

**Minutes of the Annual General meeting of the
Stoke Bishop, Westbury-on-Trym and Henleaze
Neighbourhood Partnership held at
Portway Rugby Development Centre,
Portway, Sea Mills, Bristol BS9 2HS
13 June 2016 at 7 pm**

Members

Ward Councillors

Westbury - on - Trym and Henleaze - Clare Champion-Smith, Geoff Gollop, Liz Radford;

Stoke Bishop - Peter Abraham, John Goulandris;

Neighbourhood Partnership Ward Members

Stoke Bishop - Ella Davies, Graham Donald, Roger Gamlin, Peter Robottom, Peter Weeks;

Westbury-on-Trym and Henleaze - Alan Aburrow, Valerie Bishop, Helen Furber, David Mayer, Robert Murphy, Vacancy;

Other representatives - Paul Bolton-Jones (Police Neighbourhood Manager), Jenny Hodges (Equalities representative) Vacancy (Neighbourhood Watch representative) Stephanie French (Tree representative);

Andrew McGrath-Neighbourhood Co-ordinator, Steve Gregory-Clerk to the Neighbourhood Partnership.

1. Welcome and introductions, apologies for absence.

Apologies were received from Alan Aburrow, Peter Robottom and Jenny Hodges.

The Partnership expressed its sincere thanks and appreciation to the former ward members Gay Huggins, Alan Preece, Wendy Hull who had stood down and to former Councillors Glenise Morgan and Alastair Watson for their considerable and energetic contribution to the work of the Partnership.

Newly elected ward representatives Ella Davies, Graham Donald, Roger Gamlin, Robert Murphy and Councillor Liz Radford were warmly welcomed.

The Partnership noted that since the last meeting the Ward boundaries for all the Wards comprising the Partnership area had changed and that this had raised a number of concerns and frustrations.

Whilst the Partnership had no discretion over the events brought in by the Boundary Commission a commitment was made to welcome any person who felt they had been annexed out of the NP, against their wishes, to attend any of the Neighbourhood Forums as the NP's guests and where communities had been split that it be recognised that those communities might want to retain an identity and

social cohesion that was not formally recognised by or reflected within the Ward boundaries as they now existed.

2. Neighbourhood Partnership annual general meeting report

The Partnership considered a report of the Neighbourhood Co-ordinator regarding the Neighbourhood Partnership's annual business for 2016/17.

Resolved –

1. That the Neighbourhood Partnership membership be noted and the chairing arrangements for 2016/17 be confirmed as below –

(i) **Neighbourhood Partnership Chair David Mayer and Vice Chair Graham Donald;**

(ii) **Neighbourhood Committee Chair Councillor Radford and Vice Chair Councillor Abraham;**

2. That the Neighbourhood Partnership and Neighbourhood Committee terms of reference and financial operating framework be endorsed;

3. That the devolved Neighbourhood Budget be noted;

4. That the meeting schedule including subgroups and forums be agreed;

5. That the financial statement and expenditure from 2015-16 be noted.

3. Minutes of the meeting of the Neighbourhood Partnership held on 7 March 2016

The Minutes of the meeting held on 7 March 2016 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

4. Declarations of interest

None were declared.

5. Public forum

Subject	Name	Number
Student parking issues following the major expansion of the Stoke Bishop Halls of Residence	Andy Nairn	1

The Partnership received a statement in respect of student parking issues following the major expansion of the Stoke Bishop Halls of Residence and noted the serious ongoing parking problems which were a major concern to local residents.

The Partnership was asked to help local residents hold the University to account on commitments it made to its neighbours and ensure local streets were not used by its students as a dumping ground for their cars during term time and bring pressure to bear on the University to honour its promises and take ownership of the problem of

student parking and ensure that they take meaningful action towards finding a permanent solution to the problem.

