

Cabinet

Supplementary Information



Date: Tuesday, 6 October 2020

Time: 4.00 pm

Venue: Virtual Meeting - Zoom Committee Meeting
with Public Access via YouTube

2. Public Forum

(Pages 3 - 21)

Issued by: Corrina Haskins, Democratic Services
City Hall, Bristol, BS1 5TR
E-mail: democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk
Date: Monday, 05 October 2020



CABINET – 6 October 2020

PUBLIC FORUM ITEMS

Statements and questions have been received as follows (full details are attached):

Agenda item 8 – Temple Quarter Development Framework Update

Statements:

PS08.01 David Redgewell
PS08.02 Shona Jemphrey
PS08.03 Mary Page

Questions:

PQ08.01&02 Suzanne Audrey

Agenda item 9 – Sports facilities in parks and green spaces

Statements:

PS09.01 Kay Thomson
PS09.02 Laurence Rae

Questions:

CQ09.01&02 Cllr Anthony Negus
CQ09.03&04 Cllr Martin Fodor

Agenda item 10 - Housing Revenue Account New Build Acquisitions

Questions:

PQ10.01&02 Ollie Fortune
CQ10.01 Cllr Clive Stevens

Agenda item 11 - Revision to Local Development Scheme and Application of Adopted Local Plan Policy

Statements:

PS11.01 Leigh Coghill
CS11.01 Cllr Anthony Negus

Questions:

CQ11.01 Cllr Don Alexander

Agenda item 12- Enhanced Childminding Provision

None

Agenda item 13 - Children in Care Sufficiency Strategy 2020 - 2023

Questions:

CQ13.01 Cllr Don Alexander
CQ13.02 Cllr Clive Stevens

Agenda item 14 - Medium Term Financial Plan and Capital Strategy

None

Agenda item 15 – Avonmouth Fibre Extension Project

Statements:

CS15.01 Cllr Don Alexander

Agenda item 16 - Budget Monitoring Outturn report P4 and P5

None

Agenda item 17 - Quarterly Performance Progress Report – Quarter One 2020/21

None

Statement: PS08.01

Cabinet – 6 October 2020

Re: Agenda item 8 – Temple Quarter Update

Statement submitted by: David Redgewell

We welcome the progress on the plans for this quarter of the city but we are still concerned about the access to the station for bus services especially with the new eastern entrance which will require bus services to the new university' campus. The bridge heights mean that only single decker bus can access the back of the station.

East Bristol and Kingswood have no direct access to the back of the station. The only access is by railway via bus services to Lawrence Hill station and has limited disabled access. 6 7 37 42 43 44 45 from Kingswood, Hanham and St George and take the train service to Bristol Temple meads or change at Old Market Street and walk to the back of the station or the 8 or 72a bus to Temple Meads station or 376 178 to the bottom of the approach road. 506 bus stops in Avon Street in one direction only. The answer is to look at lowering Cattle Market Road under the bridge by a few feet to allow double decker access to the station at Temple gate. This would allow a new bus network from East Bristol to operate from the Kingswood and East Bristol area via Feeder Road and to the Brislington and St Anne's area of the city link the 99 route did years ago.

The university will require better bus access and with social distancing single decker bus capacity is limited to 18 seats, 33 on a double decker.

We also want coach access to the station for National Express Coaches and megabus as these operators like to serve university campuses.

The needs to be a booking ticket facilities at the eastern entrance.

Statement: PS08.02

Cabinet – 6 October 2020

Re: Agenda item 8 – Temple Quarter Update

Statement submitted by: Shona Jemphrey

"I would like to make a statement in regards to the Temple Quarter Development, which affects both the wards of Lawrence Hill and Windmill Hill. It is hoped to bring thousands of new jobs and homes to the city, which is very welcome. I also note that is hoped to help develop an inclusive economy that offers opportunity to all. I would like to ask that the Cabinet consider how elements of Community Wealth Building could be incorporated as part of that, which is an approach that redirects wealth back into the local economy, and places control and benefits into the hands of local people. If any elements have already been incorporated, details would be very welcome. Thank you"

Question: PQ08.01&02

Cabinet – 6 October 2020

Re: Agenda item 8 – Temple Quarter Development Framework Update

Questions submitted by: Suzanne Audrey

Background

In April 2019, the Environment Agency raised concerns with Colin Molton, then Bristol's interim director of growth and regeneration, about "a disconnect between the development of the flood risk strategy and your aspirations for growth and development". Plans for St Phillip's Marsh, part of the Temple Quarter area, and Western Harbour were of concern. The Environment Agency stated: "If these come forward in the absence of a strategy setting out how wider flood risk will be managed then we will, in accordance with national planning policy, be duty bound to object on flood risk grounds as development in these areas would make flood risk worse elsewhere. This is not where we want to be and really illustrates the difficulty in taking a piecemeal approach to development and regeneration." In a subsequent meeting with Bristol City Council officers, the Environment Agency asserted its 'red lines': significant development in areas of flood risk must not be supported in the absence of a strategy and nor can areas be protected in isolation as it will increase flood risk elsewhere. In response, Colin Molton said delivery of flood defences would be "development led" and it was agreed he would "consider inviting" a representative of the Environment Agency onto the project steering group for Temple Quarter. It is not clear from the notes of the meeting why this had not already been considered.

