



Bishopston, Cotham and Redland Neighbourhood Partnership Agenda

Date: Thursday, 16 March 2017
Time: 6.30 pm - 7.00 pm
Place: Claremont hall, Redland Green School, Redland Court Road, Bristol BS7 8EH

1. Welcome and Introductions

2. Apologies for Absence

3. Minutes of the Previous Meeting (Pages 5 - 12)

To agree the minutes of the last meeting held on Monday 23rd January 2017 as a correct record.

4. Declarations of Interest

To note any declarations of interest from the Councillors. They are asked to indicate the relevant agenda item, the nature of the interest and in particular whether it is a **disclosable pecuniary interest**.

Please note that the Register of Interests is available at

<https://www.bristol.gov.uk/councillors/members-interests-gifts-and-hospitality-register>

Any declarations of interest made at the meeting which is not on the register of interests should be notified to the Monitoring Officer for inclusion.

5. Public Forum

Up to 30 minutes is allowed for this item

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:-

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 12noon on Wednesday 15th March 2017.**

6. Reports From Working Groups - Verbal

The NP is requested to receive verbal reports from all Working Groups with the exception of the Parks Working Group (Report attached at Agenda Item 6a below)

a. Parks Working Group (Page 13)

Please find attached a written report for this meeting

7. Neighbourhood Co-ordinator's Report (Pages 14 - 26)

Please find attached the Neighbourhood Co-ordinator's Report

8. Any Other Business

9. Date of Next Meeting

No further meetings have yet been fixed.

Contact – The local Neighbourhood Partnership (NP) Coordinator is:

Andrew McGrath

Telephone : (0117) 9036436

e-mail : andrew.mcgrath@bristol.gov.uk

The Democratic Services Officer of the meeting is

Jeremy Livitt

Telephone : 0117 92 23758

e-mail : democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk

What is a Neighbourhood Partnership?

Neighbourhood Partnerships are the route to influence and improve services in the neighbourhood for residents, community organisations, service partners, and where local councillors make decisions about Bristol City Council business

How do I get involved?

Anyone who lives or works in the area can get involved in this Neighbourhood Partnership by:

- **Attending this meeting and commenting on any item of business on the agenda.** Everyone is welcome to attend this meeting and contribute.
- **Submit a Public Forum statement** to the clerk to the meeting (contact details above) **no later than noon on the working day before the meeting.** The statement will, where possible, be sent directly to members of the Partnership, and be printed and circulated at the meeting.

The Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014

Any person attending a meeting must, so far as is practicable, be afforded reasonable facilities for reporting. This includes filming, photographing or making an audio recording of the proceedings.

Members of the public should therefore be aware that they may be filmed by others attending the meeting and that this is not within the authority's control. Oral commentary is not permitted during the meeting as this would be disruptive.



Bishopston, Cotham and Redland Neighbourhood Partnership
7.00 pm, 23 January 2017

Present:

* De-notes apologies/absent

Ward Councillors

Councillor Tom Brook, Bishopston and Ashley Down;
Councillor Eleanor Combley, Bishopston and Ashley Down;
Councillor Martin Fodor, Redland;
Councillor Fi Hance, Redland;
Councillor Anthony Negus, Cotham;

* Councillor Cleo Lake, Cotham;

Partners

Representatives of people who live and work in the Neighbourhood Partnership area

Roger Gimson

Alison Bromilow

* Paul Bolton-Jones

Sergeant Adam Dolling (substitute for Paul Bolton-Jones)

Jenny Hoadley

Liz Kew

Gavin Spittlehouse

Sarah Thorp

Rob Umphray

Lesley Welch

Also in Attendance - Officers:-

Andrew McGrath

Jeremy Livitt

1. Welcome, Introductions and Safety Information (agenda item no. 1)

The Chair welcomed all parties to the meeting.

2. Apologies for Absence (agenda item no. 2)

Apologies for Absence and substitutions were noted (see above attendance list).

3. Minutes of the Previous Meeting (agenda item no. 3)

Resolved – that the above Minutes be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair subject to the following alterations: the word “Botham” on Page 5 to be replaced with the word “Cotham” and the words “800 responses” at the bottom of Page 8 to be replaced with “80 responses”.

4. Declarations of Interest (agenda item no. 4)

No declarations of interest were declared by Councillors.

5. Public Forum (agenda item no. 5)

The following Public Forum statements were received:

Statement 1 - Transport Issues – David Redgewell South West Transport Network, TSSA and Director of Bus Users (UK)

It was noted that the proposals for the Metro West Phase 2 proposing a potential station at Ashley Down would affect this NP area.

Statement 2 – Neighbourhood Partnership Structure – Jenny Hoadley, Liz Kew, Sarah Thorp, Lesley Welch, Rob Umphray and Gavin Spittlehouse

Jenny Hoadley indicated that, since the statement had been prepared, confirmation had now been received by e-mail that all Neighbourhood Partnerships would continue to operate until the end of June 2017 and, therefore, the situation was not quite as urgent as originally anticipated.

