the Active Neighbourhood Travel Grant guidance (round 3) be noted; and
- (4) that the Bristol European Green Capital 2015 opportunity for NPs be noted.

## 7. AREA PLANNING UPDATE

A report was circulated which highlighted the importance of Neighbourhood Planning nationally and suggested that a small task and finish group be established to look further at the issue in more detail, consider the pros and cons and come back to the GBCP with a clear proposition to the January meeting. **(ACTION; IC)**

## 8. RESOLUTIONS TO THE GBCP

The following resolution (Agenda Item No.8) was presented to the Partnership by Matthew Symonds and debated.

*"I ask the GBCP board members to support the following motion;*

*Greater Bedminster Community Partnership calls on Bristol City Council to remove the barriers from the cycle and pedestrian designated sides of Gaol Ferry Bridge to allow a trial period (suggested 12 months) without the barriers to ease walking and cycle congestion on this very heavily trafficked bridge.*

### *Background*

*During the recent resurfacing work on Gaol Ferry Bridge the chicane barriers attached to the bridge were temporarily removed. When the bridge work was completed the barriers were not immediately reinstalled. The absence of the barriers made walking and cycling across the bridge much easier, without the 'pinch-points' created by the barriers. The pinch-points force pedestrians to squeeze past each other and lead to near-misses between cyclists on an already narrow bridge.*

*The barriers were originally installed in response to concerns that some cyclists were traveling too fast across the bridge. Since the barriers were originally installed on the bridge (some 20 years ago) walking and cycling levels in Southville have increased significantly*

*(as indicated by the Cycling City evaluation, census and the Quality of Life survey) and use of the bridge as part of a key walking and cycle route into the city centre has also greatly increased.*

*The increase in walking/cycling traffic using the bridge means that the barriers now act more as an obstacle and potential danger to pedestrians and cyclists than as a deterrent to a very few inconsiderate cyclists (and sometimes even inconsiderate walkers). The removal of the barriers for a trial 12 month period would, make crossing the bridge easier on foot and on bike and support the GBCP priority to encourage more walking/cycling.*

*I ask the GBCP board members to support a request for the barriers on Gaol Ferry Bridge to be removed for a trial period.”*

During the discussion the following points were raised:

- It was clarified that it was the chicane style ‘sticky out bits’ that were proposed for removal for a 12 month pilot period.
- A survey of about 400 people had found that 90% wanted the barriers removed.
- It was highlighted that the bridge did not appear to meet equalities standards as prams and mobility scooters as well as the visually impaired with canes, had difficulty getting across the bridge.
- It was highlighted that the chicanes had been installed to stop motorbikes crossing the bridge and further suggested that officers at BCC would need to consider the engineering of the bridge including gross overloads.
- Service Manager at BCC had confirmed that if the partnership passed the resolution that a structural assessment would take place with view to removing the barriers.

**The NEIGHBOURHOOD PARTNERSHIP voted unanimously in favour of the resolution.**

**ACTION: NC to follow up with Service Manger BCC**

\* \* \* \* \*

The following resolution (Agenda Item No.8) was presented to the Partnership by Tess Green and debated.

*“GBCP is requested to*

- 1. note the points made below relating to the former ITO building on Lydstep Terrace, Southville;*
- 2. recommend that BCC change the current leasing arrangements to allow this development to go forward*

### **BACKGROUND**

- *Site has a lease of 992 years remaining. Lease was issued by Bristol City Council originally to ensure that more than 50% of the site was not used for residential. At the time it was felt that there would be a good demand for small business units.*
- *There is an existing consent for 23 flats, 21 small industrial business units (B1, B2, B8 class), and a café (ref: 07/00476/F)*
- *No bank is willing to lend on the delivery of this consent due to the surplus of unoccupied office space in Bristol and inherent risks of empty industrial units/flats on completion.*
- *It is deemed that a better use of the site would be to provide large family houses with parking, a café, a nursery and perhaps some offices/live-work units. 3 occupiers have already expressed a strong interest for the nursery.*