Question 1: Is a representative of the Environment Agency now on the project steering group for Temple Quarter?

Question 2: The Temple Quarter – Development Update indicates agreement to appoint a Project Director initially on a 2 year fixed term to lead the team. Please can you give details of the process that will be followed to recruit and appoint the Project Director, including compliance with the Council's equality and inclusion policy?

Statement: PS08.03

Cabinet – 6 October 2020

Re: Agenda item 8 – Temple Quarter Update

Statement submitted by: Mary Page

I note two reports on the agenda which have long term impacts for the future accessibility of Bristolians to public spaces, transport infrastructure, parks and green spaces. The Temple Quarter development proposals will have a huge impact on a key transit route for people from the South and East of Bristol. **I and many others will be wondering** How will the needs of Bristolians from some of the most deprived areas of the further away areas like Brislington, Knowle and Hengrove and Whitchurch Park to access the mainline train station by sustainable travel means be catered for, and how can the plans avoid sexist or ableist infrastructure mistakes, like those of the recent installation of inappropriate bike racks?

Equally, In regards to the Sports Facilities in parks and green spaces transfer proposals, how can the public trust that the Mayor and Cabinet will protect and guarantee their right of access to Canford Lane, Begbrook Park, Netham Park, Eastville Park, St George Park and the Ardagh bowls facilities in those publicly owned parks and green spaces in perpetuity? As we have seen this Mayor and Cabinet fail to protect the public right of access to Stoke Lodge by an apparent failure to uphold the terms of the lease to preserve the existing access rights.

Statement: PS09.01

Cabinet – 6 October 2020

Re: Agenda item 9 – Sports Facilities in parks and green spaces

Statement submitted by: Kay Thomson, Ardagh Bowling Club

I question the Ardagh Bowling green being included in transferring sports facilities to be operated by a third party without the condition that they continue to be used only for sport when the Ardagh Bowling Club already wholly maintain the green at no cost to the council We did approach the council to give us a lease to continue with this arrangement which we have been paying for over the last ten years but have had no response from Mr Fletcher or the Deputy Lord Mayor.

Information regarding this meeting came from another bowling club as we have received no contact.

Statement: PS09.02

Cabinet – 6 October 2020

Re: Agenda item 9 – Sports Facilities in parks and green spaces

Statement submitted by: Laurence Rae

I am the elected Secretary of Eastville Park Bowling Club (EPBC), the new name for the former Whitehall Bowling Club which had an agreement with BCC to play bowls on the green for a period up to the end of the 2019 season.

Bowls has been continually played at Eastville Park since 1910. There were two first class bowling greens but only one is now being used. Agreement from the Council was received early in September 2020 to recommence bowling. Since then there have been regular bowls sessions on the green. Eastville Park Bowling club is a community bowling club and over the last three weeks 36 people, including the East Bristol Elderly Sikhs have enjoyed taster bowls sessions on the green. If the weather had been better I believe we could have doubled this number. This confirms there is significant interest in bowling at Eastville Park and this facility should be maintained for the community.

In respect of the green a proposal has been submitted in writing to the Council setting out essential maintenance works and offering to either fund it or to employ a contractor to carry out the work this autumn and to set up the green for bowls use from April 2021.

Plans are in hand for 2021. We have a group of paid up members and in December 2020 we will pay the clubs registration fee to Gloucestershire Bowls Association and City and County of Bristol Bowls Association. We plan to open in April 2021 with a series of taster sessions and community bowls events. We have a list of provisional fixtures against other bowls clubs within Bristol and South Gloucestershire. In 2020 we had 34 fixtures arranged. All were cancelled due to Covid19. Overall the club is extremely active preparing for bowling at Eastville Park in 2021.

In January 2020 representatives of the bowling club and Friends of Eastville Park (FOEP) had a very positive meeting with Richard Fletcher. He confirmed that the council want bowling to continue at Eastville Park. He also confirmed that he would recommend the green and the two buildings are taken out of the Council Review. It was agreed that Friends of Eastville Park would put forward a detailed business proposal for the bowling green and its two buildings. He agreed to involve the Council's solicitors regarding an agreement, an initial five year term was intimated. He also stated he needed to look in detail at the condition of the two buildings.