However, she pointed out that the proposed budget reductions of over 90% would result in the end of the existing structures and, therefore, members of the NP had met in early January 2017 to discuss what should replace it. Whilst the community was keen to have a say in future arrangements, the current situation was an unknown. In the interim period, temporary arrangements for the NP would remain until the next 12 months was clearer. It was noted that other community organisations in different parts of the city could support any proposed alternative structure, such as “Up Our Street” and the Greater Partnership.

Statement 3 – Sustainable Transport Working Group – Addendum – Roger Gimson

It was noted that this statement related to Agenda Item 9(b) and would be considered under this item.

6. New Business Representative - Formal Adoption (agenda item no. 6)

Members noted this report proposing the adoption of Shelly Swift as a Business Representative on this NP.

However, the Chair advised that she had informed him today that she was probably going to leave the country. He stated that he would be meeting on Monday 30th January 2017 with Eva Fernandes who was the Business Manager for the G Bird Group and discuss with her if she wished to join the NP as the Business Rep.

7. Discussion on the Budget Situation and the Future of Neighbourhood Partnerships (agenda item no. 7)

The Neighbourhood Co-ordinator advised the NP that a large part of the Council budget had been frozen as a result of the financial crisis with which it was faced, including Neighbourhood Partnerships. Very significant cuts (96% of the current budget) were proposed to the NP programme across the city.

Members noted the following situation in terms of remaining funding which was available in addition to different proposals for future arrangements:

- (1) £350,000 across the city remained for Small Grants, from which £30,000 was currently available for BCR NP. However, proposed cuts of £100,000 would result in the remaining £250,000 being transferred to a Central Grant Fund to be managed by the Quartet Foundation;
- (2) Every small grant previously agreed for this financial year had been paid. However, whilst the funding had been provided, there was frequently no longer any resource to deliver the necessary work ie tree planting, road schemes, playgrounds for parks. Nevertheless, due to the current situation, some officers temporarily had more time than before to help with implementation of these projects since they had been removed from other work;
- (3) It was noted, for example, that trees would not be planted until the next planting season (ie not until December 2017 to March 2018);
- (4) Only £223.48 of CIL was available for use by the NP. Section 106 funding was, however, not part of the freeze;
- (5) The key decisions relating to the NP budget would be taken at Cabinet on 30th January 2017 and then at full Council on 21st February 2017. NP members were urged to make their views known at these meetings by submitting statements and questions as appropriate;
- (6) A meeting of Cabinet with stakeholders was taking place on 4th February 2017. However, the future of Neighbourhood Engagement remained uncertain;
- (7) This was a very difficult situation but did need some more clarity. It appeared that the approach was to allow local people throughout the city to decide whether or not they wanted to adopt a policy of future community engagement. In the meantime, measures were being put in place to set up a Bank Account and for officers to continue to provide support in the interim;
- (8) Any new measures may require a different geographic approach;
- (9) Local traders from the area had spoken to the Mayor to indicate that they had found the NP very useful to them;
- (10) Any successor body would operate in a different way. There would be less opportunities to contact Council officers and more responsibility for Councillors to ensure Neighbourhoods issues were dealt with and for groups requesting funding to take action themselves but given assistance where available. The financial status of groups such as VOSCUR and Quartet needed to be reviewed in view of the situation;
- (11) It was proposed that there would be no further funding for local traffic schemes, that the library service would be reduced to the Central Library only and that funding for the Parks would be budget neutral;
- (12) Some Councillors from the NP had attended the first meeting of the Task Group at which NPs had been invited to become involved in neighbourhood engagement through the establishment of a community interest company to run a hub and act as a local community association to promote development in an area. It was noted that most of the NO would be attending subsequent meetings of this group;
- (13) The Street Scene group already operated with a constitution and a bank account with the support of the Police and council officers. Any alternative arrangement would need to safeguard these arrangements. It was also noted that other groups such as Sustainable Redland and Bishopston, together with the Redland and Cotham Amenities Society, also operated under similar arrangements;

- (14) Whilst the BCR NP area was better resourced than other areas, the level of deprivation was not as high as other areas and, therefore, future support might be less likely. It was, therefore, important for the NP to demonstrate that there remained pockets of need which existed and which did still require support;
- (15) Any future organisation needed to be properly constituted and to provide an effective voice for the community.

8. Neighbourhood Co-ordinator's Report (agenda item no. 8)

NP members noted that £10,671.54 had already been allocated for the provision of improvements to Parks and Open Spaces within one mile of the former Kings Arms in Kingsdown and that, therefore, no decision was required.

Rob Umphray confirmed that discussions had taken place with Kurt James from the Cabinet Clean and Green Team and the Street Scene Group but had not been helpful.

A request had been made for a resource from Nordic Pioneer (similar to what had taken place in the Bear Pit and St Pauls) but nothing had yet been received.

