

**Stoke Bishop, Westbury-on-Trym & Henleaze
Neighbourhood Partnership**

Title: Notes of Environment Working Group (28th April 2016) and Tree Report

Report of: Andrew McGrath and Stephanie French

Contact details: 9036436 andrew.mcgrath@bristol.gov.uk

Recommendations:

1. The Neighbourhood Committee is **requested to agree** to fund up to £6,000 for trees from the NP's CIL allocation (please see section 5.1 below). The exact cost will be determined as soon as possible
2. The Neighbourhood Committee is **requested to agree** to fund £1,000 from the NP's CIL funds for daffodils to be grown around the NP's playgrounds (see 5.4 below).
3. The Neighbourhood Committee is **requested to agree** to the allocation of the NP's £1,500 Clean and Green allocation as set out in 6.1 below.

Present: Sheila Preece, Alan Preece, Hilary Long, Gill Brown, Val Bishop, Clare Milne, Helen Furber, Eileen Poad, Stephanie French, Susan Mayer, Alan Aburrow, David Mayer, Duncan Venison (BCC), Alan Morris, Mildred Miller, Kevin Chidgley, Glenise Morgan, Gary Brentnall, Andrew McGrath

Apologies: Claire Campion-Smith,

Meeting Chaired by David Mayer –

1. Minutes and Matters arising from 14th January 2016 meeting:

Notes considered accurate with the following exceptions or continuing actions:

1.1 Phoenix Lane Weeds. This is being picked up by BCC maintenance.
Action: Gary to check.

1.2 Tree Sculpture. The issue of moving the large branches is not yet resolved. The working group is adamant that this should be paid for by BCC as it would have had to remove everything if the tree had been felled. Carry forward. **Action:** Gary to look for a solution. Carry forward to next meeting. **Afternote:** Tree sculpture completed on 25th May 2016.

1.3 Japanese Knotweed Flier. This has been approved by BCC. Could add the NP and BCC logos. It needs to be distributed around the affected houses in the area. It should also be sent to Alan Aburrow for the website and to OSPNR for their website. Also to go in local noticeboards. **Action:** Gary

1.4 Work on PROWs part-funded by the NP. This is now complete.

1.5 Roman Villa information board. The design has been done. It needs a little –re-jigging and a larger font size. **Action:** Gary and Alan **Afternote:** Information board has been re-jigged according to the suggestions given.

1.6 Westbury in Bloom. Hilary mentioned that there is now a team of four volunteers working on Westbury in Bloom following Sue's retirement from the role

2. Ebenezer Lane

2.1 There has been on-going correspondence on this matter between residents and BCC. Duncan Venison from BCC Highways attended the meeting to discuss this matter.

2.2 The current schedule is for two cuts per year (June and September). The proposal to go to one per year would mean the cut being performed in September. The Maintenance team deals with all of these cuts. Whilst it may be possible to go to one per year there is a concern that if complaints are received this will mean an extra cost scheduling in an unplanned cut. It is possible to go to one cut. Duncan said he would consider it and get back to the group.

2.3 Why not trial it for a year? The first year is unlikely to be a problem but it may become a problem in future years. The issue for BCC is the cost of extra cuts (probably in July).

2.4 If we go to one cut per year, the spare capacity could be used elsewhere (Hollybush Lane) where more cuts are needed.

2.5 It is acknowledged that trees shouldn't be cut by the strimmers cutting back the lane. There has been some tree work performed on the Stoke Lodge side of the lane. This isn't performed by BCC contractors.

2.6 Cyclists should not be using the footpath. Obviously it's very hard to catch them at it. This is a police enforcement matter. A sign could be put up but it is known that these have limited impact.

2.7 There has been an increase in Japanese Knotweed on the path. Do contractors know what to do with this? It has to be dealt with under strict guidelines.

2.8 Duncan will send an email response regarding all the issues raised

3.0 Neighbourhood Partnership Plan

3.1 The NP Plan is now a year old and needs refreshing. There followed a discussion regarding the best way to populate the Environment Working Group's part of the NP Plan. The discussion focussed on the local priority column (2nd column on the left). This is where the priorities should go.

