



## Greater Fishponds Neighbourhood Partnership Agenda

**Date:** Thursday, 23 March 2017  
**Time:** 7.00 pm  
**Place:** The Vassall Centre, Gill Avenue, Bristol, BS16 2QQ

**1. Chairing Arrangements**

Tony Locke – Neighbourhood Partnership  
Councillor Khan – Neighbourhood Committee

**2. Welcome, Introductions and Safety Information (Pages 4 - 5)**

**3. Apologies for Absence and Substitutions**

**4. Declarations of Interest**

**5. Minutes of Previous Meeting (Pages 6 - 14)**

To agree the minutes of the previous meeting as a correct record.

**6. Bristol Waste Company Report (Pages 15 - 16) 7.10 pm**

Report of BWC – Tracy Croft.

**7. NP Business Report 7.25 pm**

Report of subgroups and NP Co-ordinator, Abdulrazak Dahir.

NC & NP decision and discussion :

- Section 106;
- CIL requests;
- Other NP Business

**8. Future of GFNP (Pages 17 - 25)**

8.05 pm

Report of Transitional Working Group

- Bristol City Council Offer;
- Proposals from Transitional Working Group.

**9. 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](mailto:democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk) and please note that the following deadlines will apply in relation to this meeting:-

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 5 pm on **17 March 2017**.

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 **22 March 2017**.

**10. Date of Next Meeting**

Thursday 21 July 2017 at 7pm.

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

Abdulrazak Dahir

Telephone : 0117 903 6409

e-mail : [abdulrazak.dahir@bristol.gov.uk](mailto:abdulrazak.dahir@bristol.gov.uk)

**The Democratic Services Officer of the meeting is**

Allison Taylor

Telephone : 0117 92 22237

e-mail : [democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk](mailto: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.

## Neighbourhood Partnerships

All members of the Neighbourhood Partnership (NP) must abide by the following fundamental values that underpin all the activity of the NP:

**Accountability** – Every decision and action undertaken by the NP will be able to stand the test of scrutiny by residents, Bristol City Council (BCC) (councillors and officers), service providers, the media, and any other interested party.

**Integrity and honesty** – All members of the NP are expected to undertake all duties (within the NP and externally) with integrity and honesty, and to always act within the law.

**Transparency** – The NP will maintain a practice of openness and will ensure that as much as possible of its work is available to public scrutiny.

**Equality** - All members of the NP agree to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation, and advance equality of opportunity between people from different groups and foster good relations between people from different groups in the NP

### **Councillors Code of Conduct for Members.**

This is currently set out in item 6 of the Neighbourhood Committee Terms of Reference:

---

*6.1 Neighbourhood Partnership Councillors shall comply with the Bristol City Council Elected Members' Code of Conduct and any other code of conduct of councilors which may be adopted by the council (eg. Officer member protocol).*

---

### **Anyone attending NP-related meetings and events should – :**

- Be courteous to all others during the meeting and allow each other the opportunity to speak
- Speak through the Chair and respect their role as meeting leader
- Keep to the subject being discussed
- Follow the guidance of the Chair in the conduct of the meeting

Personal attacks, harassment, bullying, offensive and abusive comments are not acceptable. Substantial breach of any of these points will result in the offender being asked to leave the meeting by the Chair or NPC.

**The Neighbourhood Committee** made up of the ward elected members make decisions on the funding and spend within each Neighbourhood Partnership, they can consider recommendations from the floor, sub groups and partners but they alone make the final decision

## **Public Sector Equality Duty**

Before making any decision, section 149 Equality Act 2010 requires the Neighbourhood Partnership to consider the need to promote equality for persons with the following “relevant protected characteristics”: **age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation.**

The Neighbourhood Partnership must, therefore, have due regard to the need to:

- Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation
- Advance equality of opportunity between different groups who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not share it.
- Foster good relations between different groups who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not share it.

