

**AREA PANEL FIVE – UPDATE REPORT
FOR 6 JULY 2005
ST MARY'S PARISH CHURCH, DARLEY LANE**

**Area and Neighbourhood Unit
Bill Reed, Area Panel Manager, telephone 258501
Vickie Butler, Information and Communications Officer, telephone 258529**

CONTENTS PAGE

COMMUNITY ISSUE	PAGE NO
1. Ref: 503035 – Parking at Markeaton Primary School – raised 02.07.03.....	3
2. Ref: 503051 – King Street Subway – received 08.10.03.....	4
3. Ref: 504020 – Concrete Bollards, Prince Charles Avenue – received 02.06.04	5
4. Ref: 504027 – Pedestrian crossing, Blenheim Drive – received 02.06.04	6
5. Ref: 504035 – Pedestrian Crossing, Mackworth Estate – received 21.07.04	7
6. Ref: 504046 – Garages, Darley Abbey– raised 06.10.04.....	8
7. Ref: 504054 – Rat running on Church Lane, Darley Abbey– raised 07.12.04	9
8. Ref: 504055 – Litter bins in Knightsbridge Recreation Ground – raised 07.12.04	11
9. Ref: 504058 – Litter, footway St Benedict School to Broadway– raised 07.12.04	12
10. Ref: 504059 – Balustrade at Darley Abbey Park and S106 monies in Strutts Park.– raised 07.12.04.....	13
11. Ref: 505005 – Graffiti - raised 02.02.05	15
12. Ref: 505006 – Petition – Planning application for 24 flats, Duffield Road - raised 06.04.05	17
13. Ref: 505007 – Parking issues, Kedleston Road- raised 06.04.05	18
14. Ref: 505008 – Bushes - raised 06.04.05	19
15. Ref: 505009 – Council budget process.- raised 06.04.05	20
16. Ref: 505011 – Speed limit on Broadway - raised 06.04.05	21
17. Ref: 505012 – Bollards, Darley Park - raised 06.04.05	22
18. Ref: 504060 – Petition - Parking, Oakover Drive - Petition – raised 07.12.04.....	23
19. Ref: 504061 – Petition - Parking on Penny Long Lane - raised 07.12.04	24
20. Ref: 505010 – Petition – Prince Charles Avenue - raised 06.04.05	26
21. Ref: 505013 – Petition – Restrictive Parking, North Street - raised 06.04.05.....	28
22. Ref: 505014 – Petition – Crossing on Park Lane and Cornhill- raised 06.04.05	29

1. Ref: 503035 – Parking at Markeaton Primary School – raised 02.07.03

Issue

The need to introduce parking restrictions outside Markeaton Primary School.

Action reported at the meeting on 6 April 2005

It is unlikely now that we will be far enough into the consultation process to have the draft Order drawn up for 6 April. However, part of this statutory consultation procedure involves advertising the Order in the press and in notices on site. This is so that all members of the public have the chance to view the proposals and put their comments forward. As such, everyone will get the chance to see the proposals at the appropriate time.

Public response at the meeting on 6 April 2005

A Mackworth resident asked the panel who they had spoken to in the area.

Council response at the meeting on 6 April 2005

Bill Reed confirmed that it is a formal order that is drawn up with the school and other organisations in the area. Once the order is ready then it would be publicised in the Derby Evening Telegraph. The public then have a three week period to comment.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 6 April 2005

Updates on agreed actions to feedback at the meeting on 6 July 2005

The order is not yet available. We are mid-way through the process and still undertaking consultation. No objections have been received to date.

We hope to have the order available for the October meeting.

Responsibility

Michelle Spamer, Area and Neighbourhood Co-ordinator, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 715064

2. Ref: 503051 – King Street Subway – received 08.10.03

Issue

Residents voiced concern about the safety of the subway under King Street and asked that it be closed.

Action reported at the meeting on 6 April 2005

Cabinet have set aside £100,000 for the subway to be filled in and a surface crossing provided. A further update will be provided at the meeting. Bill Reed confirmed that preparation for the work is currently underway, and he understands that it will be concluded by the end of this current financial year, so within 12 months.

Public response at the meeting on 6 April 2005

None.

Council response at the meeting on 6 April 2005

Councillor Repton welcomed this news.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 6 April 2005

It was agreed to keep this issue on the Panel agenda.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback at the meeting on 6 July 2005

We are currently working on plans for to put in a surface crossing and close the subway at Kings Street.

Responsibility

Michelle Spamer, Area and Neighbourhood Co-ordinator, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 715064

3. Ref: 504020 – Concrete Bollards, Prince Charles Avenue – received 02.06.04

Issue

Need for bollards to stop vehicles driving over paved pedestrian areas. In particular, vehicles servicing the cash machine were driving on the paved areas. Agreed to ask the Co-op whether they could make alternative arrangements with the cash machine suppliers.