Members noted that a decision would be required later in the meeting concerning what future meetings the NP should hold. In view of the former decision to stop the operation of NPs from the end of March 2017, it had been proposed that the 10th April 2017 meeting should be moved to 16th March 2017 and held at Redland Green School. In addition, a meeting should be provisionally booked for June 2017 pending decisions on future arrangements.

Councillor Combley moved, seconded by Councillor Brook and it was AGREED (UNANIMOUSLY) that the Neighbourhood Committee approves the release of £84,595.16 Section 106 funding for the new playground in Ashley Green Park.

Resolved by the Neighbourhood Partnership:

- (1) that the current budget of the NP be noted;**
- (2) that the latest meeting schedule of dates for Forums and NP meetings in 2016/17 be noted subject to a decision on future NP meetings being made under Agenda Item 10 (Date of Next Meeting);**
- (3) that the brief update regarding the Corporate Strategy be noted along with discussions regarding potential future governance models;**
- (4) that the recently launched Clean Streets Campaign is noted;**
- (5) that the recent case study report regarding the new playground at Ashley Green Park be noted;**
- (6) (unanimously) £5,000 Transformer's Youth Fund is accepted and administered through the small grants process as per the conditions within the report**

Resolved by the Neighbourhood Committee: (unanimously) that £84,595.16 worth of Section 106 funds are released for the new playground in Ashley Green Park.

Action: Andrew McGrath

9. Street Scene Working Group (agenda item no. 9a)

Rob Umphray gave the above report and made the following points:

- (1) 250 litres of paint had been used for this group's work in the last 12 months;
- (2) He noted the NP's thanks to him and Liz Kew and to Community Payback for their work;
- (3) A great deal of work was being carried out to address issues like fly tipping and it was, therefore, disappointing that the work it did was sometimes seen as a cost not an asset. Volunteers report that

Bristol Waste were dropping less recycling and a bin had been recently replaced outside the Quaker Meeting House in Gloucester Road;

(4) At least an extra 1.5 people simply to keep Gloucester Road free of graffiti. The continuation of work to control graffiti and tagging was at huge risk;

(5) No survey work could be done in Kingsdown as originally hoped until there was much greater clarity concerning the future for the existing work.

The Chair pointed out that the greatest success of this group's work was the combination of Councillors, the Police and officers working together.

10 Sustainable Transport Working Group (agenda item no. 9b)

The Chair introduced this report and made the following points:

(1) It would not be possible to fund Traffic Road Schemes in future if the proposed NP budget reductions went ahead;

(2) The Group had decided to recommend the following schemes for approval even if no resources were available as they placed a marker for what the NP's priorities were at the moment;

(3) Cranbrook Road Crossing – the results of the traffic monitoring set out in the addendum report indicated that at the crossing points on the monitored junction sites showed a very high usage, particularly at rush hour (9am in the morning) with 12% of vehicles exceeding 30mph;

(4) Church Road – the proposed one way markings to encourage cars to slow down were not popular. There has been a clear preference for the road to be closed to through traffic. Whilst this scheme was a very good candidate to proceed, further consultation with details were required;

(5) Ralph Road/Muller Road Crossing – This could be done as minor works by building out the south corner of the junction;

(6) Hampton Road Crossing Haloes – Approval of the £2,000 scheme was recommended in principle. However, since most of the CIL budget was frozen, only £223.48 was available and it would require further funding to become available to fund this

(7) NPs were requested to endorse these schemes as needing to be carried out and sending details to Senior Highways Officers and the relevant Cabinet Member (Councillor Bradshaw).

NP members made the following points:

(8) It was very disappointing that these schemes had not been possible to implement at the very last stage. Hopefully, funding will come from another source;

(9) There would be no team in future to support these type of local projects – a new channel was required to raise these types of issues which highlighted safety concerns about particular roads;

(10) In future, the role of Councillors and direct lobbying would be critical;

(11) £600 of Section 106 funding was still available from Parks;

(12) Since the Cabot Clifton and Harbourside Neighbourhood Partnership had an unallocated £256,000 of CIL available to them, they should be asked to pay for all of the required funding for the Hampton Road scheme which bordered both NPs

Resolved (unanimously) – that the Cabot Clifton and Harbourside Neighbourhood Partnership be requested to fund the complete cost of the £2,000 Hampton Road scheme and that support for the remaining schemes listed above (Cranbrook Road Crossings, Church Road, Ralph Road/Muller Road) be endorsed as needing to be carried out and details sent to Senior Highways Officers and the relevant Cabinet Member (Councillor Bradshaw)

Action: The Chair (Hampton Road reference to CCH NP) and Andrew McGrath

11 Parks Working Group Report (agenda item no. 9c)

Alison Bromilow introduced this report and pointed out that there remained £8564.64 within the Section 106 budget. She suggested that the NP identify the Bench Renovation and the Cotham Garden Play equipment as two schemes that the NP favours. She confirmed that discussions were taking place with the Play Officer to develop a scheme with a private company.