*The duty to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination in the area of employment, also covers marriage and civil partnership*



## Greater Fishponds Neighbourhood Partnership 7.00 pm, 8 December 2016

### Present:

\* De-notes apologies/absent

### Ward Councillors

- Councillor Lesley Alexander, Frome Vale;
- \* Councillor Nicola Bowden-Jones, Frome Vale;
- Councillor Craig Cheney, Hillfields;
- Councillor Sultan Khan, Eastville;
- Councillor Anna Keen, Hillfields;
- \* 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
- \* Anthony Westhall
- Deborah Yeates
- Brian Smith
- Richard Scantlebury
- Viran Patel
- Rick Lovering

### Also in Attendance:-

Abdulrazak Dahir, Neighbourhood Partnership Co-ordinator  
Allison Taylor, Democratic Services Officer  
Lucy Touray, Creative Youth Network

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

These were done.

**2. Apologies for Absence and Substitutions (agenda item no. 2)**

These were received from Councillors Threlfall and Bowden-Jones, Yvonne Sadler, Tony Locke, Pauline Shaw and Fiona Gleed.

It was noted that David Mock would chair in the absence of Tony Locke.

### **3. Declarations of Interest (agenda item no. 3)**

There were none.

### **4. Minutes of Previous Meeting and Action Tracker (agenda item no. 4)**

The Action Tracker was noted.

Page 11, Part 5: Environment Subgroup. Table title should read 'NP Budget'. Delete word 'Environment'. The minutes were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair, subject to the amendment above.

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

### **5. First Bus (agenda item no. 5)**

It was reported that the representative from First Bus was not in attendance. The NP Co-ordinator would follow this up.

**Action: NP Co-ordinator to follow up non-attendance.**

### **6. Bristol Youth Link Update. (agenda item no. 6)**

Lucy Touray addressed the Partnership on the work of the organisation and the following points arose:-

- Individuals could be with the organisation for up to 12 weeks, some individuals needed more time. At the completion of working with an individual, the referrer is informed that contact had now stopped;
- Individuals were taught resilience and techniques to build their confidence;
- Councillor Keen acknowledged the invaluable work of the CYN which saved the authority expenditure. She added that many voluntary hours were given to individuals with complex needs. CYN is a huge asset in Hillfields ward.

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

#### **Part 1: Transformers Youth Fund:**

The Neighbourhood Partnership heard that Avon & Somerset Police Community Trust managed the Transformers fund, a small grant aimed at working with young people and delivering youth activities. It has proved difficult to attract enough projects so the Trust has decided to devolve £5000 to each of Bristol's NPs. The fund would be administered through the Wellbeing Small Grants Process, the spend would need to be allocated by March 17 and spent by end of March 18. Creative Youth Network agreed to provide support and facilitate a proposal to set-up young people led panel. The NP is asked to accept the funds and transfer to Creative Youth Network, subject to completing an application. The NP heard



from George Sloan, the Youth representative who explained that the aim was to create a group like the NP for young people with the aim of improving the community for people of their age.

The following points arose from discussion:-

- The NP Co-ordinator would monitor the funds and ensure there was an audit trail of spend. There was a social value impact which would also be monitored;
- When funds were made available, the structure and membership could be formed;
- They needed to be some level of accountability for the public;
- Immediate funds were needed for expenses such as travel and snacks.

The NP was asked to show their support for this proposal. It was unanimous.

### **Part 2: Wellbeing Grant Applications.**

The NP Co-ordinator reported that subsequent to the publication of these papers, there had been an immediate across the Council freeze on spending due to the current budget situation. This therefore meant that decisions could not be taken on the Wellbeing applications in these papers. S106 monies could still be spent and guidance was awaited regarding the spending of CIL monies.

The following points arose from discussion:-

- The Wellbeing applications approved at the last NP would be processed;
- The Council should look at all Wellbeing applications to see if S106 could be used instead. It was unfortunate that it would now be necessary to wait until March in order to determine if applications can be funded by S106 monies;
- Clarity regarding the use of CIL monies should be come quickly;
- It was agreed that the NP Co-ordinator would produce a note for the NP clarifying budget pots.

#### **Action: NP Co-ordinator to:-**

- **produce note confirming budget pots;**
- **To confirm if CIL can be used by the NP;**
- **To consider whether the applications not dealt with can be granted with S106 monies in light of frozen spending.**

### **Part 3: Traffic and Transport Update.**

It was noted that subgroup recommendations could not be considered due to the spend freeze.

### **Part 4: Environment Subgroup.**

The Neighbourhood Partnership agreed to note the proposals with respect to S106 funding for PROW improvements between St Matthias College Development and Halfpenny Bridge.

