



**AVONMOUTH AND KINGSWESTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PARTNERSHIP
7.00 PM ON 6TH MARCH 2012
AT PBA SPORTS AND SOCIAL CLUB,
NIBLEY ROAD, SHIREHAMPTON, BRISTOL**

PRESENT:

Ward Councillors:

Councillor Doug Naysmith (Avonmouth Ward)
Councillors Tim Leaman and Simon Rayner (Kingsweston Ward)

Partners: Representing Lawrence Weston (LW), Sea Mills (SM), Shirehampton (S) and Avonmouth (A)

Jenny Winfield (SM), Gil Osman (S), David Thomas (S), Val Pospichil equalities rep (LW)
David Trivitt (SM), John Bees (SM), Ann Green (SM), Mark Pepper, Renee Slater (S), Val Jenkins equalities rep (S), Angela Abbott (A) and Alv Hirst (A).

Officers:

Gillian Douglas (BCC, Equalities), Gary Brentnall (BCC, Parks), Hayley Ash (Area Coordinator), Jenny Makely (BCC, Parks), Raquib Khandken (BCC, Neighbourhoods) Alan Berridge (BCC, Traffic), Mark Sperduty (BCC, Traffic) and Sam Mahony (DSO).

Other attendees: Sam Parker (LW), Helen Bone (LW), Deb & Phil Rees (A), Ed Williams (SM), Stella Dinevz (SM), Rosy Fowler (SM), Amanda Eldridge (SM), Martin McDonnell (SM).

Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillor Kennedy-Hall and Ann Hawker,

***Neighbourhood Partnership chair John Bees chaired items 1 to 6
Neighbourhood Committee chair Cllr Simon Rayner chaired items 6 to 12***

- 1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS, APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**
- 2. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PARTNERSHIP HELD ON 6TH DECEMBER 2012**

THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PARTNERSHIP RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 6th December 2011 be agreed as a correct record.

- 3. PUBLIC FORUM**

A public forum statement from Avon Wildlife Trust would be heard prior to Item 9.

4. AREA CO-ORDINATOR UPDATE

The Neighbourhood Partnership (NP) considered a report of the Area Co-ordinator (agenda item no. 4). The report outlined projects and updates carried out over the last three months.

The Partnership noted their appreciation to the Police for the reduction in crime over the whole area and for presenting the statistics in a helpful and relevant format.

The 'You Said We Did' summary in Appendix (4) A analysed on a village level, issues coming forward and how they were addressed. It would be presented to future NP meetings.

Councillor Leaman confirmed that reports of trail bike use in Lawrence Weston had increased and that he would raise it at the next NDT meeting.

THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PARTNERSHIP RESOLVED that the contents of the report be noted.

5. EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES UPDATE

The Neighbourhood Partnership considered a report from Gillian Douglas (agenda item no. 5) giving an update on equal opportunities policy. The Equalities and Community Cohesion Team were available to advise on any equalities issues, discussions and decisions made within the Neighbourhood Partnership. Val Jenkins and Val Pospichil were the equalities representatives on the partnership.

People should be able to access services appropriate to their needs, as legislated in The Equalities Act 2010 and should not be discriminated against. Wellbeing Grant money should be inclusive and reach targeted groups who need particular activities or outcomes.

The Partnership were encouraged to monitor equalities data such as the profile mix served by Wellbeing Fund projects and events. Information supplied on the application form could be followed up upon delivery.

The Partnership acknowledged that some groups within the community (such as some older people) did not have access to the internet, which resulted in a division between those who can and those who cannot get information electronically. There was a responsibility on all organisations to make sure information is able to be accessed in alternative formats such as translated, paper copies, Braille or large print.

In response to a query, it was explained that a certain amount of exemptions were permitted to allow positive action against historical negative inequalities. Exemptions were allowed on the basis of evidence and justified to speed up the process of reaching equalities.

THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PARTNERSHIP RESOLVED that the contents of the report be noted.

6. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were none.

7. DEVOLVED SERVICES REPORT

The Neighbourhood Partnership considered a report of the Area Co-ordinator (agenda item no. 7) which gave an update on devolved services.

Suggestions of further projects for the Clean and Green team were sought. Any requests should go to Hayley Ash. Completed jobs/ funds allocated were listed within the appendix to the report. Any money not spent would be carried forward for the following year.

Residents were concerned about the state of disrepair of the tennis courts in Sea Mills and although that was not a job suitable for Clean and Green funds, Councillors would speak to the residents directly to ascertain the appropriate course of action.

THE NEIGHBOURHOOD COMMITTEE RESOLVED that the report be noted.

8. SAFER BRISTOL REPORT

The Neighbourhood Partnership considered a report of the Safer Bristol Partnership (agenda item no. 8) setting out the Community Safety Delivery Agreement.