Resolved (unanimously) – that the Neighbourhood Partnership approves putting forward the above two schemes for possible consideration at the proposed June 2017 meeting.

Action: Andrew McGrath

12 Report of the Small Grants Working Group (agenda item no. 9d)

Jenny Hoadley confirmed that 8 applicants for small grants which had been frozen. However, £5,000 was available from the Transformer Fund from the Police for use.

The NP noted that TIGER was a gender equality promotion scheme in Redland Green School.

Resolved (unanimously) by the Neighbourhood Partnership:

- (1) that the Transformer Fund be devolved to Neighbourhood Partnerships from the Police service, aimed at services for young people, be allocated to the following applicants which had originally applied to the Small Grants Fund: Golden Hill Community Garden (£2,900) and TIGER (£2,900);**
- (2) that the remaining £176 be split equally between both of the above applicants;**
- (3) that the remaining six applicants be invited to re-apply to the Small Grants Fund if the Small Grants Fund becomes available in the future.**

Action: Andrew McGrath

13 Date of Next Meeting (agenda item no. 10)

It was agreed that the original proposed next NP date of 10th April 2017 be replaced with a meeting at 6.30pm on Thursday 16th March 2017 at Redland Green School immediately followed by a meeting of the BCR Neighbourhood Forum at 7pm which would be attended by Sue Mountstevens, Avon and Somerset Police Commissioner.

It was noted that the NF meeting would include discussion as to how the community can put forward any future views on how their views can be taken account in any successor structures.

Action: Andrew McGrath and Jeremy Livitt

14 Any Other Business (agenda item no.)

Councillor Martin Fodor advised NP members that the shell of the new build had been handed over to be fitted out as a library – the shelving had been in store for 2 years waiting for the building.

Councillor Tom Brook advised that the old library site in Cheltenham Road would be closing on 28th February 2017. It was hoped that the final works for the Bishopston Library site would be carried out in 2 to 3 weeks, to be fitted up and opened within 4 to 6 weeks.

Meeting ended at 9.00 pm

CHAIR _____

Agenda Item 6(a)

BCR NP Parks Report for March 2017 meeting.

The corporate strategy proposes that Parks will in the future run at no cost to the council. Parks groups representatives from BCR parks attended the Bristol Parks Forum meeting on 28 January 2017 to discuss this with other parks groups.

The BPF committee has met with the Cabinet Member for Parks, and shared the parks groups' concerns about the viability of this proposal. They have responded to the corporate strategy consultation and through the Scrutiny Commission.

At the BCC/ Locality meeting on 4 February, it was suggested that all communities can generate funding for local parks by taking on responsibility for their community buildings, through Community Asset Transfer, or building new community assets on unused green space in the area, and running businesses that will bring in an income. We pointed out that this was not going to be possible in our area. This seemed to be the only option presented by Locality.

BPF is networking with other parks and green space groups and organisations across the country, where a number of studies have already been done into management models for parks. So far, no solution has been found which does not include council funding support.

The budget implications are already being felt. High Kingsdown Residents Association has been told that their plans to replace some sections of tarmac hard surface with grass will not be allowed by BCC because it would necessitate more maintenance. This of course does not align with the wider aspiration to increase green infrastructure in the city for a number of flood management, health and wildlife aspirations. This is a project partly funded by BCRNP grant.

The Cotham Gardens and Lovers' Walk bench project, which was to be jointly funded by RCAS and BCR NP has not progressed following a meeting with the new Parks officer on 13 December 2016, where the full survey and conditions audit was passed to the officer for action.

Alison Bromilow
28 February 2017



MY NEIGHBOURHOOD



AGENDA ITEM NO.

Bishopston, Cotham and Redland NEIGHBOURHOOD PARTNERSHIP

Monday 16th March 2017

Report of: Andrew McGrath – Communities & Neighbourhoods

Title: Neighbourhood Co-ordinator

Contact Telephone Number: 0117 9036436

RECOMMENDATIONS. The NP is asked:

1. To **note** the current budget of the NP
2. To **note** the brief update relating to parks' schemes in BCR with regard to the budget cuts
3. To **note** the brief update regarding Gloucester Road Library and potential future use
4. To **note** the discussion paper on potential funding for local engagement models following the end of NPs in June

1. Budget update

Please see appendix 1 for the final account of the NP following the budget freeze. The only agreements made at the January meeting on funds in the general budget were for the additional £5,000 Transformers Fund. As we know, with the exception of S106 & CIL, no more money is available to the NP. New arrangements regarding the future influencing of decisions on S106 and CIL are currently being discussed. Please see 4 below.