The business plan has been submitted by FOEP but I understand the Council has not yet responded. We are also awaiting discussions with the Council about maintaining the green for bowling in 2021. An option discussed is that the bowling club and FOEP take on the preparation of the green for bowling.

Overall, we have been very active and it is disappointing that none of these discussions and draft agreements are included within your Council report to the Cabinet on Tuesday. I would like the following considered in detail.

1. There is significant demand for bowling within the community for Eastville Park
2. Detailed proposals for bowling to continue at Eastville Park in 2021 and beyond have been submitted to the Council
3. The Council have not responded to these proposals

It is recommended that the recommendation for the main bowling green and its two buildings is included within Group C and

- a. The Council to confirm that Friends of Eastville Park and Eastville Park Bowling Club can continue to use the bowling green and its two buildings for 2021 whilst discussions continue to secure the long-term future of bowling in Eastville Park
- b. The Council to progress an agreement with EPBC and FOEP including some investment. The Council to work in partnership with EPBC and FOEP to realize further financial support and expertise from sports governing bodies and others
- c. The disused old bowling green to be retained in Group A and incorporated into the Bristol Future Parks programme without a condition to be used only for sport.

Question: CQ09.01&02

Cabinet – 6 October 2020

Re: Agenda item 9 – Sports Facilities in Parks and Green Spaces

Question submitted by: Councillor Anthony Negus

Q1. Please clarify the implications of the very particular wording: “incorporate.... into the Bristol Future Parks without a condition that they continue to be used only for sport” and “with a condition that playing pitches must be able to be provided”.

Q2. Where leases are not granted would the council consider arrangements with individual-site trusts or even a city-wide trust or more boldly looking through the telescope the usual way and developing mutual engagement with companies, such as schools, universities and colleges, retirement homes, private sports centres or business groups wishing to adopt or share our facilities to joint benefit as has been done with BCC-owned sites for housing?

Question: CQ09.03&04

Cabinet – 6 October 2020

Re: Agenda item 9 – Sports Facilities in Parks and Green Spaces

Question submitted by: Councillor Martin Fodor

(i) The report identifies funds from sale of green spaces to deliver its objectives. Further sales of green spaces could affect both community well-being and have implications for action on the Ecological Emergency.

Question 1: Are further sales of green spaces planned and what would be the process for pursuing this?

(ii) The report selects some facilities for Asset Transfer with permanent use as sports pitches currently offered or multifunctional sports, and others without this condition. It creates different categories of Asset Transfer and says:

A = Incorporate in to the Bristol Future Parks programme without a condition that they continue to be used only for sport.

B = Invite Expressions of Interest from Sept 20 with a condition that the function for sport must be protected. Site use may be multifunctional in order to support sustainable funding, use and [word missing from report].

Question 2: Why is this distinction being made?

Question: PQ10.01&02

Cabinet – 6 October 2020

Re: Agenda item 10 – Housing Revenue Account New Build Acquisitions

Questions submitted by: Ollie Fortune

Question 1:

I'm sure all of us living in Bristol welcome the commitment within agenda item 10 to build more council housing but it is disheartening to see this report talking about 10s of houses dotted around various private developments across the city when we have 13,000 households currently waiting to be housed by Bristol city council.

How disheartening it must be for them to hear the council talking about 10s of houses being built when it's thousands that are needed! And quickly!

Do you agree that this report is not nearly radical enough and that it offers the 13,000 households waiting for permanent accommodation no realistic prospect of a home in a timely manner?

Question 2:

I've made it known that I am pleased to read that more council housing is being built although I find the low numbers demoralising so I won't make that point twice. In the spirit of recycling and reducing our carbon footprint does this administration plan to make more money available for buying up former council houses flogged at a heavily reduced rate under right to buy as and when they come on the open market?

Question: PQ10.01

Cabinet – 6 October 2020

Re: Agenda item 10 – Housing Revenue Account New Build Acquisitions

Questions submitted by: Councillor Clive Stevens

This £20million is a great first start, but is it likely to do further rounds like this in future years?

Statement: CS11.01

Cabinet – 6 October 2020

Re: Agenda item 11 – Revision to the Local Development Scheme and Application of Adopted Local Plan Policy

Statement submitted by: Leigh Coghill

There have been 17 separate applications for large new digital advertising screens in Bristol since August 2019. We thank the council for rejecting every single one of these applications. We recognise that the council shares our concerns about the scale and intensity of applications for digital advertising screens in our city. A specific policy on digital outdoor advertising would strengthen the council's position. It would help avoid the significant time spent by members and officers in assessing and rejecting these applications on a case by case basis, and act as a deterrent to companies relentlessly dragging the council through unsuccessful but time consuming appeals. We hope to see a policy adopted in the new Local Plan (and note that a large number of respondents to the consultation asked for such a policy to be adopted). What provision is there to guide officers and councillors on planning decisions on digital advertising screens in the interim?