Action reported at the meeting on 6 April 2005

Concrete bollards will be put in on the land belonging to highways. Wooden bollards will be put in on the grassed area opposite the shops. We expect that this work will be completed by June 2005.

Public response at the meeting on 6 April 2005

None.

Council response at the meeting on 6 April 2005

None.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 6 April 2005

Updates on agreed actions to feedback at the meeting on 6 July 2005

The bollards should be in by the end of June and before the meeting on 6 July.

Responsibility

John Edgar, Maintenance Manager – Highways and Footways, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 715067
Bill Reed, Area Panel Manager, Policy Directorate, telephone 258501

4. Ref: 504027 – Pedestrian crossing, Blenheim Drive – received 02.06.04

Issue

Need for a pedestrian crossing at Woodlands School

Action reported at the meeting on 6 April 2005

There is no additional information to incorporate in the update report.

Public response at the meeting on 6 April 2005

None.

Council response at the meeting on 6 April 2005

Councillor Webb requested that this item be kept under review. He stated that a pedestrian crossing is in place less than 100 yards away from this area, at the infants and junior school. It is on the same road, and therefore does not understand how within 100 yards distance, how the criteria can change.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 6 April 2005

To keep this item under review.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback at the meeting on 6 July 2005

The pedestrian crossing referred to was put in place as part of the school travel plan. The traffic flows differ in this location, as a lot of traffic turns left before reaching the point where the request has been made for a further crossing. We would review the situation should Woodlands School develop a travel plan in the future.

Responsibility

Tony Gascoigne, Traffic Control Engineer, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 715019

5. Ref: 504035 – Pedestrian Crossing, Mackworth Estate – received 21.07.04

Issue

A pedestrian crossing was requested across the A52 between the Mackworth Estate and Markeaton Park as it was extremely dangerous, especially for children crossing.

Action reported at the meeting on 6 April 2005

The site suggested for a pedestrian crossing does not meet the Council's approved criteria and the Council is unable to provide a crossing.

Public response at the meeting on 6 April 2005

Council response at the meeting on 6 April 2005

Councillor Gerrard requested that this item be kept under review. He stated that facilities should be there for people cross safely, and just because there are few people crossing now, does not mean that a need does not exist.

Councillor Higginbottom stated that officers had been asked to carry out the count at a time when there would be people around, such as bonfire night, and not during a holiday period.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 6 April 2005

Updates on agreed actions to feedback at the meeting on 6 July 2005

The survey was conducted at the busiest traffic times, during the morning and evening peaks. It is recognised that on occasions pedestrians may have to wait some time for a safe gap in traffic or use other facilities which may be less convenient. However, the very low level of pedestrians means that the crossing falls well short of the Council's approved criteria. In these circumstances, it is not recommended that a crossing be introduced on Ashbourne Road on the approach to Markeaton Roundabout.

Responsibility

Michelle Spamer, Area and Neighbourhood Co-ordinator, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 715064

6. Ref: 504046 – Garages, Darley Abbey– raised 06.10.04

Issue

A member of the public questioned whether the nine Council garages adjoining the car park west of Darley Abbey in Darley Abbey village are being used effectively, as local residents had been informed that there was a waiting list for the garages, when in fact some were not in use, and repairs were taking a long time to be done.

Action reported at the meeting on 6 April 2005

The new garage doors have been fitted and the keys passed to us on 8 March. We are now approaching the next two people on the waiting list and hope to have these relet very soon.

Public response at the meeting on 6 April 2005

A Darley resident who originally raised this issue, stated that this should have been done without public intervention. She stated that at the October panel meeting they had been informed that all tenants would be written to, to find out if they still use the garages. After speaking to one of the tenants, they had informed her that they had never received such a letter. She asked that this be checked, and that letters are sent out.

Council response at the meeting on 6 April 2005

Actions agreed at the meeting on 6 April 2005

To report back on this item at the next meeting.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback at the meeting on 6 July 2005

The two garages with replacement doors have now been relet. Another garage has since become vacant and is being offered to the next person on the waiting list. A letter went out to all tenants at the start of June and at the time of writing this update, none of the tenants have replied to say that they wish to terminate their tenancy.

Responsibility

Julie Basford, Property Review Officer, Estates department, telephone 255545

7. Ref: 504054 – Rat running on Church Lane, Darley Abbey– raised 07.12.04

Issue

A number of residents raised concern about vehicles using Church Lane to avoid traffic queues on Duffield Road. It was reported on behalf of the Darley Abbey Traffic Committee that the Council had agreed to put in additional traffic calming measures, but that these had been withdrawn two years ago. The money had apparently been spent on coloured paving instead.