The table below outlines what each working group has committed/spent against its spend limit. The figures match those in the budget update

Working Group	Spend limit for 2016/17	Notes
Street Scene	£16,973.50	£5,000 2016/17 + £2,083.50 c/f approved at the April NP for 2016/17 + £3,000 for Kingsdown – (June NP) +£6,890 (Oct NP)
Sustainable Travel	£37,000	£30k for Sommerville Rd project, £3,000 committed (June NP)
Trees	£7,782	All committed
Young People	£1,000	c/f from 2015/16. Overseen by C&E working group. Not spent
Communication & Engagement	£3,250	£2,500 committed to community fair costs at June NP (inc £2,100 for small grants process)
Parks	£57,842	£48,342 approved and committed (inc £7,842 RCAS play equipment)
Small Grants	£30,000	£18,494.44 allocated at June and Oct NPs Includes the Transformers Fund
TOTALS	£148,847.50	Agreed expenditure = £132,091.94

2. Future investment in parks and green spaces- play and access programme.

The Council will be making considerable savings up to 2020, as outlined in the new corporate strategy. This is going to have a significant impact on levels of investment in parks.

It is proposed that only those projects fully funded by S106, CIL or other external funding such as charitable trusts will included in the **2017/18 parks play and access programmes**.

The table below shows which projects are proceeding as the NP has identified and allocated funding. The access project identified by BCC Parks is on hold as the whole Parks access budget has been taken away. Future parks management arrangements may enable this project to be revisited (please see Alison's Park update).

BCC Parks Source	Project	Work type	Funding	Status
Play Priorities	High Kingsdown play ground - contribution to new playground	Play	S106/NP/CIL	Funding Secured
Play Priorities	Noticeboards in Ashley down green - 2 noticeboards for new play area	Play	CIL	Funding Secured
Play Priorities	benches for Cotham Gardens/Lovers' Walk - New accessible benches	Play	CIL	Funding Secured
Parks Access work				
Parks Central 2017/18	Access/Roads/Tracks	Access	Access Fund	Funding required

3. Gloucester Road Library

A group of reps and councillors recently met with the Head of BCC Library Service, Kate Murray, and other officers, to discuss future arrangements for the new library. The good news is that the library will open at some point in April (barring unforeseen problems). It will operate on the same hours as the, now closed, Cheltenham Road Library.

The NP is very keen to ensure that the new library is available to residents for activities additional to those provided by the Library Service. Kate is equally keen and will provide help to residents to set up a Friends group. With the NP going, whatever organisation follows may wish to involve itself in the potential opportunities the library building provides, perhaps as a hub for the community.

What isn't known at present is what the long term future holds for the library. A citywide consultation is to be conducted for 12 weeks starting in late May to gather ideas and concerns from residents across Bristol. The consultation is being conducted in the context of the severe cuts to the Library Service's budget (30%). Residents will be presented with options for their local and the city wide library provision. The long-term future of Gloucester Road Library cannot be considered until the consultation analysis is complete; probably in early autumn.

The NP may wish to consider recommending making the future use of this library a priority for a new community partnership, should one be formed.

4. The future of Neighbourhood Partnerships – local decision making models for discussion

In late February, councillors were asked to attend meetings to discuss the finances relating to local governance models once NPs disappear. The paper from these meetings are reproduced below. NP members are reminded that this is only a discussion document and carries no formal status at present. The NP is asked to **discuss** the paper and to **give its views** on the draft proposals. These views will be used to inform the next steps on this matter.

The future of Neighbourhood Partnerships – local decision making models for discussion

This paper sets out a number of ideas. We would like your feedback and suggestions. These are not fully worked up proposals. We understand there will be lots of questions about how things will work in practice. We are looking to develop these ideas and proposals with you. There will be time to work on the detail. During March we would like to have conversation about the broad ideas.

There will be a formal consultation which will start in May. This initial discussion is about helping us develop proposals which we can then consult on.

We would like feedback about these proposals and options by 7th April at the latest. We will be arranging a meeting with ward councillors to follow up these discussions. Please use this document to respond to each option or state your preferred option.

At the end of this document you will find some 'useful information' links where you will find some background information.

Priorities

- Retain access to some funding, especially in areas of most need
- Enable decisions about the local portion of CIL and other neighbourhood decisions to be made/informed locally
- find a mechanism that does not heavily involve paperwork for making local decisions

Options

A – Community 'Spaces'

There is a clear steer based on feedback from members that retaining something similar to a forum function is a priority. The proposal is to set aside £14k from the

£271k remaining in the neighbourhood budget to support this, and for the money to be given to a nominated community organisation in the area so the community space is organised locally. Council colleagues will help where this is needed in the transition period as resources allow. Councillors will decide which community organisation will receive the funding to run the community space. This could be based on agreed criteria.

Option A1: To offer £200/£400/£600 per ward to organise 2 community events / spaces per year. This would be a universal offer across the city for every ward. Total cost £14,000 from the remaining budget. £200 would be offered to one councillor wards, £400 to two councillor wards and £600 to three councillor wards. For example, we know that St George want to keep the same boundaries and create a community partnership, this area would receive £800 to run their community spaces.

Option A2: To offer £1000 per existing NP rather than a set amount per ward. Universal offer across all NPs based on existing boundaries. Total cost £14,000.