The Neighbourhood Committee were asked to approve the following :-

2016/17 S106 funding available for Roegate House, Whitefield Avenue, Speedwell £13, 133.75

<b>NP Priority</b>	<b>Works</b>	<b>Amount £</b>	<b>Balance £</b>
Priority 3 – Upgrade Play Facility in Fishponds Park	Improvements to Parks and Open Spaces within one mile of Roegate House	13, 133.75	00.00

On being put to the vote, this was carried unanimously.

The Chair referred to para. 20 concerning the replacement signage in the vicinity of the M32 Junction 2 roundabout to reflect the new roundabout layout and to carry out repairs on carriageway surfaces in some areas as part of process for taking old white lining with the new layout.

Noting that an argument could be made for funds to be unfrozen if the matter was a health and safety risk, the NP agreed this was indeed a safety risk and noted that an accident would cost the authority additional money. The NP therefore agreed to argue the case for the release of £10,000 for the works.

**Action: NP Co-ordinator to work with Councillor Cheney to argue the case for funding the M32 works.**

**Resolved:-**

- 1. That the NP accepts the Transformer’s Youth Fund and agrees to transfer the funds to Creative Youth Network noting that the funds will be processed using the Wellbeing Process.**
- 2. That the freeze on spend for the Wellbeing Grant Applications be noted.**
- 3. That freeze on spend for Traffic and Transport subgroup recommendations be noted.**
- 4. That the S106 funds for improvements to Parks and Open Spaces within one mile of Roegate be approved.**
- 5. That on H&S bases to use £10,000 from the Devolved NP Budget to install suitable signage reflecting the new roundabout layout and to repair carriageway surface.**

At this point, Councillor Cheney arrived.

## **8. NP Community Engagement (agenda item no. 8)**

Georgie Bryant, Neighbourhood Officer, tabled a report and the following points arose:-

- Neighbourhood Forums did not have engagement capacity due to the numbers who attended and the reason people came to them. It was necessary to look at them in a different way in the future, more as an information sharing forum;
- The future of NP’s was also under review;
- It was noted that good works had taken place by groups around the triangle area of Eastville. These groups wanted more funding to do other things and the neighbourhood team could assist in connecting the groups up to resources other than the Council;
- The reason most people engaged in the NP is to have some influence on spending in their community, if budgets remained frozen going forward, this engagement would be lost;
- The future dates for Forums and NP’s should be accepted until informed otherwise.

The NP agreed to support the Engagement Plan.

## 9. Neighbourhood Partnership Plan (agenda item no. 9)

Inspector Deborah Yeates made note of the following issues reported by Partnership members and agreed to follow up those within her responsibility:-

- There was increased drinking in Fishponds Park;
- There was intelligence that the Polish Shop was selling illegal alcohol 'under the counter';
- Residents of Symington Road were concerned at the activities of an individual with a yellow car who regularly drove at 60/70 mph on mornings and evenings;
- A blond lady was regularly seen outside the Lloyds Pharmacy using inappropriate language;
- Another lady visited Coffee No 1 often and talked very loudly, displaying some mental instability;
- Travellers with at least 25 vehicles had moved to Greenbank. It was noted that this was a matter for the Neighbourhood Enforcement Team
- Air quality in Eastpark area was poor due to car engines left running outside May Park School.

## 10 Public Forum (agenda item no. 10)

Subject	Name	Nu
Speedwell Baths	Ian Beckey	
Speedwell Baths	Mike Baker – Living Easton Heritage & Environmental Group	

Ian Beckey was in attendance and spoke to his statement. Councillor Keen reported that Fishponds Councillors were working with St George Councillors on a more creative option. Councillor Cheney reported that the Council had the resources to build a pool but not to run one.

**RESOLVED – the Statements were noted.**

## 11 Date of Next Meeting. (agenda item no. 11)

This was noted as 7pm on 23 March, 2017.

