



**Greater Fishponds Neighbourhood Partnership**  
**7.00 pm, 23 March 2017**

**Present:**

\* De-notes apologies/absent

**Ward Councillors**

- \* Councillor Lesley Alexander, Frome Vale;
- \* Councillor Nicola Bowden-Jones, Frome Vale;
- Councillor Craig Cheney, Hillfields;
- Councillor Anna Keen, Hillfields;
- Councillor Sultan Khan, Eastville;
- \* Councillor Mhairi Threlfall, Eastville;

**Partners**

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

- \* Kate Brook
- \* Ben Cattle
- Leigh Cooper
- Hazel Durn
- \* Joseph Glasgow
- \* Joseph Hassell
- Scott Jacobs-Lange
- Mo Lewis
- Tony Locke
- Mark Logan
- \* David Mock
- Yvonne Sadler
- George Sloan
- Mike Tuohy
- Mary Wellbourne
- Brian Smith
- Tony Creasy
- Rick Lovering
- Richard Scantlebury
- \* Anthony Westhall - A&S Police
- \* Deborah Yeates – A&S Police

**Also in Attendance:-**

Abdulrazak Dahir, Neighbourhood Partnership Co-ordinator

**1. Chairing Arrangements (agenda item no. 1)**

Tony Locke as Chair of NP. Councillor Khan as Chair of NC.

**2. Welcome, Introductions and Safety Information (agenda item no. 2)**

These were done.

**3. Apologies for Absence and Substitutions (agenda item no. 3)**

These were received from Councillors Threlfall, Bowden-Jones and Alexander and from Yvonne Sadler.

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

There were none.

**5. Minutes of Previous Meeting (agenda item no. 5)**

These were agreed as a correct record. The Action Tracker was noted. Discussion took place regarding the need for greater clarity regarding the use of CIL. The NP Co-ordinator stated that this was officially the last meeting and there would be a Transitional Work Plan which should allow for a better and more transparent approach to CIL to be developed and adopted.

**RESOLVED – that the minutes were agreed and signed by the Chair.**

**6. Bristol Waste Company Report (agenda item no. 6)**

This was an update on Stapleton Road recycling and refuse collection pilot project which started in October 2016 in order to respond to complaints from members and residents regarding fly tipping near communal bins and poor waste management in the area. The representatives of Bristol Waste Company reported that as a result of the pilot there had been an increase of recycling rates, an improvement in

residents' management of waste and a reduction in street cleansing. Bristol Waste had worked closely with enforcement officers to bring about these changes. The pilot was therefore considered to be a success and it was recommended that the arrangements be adopted for a longer term in the area.

The following comments arose from discussion:-

1. Councillor Keen had noticed dramatic improvements in the last month as a result of the range of measures, adding that this helped restore pride to an area. She asked whether there had been any feedback regarding retail businesses becoming responsible for keeping tidy the space outside their shop. She was informed that as part of a trial in BS5 the Business Improvement District had agreed a business pledge which covered this matter. She suggested that the results of this trial be reported before rolling it out in other areas;
2. Bristol Waste had knocked on doors in the area to inform residents that they could request nets or lids for their recycling box in order to prevent waste blowing away. Inevitably some of this was as a result of Bristol Waste collectors failing to pick up waste that had dropped. This was not good for the brand and a behaviour change plan was planned for collectors. If road names were supplied, it was possible to find out which crew had worked there;
3. A resident asked what the position was regarding private land being used by the public as a dumping ground, and used, as an example, pub car parks. She added that she had previously moved waste to a public area and then reported it to Bristol Waste to collect. In response, she heard that Bristol Waste had no contract to go onto private land and health and safety issues also prevented them becoming involved. It was a matter for Council enforcement officers;
4. It would not be possible to pre-label bins for each household as it would be too costly and time consuming to deliver. Consideration was being given to making stickers available online for community groups to improve areas;
5. It was the responsibility for householders to look after their waste. Bristol Waste would not collect black bin side waste;
6. It was noted that it was not possible to compare recycling rates to other areas with a scheme as it was only relevant to households with bins and not black bags;
7. It was not intended to roll out the pilot significantly but individual streets would be targeted in the future. Bristol Waste worked with community engagement teams in communicating with Councillors and residents for particular areas;
8. It was not possible to comment on the reaction of individuals or businesses at the receipt of a fixed penalty notice as this was undertaken by enforcement;
9. On being put to the vote, the NP was unanimously in favour of retaining the pilot.

**RESOLVED – that the new collection method is adopted for the longer term in this area.**

## **7. Future of GFNP (agenda item no. 8)**

It was agreed to amend the order of the agenda.

At this point, Councillor Cheney arrived.