B – Local decisions and allocation of funding

The way funding is currently devolved to members required a paperwork-heavy bureaucratic process. The important thing is for members (using feedback from local people) to inform the decisions in public on local relevant things, and for this to be something that a wider range of local people want to be part of.

C – Neighbourhood Funding

C.1 Neighbourhood budget (£271k minus £14k for community space costs and £7k for annual public event costs = £250k)

Option C1.1:

- £1,250 (one councillor ward) /£2,500 (two councillor ward) /£3,750 (three councillor ward) to be available each year to every ward that has access to less than £30k in CIL money via their community space. The money would be given to a local organisation chosen by the ward members and the idea would be that the money is then allocated via arrangements such as community soup* that engage with local people.
- Cost = up to £87.5k
- The remaining money (£169.5k+) to be distributed across the 42 LSOA in 10% most deprived (2015 data) for all areas that have less than £30k in CIL available in their community space area. For example, £4k per LSOA = Approximately £28k in Hartcliffe & Witherwood. Cost = £168k.
- Total cost = up to £253k

NB CIL threshold needs to be considered so that it doesn't disadvantage wards that are working together and we don't create more back office administration. At the moment CIL is allocated by NP area – this needs more thought.

Option C 1.2

- Same as above but with amended thresholds / amounts?

S106 and CIL decision making

There is only one option being proposed – this is based on what is possible with future resources and funding. **The proposal for the future is for an annual public event to take place where all of the community spaces can come together over a wider geographical area (North, East/Central, South).** It would be in this setting that allocation of funding takes place. In order to reduce the need for paperwork, and to allow flexibility, the decisions may not be legally devolved in the same way as they are currently, but any formal sign off would require the allocation decided at this meeting to be honoured unless there were legal implications. Formal sign off might sit with Cabinet Members, the Mayor or a combination of members and officers. This is being explored.

Cost: this will need some officer support (perhaps through democratic services using the time that is spent on current NP meetings?). There may also be venue costs. The proposal is to use the remaining £38k in the NP budget on officer support for these meetings, and allocate up to £7k a year from the £271k Neighbourhood budget for costs associated with these events.

C2: Section 106 budgets

Important context: since the introduction of CIL, the law now says that s106 must be very specific about the mitigation measure and the location, so new s106 agreements do not have much real decision making associated with them.

Option C2.1: No local allocation of remaining s106 budgets - officers / Cabinet leads in consultation with ward members prioritise and deliver works

Option C2.2:

- Allocate remaining flexible s106 budgets at the annual public event (North, East/Central, South). These will tail off towards zero over time due to the newer s106 rules.
- Remove local decision making on s106 budgets that are very specific and therefore don't have any real decision making associated with them (e.g. installing a pedestrian crossing at a set location) – these decisions to go back to officers / Cabinet leads.

Option C.2.3: Allocate/prioritise all local s106 agreements at the annual public events (North, East/Central, South).

C3: CIL budgets

The way that the local component of CIL can be spent has two main constraints. The first is that the CIL must be spent on measures to support the growth of the area, and the second is that the CIL must be spent in accordance with the wishes of the local community (i.e. the community that the development that paid the CIL is located within or near). There are no specific geographical limits to this, but it is clear that CIL cannot be spent in a way that does not relate to the wishes of the community in or near to the development that paid the CIL (for example, it would be difficult to show that money from a development in the city centre could be spent legitimately on the outskirts of the city).

However, there is a case to be made that the money can be invested more widely than the current geographical areas imposed via Neighbourhood Partnerships. For example, if there are fewer libraries or other public facilities in the future, a case could be made for spending CIL money on facilities that are some distance away from the development – further than the existing NP boundaries. The options below try to take this into account.

The method of allocation is not specified here. It could be through direct allocation at meetings, or through an application process (this would need to be done via a third party as there will be little officer resource to manage these process in the future – and may involve a percentage of the money to be paid in a fee).

Areas with Neighbourhood Development Plans (these are formal plans which are part of the Localism Act) receive an additional 10% and would expect the full 25% to benefit the plan area. It is proposed that allocation of the CIL attached to NDPs is made within the community space covering that area.

For example, CIL allocations connected with the Old Market Neighbourhood Development Plan would be made by Councillors in the community space covering Lawrence Hill.

Option C3.1: Allocate CIL spend at the annual public event (North, East/Central, South). 50% of the local element of CIL is to be spent in the community space area (ideally 2 or more wards but this will be locally determined also some areas may decide ward boundaries do not work for them) with 50% to be spent over a wider geographical area on anything that can legitimately be connected to supporting the growth of the wider area and the rules of CIL. Councillors will need to agree area wide priorities for spend.

Option C3.2: Allocate CIL spend at the annual public event (North, East/Central, South) according to member discretion and planning/legal advice. No specific geographic parameters would be set in advance, the responsibility would sit with the

councillors to ensure that the CIL spend could be directly be connected to supporting the growth of the area.

