

Bedminster Green River Restoration Proposals - You said, we did

This document aims to evidence how Bristol City Council is using community feedback from the Bedminster Green consultation undertaken in February and March 2021, to inform detailed designs going forward. Common themes found in the responses can be found in the first column, the corresponding feedback and design changes are then found adjacent to each theme.

Theme	Community Feedback Received YOU SAID:	Resultant Design WE DID:
<p>Design of the Amphitheatre Area in the Green, with:</p> <p>Option 1: Straight path down to the river's edge in the Green</p> <p>Option 2: Zig-zagged path along the stepped amphitheatre down to the river's edge in the Green</p>	<p>The majority of respondents (38%) had no preference in designs. However, for respondents who did have a preference, the majority preferred design option 1 (straight sloped path down to the river's edge in the green) (36%), as opposed to only 26% preferring design option 2 (zig zag path along the amphitheatre levels down to the river's edge in the green).</p> <p>The majority of respondents felt that design option 1 would be the most accessible design option for all, with 51% of respondents choosing this option as opposed to 31% supporting design option 2 as most accessible design option for all. There were 18% of respondents who felt that neither design of the two options proposed would make the space accessible for all.</p>	<p>Design option 1 (straight path down to the river's edge) has been chosen to be included in the detailed designs for the river restoration, given it was the most preferred option and considered the most accessible of the two design options.</p>
<p>Accessibility</p>	<p>There was strong support for the proposal to provide both a stepped pathway and a sloped ramp from the Green down to the edge of the river, with 81% of respondents either agreeing or strongly agreeing to the proposal. 7% of respondents did not support the inclusion of a stepped pathway and a sloped ramp by either disagreeing or strongly disagreeing. 12% of respondents had no preference.</p>	<p>Both stepped access and ramped access within the Green will be retained within the detailed designs to ensure designs are accessible for all.</p>
<p>Amphitheatre Seating</p>	<p>Respondents largely supported the proposal to provide amphitheatre type seating leading down towards the river, with (78%) of respondents either agreeing or strongly agreeing to the proposal. 13% of respondents had no</p>	<p>Given the strong support for the amphitheatre, this will remain within the detailed designs.</p>

	<p>preference as to whether amphitheatre seating is provided and therefore neither agreed nor disagreed to the proposal. 9% of respondents either disagreed or strongly disagreed with providing amphitheatre seating.</p>	<p>The amphitheatre seating will also be extended round on the eastern side to provide further seating, given feedback suggested seating provision was a high priority for the Green.</p>
Tree Removal	<p>The majority of respondents agreed to removing some trees to allow for opening up the river in the Green (37%), with a further 9% strongly agreeing to this. A total of 46% of respondents are therefore supportive of removing trees within the green to allow for the river to be brought back above ground. A slightly smaller percentage of respondents either disagree or strongly disagree with removing trees (31%). Nearly a quarter (23%) of respondents had no preference.</p> <p>The majority of respondents (42%) agreed to removing trees to allow the river to be opened up and allow for improved biodiversity in the area. The second most common response was that respondents strongly agreed to removing trees, given the proposed benefits. The third most held view was that respondents did not agree nor disagree with the removal of trees (14%). The least most held view was strongly disagreeing with proposals to remove trees (5%). 13% of respondents were opposed to tree removal.</p> <p>Tree replacement was considered to be essential, if tree removal is necessary and it was suggested that this should be done on site, or as close as possible.</p>	<p>Only essential tree removal will be undertaken to allow the river to be opened out within the Green and for the river restoration to be undertaken. Tree loss will be mitigated through tree replacement within 1 mile of the Green, in accordance with the Bristol Tree Replacement Standard.</p>
Removing Channel Walls/Opening up the River	<p>The proposal to open up the river in the Green and remove channel walls in Plots 1 and 3 was supported by the majority, with 46% of respondents agreeing to the proposal and 42% of respondents strongly agreeing to the proposal. 8% of respondents neither agreed nor disagreed to the proposal. No respondents disagreed with the proposal, however 4% did strongly disagree</p>	<p>The river will be opened-up within the Green and channel walls will be removed in Plots 1 and 3.</p>