Meeting ended at 9.10pm

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



## Greater Fishponds Area Neighbourhood Partnership

### Action Tracker – 8.12.16

Agenda Item No. & Mtg Date	Title of Report	Action	Responsible officer	Action taken and date completed
N/A  Page 13	Highways Carriageway & Footway	<p><b>2 April 2015 ACTION CARRIED FORWARD</b></p> <p>- Double yellow lines not on Station Road even though signage was there, also no disabled parking bays. These had apparently been done since. Mark Sperduty asked to be kept informed if not so;</p> <p>Diagonal lines for crossing outside May Park school not sufficient, Mark Sperduty to look into;</p> <p>Improvements on Old Station Road near Railway Pub not acceptable Mark Sperduty to look into</p> <p>Decision to retain a left turn ban on Hockey's Lane be reconsidered on safety grounds</p>	Mark Sperduty	CF
6 – 24.3.16	NP Activities report	<p>Part 5 – Traffic and Transport – to arrange meeting with Highways on Duchess Way and Hockey's Lane</p> <p>Part 6 – Environment – - investigate Beacon Tower proposal;</p>	NP Co-ordinator	On going- Briefly discussed this at the traffic and transport subgroup meeting on 1 <sup>st</sup> March 2017, which focused on the Cycle Ambition Funded project along Blackberry Hill/Brandon Hill

				On going:
9 – 6.10.16	Part 5: Environment Sub-Gp	Section 106 – contribution to planting of up to 21 trees within one mile radius of Gleeson House – unclear re cost of trees and therefore NC agreed full amount on basis of securing as many as possible with the money.	NP Co-ordinator to confirm number of trees secured	Ongoing: Full plan will be presented to the next Environment subgroup meeting on Wednesday 30 <sup>th</sup> Nov.
7 - 8.12.16	NP Business Report  Part 2   Part 4	To confirm if CIL can be used now that Wellbeing budgets are frozen  To consider whether the applications not dealt with can be granted with S106 monies in light of frozen spending.  To produce note for NP clarifying budget pots.  To make case as a health and safety issue to Highways that monies be released for replaceme signage in the vicinity of M32 Junction 2 to reflect the new roundabout layout.	All NP Co-ordinator   Cllr Cheney to pursue this action also	Completed.  Completed: On the NP agenda in March 2017.  Closed: Changes have been made to NP funding, so no longer relevant.  On going:

**Ashley, Easton and Lawrence Hill Neighbourhood Partnership – 6<sup>th</sup> March 2017**

**Greater Fishponds Neighbourhood Partnership – 23<sup>rd</sup> March 2017**

**Report from Bristol Waste Company**

## **Summary and Recommendation**

This report updates Neighbourhood Partnerships on the Stapleton Road recycling and refuse collection pilot project that both meetings considered in October 2016.

Following the 12 week pilot project Bristol Waste Company's (BWC) recommendation is that the communal bins in the pilot area are not reintroduced and the collection methodology used during the pilot is now adopted for the longer term. Bristol Waste will, however, keep the frequency and methods of collection under review.

## **Background**

Working in partnership with Bristol City Council (BCC) and local communities, BWC removed 164 communal bins from the pilot area (Stapleton Road and 34 surrounding streets) in October last year. 1000 households were put on a regular, fortnightly refuse bin and weekly recycling box collection where their properties allowed for this. In other cases (c400) properties a three times a week (Monday/Wednesday and Friday) bagged waste collection was offered. This applied largely to properties above shops and where there is no storage for bins and boxes.

## **Aims and Objectives**

The aim of the project was to respond to complaints and issues raised by elected members and residents of the area mainly around fly tipping near communal bins and generally poor waste management in the area. These issues were seen to be contributing to a poor street scene. There were also suggestions that some traders were abusing the communal street bins and perhaps did not have appropriate commercial waste contracts in place. BCC's Enforcement team undertook to support BWC in assessing the situation.

BWC was also keen to increase the recycling rates in the area and move towards a unified service that reflected the offer in place across the rest of the city.

## **Supporting Actions**

BWC has committed significant time and resource to supporting the project. Residents have all received written communications explaining the pilot in detail and offering advice on how to recycle where appropriate. The company hired in specialist support in terms of a community worker able to speak Somali to work with that particular section of the local community. His work has included ongoing liaison with traders as well as residents. There have been two drop in sessions in the local area which encouraged landlords, residents and business owners to come and give their thoughts and feedback on the pilot. Information has been shared on BWC's website and social media.

The company has been supported by BCC’s Enforcement team who have been visible in the area. At the start of the trial BWC was clearing illegal fly tipping from the area on a daily basis. During the trial we decided to draw attention to the scale of the problem by leaving the waste and sticking the bags. Enforcement officers subsequently searched the stickered waste for evidence and the results of that are shown below.

