



Derby City Council

**Council Meeting
Wednesday 16 September 2015**

**Public and Member Questions
and Responses**

COUNCIL – 16 September 2015
PUBLIC QUESTIONS

Questioner	Respondent	Subject
-------------------	-------------------	----------------

Public Questions

A	Dorothy Skrytek	Councillor Afzal	Sinfin Waste Treatment Plant
B	Robert Cooper	Councillor Rawson	Mackworth District Centre Renewal
C	Simon Bacon	Councillor Rawson	Sinfin Tannery Site
D	Dorothy Skrytek	Councillor Afzal	Sinfin Plant Night Working
E	Simon Bacon	Councillor Afzal	Household Waste Recycling Act

Councillor Questions

F	Councillor Graves	Councillor Rawson	Libraries Strategic Needs Assessment
G	Councillor M Holmes	Councillor Rawson	Derby Arena Income and Expenditure
H	Councillor Harwood	Councillor Banwait	Council Tax Increase
I	Councillor Carr	Councillor Banwait	Derby Refugee Response
J	Councillor Care	Councillor Banwait	Westminster Delegation
K	Councillor Ashburner	Councillor Repton	Protecting Vulnerable Adults Overview and Scrutiny Board
L	Councillor Naitta	Councillor Banwait	Meeting Attendance
M	Councillor Graves	Councillor Afzal	City Point Street Adoption
N	Councillor M Holmes	Councillor Rawson	Derby Arena Business Plan
O	Councillor Care	Councillor Banwait	Scrutiny Staffing
P	Councillor Graves	Councillor Afzal	Raynesway Road Safety
Q	Councillor M Holmes	Councillor Banwait	Job Evaluation Methodology

a. Question from Dorothy Skrytek to Councillor Afzal

The UK Government has recently announced the dismantling of the Climate Levy Framework, which means that the 4.3 million tonnes of carbon dioxide to be produced by the Derbyshire incineration plant, being built in Sinfen, has to be paid for.

What will be this new cost to the Council/Shanks/Green Investment Bank, on top of the £25 million being paid for what looks like a 'retainer' and £1 million pounds in yearly interest alone, for 25 years?

The Chancellor, George Osborne announced in July that the 'CCL exemption' would be removed for renewably sourced electricity from August 1 2015. The Energy from Waste Industry (and many other related sectors too) are in the process of clarifying the impact of this decision on many projects in the UK, both under construction and in operation.

b. Question from Robert Cooper to Councillor Rawson

After the large investment on district centres such as Alvaston, London Road shopping centre, will the people of Mackworth be able to see similar large scale investment being put into the Prince Charles Avenue shopping precinct and district centre within the next 6 to 12 months?

The Vibrant District Centres Programme, approved in October last year, includes a number of priorities and Mackworth is one of these. Improvements are currently programmed to take place from March 2016 and be complete by August 2016.

c. Question from Simon Bacon to Councillor Rawson

At a recent Blagreaves Forum Councillor Banwait suggested the council lacked property that it could generate income from to help in these times of financial hardship. The city council is owner of the Sinfin Tannery site on Sinfin Lane which is now in use as a building site for the joint waste management contract.

Please confirm how much the Council is being paid yearly since work started for use of the site?

The Council is not seeking to generate an income from this site; we are building a waste processing centre on it with our partners. The facility will provide a sustainable way of dealing with the residual waste produced by the City and parts of the County.

d. Question from Dorothy Skrytek to Councillor Afzal

The incinerator developers Shanks/Interserve have applied to increase noise and pollution at night in Sinfin, the worst affected in terms of health of all the wards (See comparison of health rates between Allestree and Sinfin wards here - <http://tinyurl.com/qefjxnp>).

Shanks have already been poor neighbours, polluting the area with hexavalent chromium, methane, dust and noise. Can Derby City Council assure the people of Derby that their health and protection of their environment, through environmental policies such as E12, is uppermost in the Council's mind and that night work will not be permitted?

RRS through its construction contractor ICL is in the process of constructing the Sinfin New Waste Treatment Facility in accordance with its planning consents and Environmental Permit issued by the relevant authorities. An application was made to the city council planning authority in May to vary Condition 26 of the planning consent, to allow for certain specified exceptions to the construction working hours.

This application included a request to allow, with prior approval of the planning authority, limited night-time working to allow for exceptional circumstances, primarily the need on a very few occasions to pour concrete continuously for periods of approximately 20 hours. Such extended pours of concrete were specifically envisaged in the original planning application and environmental statement submitted by RRS, and are not unusual on large construction projects of this type. RRS/ICL has not requested routine night-time working during construction. At the time of writing the city council as planning authority is still considering the application.