After considering this issue the Partnership –

Agreed – that two of the five ward Councillors (on the NP) meet with the Vice Chancellor, or other appropriate officer, to have a reasonable discussion with the aim of finding an amicable solution acceptable to all parties. Councillor Campion-Smith also agreed to write a letter to the University in her capacity of Cabinet Member for People.

5 (a) Police

The Police representative reported that it had been intended for Unit Beat policing areas to match the recent ward boundary changes but there had been an unavoidable delay in implementing this. It was anticipated that this would be resolved within the next four weeks.

6. Wellbeing

The Partnership received a report of the Neighbourhood Co-ordinator regarding the allocation and recommendations of the Wellbeing Panel.

Well Being funds available at the start of the year: **£30,000**

At the June meeting the NP awarded:	£1,266
At the September meeting the NP awarded:	£1,630
At the December meeting the NP awarded:	£150
At the March meeting the NP awarded:	£4,839.79

Total allocated in 2015/16 = **£7,885.79**

This left (unspent in 2015/16): **£22,114.21** (c/f to 2016/17)

In respect of recommendation (3) St Ursula's PTFA playground project a question was raised about how provision of playgrounds in academies was funded. It was considered that further information be sought before making a decision.

In respect of recommendation (4) Councillor Radford declared a non-pecuniary interest regarding her work in relation to the Westbury Park Youth Group and informed the Partnership that she would not take part in the consideration and vote for this item.

The Neighbourhood Committee Members present voted on the recommendations as set out in the report.

On being put to the vote, subject to Councillor Radford abstaining with regard to recommendation (4), it was unanimously –

Resolved - to note the current Well Being allocation and approve funding allocation as recommended by the Wellbeing Panel (as amended regarding recommendation 3), as set out below -

Name	How much Requested £	Discussion and Recommendation
(1) Golden Hill Sports	£1,118.69	<p>The panel was pleased that the applicant has sought and gained match-funding.</p> <p><u>Vote:</u> Unanimous in favour of funding</p> <p>Recommendation: Fund Fully</p>
(2) Sea Mills Together	£250	<p>This has to be considered a one-off grant. The NP is supportive of Sea Mills residents wanting to retain their idea of being a village, but the NP is also keen to fully integrate Sea Mills in to the Stoke Bishop ward.</p> <p><u>Vote:</u> Unanimous in favour of funding</p> <p>Recommendation: Fund fully</p>
(3) St Ursula's PTFA playground project	£3,000 (£3,913.64)	<p><i>The panel has supported schools before but is concerned that the plans for the new build do not include playground provision.</i></p> <p><i>The panel would like a plaque acknowledging the NP's contribution placed either on the new bench or nearby.</i></p> <p><u>Vote:</u> Unanimous in favour of funding</p> <p><i>Recommendation: Fund fully</i></p> <p>DEFERRED – pending further information regarding Academy funding for playground provision</p>
(4) The Church in Westbury Park	£992.55	<p>The panel is not inclined to fund the compost element of the application as this is something that can be sought cheaply and regularly elsewhere</p>

Name	How much Requested £	Discussion and Recommendation
		<p>The panel would like a plaque acknowledging the NP's contribution placed either on the new bench or nearby.</p> <p>Vote: in favour of funding £792.55</p> <p>Recommendation: Fund £792.55</p>
(5) W-o-T Village Hall	£3,000	<p>The panel would like a plaque acknowledging the NP's contribution placed either on the new bench or nearby.</p> <p><u>Vote:</u> Unanimous in favour of funding</p> <p>Recommendation: Fund fully</p>
(6) W-o-T Methodist Church	£2,155	<p>The application was difficult to understand but it is assumed that the figure here is what is being requested.</p> <p>The application appears to contain a prayer. The applicant should be reminded that BCC funds cannot be used to fund religious work. This application comes close to being overtly religious. As the application is to help upgrade facilities for the benefit of user groups, the request is granted.</p> <p><u>Vote:</u> Unanimous in favour of funding</p> <p>Recommendation: Fund fully</p>
(7) Working Group for Older People	£3,000	<p>This application was withdrawn. The Well Being Panel believes that the WGOP, as a working group of the NP, shouldn't have to apply for funds from the Well Being budget. It has</p>

Name	How much Requested £	Discussion and Recommendation
		<p>recommended that the Chair of the WGOP put in a formal request to the NP for £3,000 from the NP budget.</p> <p>Recommendation: Do not fund as application withdrawn</p>

7. Feedback from Working Groups

(a) Environment and Tree Champion's report

The Neighbourhood Partnership noted the report and the decisions that were required to be taken.