A resident felt that the situation would only improve if the A38 junctions were improved at Mackworth and on the A61.

Action reported at the meeting on 6 April 2005

Consultation about traffic management in Darley Abbey took place in the context of the Connecting Derby exhibitions and publicity, in November and December 2003. The report to Cabinet included the following section:

- 3.7 The responses on feedback on traffic management and calming measures that have been implemented in the Strutt's Park and Darley Abbey areas were most positive. Overall, people felt that traffic speeds had reduced and it was easier to cross the road. However, although in Strutt's Park, most people felt that rat-running had reduced, this was not considered the case in Darley Abbey. There was a strong view however, that no work to reduce rat- running further should be carried out at this time. It is therefore proposed that no further action is taken on specific measures in these areas, but that we will continue to monitor the situation.

A copy of the Cabinet report will be available at the meeting.

Public response at the meeting on 6 April 2005

A Darley Abbey resident thanked Councillor Repton for his comments, and stated that they would not sit back and wait for a fatality to happen. They need somebody to survey this area on a regular basis, as it is only a small reduction in through traffic, which is the danger area.

Another resident from Allestree reinforced that this is just part of the shocking traffic flow at peak times, right through from the boundaries of the City to the Five Lamps area. She agreed that the Council should look at this as a much wider issue.

Council response at the meeting on 6 April 2005

Councillor Repton highlighted his concern over the update given. He stated that residents do not feel that the existing measures sufficiently calm the traffic. The measures do not resolve the problems, and there will be dangers if this isn't addressed. He asked that Officers monitor the level of traffic, and then attend the meeting with positive suggestions to deter people from these routes, and prevent accidents occurring. He confirmed that residents want simple, effective measures, and the current measures do not deal with the problems.

Referring to the update, he asked the panel when and how the Darley Abbey residents were asked, as he was not aware of any recent surveys being done in the area. He explained that they had been promised that if the measures didn't work then it would be revisited. As a result, local residents were being misled. He urgently requested that Officers address this issue.

Councillor Travis explained that the Traffic Committee in Darley Abbey had specifically made suggestions, and that they were not happy with the current measures. This committee still

Area panel 5 update report – for 6 July 2005

exists, and would like to be consulted. She went on to explain that the survey was a side survey of the Connecting Derby scheme, and was not adequate.

Councillor Higginbottom stated that people are finding the reports somewhat misleading, and asked that were consultation is referred to, the reports should give specific details of when and where they were done.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 6 April 2005

A full report will be made in the update at the next meeting.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback at the meeting on 6 July 2005

In total, around 13,000 households were invited to attend exhibitions and make comments concerning transport plans, including the Five Lamps junction improvements, as well as Connecting Derby. As indicated in the report to Cabinet, residents felt strongly that no further action should be taken in this area as most people felt that rat-running had reduced. Cabinet recommended that no further action should be taken. We continue to monitor the situation.

Responsibility

Michelle Spamer, Area and Neighbourhood Co-ordinator, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 715064

8. Ref: 504055 – Litter bins in Knightsbridge Recreation Ground – raised 07.12.04

Issue

A resident asked whether additional bins could be provided in Knightsbridge Recreation Ground

Action reported at the meeting on 6 April 2005

The site has been included in a list from among which the 20 new dog bins in the city will be chosen

This location has been inspected on a number of occasions and does not currently meet the criteria to have an extra highways waste bin installed.

Public response at the meeting on 6 April 2005

None.

Council response at the meeting on 6 April 2005

None.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 6 April 2005

To keep this matter under review

Updates on agreed actions to feedback at the meeting on 6 July 2005

This location is still under consideration.

Responsibility

Richard Winter, Assistant Waste Management, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 716352

9. Ref: 504058 – Litter, footway St Benedict School to Broadway– raised 07.12.04

Issue

A resident raised concerns about the amount of litter deposited on the footpath between St Benedict School and Broadway. He was also concerned that the hedges on this footway were only trimmed when he requested.

Action reported at the meeting on 6 April 2005

The footway is not currently owned by anyone and there is no fixed frequency for litter collection. We have recently negotiated a new litter collection contract and this footway will be placed on the contract once it is in place. The frequency will then be established at that point.

Public response at the meeting on 6 April 2005

None.

Council response at the meeting on 6 April 2005

None.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 6 April 2005

To identify the frequency of cleansing as soon as possible.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback at the meeting on 6 July 2005

This footway has now been scheduled for a weekly litter collection each Wednesday. This is a high cleansing frequency. We will continue to monitor the area.

Responsibility

Richard Winter, Assistant Waste Management Officer, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 716352

John Edgar, Maintenance Manager – Highways and Footways, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 715067

Bill Reed, Area panel manager, Policy Directorate, telephone 258501

10. Ref: 504059 – Balustrade at Darley Abbey Park and S106 monies in Strutts Park.– raised 07.12.04

Issue

A resident asked what had happened about the balustrade at Darley Abbey Park. The Area panel had agreed a feasibility study and temporary measures were in place to prevent accident.