Option C3.3: Allocate CIL spend in the same way as current arrangements – i.e. according to existing NP boundaries. The process for this would have to be managed locally as there is no allocated resource for managing this.

Some worked examples based on some of the NPs that have started to decide their future

(Please note the budgets are based on spend commitments as known on 1st Feb)

St George Community Partnership (2 x one councillor wards, 1 x two councillor ward)

- St George are planning to keep the current geographical boundary and form an open community partnership, independent of the council and working collaboratively with councillors and local people.

Budgets available to St George Community Partnership if the suggested options are taken

- £800 for running the community spaces
- £18,000 in CIL to spend in the Community Partnership area
- £5000 neighbourhood budget, allocated via community soup / at community space events / other allocation methods
- Access to additional funding (CIL, s106) and participation in budgeting and decision making at the annual event for East/Central area.

Bishopston, Cotham and Redland Neighbourhood Partnership (3 x two councillor wards)

- BCR are planning to keep the same geographical boundaries and build on the success of some of their recent community events and grant allocation events. Councillors and local residents are currently working together on the plans.

Budgets available to BCR if the suggested options are taken:

- £1,200 for running the community spaces
- £6,000 in CIL to spend in the Neighbourhood Partnership area
- £7,500 neighbourhood budget, allocated via community soup / at community space events / other allocation methods
- Access to additional funding (CIL, s106) and participation in budgeting and decision making at the annual event for North area.

Greater Bedminster Community Partnership (2 x two councillor wards).

- Greater Bedminster have been a strong, independent community partnership for many years who also took on the role of the Neighbourhood Partnership. They will continue to retain the community partnership.

Budgets available to Greater Bedminster Community Partnership if the suggested options are taken

- £800 for running the community spaces
- £55k in CIL to spend in the Community Partnership area
- Access to additional funding (CIL, s106) and participation in budgeting and decision making at the annual event for South area.

You can find further information about Neighbourhood Development Plans, Bristol's approach to CIL and what we know about 'deprivation' in the city by following the links below:

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2>

<https://www.bristol.gov.uk/planning-and-building-regulations/community-infrastructure-levy>

<https://www.bristol.gov.uk/statistics-census-information/deprivation>

* **Community Soup** – this is based on the idea of 'Bristol Soup', a community-led project which support micro grants. People get together to have a light meal of soup. Everyone pays for the meal. This fund is then available to groups who present their 'ask' to the people gathered. The winning idea receives the finding and come back at a later date to share what happened. In Bristol this has led to groups receiving further funding and 'in kind' support. Crucially it minimises paperwork and is about local people deciding what's important.

<https://bristolsoup.wixsite.com/home>

Neighbourhood Partnership transition – timeline DRAFT (1st March 2017)

This timeline is evolving and changing but it gives an idea of direction of travel and key milestones. We welcome feedback at forthcoming councillor and partnership meetings.

Action	Outcome	Timescale
<p>Transition phase 1 – up to 12 week piece of work within each np area to consider priorities and options for the way forward. Support from the neighbourhoods team could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) make links with groups/activists that may not be involved b) Have a full picture of the assets and resources 	<p>This will result in a transition plan which will set out what communities and wanting/willing to do, where you want to be by 31st March 2018 and the help you think you will need to get there.</p>	<p>4th Feb – 28th April 2017</p>

Action	Outcome	Timescale
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> c) Agree priorities. d) Understand the risks. e) City-wide networking/learning event/s. f) Organisational governance 		
Draft proposals and options to support local decision making and resource allocation including S106 and CIL to be considered by Councillors and NPs/communities and feedback ideas and suggestions.	These early discussions will inform firm proposals for consultation in May. BCC receive feedback 7th April, work up firm proposals during April for consultation starting mid May.	Cllr meetings – Feb/March NP meetings/local discussions – March Feedback by 7 th April
Set up 1 hr Cllr meetings every 4 weeks? (<i>What works?</i>)	Feedback/information sharing	Regular meeting
NP Team reduced by approximately 7 full time equivalent colleagues. Reallocation of team resource to support the transition process.	Reduction of officer support for NP transition process.	Process underway timescale depends on staff securing other roles – early part of 2017/18
Establish transition support group with partners.	Joint planning and pooling of resources so we can respond effectively to requests for support	March 2017
Discussions with equalities communities and young people (via the voice and influence groups and Youth Council) about	Develop ideas about how we can work together to inspire and involve diverse communities to be involved in and feel some ownership of neighbourhood conversations	March/April 2017 agree a way of working together.
Neighbourhoods Scrutiny		31 st March 2017
<i>City wide networking event</i>	<i>Information sharing /Networking between areas. Consider feedback re decision making options/proposals Is this helpful?</i>	<i>Wk. com 3rd April TBC (2 hours evening)</i>
Transition plan complete	All NP areas will have a transition plan showing key actions and support needed between May and March 2018.	Complete by 30 th April 2017
BCC consider transition plans and with partners put together support package.	Offer of support for May 2017- March 2018.	Review plans wk. com 1 st May Respond wk com 8 th May 2017
<i>Citywide networking event –</i>	<i>Proposal of support in response to transition plans. Networking & information sharing - what would be needed?</i>	Wk. com 15 May 2017