Statement: CS11.01

Cabinet – 6 October 2020

Re: Agenda item 11 – Revision to the Local Development Scheme and Application of Adopted Local Plan Policy

Statement submitted by: Councillor Anthony Negus

The document 'A statement about planning in Bristol' (that on page 4 notes that it has already been approved at cabinet), appears to be a light statement of intent to fill the void left by the demise of the Joint Spatial Plan and with it the Bristol Local Plan documents.

It contains statements that, no matter how often they are said, remain dubious and unhelpful as they represent factional views and undisclosed interests. The Urban Living section refers again to the document of that name which states the Administration's poorly-informed preference, supported by the mayor, for tower blocks. People who understand these matters and have won awards for good urban design recognise and have proved that there are ways of integrating with and indeed strengthening communities in high-density living, not in isolating tower blocks but in ways that work with design, scale and form. Many guidance notes have been written on this to show how to avoid the damage created by civic and political megalomania of the past. Apart from being an architect I represent the most densely populated ward in Bristol – by a country mile – with not a tower block within its bounds and very few buildings over 4 storeys. This policy is misguided and should be graciously withdrawn, unless there are other reasons for its retention that need to be explained.

Only since I brought a successful motion to Full Council has the unhelpful issues of student accommodation in the city been acknowledged. By arrangement with the Universities, principally UoB, new areas to accommodate increasing numbers of students are to be created within existing communities throughout much of the city. This document has a fair description where this is to be achieved from new Purpose-built Student Accommodation (PBSAs) but so often present permanent family homes will be lost to short-term lets where students cannot be expected to settle in to their neighbourhoods and so are 'alongside' rather than 'within'.

This can be mitigated by avoiding concentrations that erode original communities and after a long fight a Supplementary Planning Document for Houses of Multiple Occupation (HMO SPD) has finally been prepared setting out criteria and formulae to prevent local hot-spots. The councillor group supporting this was told that all student accommodation would be taken into account in these calculations but part-way through the consultation process the PBSAs were taken out of this reckoning. The balloon crafted to carry away all our concerns will not fly with this fundamental panel missing - lobbied away by vested interests?

I have no problem with a statement from BCC that tries to lay down a marker for future plans within WECA. But it has to be informed, carry consensus and reflect open, honest and unprejudiced approaches to major issues facing the whole of our city. Without this, division and social deprivation is created, not minimised.

Question: CQ11.01

Cabinet – 6 October 2020

Re: Agenda item 11 – Revision to Local Development Scheme and Application of Adopted Local Plan Policy

Question submitted by: Councillor Don Alexander

I notice that this scheme may only be 'interim' pending the results of the Government's White Paper called 'Planning for the Future'. Could the Cabinet Member please tell me what she thinks of this White Paper and particularly its promise to end the role of planning committees? Thanks

Question: CQ13.01

Cabinet – 6 October 2020

Re: Agenda item 13 – Children in Care Sufficiency Strategy 2020-23

Question submitted by: Councillor Don Alexander

Could Cllr Godwin please explain some of the advantages of caring for our children and young people who need to be living in children's homes in council-owned homes here in the city rather than further afield with private sector providers? Thanks.

Question: PQ13.02

Cabinet – 6 October 2020

Re: Agenda item 13 – Children in Care Sufficiency Strategy 2020 – 2023

Questions submitted by: Councillor Clive Stevens

Bristol has done well with its approach to Children in Care. One thing I would like to ask about is the future market positioning statement to replace the current one for Foster Agency placements. I note from Adult Social Care there is Government guidance issued about market positioning statements which includes grants to organisations, working with charities etc. I am most concerned about recent news reports of the private sector (for profit) entering this market for children in care.

My question is therefore whether the new market positioning statement for CiC will create opportunities for the social and charity sectors to thrive?

Statement: CS15.01

Cabinet – 6 October 2020

Re: Agenda item 15 – Avonmouth Fibre Extension Project

Statement submitted by: Councillor Don Alexander

My ward contains some of the most deprived areas of the city and this investment in digital connectivity for public buildings and ultimately residences and businesses will be extremely welcome. In addition, improved connectivity to the Severnside Enterprise Area will boost our economy and further our ambitions for environmental sustainability through reducing travel requirements. This is also an opportune time to thank Bristol and Bath Regional Capital (City Funds) and WECA for their willingness to invest in our new community-led wind turbine project which has rightly attracted national interest.