3.2 The activities relating to the achievement of these priorities will go in the right hand column. Andrew will suggest activities for each priority and circulate.

3.3 The discussion included the need to make specific reference to sites and parks that need to be included, and the reason for their inclusion. This will enable the NP to take funding and other opportunities when they arise.

3.4 The example was given of old play equipment in playgrounds. If this is mentioned in the plan (eg the helicopter frame in Canford Park playground), there may be an opportunity to access funding if or when it becomes available.

3.5 The list of updated priorities handed to the meeting will form the main, headline priorities. The job of the working group is to think of the more specific priorities that come under each of these headline priorities. An email of the priorities will be sent to the working group members asking them to identify specific priorities. **Action:** David to send the form to the group. **Afternote:** Sent on 29th April with a deadline for 6th May for responses. **Action:** Once received, Andrew is to absorb all the responses in to the single document. It will be distributed to the working group for comment prior to going to the NP for signing off. **Afternote(2):** Responses received and distributed to the working group

4.0 The Bristol Walking Alliance

4.1 Following a proposal from Glenise Morgan, Alan Morris from the Bristol Walking Alliance (BWA) was present to explain the aims of the group and ask for the NP to become a member of the Alliance.

4.2 Alan explained that there are a good mix of groups on the BWA. It would be good to have something on walking in the NP plans. The group looks at all issues related to walking including crossings, traffic, condition of pavements etc

4.3 There is a Bristol Walking Strategy but this needs updating. Last done in 2011.

4.4 The BWA is a democratic organisation. It has a small management committee. The group's aim is to influence all policies that might affect walkers. It is a campaigning and lobbying group.

4.5 Working group members had a couple of concerns about the aims and manifesto of the group:

4.6 The wish to commit to an increase of 10% year on year of budgets promoting walking seems unlikely and may be seen as a commitment the NP is unwilling to take on.

4.7 It seems anti-car. Spaces should be shared. Alan agreed with this but this is specifically about promoting the idea of walking as a valid way of getting about and keeping fit.

4.8 The meeting agreed that it fully endorses the group's aspirations but is unable to support its manifesto, and therefore cannot sign up as a member of the group. The meeting agreed to accept Glenise as a walking champion for the NP.

5. CIL/S106

5.1 Stephanie requested that the meeting agree to request between £4-6k for six trees as set out in her report. The final cost is dependent on factors such as location. The meeting **unanimously agreed to request the Neighbourhood Committee agree** the cost of these trees at the NP.

5.2 It was also **agreed** that there should be a tree sub-group of the Environment Working Group, looking at possible tree sites and other issues relating to trees in our NP area. Stephanie, Gary and the Chair of the NP will

sit on it. When the new reps are known, one from W-o-T/Henleaze ward will also be asked to sit on it.

5.3 Val also suggested that something for older people be put in Old Quarry Park. Something such as a gazebo would be a good idea. It was agreed that a formal request will come to the next meeting.

5.4 It was **agreed unanimously to request £1,000 CIL funding from the Neighbourhood Committee** for planting daffodils around play areas in the NP's parks.

5.5 Another possible suggestion for CIL expenditure was to tarmac Phoenix Lane. This will need to be costed and a formal request brought to the working group.

5.6 Kevin Chidgey of Westbury Park Community Association discussed the possibility of accessing the S106 NP allocation relating to 99 Devonshire Road (£7,623.03) to help update the community facilities at the Westbury Park Church. It was agreed that a detailed proposal could come back to the Environment Working Group at a later date.

6. Clean & Green and Community Payback projects

6.1 It was agreed the allocation of the NP's £1,500 Clean and Green allocation should be as follows:

- Stoke Bishop - £500 hanging baskets
- W-o-T - £500 flower fund (WOTSOC)
- Henleaze - £500 flora (details to follow)

The Neighbourhood Committee is requested to agree to this allocation of £1,500 Clean & Green

6.2 There is an option to have Community Payback on Stoke Lodge to start clearing the walled garden area. This was agreed. Action: Gary to investigate with the Library Service about the wall to the garden. Can it be repaired by CPB or is it more delicate due to its possible listed status? **Action:** Gary to communicate with BCC Library Service. **Afternote:** This CPB took place the following day. Photos of the clearing are available

6.3 Other CPB options:

- Sea Mills Lane (near the depot)
- Mariners Path (this is a larger +1 day project. Needs to be scoped)

- Hill View Lane (Sweeping and scraping)

7.0 Tree Sculpture update

7.1 Stephanie is in the process of writing articles in local publications about the sculpture. Should we go wider with our publicity? BBC? Destination Bristol? Local groups e.g. Badocks Woods? We could have an opening ceremony. The Lord Mayor could be invited.