Action reported at the meeting on 6 April 2005

The following public open space contributions have been secured from development within the Strutts Park Conservation Area:

- St Marys School - Wheeldon Homes - £14,400. This has not yet been received.
- Children's Hospital - Miller Homes - £15,000. This has been received and is earmarked to be spent at Bendall Green.

A number of other developments outside the Conservation Area have contributed towards work in Darley Park.

A significant scheme has been agreed with DEFRA funding to replace pipework to the rear of the outfall culvert in Darley Park. However, the culvert outfall structure itself will not be replaced as this is not considered to be unsafe, despite superficial cracking.

There are no funds in this scheme to pay for ornamental features. No replacement balustrade will be funded as part of this scheme. No Council funds have been identified for this work, which would cost in the region of £26,000.

It is considered safer to remove locking grilles at the entrances to outfalls. This will be done at the outfall in Darley Park as part of the works. Similar situations in other areas have in the past been the site of drownings from persons accessing the works upstream and then being unable to egress at the downstream end. Ian Frearson, Land Drainage and Flood Defence Manager for Derby considers that removing the current locked gates would remove this threat and therefore present a more acceptable situation. There is no satisfactory method for an automatic arrangement that would allow persons to egress but prevent access. An instruction to stop the proposals would be accepted albeit reluctantly.

Public response at the meeting on 6 April 2005

A local resident highlighted the reference to the possible danger mentioned in the report, and stated that if there is a danger, then the temporary measures would not prevent a balustrade from falling, and therefore the danger still remains. As a result of this, she therefore assumes that danger to members of the public would take a high priority in the Council's funding. This matter was raised in the last financial year, and therefore she does not understand why this was not included in the budget for this financial year, particularly when money has been given for the filling in of the King Street subway, which is not a danger to life. She asked the panel to explain their priorities. She later went on to ask what the point is of people regularly attending this panel to raise concerns, when the Officers have not carried out any risk assessment on the area. She asked that a risk assessment be done as a matter of urgency.

With regard to the lottery money, a member of the public stated that if it is to be spent on areas that are the responsibility of the Council, then it is very unlikely that it will be approved. She therefore asked why the Council are wasting time putting a proposal together. With regard to the culvert, the council are happy to see the concert happen on the park, which potentially is putting thousands of people in possible danger.

Council response at the meeting on 6 April 2005

Councillor Hickson explained that £15,000 of the Section 106 money was allocated to Littleover in error. This had only been brought to their attention during the week. The Section 106 agreement was not drawn tightly enough. He apologised on behalf of the Council, and confirmed that the money has been given to Bendall Green. He went on to explain that money will be given back to Darley ward, and then it is a question of priority as to how it is spent.

Councillor Repton agreed that there was a health and safety issue here to address, and that the response was not acceptable. He explained that when developers build sites, they have to pay the Council Section 106 money. He noted that £15,000 arising from a proposal in the Darley area, has been spent in Bendall Green. He thought that this was totally unacceptable, and the money should have been spent on addressing this urgent health and safety issue. He asked that the Committee send a clear message that this is a health and safety issue and is about priority, and therefore a recommendation should be made to the area panel that the £15,000 should not be spent in Littleover, rather it should pay towards the works on the balustrade.

Councillor Travis second this suggestion..

Actions agreed at the meeting on 6 April 2005

To refer to Cabinet the decision to use the section 106 money from the Children's Hospital development at Bendall Green.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback at the meeting on 6 July 2005

Council Cabinet discussed this on 26 April and agreed to identify £15,000 for appropriate use in Darley Ward when the 2004-5 budget outturn was known. They also agreed to ask Planning Control Committee to make sure full consultation takes place with ward members before final decisions are made about the allocation of funds received under S106 agreements for use in connection with environmental or community purposes.

It is intended that an application will be made to the Lottery within two years to enable improvements to be made to the Park.

Responsibility

Dawn Dagley, Parks Liaison Officer, Commercial Services, telephone 716272
Bill Reed, Area Panel Manager, Policy Directorate, telephone 258501

11. Ref: 505005 – Graffiti - raised 02.02.05

Issue

A member of the public handed in photographs that she had took of graffiti around St Mary's Church, Arthur Street, and North Gate, and asked that these be passed to Mr Winter. She asked the panel what the Council intend to do about graffiti. She went to explain that the utility boxes are a prime target for this, and asked if there was any agreement with the owners of them, to clean them. She stated that lampposts on Normanton Road have been painted with anti-graffiti pain, and asked that utility companies, and the public are given information about this.