- *This mix on a potential scheme could attract a CIL payment of circa £90,000 plus that can be used by GBCP to improve Dame Emily Park.*
- *To progress this idea, a new planning application needs to be submitted to BCC, but this can only be done if the covenant on the lease is changed or removed. At the very least, Clause 6 of the lease that refers to the maximum residential use by floor area needs to be changed from 50% to 80%.*
- *It would greatly assist the delivery of the scheme if each unit is sold freehold as opposed to leasehold.*

**PROPOSAL**

- *Due to the long term on the lease, and the fact there is no ground rent or passing rent, the value of the freehold is negligible. However to resolve the last point above and enable phasing of the proposed scheme, Chest Properties would pay the Council/GBCP a sum of £5000 to purchase the freehold, and pay for reasonable legal expenses incurred.*
- *At the same time, Chest Properties would enter into a deed of covenant that stated the maximum percentage of residential use to be 80%. This would enable a minimum commercial use of 20% but should the demand arise, allow for a greater percentage of commercial use.*
- *It would also mean that GBCP/Council would keep the effect of the original lease and never lose the commercial use status of part of the site.*
- *A CIL payment would follow in due course assuming planning consent is granted for the revised scheme”*

During the discussion the following points were raised:

- The building had been partly demolished following the bankruptcy of the developer at that time.
- Restrictions had been placed on the use and development of the building that were now considered an obstacle to bringing the building back into use.
- There was a need for the leasehold status of the building to be relaxed.
- It was suggested that BCC should reconsider the building and feel free to change the rules applied.

There was a vote, 10 people voted for, 1 against and there were two abstentions.

**The NEIGHBOURHOOD PARTNERSHIP voted in favour of the resolution.**

**ACTION: NC to inform Chris Woods**

\*\*\*\*\*

The following resolution (Agenda Item No.8) was presented to the Partnership by Bob Hussey and debated.

*“Bristol South Scouts request continuing support from the Greater Bedminster Community Partnership in urging Bristol City Council to robustly defend their review decision to list the land in Balfour Road as an Asset of Community Value, when considering a response to the HM Courts & Tribunals, First-tier Tribunal (General Regulatory Chamber).*

*They also urge the GBCP to recognise the importance of this site when they consider possible future community uses for this locality e.g. provision of a Community Building or maybe one for specialist use (i.e. nursery) or a Community Garden (open space). The Scouts and Guides would prefer a Community Building that would be made available to them.”*

During the discussion the following points were raised:

- An 'asset of community value' status had been applied to the land of the Scout Hut which meant that the developer could not develop or sell the land unless it was to the Scouts.
- The developer had challenged the decision in the 'high court' and the Council was defending their decision.
- In the meantime the Scouts had been made to leave the building and it had been demolished.
- It was proposed that the land be added to the shortlist of places to take the Mayor on the 5<sup>th</sup> November **(ACTION: NC)**

**The NEIGHBOURHOOD PARTNERSHIP voted unanimously in favour of the resolution.**

**9. MINUTES – 24<sup>TH</sup> JUNE 2013**

**The NEIGHBOURHOOD PARTNERSHIP AGREED - that the minutes of the Greater Bedminster Community Partnership held on 24<sup>th</sup> June 2013 be confirmed as a correct record.**

It was agreed that the small group that went to speak to Upfest organisers would give an update at the next meeting **(ACTION: Rosie Tomlinson & Anna Bryant)**

The situation regarding the cutback of vegetation on South Liberty Lane, and the installation of play equipment in Ashton Vale would also be updated at the next meeting. **(ACTION: NC)**

**10. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

**AGREED -:** that the date of the next neighbourhood partnership meeting be held on 27<sup>th</sup> January 2014 at a time to be confirmed.

(The meeting ended at 9.45pm)

CHAIR