**Outcomes**

Headline figures (as at end January) from the trial are below:

<b>Service</b>	<b>Pre Trial</b>	<b>Post-Trial</b>	<b>Change</b>
Recycling	7.14	8.70	21.8%
Refuse	25.30	14.66	-42.0%
<b>Recycling Rate</b>	28%	59%	110.2%
	<b>During Initial Trial Weekly average</b>	<b>With Education &amp; Enforcement weekly average</b>	
Street Cleansing	6.3	3.86	-38.7%

**Enforcement figures for trial period:**

62 notices served on individuals on how to present waste

16 Fixed Penalty Notices on individuals

35 ongoing investigations on domestic properties

8 Fixed Penalty Notices on businesses

7 businesses being investigated

**Summary and Recommendation**

The trial has generated mostly positive feedback from local residents who report that the streetscene is improved by the removal of the communal bins. Some residents from neighbouring streets have asked that we consider expanding the area of the trial. The increased recycling rates are heartening as is the reduced residual waste. Enforcement officers continue to make inroads in to the issue of commercial waste from traders on Stapleton Road.

Taking all these factors in to account BWC recommends that the new collection methodology is adopted for the longer term in this area. Bristol Waste will, however, keep under review the three times a week collection frequency with a view to potentially reducing this to twice a week as residual waste levels continue to decrease. In due course, we will also review the ongoing provision of the free of charge grey refuse bags that we have been providing to participants in the trial.





**MY NEIGHBOURHOOD**

**Greater Fishponds Neighbourhood Partnership  
Thursday 23<sup>rd</sup> March 2017**

**Report of:** Subgroup Chairs, Neighbourhood Co-ordinator.

**Title: NP Activities- Business Report**

**Recommendation:**

- 1- **Traffic & Transport update:** NP members to note progress.
- 2- **Environment Subgroup:** NP members to note progress and NC to approve subgroup recommendations to approve S106 and CIL proposals.

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

- 1- The Traffic and Transport subgroup met with the City Transport Team managing the Cycle Ambition Fund on Wednesday 1<sup>st</sup> March 2017.
- 2- Main item for discussion was the recent Broom Hill/Blackberry Hill TRO improvements consultation. The group had detailed discussions about the scheme and proposed amending the proposal by moving apart proposed two bus shelters opposite one another located in Broom Hill in order to enable traffic movements in both directions. They also suggested widening the lane approaching the roundabout from Broom Hill in order to accommodate two lanes and increase the capacity of the roundabout.
- 3- The group also discussed the recent Bristol City Council (BCC) announcement to find savings amounting to £500,000 during 2017/18 financial year from the Neighbourhood Management service. The group were notified that BCC is unable to provide the level of support they had and if they wanted to continue to operate would have to depend using their own resources.
- 4- Following discussions the group agreed to continue to operate with more focused remit, despite BCC's Neighbourhood Management service reduction.

## **Part 2: Environment Subgroup**

- 5- The Environment Subgroup met on Wednesday 8<sup>th</sup> March 2017. The group discussed number of projects requesting S106 funding and CIL.
- 6- Friends of Fishponds Park (FoFP) carried out extensive consultation with local children and parents who use the park's children play facilities. The group is also actively seeking funding from external sources.
- 7- With the help from the Neighbourhood Partnership team the group secured £20,000 funding from Bristol City Council's (BCC) Parks Fund. They were hopeful works for phase 1 of the park's development plan would be installed before summer 2017.

- 8- However due to BCC's recently announced budget cuts the funding previously allocated from the Bristol's Parks Fund was withdrawn, putting the project under threat.
- 9- The FoFP require £20,000 from GFNP CIL to enable the group secure enough money to complete phase 1 of the parks development plan within reasonable timescales. They also require additional £11,395.29 of Section 106, to enable the group fundraise further funding needed to complete the project or downsize it to deliver improvements on the current play offer.
- 10- In addition FLAG have managed to raise £46,000 to upgrade the skate park in Hillfields Park. Total cost of the project is estimated to be £115,750 including BCC Management Fee. The group is looking to submit a grant application to a landfill trust for £50,000. However the group is short in the management fee along with the land trust fee, which in total amount to approximately £14,000. The group is seeking this £4k of Section 106 to secure the project and further £10K from CIL to cover this. A financial break down will be available at the NP meeting on the 23rd March Hillfields Park.
- 11- Subgroup members also heard Eastville MUGA project worth in excess of £70,000 was also affected by the recent cuts and the Friends of Eastville Park require additional £16,113.06 to help the group fundraise funding needed to upgrade the very much loved Children Play Facility in Eastville Park.
- 12- Other projects BCC's cuts affected include SMAG proposal to replace accessible picnic bench, which they previously submitted a Wellbeing application for and proposal for Park Works Team to carryout works in number of parks in the NP area.
- 13- The Neighbourhood Committee is hereby asked to approve subgroup recommendations summarised below.