Heritage/Penstock Restoration	<p>There was strong support for the proposed improvements to the penstock, with 78% of respondents either agreeing or strongly agreeing to the proposal. A small percentage of respondents did not support the improvements (6%), by either disagreeing or strongly disagreeing to the proposals. 16% of respondents did not agree or disagree to the proposed improvements to the penstock.</p> <p>It was suggested that proposals could benefit from the inclusion of information boards advising on the history of the River Malago and the ecological benefits it provides.</p>	<p>The penstock will be improved and restored to preserve the heritage of the area.</p> <p>The inclusion of information boards on the area's heritage and ecology is being considered for delivery through either BCC's (Bristol City Council's) Public Art scheme for Bedminster, or through BCC's river restoration proposals subject to obtaining Heritage Lottery Funding.</p>
Vegetated Banks and Railings	<p>Respondents supported the proposal for vegetated banks within the Green and railings on the edge of banks in the development plots, with 84% of respondents either agreeing or strongly agreeing with the proposals. Only 7% of respondents were opposed to the proposals, either disagreeing or strongly disagreeing with including vegetated banks in the Green and railings along the banks in development plots. 9% of respondents neither agreed, nor disagreed to the proposal.</p> <p>The Environment Agency advised that banks should be vegetated with shrubs, wildflowers and grass, rather than trees, which can present greater risk of channel blockage and flood risk issues.</p>	<p>Vegetated banks will be retained within the detailed designs, however they will now consist of shrubs, grass and wildflower mixes, rather than containing new trees, as these have greater risk of blocking the channel and presenting a flood risk to surrounding developments. Tree's will instead be replaced a close as possible to the Green and within a 1-mile radius.</p>
Maintenance	<p>Suggestions were given that the proposed works will need to be appropriately maintained in the long term and consideration should be given to regular channel clearances (fly tipping) and street cleaning; it was considered that the current fly tipping and rubbish issues in the area will not improve, despite the physical improvements to the area.</p>	<p>Proposed works will receive routine maintenance visits from our watercourse maintenance contractor, who will clear the channel of litter, small debris and silt. Proposed works in the Green and on the channel banks will be maintained by BCC's Parks Department. Large in channel blockages will be removed by the Environment Agency (EA). BCC has been closely liaising with the EA to ensure designs consider their access requirements to remove larger blockages.</p>

Amenities and Natural Surveillance	<p>The majority of respondents either agreed or strongly agreed (56%) with improving the amenities within the Green and retaining the views from existing roads. 13% of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with improving the amenities and retaining views from existing roads, whilst 31% of respondents had no preference on amenities in the Green and surveillance.</p>	<p>Seating provision will be increased from the current designs, through extending the length of the seating provided within the amphitheatre.</p> <p>Natural surveillance within the amphitheatre area will be ensured through selection of a railing design, which allows for views to be retained from Whitehouse Lane.</p>
Lighting	<p>The inclusion of unlit areas along the river channel to benefit nocturnal wildlife was supported by the majority of respondents, with 74% of respondents either agreeing or strongly agreeing to unlit areas. 14% of respondents do not agree with the proposed unlit areas, either disagreeing or strongly disagreeing to them. 12% of respondents had no preference for or against including unlit areas.</p> <p>Support was given to limiting light within the area, specifically in and immediately next to the river to benefit nocturnal species. However, concern was given to the safety of the area at night and therefore respondents suggested that there was a need to ensure that the area (or at least the paths) are lit and CCTV is used.</p>	<p>BCC is working with the developer of Plot 5 (who is undertaking the design and landscaping of the northern part of the Green), to ensure the paths within the Green will be appropriately lit to provide a sense of safety at night. Additionally, the surrounding new development and highway lights, will overspill into the Green at night, given their proximity.</p> <p>Through working with the Local Police and Secure by Design Officer, to avoid attracting people into the Green at night (when antisocial behaviours are most likely to occur), the designs for the stretch of river to be brought back above ground (through the Green) and the amphitheatre seating area (which will be accessible to the public), will not include lighting. Monitoring the scheme after construction will be used to inform whether CCTV will be required to deter antisocial behaviour.</p> <p>The stretches of river restoration flowing through Plot's 1 and 3 will be inaccessible to the public and therefore will not be lit, to provide a space for nocturnal wildlife to thrive.</p>