Action	Outcome	Timescale
Start of consultation on decision making/neighbourhood budget and s106/CIL proposals		May 2017
Final NP meetings/Introduce new community space format where possible.	Introduction of new way of working	June 2017
End of consultation	Consideration of feedback/revise and produce confirmed proposals	August 2017
Implement new arrangements		September 2017
Citywide networking event		Wk. com 11 th September
<i>SUBJECT TO CONSULTATION Introduction of new neighbourhood arrangements - annual area events: north/south/central & east</i>		<i>September/Oct 2017 –held at the same time each year.</i>
<i>SUBJECT TO CONSULTATION Community space (1) takes place</i>		<i>Commencing Dec/Jan (Timings of meetings to be locally determined)</i>
Transition phase 2 – Delivery of action plans with agreed support		May 2017 – 31 st March 2018
Wider ‘neighbourhoods’ conversation including libraries, parks and community asset transfer		May 2017 – 31 st March 2018

BCR NP Running Budget update

<u>Income</u>	B/Ffrom 2015-16	New in 2016-17	Total for 2016-17
Transformer Fund		5,000.00	5,000.00
General budget	7,512.00	31,500.00	39,012.00
Highways budget	55,215.00	25,714.00	80,929.00
Narrow Estates budget		4,029.00	4,029.00
	<u>62,727.00</u>	<u>66,243.00</u>	<u>128,970.00</u>
Other			
RCAS Play equipment	7,842.00		7,842.00
Winning Whiteladies repayment		1,109.97	1,109.97
	<u>7,842.00</u>	<u>1,109.97</u>	<u>8,951.97</u>
Sub total	<u>70,569.00</u>	<u>67,352.97</u>	<u>137,921.97</u>
Section 106			
Trees	4,653.83		4,653.83
Parks	8,564.64		8,564.64
	<u>13,218.47</u>		<u>13,218.47</u>
CIL			
Remaining at 1 April	13,690.36		13,690.36
Additional to 31 July		13,043.31	13,043.31
	<u>13,690.36</u>	<u>13,043.31</u>	<u>26,733.67</u>
Sub total	<u>26,908.83</u>	<u>13,043.31</u>	<u>39,952.14</u>
Total	<u>97,477.83</u>	<u>80,396.28</u>	<u>177,874.11</u>

Expenditure	NP Limit	VC/NP* Approved	From CIL	From S.106	Date
Highways Scheme - Sommervil	30,000.00	30,000.00			26.1.15
Communications & Engageme	3,250.00				20.6.16
Community Fair		2,500.00			20.6.16
	<u>3,250.00</u>	<u>2,500.00</u>			
Parks					
RCAS Play equipment	7,842.00	7,842.00			C/F
	50,000.00			8,564.64	10.10.16
Ashley Down Green		3,500.00	3,500.00		10.10.16
Cotham Gardens		11,000.00	11,000.00		10.10.16
High Kingsdown play		26,000.00	5,717.00		10.10.16
	<u>57,842.00</u>	<u>48,342.00</u>			
Small Grants	20,000.00				11.4.16
	5,000.00				20.6.16
Chandos Rd Cty Assoc		876.00	876.00		20.6.16
Golden Hill Cty Garden		1,640.00	-		20.6.16
Playing Out		2,340.00	-		20.6.16
Redland Parish Church		2,000.00	2,000.00		20.6.16
SusBish/Living Room		3,000.00	2,200.00		20.6.16
Glos Rd Central banners		4,820.00			10.10.16
TIGER - gender equality		1,924.44			10.10.16
WIAS - women &		1,894.00			10.10.16
Transformers Fund* (NP decision)		5,000.00			23.01.17
	<u>25,000.00</u>	<u>23,494.44</u>			
Street Scene	8,000.00				20.6.16
Approved from 2015/16	2,083.50	2,083.50	-		20.6.16
Current year		5,000.00	300.00		20.6.16
Kingsdown street scene		3,000.00	-		20.6.16
Additional current year	6,890.00	6,890.00			10.10.16
	<u>16,973.50</u>	<u>16,973.50</u>			
Sustainable Travel	7,000.00				20.6.16
Minor signs, lines, etc		2,000.00			20.6.16
Forecourt cycle stands		1,000.00			20.6.16
	<u>7,000.00</u>	<u>3,000.00</u>			
Trees					20.6.16
Redland House	4,653.83	4,653.83		4,653.83	20.6.16
	3,128.17	3,128.17			
	<u>7,782.00</u>	<u>7,782.00</u>			
Young People	1,000.00				20.6.16
	<u>148,847.50</u>	<u>132,091.94</u>	<u>25,593.00</u>	<u>13,218.47</u>	
Unallocated	29,026.61				