There is no evidence to suggest that RRS or ICL, its construction contractor, has polluted the area as suggested in the question. The Sinfin development is closely monitored by the Council and our advisors, as well as by other statutory authorities. The evidence demonstrates that RRS and ICL operate a safe site at Sinfin in accordance with their various consents and contracts.

e. Question from Simon Bacon to Councillor Afzal

The Household Waste Recycling Act requires councils to collect two forms of material from residents for recycling. Having removed blue bin collections from a number of streets in Normanton, including Balaclava Road in November 2014, and having left many streets in the community without access to a recycling service having failed to install a full network of recycling bring sites, why is the council failing to comply with the requirements of the Household Waste Recycling Act?

There has been consultation and discussions with the community and local businesses regarding the installation of the recycling sites, as it was important to ensure they were in the right locations. Two sites have now been identified and will be installed during the week commencing 21 September 2015.

f. Question from Councillor Graves to Councillor Rawson

Budgets are under severe pressure and this Labour-led council has decided to spend £300,000 on consultants to help you decide where to make cuts.

It has become apparent that one 'soft' target is the Library Service as it is open to the legislation that states it has to provide a comprehensive and efficient service with no reference to the number of libraries that relates to.

Under what circumstances would you shut Alvaston Library?

As a result of the worst cuts to local government funding in history and as part of this administration's campaign for a Fair Deal for Derby, we have recently opened dialogue with DCLG. This resulted in a delegation led by the Labour Leadership, and supported by local businesses, recently travelling to London to meet ministers.

It is the policy of this Labour administration to fight tooth and nail for all our vital public services. We call on the people of Derby to support us in that campaign. We have no plans to close Council libraries.

The Council is conducting a strategic review of its library service. One of its intended outcomes is for the Council to determine the future service delivery model that delivers a modern, relevant, good quality library service, which complies with the Council's legal duty under the Public Libraries and Museums Act 1964.

This will be carried out in the next few weeks, but I must reiterate we have no plans to close Council libraries.

g. Question from Councillor M Holmes to Councillor Rawson

Would the Cabinet Member please detail the monthly income and expenditure (April to August 2015) of the Derby Arena?

The monthly income and expenditure figures for the Derby Arena require ratification by the finance team. This is due to new systems being implemented in April. However, I am pleased to confirm that the overall forecasted figures that have been provided for the venue show that it is on track to hit budget at year end.

h. Question from Councillor Harwood to Councillor Banwait

As the Leader of the Council is lobbying government to remove the cap on council tax raises, what rise in council tax would he be proposing for the forthcoming 2015/16 budget if there were no 1.99 per cent public referendum threshold?

Verbal response to be provided.

i. Question from Councillor Carr to Councillor Banwait

How has the Leader of the Council been revising his views regarding Derby's willingness to receive refugees fleeing to Europe (as reported by the Derby Telegraph) following the comments by faith leaders (and others) as reported by the local media?

Verbal response to be provided.

j. Question from Councillor Care to Councillor Banwait

I note from media and Twitter reports that the Derby City Council leadership visited London to share with the Government the Council's difficult financial situation. How did that meeting go and what actions do you intend taking as a result?

Verbal response to be provided.

k. Question from Councillor Ashburner to Councillor Repton

The Protecting Vulnerable Adults Overview and Scrutiny Board is concentrating its limited resources on scrutinising the Southern Derbyshire Clinical Commissioning Group's work rather than the work of Derby City Council. What areas within the Board's remit do you think they could have investigated to improve safety or reduce cost?

Councillor Ashburner will be aware as a member of the Protecting Vulnerable Adults Board of the wide remit it has. This includes directly delivered Council care services such as home care and day services but also the services which are commissioned by the Council from the private and voluntary sector, for example, residential and nursing care. The Board's remit also includes safeguarding, commissioning, the core social work service and public health provision.

As the Cabinet Member I would welcome scrutiny by the Protecting Vulnerable Adults Board into any of the areas identified above to critically assess safety, quality and value for money. I am comforted by the fact that as recently as April 2015 a Use of Resources Peer Review by an expert panel concluded:

"On the whole Derby City Council adult social care does deliver best value in the vast majority of services."

I support the work of the Protecting Vulnerable Adults Board, but it is not my role to direct their work. It must be the Board's collective view that the considerable pressure and change in health services is a higher priority and hence that is their focus. But I assume that as a Member of that Board Councillor Ashburner is fully aware of their position.