Action reported at the meeting on 6 April 2005

The technical position adopted by the Council is as follows:

There is no law regarding graffiti. It is not illegal to have graffiti on your property. There is no technology currently available to clean graffiti without risking damage to property. If the owner of private property does not want to remove graffiti, we cannot force them to clear it. We do have a waiver that we use which states that the property owner cannot take the Council to court if we caused any damage whilst removing graffiti. However, if we feel that we will cause damage to private property by removing graffiti, we will not attempt removal. We consider painting over graffiti to be the safest and the preferred method of graffiti removal on private property.

Additional funds for graffiti removal were awarded by the Council and these funds came into effect on 1 April. The impact on Council owned and other buildings will become apparent over the next few months.

It is understand that graffiti on Mackworth Community Centre was removed on 24 March.

Public response at the meeting on 6 April 2005

Paul Pegg, resident of Mackworth Estate confirmed that the graffiti had been removed. He raised concern that when he had approached the Council Officers at the education department, who own the property, they had not been aware that it was their responsibility to remove the graffiti, and it was only because he had photographic evidence that this had been done.

He asked the panel how they intend to stop graffiti happening.

Another resident stated that he felt the Council encourage graffiti by using advertisement boards on footpaths. If this was stopped, perhaps other people wouldn't do it.

Council response at the meeting on 6 April 2005

Councillor Hickson explained that there has to be a two-pronged approach. They want the graffiti moved quickly, but in tandem, are working in partnership with the Police to make sruer the message goes out that they will be looking to prosecute those who do the graffiti.

Councillor Repton agreed that graffiti has become a considerable problem, and confirmed that the Council are working closely with the police, but agreed that they need some understanding why there has been a rise in graffiti. He also reported that he had held a meeting with the Chief Executive to make sure that Officers are made aware of their responsibility. He stated that there was no report on how the Council intend to tackle this issue with the police, with the extra money. He asked that this be brought to the meeting so it can be debated.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 6 April 2005

Full report at the next meeting on how the Council will improve the removal of graffiti and prevent it occurring.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback at the meeting on 6 July 2005

As of 1 March 2005, the contract for graffiti removal passed from Onyx to the Council's Commercial Services Department.

It is intended to commence an enhanced graffiti removal service from mid to late summer. The new service will expand to removal from Private Property though the following provisos will apply. We will only remove if ...

- it is safe to do so
- That we can actually remove the graffiti
- That we will not damage the fabric of the building
- and we have the written permission from the property owner.

This will involve recruiting an additional employee - currently Commercial Services provide a member of staff who has graffiti removal as part of a wider range of jobs. The staff concerned will work with new chemicals and new practices which have proved effective in Australia and a number of high profile local authorities in the UK.

The new chemicals will allow the Council to remove graffiti from private properties and other organisations equipment because they do not cause damage as much as previous chemicals and practices. The company who will be supplying the chemicals are also in the process of providing training for the Council in time for the start on 1 August.

This changed practice featured in the Derby Evening Telegraph on Monday 27 June.

Responsibility

Richard Winter, Assistant Waste Management Officer, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 716352

12. Ref: 505006 – Petition – Planning application for 24 flats, Duffield Road - raised 06.04.05

Issue

Councillor Repton informed the panel that a petition had been received regarding a planning application on Duffield Road. He explained that there had been lots of people who had expressed their concerns, and asked for the support of the area panel to object against this applications. He confirmed that details of the objections would be known over the next week, and more details would be brought to the next area panel meeting. The petition was submitted.

Action reported at the meeting on 6 April 2005

Public response at the meeting on 6 April 2005

Various residents of Duffield road informed the panel that they had received approaches from a developer outside of the Derby area. As a consequence of this a first planning application has appeared which details 24 flats contained in a 2-3 storey building, with inadequate parking, which is located on a busy road. They highlighted problems they have in trying to work with the Council to get the benefits of the Connecting Derby scheme working problem, and stated that this application had no connections whatsoever with the Connecting Derby scheme.

The residents expressed their wish not to have this development which would look like an hotel in the middle of a small residential area, and stated that developers should take into consideration the views of the residents. They stated that they would object on the grounds of safety.

Council response at the meeting on 6 April 2005

Councillor Samra confirmed that he had been speaking to the Chair of the Planning Committee, and this is being reviewed with Senior Officers at this moment. He stated that they are presenting a list of the planning committee members, and guidance on how to write the letters of objections. He agreed to give these details out at the end of the meeting.

Bill Reed confirmed that the petition would be passed to the relevant officer, and explained that this would be considered by the planning control committee. He informed residents that this issue would be reported back to the area panel, or when a decision has been made.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 6 April 2005

Updates on agreed actions to feedback at the meeting on 6 July 2005

This application has been refused.

