



**Agenda Item No:**

**Bristol City Council**  
**Minutes of Neighbourhoods Scrutiny Commission**  
Monday 11<sup>th</sup> April 2016

---

**Councillors:** Denyer, Fodor, Hickman, Lovell (Vice-Chair) and Negus (Chair)

**Assistant Mayors in attendance:** Councillor Hance

**Officers in Attendance:-**

Alison Comley (Strategic Director Neighbourhoods), Claire Lowman (Health Improvement Specialist), Kathy Derrick (Environment Team Manager), Gillian Douglas (Interim Service Director – Clean and Green), Di Robinson (Service Director – Neighbourhoods and Communities), Gemma Dando (Service Director – Neighbourhoods), Hayley Ash (Area Neighbourhood Manager), Mark Wakefield (Service Manager – Performance and Infrastructure), Tom Oswald (Executive Assistant) and Jeremy Livitt (Democratic Services Officer)

**125. Apologies for Absence and Substitutions (Agenda Item 1)**

Apologies were received from the following:

Councillor Harvey  
Councillor Milestone  
Councillor G Morris  
Councillor Radice – Assistant Mayor

**126. Public Forum (Agenda Item 2)**

No Public Forum items were received.

**127. Declarations of Interest (Agenda Item 3)**

There were no Declarations of Interest.

**128. Minutes of Neighbourhoods Scrutiny Commission – 21<sup>st</sup> March 2016 (Agenda Item 4)**

**Resolved – that the minutes of the above meeting be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair subject to the following amendments:**

**(1) references in Minute Number 118 to Bristol Active Sports and Recreation” be altered to read “Bristol Sports and Active Recreation” and “Partnership for Sport” be altered to read “Bristol Partnership of Sport and Active Recreation”**

**(2) references in Minute Number 118 to “West of England Partnership” be altered to read “Wesport”**

**(3) Paragraph 3 of Minute Number 121 be altered to include a reference to a need for indicators at key dates to be incorporated into the performance targets**

**Action: Jeremy Livitt**

**129 Action Sheet – 21<sup>st</sup> March 2016 (Agenda Item 5)**

Members noted progress against the Action Sheet.

The following additions were agreed:

Include a reference to the requested action to investigate the fact that the paperwork for the meeting was not included on the Bristol City Council website

**Action: Jeremy Livitt**

Inclusion of the reference to the drop in indicators (Minute Number 121 above)

A note that key actions contained for Agenda Item Numbers 7 (New Active Sports Partnership), Libraries Update (Agenda Item 8), Waste Inquiry Day Action Plan (Agenda Item 9) and Bristol Waste Company Performance Report – see addition above (Agenda Item 10) all to be implemented as soon as possible with Agenda Item 7 and 10 to be done at a later date as soon as possible

**Action: Alison Comley/Guy Price/Di Robinson/Kate Murray/Gemma Dando/Tracey Morgan**

**130. Chair’s Business (Agenda Item 6)**

The Chair pointed out that the information discussed at the Supermarket Evidence Session on Monday 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2016 had been reported at the Sheffield Waste Group Core City meeting where it had been agreed that there would be regular conversations between core cities on supermarkets. It was extremely encouraging to see that there had been progress on this and it was important that the actions arising from this session should be robust and action pursued.

A Committee member pointed out the importance of also keeping the British retail Association involved in the process.

**Resolved – that the recommendations arising from 22nd February 2016 “Dealing with Waste” Evidence Session (Agenda Item Number 8) are included as an item for discussion to consider for inclusion on 2016/17 Work Programme.**

**Action: Jeremy Livitt**

### **131. Food Update (Agenda Item 7)**

Members noted this report which had been submitted in response to issues that he been raised by members at 18<sup>th</sup> December 2015 Scrutiny meeting.

Officers drew attention to the work that Bristol City Council was carrying out concerning the Food Policy Council (which met quarterly) and to the role of the Bristol Food Network in this process. It was noted that the Bristol Officers’ Food Group met every 6 weeks. Officers also pointed out the importance of the recent catering mark that Bristol City Council had received for school meals which would allow an assessment of the value that the Council was getting. There was an opportunity to influence nutrition in schools and early years, including through the Healthy Schools Programme of which 65% was based in the most deprived areas.

