

Public Forum

Public Forum for Area Committee 4



Date: Monday, 27 July 2020, 6pm

Issued by: , Democratic Services

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

Date: 26th July 2020



www.bristol.gov.uk

Agenda

1. Public Forum received.

Public Forum Question received:

(Pages 3 - 5)

| Ref No | Name | Attending? |
|--------|--------------|------------|
| PQ01 | Joanna Booth | No |

Public Forum Statement received:

| Ref No | Name | Attending? |
|--------|-----------------------------------|------------|
| PS01 | Mark Ashdown – Bristol Tree Forum | Yes |



Question to Area Committee 4 Chair

PQ01 – Joanna Booth

I note that there is a worry in the papers about nearly £60,000 of CIL/S106 money for tree planting being lost if suitable locations are not found around Nelson Street and Bridewell.

Would you please let me know whether the locations listed by the Tree Forum at the following location are suitable? <https://bristoltrees.space/Tree/search/tree?latitude=51.456714&longitude=-2.593967&range=100&x=Find>

And if they are suitable, why have they not been assessed.
If they are not suitable locations, would you please explain why?

I am a local resident to this area -- two to three streets away and I am very worried about the air quality and the removal of the trees on Nelson street two years ago.

PS01 - Mark Ashdown - Bristol Tree Forum

Firstly, I was rather surprised to see that there is absolutely no mention of the Bristol Tree Forum proposal or of all the hard work we have done to identify the funds available and [map all the trees](#) which might be planted with the available s106 funds. Why is this? When I look at the agendas for the other Area Committees which are also due soon to meet, will I find the same story?

Secondly, have I misunderstood the approval process? My understanding was that Stage One proposals were to be generic without going into detail and that, only if these proposals were approved, were more detailed, Stage Two proposals to be submitted. Is this wrong?

When I last advised the committee at the end of May, I calculated that there was some £247,701 available, sufficient to plant 318 trees (assuming that planting would take place on open ground - see the attached, at page eight). I see the report now identifies ££257,534.58 is available. This would plant, in theory, 366 trees (in open ground). Can you explain the difference between our two figures? I thought I was keeping up-to-date by using Jim Cliffe's monthly reports?

I see that the agenda has a schedule for planting just 107 trees both in AC4 and in the nearby ACs where the ambit of the particular S106 Agreement permits this. I assume this schedule has been prepared by John Atkinson (for which many thanks, John) and that the sites chosen are TreeBristol Tree Planting Locations (TPLs).

I appreciate that there are very few open spaces in the centre of the city where trees might be planted without a tree pit being required - something that would add considerably to the costs of planting - currently it is £3,318.88 per pit.

Of course, we have no objection to John's selection if indeed these sites are available, but we can see no reason why the balance of the funds available (£257,534.58 - £81,877.47 (107 trees x £765.21) = £175,657.11 still available for tree planting) cannot now be used. This would be equivalent to some 229 trees planted in open ground or 52 trees planted in pit trees, a substantial contribution to the City's aspiration to double tree canopy cover by 2046!

Every year lost planting trees that can be funded now is a year lost towards achieving this very important goal, not to mention the negative impacts on the declared Environmental and Ecological emergencies and the plans to become carbon neutral by 2030. There is no time to waste!

I am sure that suitable sites can be identified between now and the start of the planting season. For example, I have seen a recent [twitter thread](#) about the lost trees of Nelson St and their need to be replaced. I am sure there are many others that we can find with the help of the local community (and their councillors). And surely there must be space in the city centre parks which could have more trees. Looking at the mapping work we have done, the [Former Magistrates Court in Nelson Street](#) has funds available to plant 54 trees. We have identified [156 TPLs](#) and [71 stumps and lost tree sites](#) available to plant trees.

The story is the same with the other 17 S106 Agreements that we have identified available to plant trees in AC4 (spreadsheet attached), albeit that we will need to resolve issues relating to those sites where planting could be funded by more than one S106 Agreement.