THE NEIGHBOURHOOD COMMITTEE RESOLVED that the report be deferred to the next meeting of the Neighbourhood Partnership.

9. PARKS AND GREEN SPACES SURPLUS LAND DECISION

The Neighbourhood Partnership considered a report of the Neighbourhood Engagement Manager (agenda item no. 9) which set out the parks and green spaces surplus land decision. The Committee were asked to consider which sites presented were surplus to requirements, or alternatively, to decide by which date that decision would be made.

A statement was noted from the Avon Wildlife Trust against the sale of Portway Tip/Daisyfields and Henacre open spaces as they were designated wildlife sites protected under national policy. In response to this it was confirmed that some areas may provide a wildlife corridor to protect areas such as sites for water voles.

A lengthy discussion took place, within which the following points were made;

- A consultation had taken place between June and October 2010.
- Sites not declared surplus were expected to be designated as 'important open space' and given a high level of protection (although not fully protected) through the planning process.
- An incentive scheme was outlined as agreed by a cross-party working group with decision making delegated from Cabinet to Neighbourhood Committees.
- Sites were identified in value bands due to commercial sensitivity. Four sites were identified as in flood risk zones, reflected in their estimated value, and needed further work.

- On a sliding scale, a maximum of 70% of the money from the sale of all the open spaces could be allocated back to the NP, if they choose to sell all the sites proposed. The remaining 30% of the money would be kept centrally for parks across the city. The sliding scale meant that if the Committee chose not to sell Daisyfields/ Portway Tip and Henacre, they would only get 8% of the proceeds of the other sites, a maximum of £50,000. It was suggested therefore that the gains were not worth the sales and that the rules of the incentive scheme were punitive and should be reconsidered.
- Sites would continue to be maintained to the current specification, but new facilities may not happen as quickly without additional money from the sale of land. BCC had set their own levels to help prioritise parks improvements for the future.
- It was possible that the land could be held until sales values increased.
- Any development on the land could bring in money through Community Infrastructure Levy for improvement in area. There would be consultation with residents about how the land could be used and it would go through the planning process.
- It was suggested that some land should be kept free from development to stop areas building up entirely and also to prevent high emissions in the area.
- Questions were raised about whether some of the land could be divided up and sold to different people (local residents/businesses). It was suggested that the full footprint would be marketed and each site considered separately.

It was agreed that each of the sites would be considered in turn and comments noted. The residents would also then be asked their thoughts at each of the Forum meetings before returning for a decision on June 12th. The initial thoughts of the Partnership were as follows;

Cook Street Open Space – The site was in flood risk zone 3 and it would be difficult to develop, which was reflected in the proposed value. The park was currently a haven for anti social behaviour and development could improve the area.

Land at rear of Merrimans Drive – The site was in flood risk zone 3 and would be difficult to develop, which was reflected in the proposed value.

Longcross Woodland – There were no comments against the proposed sale of the land.

Moorend Gardens – A compromise could be to allow housing along Barrowmead edge of the site but keep some land for the residents of the other street to park on. It was suggested that the Moorend Gardens should be spoken to and that the Planning Group be consulted. Seven responses received in initial consultation on that site.

Moorgrove – There were issues with access as development was ongoing at the Penpole Inn. The developers had an offer for the land turned down due to the ongoing process. As the site was now landlocked it was thought that development was unlikely.

Napier Square Park – There were no huge objections to development of the site as there was currently a playground at the end of Richmond Terrace. The proposal should be discussed with local residents at the Avonmouth Forum.

Daisyfields (Portway Tip) – There had been objections at every consultation from the beginning of the process. The public feeling was for the site to be saved, and it was also an important site in terms of wildlife on both sides of the footpath. Although, it was noted as a large piece of land which could potentially unlock a large amount of investment for the parks across the NP area.

Henacre –The site was near one of the most deprived parts of Avonmouth. Residents of the flats used the land, and it was had a cycle path. Some anti-social behaviour could be tackled by positive landscaping which could help change the current use of the land. It was suggested that there may have been a past planning decision on appeal that the area of land between the roundabout and the houses should not be built on.

The residents group at Henacre should be consulted and there needed to be a community plan for the land, to see whether some land could be released for investment. Specific conditions could be included for a playground, wildlife protection etc.

It was an important consideration of how much of any proceeds would be reinvested on that site and to improve the area of Avonmouth and Lawrence Weston. The sale of the sites via the incentive scheme could mean such a small amount of money that it penalised residents for wanting to save their loved spaces.

THE NEIGHBOURHOOD COMMITTEE RESOLVED THAT the formal decision regarding the sites would be made at the meeting of 12th June 2012.

THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PARTNERSHIP expressed concerns about the incentive mechanism and asked the Cabinet to reconsider in line with proportion that if any or all are sold, to receive 70% of the proceeds.

10. DEVOLVED TRAFFIC SCHEMES 2012/13

The Neighbourhood Partnership considered a report of the Service Director, Transport Services (agenda item no. 10) setting out the devolved traffic schemes 2012/13.

Local Traffic Schemes

The total budget was identified as £17,147 with an estimated underspend from 2011/12 of £4,450 which brought the total to £21,597. The options were discussed and the following chosen in priority order;

1. **T8 – Minor signs and lining £1500**
2. **T7 – Kingsweston Lane/ Kingsweston Road Junction approx £2,000 –** The project should be continued as agreed in the previous financial year. It was confirmed that the proposal included the installation of an anti skid surface. Officers agreed to consider relocating the bit of wall that juts out, although as it was likely to be listed, it may not be possible.
3. **T3 – Shire Health Centre approx £1,500 –** The scheme included parking deterrent measures on public highway outside the health centre. The PCT would also allocate £1500.
4. **T2 – Hung Road/Station Road Junction approx £4,000 –** Lesser measures had been attempted through minor signs and lining but it was proposed that yellow lines would complete the project.

5. **T5 – Westbury Lane adjacent to shops approx £12,000** – This would likely be sited on the Nursery side. The work needed would include yellow lines on the corners. A refuge island was particularly discussed and would be possible with the £12,000 however, officers would confirm which type of crossing was the most viable option.

THE NEIGHBOURHOOD COMMITTEE RESOLVED THAT Local Traffic Schemes be supported in the following order;

T8 – Minor signs and lining £1500

T7 – Kingsweston Lane/ Kingsweston Road Junction approx £2,000

T3 – Shire Health Centre approx £1,500

T2 – Hung Road/Station Road Junction approx £4,000

T5 – Westbury Lane adjacent to shops approx £12,000

Footway Resurfacing

There had been a slight underspend of £1000 from the last financial year which would be carried over which brought the total to £43,000.

It was confirmed that the cycle way was not included within the assessment of the footways.

Members of the Partnership favoured work to **Avonlease and Woodlease (F2)** as it had not been selected in previous years due to construction at the school. The construction work was due to finish by August and contractors would be asked to put it right if it was a requirement of the planning process. Work not done by the construction company would be completed as part of the Footway Resurfacing scheme.

The other scheme selected was **Brooklease/Meadway & Failand Crescent (F1)**.

THE NEIGHBOURHOOD COMMITTEE RESOLVED THAT Footway Resurfacing be completed as F1 and F2, with F2 higher priority. (to be started after any contractor work has been completed at the school).

Carriage Surface Dressing

With limited scope of what can use it for, prioritisation had identified only one road in need of work within the NP area. The Neighbourhood Committee agreed to allocate the funds to **Severn Road (Ableton to Motorway) (C1)**

The Committee requested more options be presented in future years to qualify as valid local decision making. Roads should also be within residential areas.

THE NEIGHBOURHOOD COMMITTEE RESOLVED THAT Carriage Surface Dressing be carried out to **Severn Road (Ableton to Motorway) (C1) to be allocated the funds.**

Section 106 –

The Neighbourhood Committee were happy for officers to proceed with the design for S1, Old Barrow Hill, pedestrian refuge facility.

Reporting back on traffic signal plans for S2 (Merebank, Kingsweston Lane, Avonmouth) and S3 (Cabot Park, Avonmouth), officers considered that signals were not needed at the moment, and put on hold in the event that traffic flow needs increased in the future.

Regarding S4, £7,500 was agreed for the provision of enhanced pedestrian facilities at the former Iron Bridge Public House, Westbury Lane, Kingsweston.

THE NEIGHBOURHOOD COMMITTEE RESOLVED THAT plans for Section 106 works be noted as follows;

S1 – Proceed with the design

S2 & S3 – To be put on hold/ under review for the future

S4 – Agreed £7,500 to continue to project.

11. WELLBEING REPORT

The Neighbourhood Partnership considered a report of the Area Co-ordinator (agenda item no. 11) which outlined proposed wellbeing grants.

The recommendation of the Grants Panel was that all projects be agreed and the overspend awarded from next years funding. This was proposed and agreed.

THE NEIGHBOURHOOD COMMITTEE RESOLVED that

(1) the current funding situation be noted; and

(2) the recommendations of the Well Being Panel of 15th February 2012 agreed (appendix A to the report).

12. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The date of the next neighbourhood partnership meeting would be on Tuesday 12th June 2012 at Highgrove Church from 7.00 p.m..

(The meeting ended at 9.40pm)

CHAIR