Responsibility

John Stewart, Planning Officer, telephone 255934

13. Ref: 505007 – Parking issues, Kedleston Road- raised 06.04.05

Issue

Mr Riley, a shop owner on Kedleston Road asked that the Council think about local businesses when looking at the parking issues at the University. He stated that if it is a 'blanket' no parking, then the businesses would close down.

Action reported at the meeting on 6 April 2005

Public response at the meeting on 6 April 2005

Council response at the meeting on 6 April 2005

Actions agreed at the meeting on 6 April 2005

This matter to be looked at as part of the discussion on parking involving the University, at the next meeting.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback at the meeting on 6 July 2005

The meeting will address these issues as part of the presentation by the University at this meeting.

Responsibility

Bill Reed, Area Panel Manager, Policy Directorate, telephone 258501

14. Ref: 505008 – Bushes - raised 06.04.05

Issue

Mr Lomax, thanked the panel for the bushes being moved, and asked if this was going to be a possibility for other similar bushes in the area.

Action reported at the meeting on 6 April 2005

Public response at the meeting on 6 April 2005

Council response at the meeting on 6 April 2005

Bill Reed informed Mr Lomax that the Antisocial Behaviour Team looked into this and concluded that it would be better if the bushes be removed in terms of antisocial behaviour.

The Community Association and local councillors have been invited to draw up a schedule of sites where they feel bushes should be removed. The Antisocial Behaviour Team will look at the sites, and make decisions based on these visits.

Councillor Gerrard explained that a lot of the bushes on Prince Charles Avenue appeared without any consultation, and are now very large and making a shield for antisocial behaviour. He asked that consultation take place about putting it back to grass.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 6 April 2005

Updates on agreed actions to feedback at the meeting on 6 July 2005

Two locations have been agreed by the Community Association; these are under consideration by the Maintenance team and the Anti social Behaviour Team.

Responsibility

Mackworth Estate Community Association, c/o Paul Pegg.

15. Ref: 505009 – Council budget process.- raised 06.04.05

Issue

Paul Pegg, Mackworth Estate resident stated to the panel that many people have attended the area panel 5 for many years now. He felt the panels appear to be taking a backwards step in some issues, for example minutes being removed – he hoped these will be reinstalled. He stated that he was surprised to read in the Derby Evening Telegraph that a proposal had been made for over £1million to be allocated to area panels, but the Liberal and Conservative group voted it down. He said that the public should have more say in how money is spent, and asked the panel on what basis this decision had been made.

Action reported at the meeting on 6 April 2005

Public response at the meeting on 6 April 2005

Council response at the meeting on 6 April 2005

Councillor Hickson explained the Conservatives and Liberals had put a budget proposal to the council. The Labour group introduced a series of amendments to those, and one was agreed, and the others turned down, as they didn't fit into the council financial framework.

Councillor Repton believed that is very important that the local people are involved in decisions made about local issues, and about certain amounts of money from the Council and how it is spent. He stated that this would be included in future proposals.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 6 April 2005

Updates on agreed actions to feedback at the meeting on 6 July 2005

No information to update.

Responsibility

None

16. Ref: 505011 – Speed limit on Broadway - raised 06.04.05

Issue

A local resident raised concern about the 40mph speed limit on Broadway. He asked the panel if they were aware that the public entrance to Highfields has been closed. The only entrance is by St Mary's school, where there is conflicting traffic.

Action reported at the meeting on 6 April 2005

Public response at the meeting on 6 April 2005

Council response at the meeting on 6 April 2005

Actions agreed at the meeting on 6 April 2005

Ask David Gartside for a full response to this question.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback at the meeting on 6 July 2005

This update was provided to the meeting on 21 July 2004.

In 2002 Traffic Control officers consulted on a scheme to implement a new crossing, kerb buildouts and speed reduction of 30 mph. A new crossing was implemented. However, the police did not support the introduction of a 30 mph limit as they believed the current 40mph limit was appropriate for the prevailing conditions. In addition, surveys had been carried out and they found there was no major problem concerning speeds in excess of the existing 40mph. There are also few recorded personal injury accidents in this section of road. If the 30 mph limit were introduced there would be few parked cars to help keep the speeds below 30mph, especially at weekends. The introduction of any reduction in the speed limit needs to be self-enforcing and appropriate for the current conditions. For the above reasons, there are no plans at present to introduce a 30mph limit. We believe that the 40mph limit is appropriate for the current conditions.

This response still applies

Responsibility

Michelle Spamer, Area and Neighbourhood Co-ordinator, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 715064

17. Ref: 505012 – Bollards, Darley Park - raised 06.04.05

Issue

A member of the public asked the panel if the Council are responsible for making sure that the bollards are put up at night at the entrances to Darley Park. She raised concern that people have been able to access the park in their cars late at night.