<b>2016/17: CIL March 2017</b>			<b>£120,766.78</b>
<b>NP Plan Priority:</b>	<b>Activity/Description of works</b>	<b>Amount £</b>	<b>Running Balance £</b>
<b>Priority 3: The NP area has quality Parks and play areas accessible to all: New Activity- Upgrade play facility in Fishponds Park Fishponds Play area:</b>	Fishponds Park: Proposed Fishponds Park Phase 1 Development contribution using (ref: 14/02640 and 13/00210)	£20,000	£100,766.78
<b>Priority 3: The NP area has quality Parks and play areas accessible to all: New Activity- Develop new play facility for older children in Eastville Park.</b>	Develop Eastville Park MUGA Using (ref: 11/01729, 14/02640, 14/06307, 14/06301, 15/04378, 14/02079, 14/02640, 15/06265, 16/00391, 15/03180, 14/02805, 15/00433, 16/02653. <b>Condition:</b> This is with the proviso that the plans and discussions are shared with subgroup members.	£70,000	£30,766.78
<b>Priority 3: The NP area has quality Parks and play areas accessible to all: Hillfields Park</b>	Contribution towards project management of skateboard Park from (Ref: 13/01732, 13/05563, 13/02654, 14/01333, 13/02883, 14/00339, 12/04279) <b>Condition:</b> This is with the proviso that -BCC Parks to agree to install and maintain the skate park. It is also subject to FLAG's funding application being successful.	£10,000	£20,766.78
<b>Priority 3: The NP area has quality Parks and play areas accessible to</b>	ParkWork will be working and supporting local residents and Friends of Parks in the NP area to organise regular volunteer sessions. These sessions will involve tree planting, footpath maintenance, bench	£6,816	£13,950.78

<b>all:</b>	restoration (including SMAGs), tree pruning, weeding, etc. The funding will be used to pay for vehicle hire, fuel, tools maintenance, clothing and hire of yard from (ref: 11/01729) This is TBC at the meeting.		
<b>Remaining CIL</b>			<b>£13,950.78</b>

<b>2016/17: Section 106 March 2017</b>			<b>£41,209.89</b>
<b>NP Plan Priority:</b>	<b>Activity/Description of works</b>	<b>Amount £</b>	<b>Running Balance £</b>
<b>Priority 3: The NP area has quality Parks and play areas accessible to all: New Activity- Upgrade play facility in Fishponds Park Fishponds Play area:</b>	Fishponds Park: Proposed Fishponds Park Phase 1 development plan contribution.(ref:06/04826/1-3 King Johns Rd & 06/04996/30 Cherrytree cres)	£11,395.29	£29,814.60
<b>Priority 3: The NP area has quality Parks and play areas accessible to all: New Activity- Develop new play facility for older children in Eastville Park.</b>	Develop Eastville Park Play including MUGA (Ref:05/03852/Ebenezer Chapel). <b>Condition:</b> This is with the proviso that the plans and discussions are shared with subgroup members.	£16,113.06	£13,701.54
<b>Priority 3: The NP area has quality Parks and play areas accessible to all: Hillfields Park</b>	Contribution towards project management of skateboard Park ( Ref: 12/04445 247 Charlton Road). <b>Condition:</b> This is with the proviso that -BCC Parks to agree to install and maintain the skate park. It is also subject to FLAG's funding application being successful.	£4,000	£9,701.54
<b>Remaining S106</b>			<b>£9,701.54</b>

14- Finally the group discussed proposed cuts of the BCC Neighbourhood Management service. Following discussions the group agreed to continue to operate.

## 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 7<sup>th</sup> 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.