The Neighbourhood Committee considered the recommendations in the report and on being put to the vote unanimously –

Resolved –

1. To fund up to £6,000 for trees from the NP's CIL allocation, with the exact cost to be determined as soon as possible;
2. To fund £1,000 from the NP's CIL funds for daffodils to be grown around the NP's playgrounds;
3. To allocate the NP's £1,500 Clean and Green budget as set out below -
 - Stoke Bishop - £500 hanging baskets;
 - W-o-T - £500 flower fund (WOTSOC);
 - Henleaze - £500 flora (details to be provided).

(b) Transport

The Neighbourhood Partnership noted the report and the decisions that were required to be taken.

The Neighbourhood Committee considered the recommendations in the report and on being put to the vote unanimously –

Resolved -

- (1) To approve a revision to the timescale for the previously sanctioned Henleaze Parking Review, whereby it would be completed over a two year period (2016/18) instead of the current one year (2016/17) at no extra cost to the NP;

(2) To approve expenditure of £10k from the NP's devolved funds for a Parking Review (and subsequent implementation) for streets around Sea Mills Station, as a Minor Traffic Scheme, spread over two years, starting 2016/17;

(3) To approve expenditure of £8k as a Minor Works project from the NP's devolved funds for kerb work, plus the inclusion of wooden bollards to prevent continuing verge damage in Canford Lane.

(c) Older people

The report was noted and a request for a **£3,000** budget for the WGOP to be drawn down as required was **agreed**. The NP noted that each draw-down would be formally requested from the Neighbourhood Committee.

(d) Communication

The report was noted. Helen Furber said that invitations to a meeting in respect of Neighbourhood Plan update were being sent out for 20 July and that any input for this meeting be sent through her rather than direct to Hayley Ash.

(e) Governance

No report was submitted for this meeting.

8. NP Plan update report

The Partnership considered a report of the Neighbourhood Co-ordinator updating the Neighbourhood Plan.

Resolved – That the updated NP Plan priorities for 2016/17 be agreed.

9. 2015/16 NP Plan achievements update report

The Partnership considered a report of the Neighbourhood Co-ordinator giving an update on the progress and some of the achievements of the 2015/16 NP Plan. It was noted that the NP had achieved an enormous amount via its working groups in 2015/16. The report highlighted a few of them.

Resolved – that the report be noted.

10. Neighbourhood Co-ordinator's report

The Partnership considered a report of the Neighbourhood Co-ordinator updating on various issues.

The NP noted that the next scheduled Forum dates should be as follows:

Henleaze – 7pm Tuesday 3 November 2016. Henleaze Library;
Westbury-on-Trym – 7pm Wednesday 2 November. Venue 35;

Stoke Bishop – 7pm Thursday 1 November 2016. Stoke Bishop Primary;

Also noted that Neighbourhood Coordinator would send out invite for 20 July NP Plan meeting, change NP pre-meeting start time from 5.30 pm to 6 pm and discuss possible arrangement of open forums for the summer period rather than wait until November.

Resolved – that having regard to the above :

- 1. The updates from the last forums be noted;**
- 2. The information relating to an upcoming city-wide NP event be noted;**
- 3. The meeting schedule and the proposed dates/times, as amended, be agreed;**
- 4. The updates on the NP's devolved budgets and the update on non-devolved S106 funding allocated to the NP area be noted.**

(The meeting ended at 8.35 pm)

CHAIR