Action reported at the meeting on 6 April 2005

Public response at the meeting on 6 April 2005

Council response at the meeting on 6 April 2005

Actions agreed at the meeting on 6 April 2005

To provide a response at the next meeting.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback at the meeting on 6 July 2005

There are no bollards replaced at the entrances to Darley Abbey Park in the evening. However, the entrances into the park are inaccessible to vehicles at that time of day. No vehicular access is available from Strutts Park or from Darley Abbey, and the entrance from Duffield Road is closed by a barrier.

Responsibility

Dawn Dagley, Parks Services, telephone 716272
Parks Ranger service, telephone 367800

18. Ref: 504060 – Petition - Parking, Oakover Drive - Petition – raised 07.12.04

Issue

A petition had been submitted, asking for action to prevent illegal and obstructing parking on Oakover Drive, Allestree.

Action reported at the meeting on 6 April 2005

As the Panel meeting is taking place during the University vacations, neither the University nor the Students Union is available. They will be invited to the meeting on 6 July.

Public response at the meeting on 6 April 2005

None.

Council response at the meeting on 6 April 2005

None.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 6 April 2005

Updates on agreed actions to feedback at the meeting on 6 July 2005

Tonight's meeting is being hosted by the University with the featured discussion on University issues.

Responsibility

Michelle Spamer, Area and Neighbourhood Co-ordinator, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 715064
Bill Reed, Area Panel Manager, Policy Directorate, telephone 258501

19. Ref: 504061 – Petition - Parking on Penny Long Lane - raised 07.12.04

Issue

A petition had been submitted asking for parking restrictions to be introduced on penny Long Lane. It was understood that an Order had been agreed several years ago for double yellow lines along the full length of the Lane, but this had not been implemented.

Action reported at the meeting on 6 April 2005

A report is attached to the agenda. This recommended that no further action be taken on the petition.

Public response at the meeting on 6 April 2005

A member of the public highlighted that they have a lot of problems with the students, and was concerned that the university was not available for the meeting, and therefore may not be available at the next meeting.

A resident, on behalf of the people who raised the petition stated that the response was not satisfactory. He explained that no onsite consultation had taken place with the residents. The parking problems are not caused by regular students, but by day students. He appreciated that the police have many other problems to deal with and asked Councillor Repton to call a meeting with the Highway Department and residents to discuss these matters face to face. Councillor Repton agreed to set this meeting up.

Another resident asked that all local residents are made aware of this meeting, and not just those on Penny Long Lane.

Council response at the meeting on 6 April 2005

Councillor Webb expressed his dissatisfaction with the situation, and agreed that if residents have off street parking, then they should be able to gain easy access to their properties. The police have a duty to remove vehicles if they are causing an obstruction, but cannot enforce blockages to people's driveways, nor can monitoring everyday. As a result, there has to be a more permanent solution, that is why the University has been invited to the meeting. He asked that adequate time is put on the agenda for the next meeting, to make sure that this issue can be thoroughly dealt with. He confirmed that this needs a serious objective review with all parties involved.

Ray Dring, Fire Service, responded to a paragraph in the report which stated that a fire engine had been unable to pass due to the parking. He assured residents that they have done a number of trips on that route, and at that time, the visit was to attend a water pipe, and not an emergency situation. If it would have been an emergency he assured residents that the engines would have passed through.

Councillor Travis confirmed that the dialogue with the University has gone on for a long time.

Councillor Repton agreed that this was not acceptable, and that local residents want actions not words. The problem has continued for two years, and the University are not taking necessary action, nor is the council. He welcomes them coming along to the next meeting, as the report given does not resolve the problems.

Councillor Samra suggested that a meeting be arranged on the University campus

Area panel 5 update report – for 6 July 2005

Councillor Webb explained that by dealing with just Penny Long Lane, will not resolve the university problems, and need to look at a much bigger area, and not on a street-by-street basis. He agreed that everybody needs to get together, including the University, residents from all the areas effected, the police and the Council, and that is why he asked for more time to be allowed on the agenda for the next meeting. He emphasised that this would be – much more vast area. Need to get everybody together, university, residents of all the areas effected, police, council.

Bill Reed confirmed that the University are currently on holiday, and that is why they could not attend this evening. He stated that they are willing to attend the next panel meeting or any other special meeting that is arranged. He confirmed that he would try and make sure that that there is a Traffic Officer also present at the next meeting, and that time is allocated specifically to this item on the next agenda.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 6 April 2005

It was agreed that the next meeting would feature a discussion about parking issues around the University, and that representatives from the University, the Students Union and the Council's Highways department would be present. The location of the meeting would be determined taking this into account; alternatively a separate meeting would be convened.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback at the meeting on 6 July 2005

Tonight's meeting is being hosted by the University with the featured discussion on University issues.