### **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 & Withywood. 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 1<sup>st</sup> 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>

# Greater Fishponds Transitional Working Group Proposal:

---

Members of the Greater Fishponds NP have been meeting to discuss how to respond to the proposed changes to NPs across Bristol, whether it should continue and if so in what form.

So far the group met twice and covered a lot of ground, including conducting SWOT analysis, agreeing what it wants to focus on going forward and agreeing mechanism of communication.

The group agreed to continue to operate in some form or another, which is hoped to be firmed up between the March and July 2017 meetings.

Members who attended the transitional working group sessions believe that any new structure superseding the GFNP should focus on the following priorities:

1. To form and support Working Groups, which reflect local community priorities (Environment, Planning and Traffic and Transport)
2. To provide information and guidance for groups
3. To present networking opportunities for local councillors, police, BCC and local community led groups/organisations, including Neighbourhood Watch groups.
4. To develop and monitor clear Community Plan for the area
5. To act as the conduit between community, BCC and the police.
6. To influence S106 and CIL and
7. To encourage resident street reps who wants to be active in their neighbourhood.

The group also identified the following risks/threats in which they would like support with.

1. Funding of meeting venues
2. Challenging the mayoral vision
3. Monies being stripped and taken back to central pots
4. Influencing BCC decisions
5. Approving finances..need cllr approval
6. Officer time
7. Support around Volunteering
8. Keeping up the momentum
9. Identifying and engaging with people
10. Website - what happens to it?
11. How will small groups access resources
12. Apathy
13. Police officer resource availability, esp if groups increase in number
14. Asset Mapping
15. Time constraint.

Shown below is a draft timeline, which is hoped, will be discussed at the NP meeting on Thursday 23<sup>rd</sup> March and subsequent Transitional Working group meeting on Thursday 6<sup>th</sup> April 2017 at the Vassall Centre to discuss Governance and Timeline.

## Greater Fishponds NP Summary of work plan to agree NP transition plan

### Key objectives:

- A. To ensure that the Greater Fishponds NP considers its future beyond July 2017.
- B. To provide all the stakeholders (including citizens and community/voluntary organisations) an opportunity to discuss and agree way forward beyond July 2017.
- C. Have in place an agreed mechanism to replace existing NP structure, with clear mandate from local community/stakeholders beyond July 2017.

### Key milestones

G= Green (Completed)

A= Amber (Partly done)

R= Red (outstanding)

DATE or wk commencing	ACTION	OUTCOME	LEAD	Status
From 1 <sup>st</sup> Feb 2017 to 7 <sup>th</sup> March 2017	Set-up Transitional working group	Transitional group set-up.	NP members Chair NO	G
	Transitional group to undertake SWOT Analysis and identify what activities it wants to pursue beyond June 2017.	Identify local led activities the new structure would want to continue.	NP members with NO support.	G
	Carryout asset mapping in the neighbourhood.	Identify local assets and potential groups who should be invited to take part in any new structure.	NP members with NO support.	A
	Agree communication method	Set-up Trello Board for all to have access and communicate and monthly meetings.	NP members with NO support.	G
7 <sup>th</sup> March 2017 to 30 <sup>th</sup> June 2017	Consult with subgroup members to determine their future beyond March 2017.	Know if Traffic and Transport & Environment subgroups would want to continue without Bristol City Council support (BCC).	NPC & NO	G
	Identify support required beyond March 2017.	A list of asks produced to request from BCC.	NP members	A
	Consider/discuss and feedback BCC's offer beyond June 2017.	NP to formally feedback proposed BCC offer. Identify provisional priorities, risks and gaps.	NP members NPC	R
	Form <b>Interim Committee/Board</b> to establish new group	NP members agree to become members of new group.	NP members	R
	Meet to consider/discuss and consult more widely on suitable structural models for new group. Events to include May Forums and any other public events	Public support for proposed structural model/s for the Greater Fishponds NP area.	Interim Committee NO & NPC	A

	organised in the area.			
	Agree organisational structure & governance for new group.	Develop and agree new governance structure. Consider BCC offer of support.	Interim Committee/Board NPC	R
13 <sup>th</sup> July 2017 – March 2018	First meeting of new group.	Interim governance to be adopted, constitution to be developed and adopted, etc.	Interim Committee/Board	R
30 <sup>th</sup> July 2017 onwards	Trial new governance structure	Group to determine what the future holds beyond July 2017	All	R