I. Question from Councillor Naitta to Councillor Banwait

I congratulate the Deputy Leader on the large number of occasions he has been standing in for the Leader. How many has it been since this May's election, including Leader's surgeries, chairing meetings, meeting delegations and meetings with external bodies? How many other meetings have been attended by other Cabinet Members, and how many has the Leader attended himself?

Verbal response to be provided.

m. Question from Councillor Graves to Councillor Afzal

City Point has been in existence for many, many years with no new development since February 2010. It is very perplexing for local residents to understand why over the last 5 years the highways on City Point have not been adopted. You will be aware of the difficulties local residents face in this situation. The council abrogates responsibility and the developer has no desire to fulfil council duties leaving them in a kind of 'no-mans land'.

Can you give residents in this area some comfort in offering a timetable of when they can expect adoption of their roads and pavements?

The Council is aware that the adoption of roads and footways at the City Point development remains outstanding and is working to try to ensure that adoption progresses as quickly as possible.

There are outstanding matters which the estate developer has so far failed to address. Councillors Tittley and Bayliss are working with officers to continue to engage with the estate developer to ensure that they remain aware of the outstanding issues and that a resolution is brought forward at the earliest possible time.

While adoption remains outstanding the estate developer remains responsible for all public areas and has an obligation to ensure that these are maintained and provided in a suitable form. Simply because adoption has not taken place should not in itself mean that roads and pavements are left to deteriorate or that residents receive any less of a service than they would expect from the Council.

n. Question from Councillor M Holmes to Councillor Rawson

Can the Cabinet Member detail when the business plan for the Derby Arena was agreed and signed off?

The Outline Business Plan for the Derby Arena was agreed by Cabinet in 2010. This has been refined within the overall budget parameters by officers within the Leisure Department in conjunction with the Strategic Director for Neighbourhoods and Cabinet Member as the project has developed.

o. Question from Councillor Care to Councillor Banwait

When councils moved to the Cabinet and Scrutiny form of administration under the former Labour government there was at least sufficient funding to support scrutiny with dedicated staffing. How does this new situation affect the assessment of the pros and cons of returning to committees?

Verbal response to be provided.

p. Question from Councillor Graves to Councillor Afzal

Accidents on the residential part of Raynesway since the new road layout have been regular and serious, especially entering Raynesway from the A6 bypass.

The most affected section is where the new pedestrian lights are, just before the Alvaston Street turning. There have been crashes damaging the fencing and the traffic lights. There have been incidents of loads falling from lorries. Incidents also include vehicles not stopping at red lights.

Many local residents, including the local Neighbourhood Watch, have expressed concerns over a long period of time. Officers have investigated many times but nothing has changed. Mobile speed monitoring/enforcement has focused on the outward bound side where there are no issues.

The speed some vehicles come from the bypass is highly excessive, in some part due to inadequate signage. The camber along this section has resulted in several drivers losing control resulting in an accident.

There is clearly a problem in controlling drivers' speed and the conditions of the highway.

There have been too many near misses to the point that some families have stated they refuse to use the crossing as they fear for both their own and their children's lives.

Despite the dialogue with the Council very little seems to be done. I appreciate that budgets are squeezed but it is not acceptable for the Council knowing this section of road is a danger to pedestrians and road users and do nothing about it.

Can the Cabinet Member please take this on board as an urgent matter before someone is fatally injured?

The Council is aware of concerns about the section of Raynesway referred to and has undertaken a review of road traffic collisions. The review shows that one collision involving slight injuries was reported on the south bound carriageway and five reported north bound, four of which involved slight injuries and one was more serious. A further collision has taken place more recently but the investigation into prevailing circumstances has not yet been concluded by the Police.

In light of the concerns raised the Council has written to Highways England's agents to determine the background to the design of the new link road and roundabout. We have asked for an examination of previous road safety audits and are seeking consensus on possible remedial measures.

q. Question from Councillor M Holmes to Councillor Banwait

At July's Council meeting the Leader of the Council stated that he believed the significant financial liabilities the Council now faces in regard to the on-going job evaluation had been caused by the Labour administration inheriting a process that was unable to be completed by the authority's chosen strategic partner.

The process inherited by the Labour group in 2012 (from the Conservative-led administration) was based on the 'job family' methodology, successfully used by many other organisations and councils. A suitable strategic partner had been contracted to complete the process.

Can the Leader of the Council please state:

- 1. If the Labour administration decided to change this methodology / approach to the job evaluation process after taking control of the Council?**

And if they did:

- 2. Which Cabinet Member(s) proposed / agreed the change of approach and / or methodology?**
- 3. Why did they do so?**

Verbal response to be provided.