7.2 Stephanie invited the group to suggest tree sites under the new tree plan policy.

8. Parks Champion.

8.1 The idea of the NP having a Parks Champion was briefly discussed. This discussion is to be carried forward to the next meeting.

9.0 One-off issues

9.1 Riverside path. Carried forward to next meeting

9.2 Trymside. Wessex Water left some scarring when they performed work here last year. This should be reinstated. Alan stated that he'd inspected the site and it didn't appear to be as bad as previously. It was agreed that a watching brief will be kept.

9.3 A planning success. A Wellingtonia at the Southmead Police Station site has been saved from felling. It has been promised that the plans will be re-jigged so that all three of the Wellingtonia will be preserved. The Committee of Councillors voted against Officers' recommendations - so thanks.

10. Any Other Business

10.1 Jenny Wilkes would like to be involved in this project.

10.2 Parks issues in papers to be carried forward to next meeting

10.3 Gary recommended the group walk around South Sea Mills. There is a lot more to it than you might think.

11. Date of next meeting: 2.00pm Thursday 28th July 2016. Venue tbc

Tree Report to Neighbourhood Partnership June 13th 2016

- The New Tree Wish List in operation!

There has been less tree activity over the past 3 months. The main thing to report is that using the new system of an Annual Tree Wish List developed and monitored by the Environment sub group we have put forward three sites for tree planting in 2016/2017. The Tree Wish List has been sent to BCC Trees and its receipt acknowledged.

- ❖ Westbury on Trym/Henleaze

One is in Westbury Road on the grass verges opposite Majestic Wines. This proposal has been greeted by many whoops of joy from the residents. My thanks to Alan Aburrow for assisting with conducting a survey of the residents. He and I are conducting a joint project at this site to get the verges tidied up. Although the verges are owned by the Council and are supposedly a visual and green amenity for all they have become a car park. **I am seeking funding of up to £3825 for up to 5 trees.**

Another is the planting of three trees along the centre of the dual carriageway opposite Old Quarry Park. These gaps have long needed filling in and the planting will mitigate for the loss of trees in Old Quarry Park when it was improved recently for play. 3 trees at £295 each will cost £885 and a local resident has come forward with a contribution of £100 in memory of a recently deceased relative. We know the cost of these trees because they are replacement trees - not new trees - and they appear on the BCC Tree Sponsorship site - it is just that the NP is sponsoring them. **I am seeking funding of £785 for those trees.**

- ❖ Stoke Bishop

Using the new Tree Wish List process we have a site for replacement trees in 2016/2017. 5 previously truly magnificent Horse Chestnuts on Church Road Sneyd Park have been lost to disease. The tops have been cut off because they had become dangerous. I am not sure when the trunks will be removed. They appear on the Tree Sponsorship list. I met the Tree Officer at that spot a few months back, entirely by chance, and he has suggested replacement with Black Pines to “match” many of the other trees in that road. As they are replacement trees and they appear on the Sponsorship site they should cost £295 each. So I would be asking for $5 \times £295 = £1475$, save that residents have agreed to contribute £125, **so I am asking for up to £1350.**

My thanks to the Sneyd Park Residents' Association for conducting a survey of the residents in the road to find some funds.

Total = ££5960

I am already working on a list for 2017/2018 and shall soon call a meeting of the sub group, after tonight but before the next Env Group meeting, to make a start. The Councillors for the former Henleaze, ever busy at spotting tree sites and encouraging residents, have given me a list as long as a branch, so there will need to be some selection process.