1. The Neighbourhood Co-ordinator referred to the report of the Transitional Working Group. Noting its complexities, he also referred to a simplified version prepared by Neighbourhood Officers. He added that the aim is to instigate discussions and entails the offer the City Council was making to groups succeeding NPs.
2. Councillor Keen observed that some of the information in the summarised papers was not accurate;

3. Regarding the community space event, it was noted that the Council was not being prescriptive but it was essentially a Neighbourhood Forum type meetings, though there was a need for further information on links and processes;
4. Councillor Keen observed that Greater Fishponds would be better off if it accepted the £200 per Councillor option as it had 6 Councillors. Some areas of Bristol would be worse off if Option 1 was used;
5. In order to influence future arrangements, members were asked to give feedback to their ward Councillor by 7 April;
6. Councillor Khan stated that it would be better if CIL money went into one central pot and was divided to all wards equally despite where the CIL originated. The rules regarding CIL were vague as it stated the monies had to be used in the 'community' so it could be used nearby but not too far;
7. Councillor Cheney stated that the rules regarding Section 106 monies were very specific in that they could only be spent in the ward the development was located. He believed there were big gains with CIL if the right decision was made;
8. Councillor Keen reported that there were legal arguments being made at Cabinet/Mayor level regarding the redistribution of CIL funds according to areas of deprivation, noting how central areas with high levels of development received huge sums of CIL;
9. It was noted that NPs were still being asked to give up 7.5% of their CIL budget. The options available were to give up the allocation to the wider community pot, to share out fairly, to continue as now;
10. It was generally felt that an annual event was unworkable;
11. It was important that the open forum events represented all areas in a community so that resource followed need. It was important to find a way to encourage individuals from unrepresented areas to become involved;
12. There was a need for community space events to move away from the current mould and become more 'fun';
13. It was noted that a Citywide event would take place on 5 April at 6.30 in City Hall. This was an opportunity to feed in and influence the agenda.

**RESOLVED – that the report be noted.**

## **8. NP Business Report (agenda item no. 7)**

### **Part 1: Traffic and Transport Update.**

It was reported that the Subgroup had decided that it wished to continue to operate with a more focussed remit.

### **Part 2: Environment Subgroup.**

1. It was reported that Fishponds Park previously received £20,000 from the Parks Play Fund, however due to BCC budget cuts this has been withdrawn. The Environment Subgroup supported proposal to use S106 and CIL monies to deliver Fishpond Park Play project;
2. Concern was expressed by a NP member, in relation to the NP priority for a skateboard park at Hillfields Park, that the applicant FLAG was not a charity but a commercial organisation which was not normally funded from public funds. In addition, it was unclear if this was wanted as there was no evidence of consultation and the location was questionable. It therefore appeared odd that it was being pushed through;

3. The NP Co-ordinator in response stated that FLAG is a not for profit organisation that had raised £46,000 for the project and asked for the NP's assistance on the basis of increasing their funding. He accepted the point regarding consultation and stated that he will feedback to the group about the consultation. However the status of organisation is similar to other previously funded groups;
4. The Neighbourhood Officer added that consultation had taken place some years ago and then again recently in the Youth Hub. It was decided not to consult more widely and raise hopes if it was unsuccessful but local residents were spoken to;
5. It was agreed that the governance document, the consultation document and procedures in relation to Council parks be made available to the NP. It was agreed that the decision to grant the funding should be subject to proof of governance;
6. It was noted that an additional £28,183.68 had been added to the CIL pot so that it stood at £148,950.46.

The Chair of the Neighbourhood Committee took the chair for voting.

On being put to the vote the following four activities were all unanimously agreed to be supported from the devolved CIL Budget. The Hillfields Park skateboard park funding being subject to having appropriate governance status.

#### 2016/17: CIL March 2017.

Activity	Amount requested	Amount granted
Fishponds Park Phase 1 development	£20,000	£20,000
Eastville Park Play including MUGA	£70,000	£70,000
Contribution to project management of skateboard park – Charlton Road, Hillfields Park	£10,000	£10,000
ParkWork – organise regular volunteer sessions in parks	£6,816	£6,816
		<b>Remaining CIL – £42,134.46</b>

On being put to the vote the following three activities were all unanimously agreed to be supported from the devolved S106 Budget. The Hillfields Park skateboard park funding being subject to having appropriate governance status.

**2016/16: Section 106 March 2017.**

Activity	Amount requested	Amount granted
Fishponds Park Phase 1 development	£11,395.29	£11,395.29
Eastville Park Play including MUGA	£16,113.06	£16,113.06
Contribution to project management of skateboard park – Charlton Road, Hillfields Park	£4,000	£4,000
		<b>Remaining S106 – £9,701.54</b>

**Action: NP Co-ordinator to circulate FLAG’s governance document, the skateboard proposal consultation and procedures in relation to Council parks.**

It was noted that the Environment Subgroup had decided that it wished to continue to operate.

NP Members took the opportunity to thank Councillors, the Chair and officers for their support to the Greater Fishponds Neighbourhood Partnership.

**9. Public Forum (agenda item no. 9)**

This was noted.

The meeting ended at 9.15pm

**CHAIR** \_\_\_\_\_