Members’ attention was also drawn to the fact that Bristol City Council had recently received a sustainable free city silver level award

In response to a member’s question, officers also indicated that they were happy to work with and to facilitate work to increase the number of allotments (Paragraph 8.7 of the Food Action Plan). Whilst previous work had tended to be quite reactive, work was now being carried out to develop a proactive sustainable policy.

Councillors made the following comments:

- (1) It was important that work carried out in this area should acknowledge the fact that most people in the city bought food on the basis of price and accessibility;
- (2) People needed to be supported in making better food choices;
- (3) Statutory engagement with schools was important in view of the increased risks to school catering likely to occur as a result of the Academy plans;
- (4) The targets for reduction of wasted food and food waste for 50% reduction of food businesses and ultimately 100% of local businesses (Section 10 of the Food Plan) were very challenging – the possibility of offering a collection service to help meet these targets needed to be considered;
- (5) Both city-wide and Neighbourhood Partnership targets were important to meet the required targets.

**Action:**

- (1) The Chair agreed to write to the representatives of the 8 supermarkets to request that they contact the Food Policy Council concerning the request for a Supermarket Representative to be represented there**
- (2) Officers to provide an overview on setting out the detail on all food-related contracts in the city.**

- (1) Councillor Anthony Negus/Claire Lowman/Kathy Derrick**
- (2) Claire Lowman/Kathy Derrick**

**132. Report on The “Dealing With Waste” Evidence Session – 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2016 (Agenda Item 8)**

Members noted the previously agreed next steps for this issue (Agenda Item 6 – Minute Number 130). They noted the work of the LGA and of the 2006 Courtauld commitments.

In addition to the verbal responses given by Supermarket representatives, the Chair also drew attention to some of the key points raised in a number of the written submissions. He drew attention to the fact that some supermarkets were taking some measures independently of each other (ie use of lorries) when they could be working co-operatively as in other industries – for example, Shipping Companies.

A Councillor pointed out that a key element of this process would be linking to particular bodies in this issue, such as the Food Policy Council (ie the Answers to Questions 18) and Local Planning Authorities (Answers to Question 20).

**Action:**

- (1) that the recommendations arising from 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2016 “Dealing with Waste” Evidence Session (Agenda Item Number 8) are included as an item for discussion to consider for inclusion on 2016/17 Work Programme (see Agenda Item 6 above – Minute Number 130**
- (2) that the various bodies involved in actions arising from this piece of work (ie Food Policy Council, Local Planning Authority) are also included within the appropriate sections of the document**

- (1) and (2) Tom Oswald**

**133. Update on Neighbourhood Partnership Plans (Agenda Item 9)**

The Scrutiny Commission received an update on the Neighbourhood Partnership Plan City Wide priorities.

Officers confirmed that, as the meeting was taking place in the pre-election period, the report concentrated on the role of Neighbourhood Plans rather than the future

of Neighbourhood Partnerships. In response to a member's question, officers confirmed that the issue of social isolation had been addressed within the health priority as it was considered the best way of delivering in this area. Officers pointed out that social isolation was a priority in 10 of the Neighbourhood Partnership areas.

Members' attention was also drawn to the extensive work that had been carried out over some time to obtain a detailed breakdown of priorities, as a result of which three quarters of work now took place through Neighbourhood Plans which made it far easier to get change.

In response to Councillors' questions, officers made the following comments:

- (1) Legal advice was being obtained concerning the phrasing of the original agreement (ie the use of the word "ward") prior to funding being assessed in view of the forthcoming changes to single, two Councillor and three Councillor wards. It was noted that the word ward was only referred to in the original document concerning Well Being funding, not other types of funding. The issue of determination of resources according to need had been acknowledged but all significant change would need to be made at Full Council;
- (2) Resources were being targeted in those areas which were most likely to change behaviour ie through the use of social media and more effective enforcement with accompanying training. Papers had not always reported positive stories in this area – greater enforcement and demonstration of making an impact were important which would save money in the longer term

Councillors made the following points:

- (3) It was important that discussion concerning the need for resources to tackle deprivation should continue, particularly for some aspects of NP work (ie Parks);
- (4) Engagement with the Police was important since their structures often mirrored those of Bristol City Council.

