



Minutes

Meeting	Date	Time	Location
WH Advisory Group	21 st October 2021	5.00pm - 6.30pm	Join via MS Teams Link

Attendees	<p>Advisory Group Chair John Savage, Executive Chairman - Bristol Chamber of Commerce & Initiative</p> <p>Advisory Group Members Chris Bond Hope Community Church David Turner Ashton Gate Dennis Gornall Cumberland Basin Stakeholder Group James Durie Business West Matthew Tanner SS Great Britain Paul Baker Bristol Property Agents</p> <p>BCC Representatives Abigail Stratford Head of Regeneration Alice Firebrace Regeneration Project Officer Emily Price Regeneration Manager Simon Cowley Mayor's Policy Manager Stephen Peacock Executive Director, Growth and Regeneration</p> <p>Apologies / Declined: Alex Hearn North Somerset Council Alice Towle Youth Mayor David Mellor Architect Gareth Blacker Homes England Ian Wilkinson Underfall Yard Marti Burgess City Centre Revitalisation Group Paul Baker Bristol Property Agents Sandra Meadows Voscur Simon Dicken Bedminster Business Improvement District</p>
------------------	---

Item	
1.	Welcome and Apologies The Chair welcomed attendees to the meeting.
2.	Previous Minutes The minutes to the meetings of 9 September 2021 and 29th July 2021 were approved.

3.

Update on engagement

Emily Price updated the AG on the feedback from the engagement thus far and next steps.

A member of the AG thought it positive that sessions were planned for different days to allow for the best possible attendance. They also asked that emerging themes from the engagement be shared with the group so that they could be passed on to bodies AG members are involved with, as well as outline opportunities for future participation. It was noted having this information publicly available would be useful for those who did not make it to the first stage of the engagement so that they are informed to contribute to the visioning process in the second phase. It was noted it is important to get the information out as widely and as soon as possible.

Emily Price noted that officers were not able to share feedback imminently as it needs to be updated with further insights from the website, the final listening labs etc, however it would be good to share this publicly. She said that information about the future session(s) and exhibition would be released towards the end of the week of the 25th October. This will be posted both on the website, (which can be referred to by members of the AG) and through other channels as well.

Another member of the AG commented that the statistics around visits to the website had been impressive. They noted that the numbers who attended live events were lower than hoped but considered the quality of the response more important than sheer numbers. They suggested that those who had not been able to secure a space in one of the sessions be sent an invitation to the next. Given the successful involvement of people online, it would be wise to ensure that the next stage of engagement and the online platforms are well aligned.

They also added that encouraging media interaction could be focused on more in the visioning stage. Emily Price noted that there had been good media coverage at the initial launch of the process. This included the Mayor speaking on local radio, a blog and articles in the press. There had been an article on one a Riverside session which covered the event in a way that was at least different to how other BCC engagement had been reported on before and which brought out how different engagement was this time around. She noted a lack of media interest since then. Once the next stage is clarified, the press team and Mayor’s office will be brought in to help spread the word.

Stephen Peacock noted that the lack of press interest suggested that the approach was appropriate. He noted that comments on the map had showed a breadth of responses and insight. He was pleased that this was being done in a ‘multichannel’ way, alongside offline events.

Simon Cowley noted that very few comments had come into the Mayor’s office, which was unusual, and a distinct contrast with the 2019 engagement. He thought that this suggested that progress was being made with the community.

Emily Price noted that seeking an in-depth response had been key to this engagement, and that the team had been conscious of not oversubscribing the events due to Covid19. She acknowledged that it was important to tie the web-based engagement to the in-person happenings, and that this point would be considered.

A member of the AG asked who was invited to the Listening Lab for local residents. Emily Price said that the mail merge was sent to 165 address points – taking in those within the line of the project area as well as those who’s streets looked into the area. Of these, 11 signed up to the session. She noted that it was a good session once it had been made clear that no decision had been made around the road network. Feedback had been that

	<p>attendees were pleased to be a part of the conversation.</p> <p>A member of the AG asked what would happen to the online map going into the next stage of the engagement. Emily Price said that she understood that another layer could be put onto the existing map, which would allow people to comment on themes that had emerged from Stage 1. This will allow the public to refine and prioritise those themes in order to better draw out place principles for the vision. The timings of when this crossover will happen is to be worked out.</p> <p>The Chair commented that a lot of impressive work had been carried out thus far and that he hoped that this was useful for what comes next.</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p>WHAG Review</p> <p>The Chair commented that WHAG had initially been quite a big group, formed to ensure that public sentiments were effectively channelled into future plans for the area. However, attendance has dropped off in recent months. He noted that it was important that the group could ensure that the concerns of the public were heard by the Council.</p> <p>Abigail Stratford commented that in 2022 the project will move into the master planning stage, making this a good time to reflect on what has gone well and what could be improved. In particular the review would look to ensure greater attendance, that the group contains the skills necessary for the next phase and that it becomes more diverse and representative. The team are planning to send out questionnaires to the AG which will subsequently be fed back into the review.</p> <p>The Chair commented that the group’s exchanges were extremely rational, and that for those who had stuck with the group over what had been a difficult time, interest was clear. He noted that it was important to identify the gaps Abigail Stratford spoke of. He also thought that it would be useful to have a clearer idea of where the project was going in order to be productive and objective, something which hopefully would be borne out in the Vision.</p> <p>A member of the AG noted that there was an opportunity to use WHAG to a greater degree, especially in the next phase. Another member thought that signposting dates of critical decisions would improve attendance.</p> <p>Stephen Peacock noted that present times had been tricky but that there had been some excellent engagement from the group. He appreciated WHAG’s guidance over the period and reflected that material will become available in the Vision to inform future decisions on WHAG. He stressed that the Mayor will ultimately decide on the formation of the group and what it does.</p> <p>Another AG member hoped that before the vision was made public, the report would be shared with the AG to allow them to advise on any gaps or further actions before the next stage begins.</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p>AOB</p> <p>Abigail Stratford reminded the AG that WHAG will be invited to a Technical Meeting with other members of the Council and external technical stakeholders on the 19th of November. This will take place before the next formal meeting on the 25th November.</p>