Responsibility

Michelle Spamer, Area and Neighbourhood Co-ordinator, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 715064
Bill Reed, Area Panel Manager, telephone 258501

20. Ref: 505010 – Petition – Prince Charles Avenue - raised 06.04.05

Issue

Mrs Lee handed a petition to the panel with some 400 signatures from residents of Prince Charles Avenue.

She raised the following four questions:

1. What is the criteria for road crossing – locally or nationally put in place
2. What department install the criteria conditions
3. When were the criteria requirements made compulsory
4. What criteria is necessary before they can have a basic need for a crossing

Action reported at the meeting on 6 April 2005

Public response at the meeting on 6 April 2005

Paul Pegg informed the meeting that he had been discussing this, and Tony Gascoigne from the Highways Department had agreed to come to the next Mackworth Estate Police Liaison meeting on 26 May at 7 pm. to discuss this issue further.

A local resident thanked Councillor Gerrard for his continued support, and stated that there is no crossing anywhere on Prince Charles Avenue. She emphasised that Mrs Leigh, also at the meeting, is physically disabled and deaf, and it is extremely difficult to cross this busy road. Following the closure of Wilmorton College, residents are concerned that the road will be even busier, as additional students will come to Mackworth College. She stated that many school children have to cross the road to get to the shop side of the road.

Council response at the meeting on 6 April 2005

Bill Reed thanked Mrs Lee for bringing forward the petition and agreed to communicate with her directly.

Councillor Gerrard explained that he didn't know the full criteria, but understands that it is based on the amount of traffic and pedestrians. He agreed that Mackworth needs to be looked at very carefully as there is a high proportion of elderly residents, and although they may not meet the criteria, there is a need for a crossing.

Councillor Higginbottom welcomed the petition, and asked that figures be made available from the College about the intake from September.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 6 April 2005

Updates on agreed actions to feedback at the meeting on 6 July 2005

Tony Gascoigne has met the lead petitioner, Mrs Lee. Mrs Lee feels that the last count was done during inclement weather and when some of the shops may have been closed. Mrs Lee has also contacted Bob Laxton MP who has asked us to consider repeating our survey on a different day. We are also aware that there may be increases in pedestrian and vehicle movements as a result of the restructuring of Mackworth College. In these circumstances it is felt that it would be better to wait until the college recommences in September to undertake our investigations. We have written to Bob Laxton MP who will inform the lead petitioner of our

Area panel 5 update report – for 6 July 2005

proposed course of action, and Mrs Lee has been informed prior to the meeting. She is in agreement with this approach.

Responsibility

Bill Reed, Area Panel Manager, Policy Directorate, telephone 258501
Michelle Spamer, Area and Neighbourhood Co-ordinator, Development and Cultural Services,
telephone 715064

21. Ref: 505013 – Petition – Restrictive Parking, North Street - raised 06.04.05

Issue

Lead petitioner stated that there were ten houses affected, and five of those houses were represented at the meeting. He stated that problems had arisen since the new housing opened. He informed the panel that the residents currently pay £25 for residents parking, and £50 for a second parking permit, but currently cannot park outside their homes. The petition was therefore asking for a residents only permit scheme.

Action reported at the meeting on 6 April 2005

Public response at the meeting on 6 April 2005

A resident asked that businesses will be taken into account when looking at this issue.

Another resident felt the restrictions were not being enforced, and was not getting anything back for his money.

Another resident noted that on a recent visit to council officers, officers parked in that area when going to work.

Council response at the meeting on 6 April 2005

Councillor Hickson gave his support to the petition, stating that the problem has got worse since the development took place. He suggested that officers look into the matter, and look at what other areas need to be considered.

Councillor Travis confirmed that Officers would look at the wider area, and not just one street.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 6 April 2005

A full report to be prepared for the next meeting.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback at the meeting on 6 July 2005

A report is currently being prepared but unfortunately this report cannot be presented until the October meeting. Investigations are still underway..

Responsibility

Michelle Spamer, Area and Neighbourhood Co-ordinator, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 715064

22. Ref: 505014 – Petition – Crossing on Park Lane and Cornhill- raised 06.04.05

Issue

A petition was submitted which asked for a risk assessment and action relating to the hazard of crossing the road at the junction of Park Lane and Cornhill, Allestree.

Action reported at the meeting on 6 April 2005

Public response at the meeting on 6 April 2005

Council response at the meeting on 6 April 2005

Actions agreed at the meeting on 6 April 2005

Investigations are on-going, and a report outlining the outcomes will be brought back at a later date.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback at the meeting on 6 July 2005

This report will not be available until the October meeting. We are still working on the investigations.

Responsibility

Michelle Spamer, Area and Neighbourhood Co-ordinator, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 715064