**Action: Not Applicable**

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

#### **134. Quarter 3 Performance Report for 2015/16 (Agenda Item 10)**

Members noted the performance report for Quarter 3 of 2015/16. Officers confirmed that Quarter 4 would be reported to the earliest meeting in 2016/17 Municipal Year for which they were available.

In response to members' questions, officers made the following points:

- (1) OSM's role in future concerning performance would be to examine any issues escalated to them by a particular Scrutiny Commission;

- (2) There had been recruitment difficulties concerning housing officers since it was a challenging job. There had already been extensive attempts to fill vacancies from existing staff whose posts had been lost but in many cases they did not have the correct skill set to deal with people who in many cases had quite challenging needs. Agency staff had been used to fill vacancies in certain situations. Consideration had been given to redesigning the Estate Management Team to help address this problem. In response to a request, the Strategic Director agreed to provide details of the levels of agency staff and the funding for them
- (3) It was acknowledged that putting ASB and Hate Crime together in a performance target was not helpful since these issues did not always overlap;
- (4) The Quality of Life data had now just been released so the information for Clean and Green Performance Targets would be included in future.

Councillors made the following comments:

- (5) There were certain strategic elements of performance which OSM monitored. However, some individual performance markers would need to be linked to each relevant Scrutiny Commission;
- (6) One possible solution to the difficulty of recruitment of Housing Officers was the use of the HRA for the Council to employ its own Mental Health support workers;
- (7) The reasons where performance targets had not been met needed to be made more clear in certain situations (ie NH586 – Percentage of Nuisance Complaints Resolved Within 6 Months);
- (8) A commitment to a unified budget would help improve performance;
- (9) The reduction in the staff in the noise team from 6 to 3 had impacted on performance – there needed to be a greater drive towards a technology based approach. Officers pointed out that, due to concerns that had been expressed about the impact on tenants, an agreement was now in place to fund additional staff in this area for 12 months

**Action: Alison Comley (Paragraph 2)**

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

### **135. Neighbourhoods Risk Register – March 2016 (Agenda Item 11)**

Officers introduced this report setting out details of the Neighbourhoods Risk Register as at March 2016. It was confirmed that the main differences from the previous register in August 2015 were in respect of Waste Management, Public Health, Health Protection and Food Safety Inspections.

In response to Members questions, officers confirmed that work was being carried out to reduce the current knowledge skills and expertise gap in particular areas of contract management. In addition, a new risk had been added concerning the risk of trees falling following a recent incident involving a member of staff.

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

**136. Byelaws for Parks and Green Spaces (Agenda Item 12)**

Members considered a report which sets out details of the consultation process to adopt byelaws for Parks and Green Spaces in Bristol and the timescales involved. It was noted that it was intended to sign off the report at 19<sup>th</sup> July 2016 Full Council meeting. It was noted that, during the consultation process, the public had indicated that they would like it to cover as many parks and green spaces as possible – 24 byelaws had been drafted and had been sent to the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) to ensure they were robust and evidence-based.

In response to a Councillor's question, officers confirmed that the DCLG were supportive of the local approach on this issue.

Councillors made the following points:

- (1) The report needed to clarify what restrictions on foraging for blackberries were, since one of the byelaws would relate to this;
- (2) Since approximately 50% of people had indicated they would like the ability to have barbecues very widely, a lasting solution to this issue needed to be considered. Officers indicated that, whilst this was correct, there were 32% of people who disagreed – issues such as disposal and damage to the ground needed to be considered.

The Commission agreed that, in addition to the two proposals for future action set out at the bottom of Page 157 of the report, the 6 additional issues identified at the bottom of the "external" heading at the top of this page are incorporated as a third proposal for future action.

**Resolved – that the action agreed above be implemented.**

**Action: Gillian Douglas**

**137. Review of 2015/16 Work Programme (Agenda Item 13)**

The review of the 2015/16 Work Programme was noted.

**Action: Not Applicable**

**138. Work Programme (Agenda Item 14)**

Members noted the Work Programme

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

**139. Date of Next Meeting (Agenda Item 15)**

It was noted that this was the last meeting of the current Municipal Year.

**CHAIR**

The meeting finished at 12.10pm.