I have to report to the NP Committee that the new Tree Wish List “process” means that at the start of each year money will have to be allocated which may not reflect the actual required spend. I shall try to present the worst case so there are no major surprises. We could come unstuck if tree pits are required which we were not expecting. These cost up to £1500 each. Naturally the EG, and the Tree sub group, would never agree to any spending over the “up to” amounts without NP Committee sanction. It is something we shall have to learn to live with. An added difficulty is that despite asking many times I still have not been

told how much trees charged against our CIL pot will cost. Richard Ennion has said that all new trees apart from s106 trees will be £295 (all that got sorted out last April). Teresa Crichton says that the s106 tree price also extends to CIL trees. I have asked her the rationale for that and asked her to confirm it because it is so different from what Richard Ennion said and he is the Manager, but I just cannot get a reply.

- I am in touch with a resident of Sea Mills who wants to work with me on Trees for the new part of Stoke Bishop in Sea Mills. There are several tree sponsorship sites already surveyed by BCC in Sea Mills and I have looked at them, with plans to bring them to your attention for the planting year 2017/2018.
- I asked Alan Preece to take a look at Trymside because I was getting angry about the state it has been left in after Wessex Water used it as a work site last year. He is not as pessimistic as me so I have calmed down a bit, but I shall be keeping an eye on it. I still fear that it will not ever be as it was before they arrived and “ab”used, it but we’ll see.
- With Hilary Long I addressed a meeting of the Development Committee in an effort to save one of the 3 Wellingtonia at Southmead Police Station which was threatened with being felled to make way for a terrace around the new Care Home Planned for that site. We felt that there was room to accommodate the building and keep the tree with a little more thought. We had much support for that view from residents who had commented on the planning website - so may thanks to them. We were successful. The Committee preferred our argument and the Application was rejected despite an Officer’s report approving the application. We are in touch with the developer, at his request, who we hope will submit a revised application keeping all three trees. One issue which arose was the fact that residents and interested groups seemingly had not been informed about the application, so could not warn the developer that there would be a reaction to the threatened loss of the tree. Had he known then he might have modified his plans before submitting the application and saved himself time and money. It turns out that Councillors and a few immediate residents were informed as part of a pre-application consultation. So could we ask please that if such a possibly tendentious application arises again at a pre-application phase that Councillors ask local groups - the WoT Society, the Henleaze Society, the Sneyd Park Residents’ Association and the Stoke Bishop Planning Group - if they know about it?
- I have been in touch many times with the University of Bristol Public Engagement Team to see if we can get one or even two trees planted in new pits in a couple of the more barren spots in the Partnership area. It seems they are almost ready to engage with us so I watch their website almost daily ready to pounce. We were excluded from the first phase but could be lucky with their second phase because we have Trees as a named Priority. I’ll keep you up to date. There are no guarantees. This is competitive bidding and our part of North Bristol is considered to be tree rich, and the residents are deemed to be rich too!

However we are losing trees at an alarming rate due to disease and age of existing tree stock and compliance with the Environmental Access Standards could make Street Tree replacement even more difficult.

Before the last Mayor was elected the waiting list for tree stump replacement using

BCC capital funds earmarked for Street Trees was 17 years long, and then all that got stopped by him in favour of the One Tree Per Child Scheme. It would be impossible to re-calculate it because there is no Capital Fund for Street Trees now. The only money for trees other than whips comes from (our) devolved funds and private (including business) sponsorship.

And the final words from our new Mayor:

“I share the goals of the Bristol Tree Forum, and agree that increased tree cover in the city can play an important role in helping with climate change mitigation, as well as enhancing public health and general well-being. It is with this in mind that I am committed to protecting our environment, and the trees around our city. You have raised a number of specific issues, some of which would involve spending commitments. At this time I am unable to commit to any specific spending. It is impossible to make specific spending commitments until we have opened the books and seen what financial situation we are left with. However, I can guarantee that we will be in touch after the election, at which time we will be able to discuss these matters in much more detail. I will continue to consult with and work with groups such as the Bristol Tree Forum to ensure that we are making policy in a way that is environmentally sustainable. We will in any case continue to protect trees across the city through our planning and conservation policies.”

so - not a lot to go on yet.

Stephanie French
NP3 Tree Champion

Public Sector Equality Duty

Before making a 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