

Communities Scrutiny Commission Agenda



Date: Thursday, 15 October 2020

Time: 10.00 am

Venue: Virtual Meeting

Distribution:

Councillors: Anthony Negus (Chair), Jo Sergeant (Vice-Chair), Estella Tincknell, Jon Wellington, Donald Alexander, Barry Clark, Graham Morris, Matt Melias, Martin Fodor and Carla Denyer

Issued by: Bronwen Falconer, Democratic Services
City Hall, 3rd Floor Deanery Wing, College Green, Bristol, BS1 5TR
Tel: 0117 9037786
E-mail: democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk
Date: Wednesday, 7 October 2020



Agenda

8. Public Forum

Any member of the public or Councillor may participate in Public Forum. The detailed arrangements for so doing are set out in the Public Information Sheet at the back of this agenda. Public Forum items should be emailed to democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk and please note that the following deadlines will apply in relation to this meeting:-

(Pages 3 - 6)

Questions - Written questions must be received 3 clear working days prior to the meeting. For this meeting, this means that your question(s) must be received in this office at the latest by **5pm on Friday 9th October.**

Petitions and Statements - Petitions and statements must be received on the working day prior to the meeting. For this meeting this means that your submission must be received in this office at the latest by **12.00 noon on Wednesday 14th October.**



Communities Scrutiny Commission
 15 October 2020
 Public Forum



Questions

Ref	Name	Agenda item
Q1	Councillor Clive Stevens	11 – Performance Report
Q2	Councillor Clive Stevens	12 – Corporate Risk Report
Q3	Suzanne Audrey	N/A (Section 106/CIL projects)
Q4	Suzanne Audrey	N/A (Jubilee Pool)



Public Forum Questions

Question 1: Councillor Clive Stevens

Item 11 – Q1 Performance Report

Q1 – Page 74, measure BCBP353: Measuring the number of households where homelessness is prevented is important BUT measuring the numbers where it isn't prevented is vital. We don't seem to measure that. How can we measure that?

Answer: Strategic Intelligence and Performance Manager

In 2017 the Homelessness Reduction Act significantly reformed England's homelessness legislation by placing duties on local authorities to intervene at earlier stages to prevent homelessness in their areas. It also required housing authorities to provide homelessness services to all those affected, not just those who have 'priority need' which had been the thrust of previous legislation. This particularly included:

- (a) an enhanced prevention duty extending the period a household is threatened with homelessness from 28 days to 56 days, meaning that housing authorities are required to work with people to prevent homelessness at an earlier stage; and
- (b) a new duty for those who are already homeless so that housing authorities will support households for 56 days to relieve their homelessness by helping them to secure accommodation.

The Business Plan measure "**Increase the number of households where homelessness is prevented**" was set up in response to this new requirement, replacing the former Best Value indicator (in place since in 2005) of "Increase number of homeless households helped by housing advice service to prevent homelessness" which was calculated in a significantly different way.

An overview of homelessness legislation can be seen at this link:

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/homelessness-code-of-guidance-for-local-authorities/overview-of-the-homelessness-legislation>

Further, as noted it is vital to also monitor numbers where homelessness is not prevented. In addition to the measure BCBP353 ("households where homelessness is prevented") we also track a number of other indicators that monitor aspects of where homelessness is **not** prevented. These are already included in the Communities Scrutiny Commission (CSC) report, with details and comments:

The primary metrics which measure where homelessness is **not** prevented are:

- BCP352b Reduce the number of people sleeping rough on a single night in Bristol (quarterly count)
- DGRC352a Reduce the number of people sleeping rough on a single night in Bristol (annual count)

Other relevant indicators noted:

- BCPB357: Reduce the number of households in temporary accommodation
- DGRC356: Reduce the number of households who were in Temporary Accommodation for more than 6 months

Question 2: Councillor Clive Stevens**Item 12 – Q1 Corporate Risk Report**

Page 101, risk CRR32: Failure to deliver enough affordable homes to meet the city's needs: The target of 800/year might eventually get beaten but in the long term it's not going to be enough. And worse, the main approach to finding space for the homes was via cooperation with our neighbouring LAs (as per the Joint Spatial Plan). That has been canned. Although Paul Smith did some good work setting up new approaches, the housing list is still growing and the price of land is still rising and so putting in enough affordable homes is getting even more difficult. I have been told that the WECA Spatial Development Strategy will create a duty to cooperate between the three authorities. But I have also been told that this is wishful thinking as the pressures on our surrounding LAs with their new Planning targets will blow a hole below the waterline of this wishful thinking.

So my question is, can someone explain to me how we will build enough affordable homes for the needs of Bristolians?

Answer, Strategy & Enabling Manager:

A public record of the actions being taken within the Housing Delivery Team to meet the target of delivering 800 affordable homes a year can be found in the Growth and Regeneration Scrutiny Commission meeting held on 14th September 2020, with the relevant papers found [here](#). The Future of Planning report from the same meeting also refers to planning policy changes.

Question 3: Suzanne Audrey**Jubilee swimming pool**

With regard to the closure of Jubilee Pool, it was agreed that a group would be set up to discuss options for the future. I understand a meeting was held recently. It seems as if the Save Jubilee Pool campaign were not invited to the meeting despite their keen interest in the future of the pool. Jubilee is the nearest pool to Totterdown, and TRESA has concerns about its closure but no-one from TRESA was invited either.

Question

Why were members of the affected community not invited to the meeting to discuss options for the future of Jubilee Pool?

Answer, Sports and Physical Activity Development Manager:

The Mayor proposed that a cross party discussion group was set up to provide the opportunity to look at community led solutions and review the reasons other options were discounted. The first meeting was on Friday 9th and intended for Ward Councillors. Beyond this first meeting the Mayor has proposed that the Councillors should arrange meetings/discussion going forward and engage with the community to discuss options for the pools future. In this respect going forward Members will seek user involvement and invitation of local people to future meetings, although it was acknowledged that the group must be careful not to share commercially sensitive information.

Question 4: Suzanne Audrey**Section 106/CIL projects**

In response to my questions to Area Committee 5, I was informed: "a full update on all current Community Infrastructure Levy and Section 106 projects is currently being prepared with a view to circulating this to all members of Council and publishing it on the Bristol City Council website by the end of August." I have not received a copy of that list yet. Members of TRESA are interested in two important projects in Totterdown - improvements to the Stanley Hill rat run and a pedestrian crossing between St Lukes Steps and Victoria Park. We would like information about progress of these projects and when they will be implemented. The list will of course be important for other neighbourhoods across the city.

Question

Please can you provide me with a copy of the list?

Answer, Neighbourhoods & Communities Service Manager and Head of Strategic City Transport

An update has now been circulated to Councillors and the Bristol City Council website will be updated by 16th October.

With regard to the specific projects mentioned, both schemes are currently on hold due to resources being prioritised to Covid-19 Social Distancing schemes.

The Stanley Hill/Angers Road scheme proceeded as far as engagement with the community group and Councillors about their requirements, but it became clear the funding was inadequate to achieve the aims. We were then hopeful that it might be possible to close the road as part of the DfT Emergency Active Travel Fund (EATF) funding and waited to hear if it had been included in the shortlist. It has not been included but is going to be considered as part of the Bus Deal corridor works. We will be speaking with the project manager next month to determine what is possible.

The St Lukes Road scheme had Engineering Design working on the preliminary drawings but they have been redirected on to Covid-19 works. We were hoping to get a drawing developed enough to be able to liaise with Councillors and then possibly go out to public consultation but there is some additional work to be done.