

Time commenced 6.00pm  
Time finished 8.40pm

**NEIGHBOURHOODS COMMISSION**  
**26 JULY 2011**

Present: Councillor Jackson (Chair)  
Councillors Davis, Keith, Rawson, Richards (arrived late), Roberts  
(arrived late) and Troup

**05/11 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies were received from Councillor Roberts as he was going to arrive late.

**06/11 Late Items Introduced by the Chair**

There were no late items.

**07/11 Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

**08/11 Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 27 June 2011 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the chair subject to the following amendments:

- That the reference to Council Cabinet minute number 07/11 in paragraph one of minute 04/11 should refer to the Review of Public Transport Supported Services and Concessionary Fares not the Waste Management Contract Update.
- That the alternatives being investigated by officers mentioned in paragraph one of page 3 should be widened to include;
  - Taxis
  - Buses provided by Supermarkets or shops
  - Buses provided by Derby County Football Club
  - Voluntary groups
- That the following reason should be added to the decision: 'that the Council Cabinet failed to follow through the equalities impact assessment.'

**09/11 Call-in**

There were no call-ins received for the commission to consider.

## 10/11      Commission Terms of Reference and Remit

The Overview and Scrutiny Co-ordination Officer informed Members of the Commission's remit and terms of reference. .

### **Resolved to note the Commission's terms of reference and remit**

## 11/11      Key issues in the Neighbourhoods Directorate for 2011-12

### **Multi-Sports Arena**

The Director for Leisure and Culture, Claire Davenport, gave a presentation to the Commission on the proposed multi-sports arena. She explained that the Council planned to build a 250m indoor velodrome, with seating for 1,000 spectators, a 400m outdoor athletics track and a 1km closed road cycling circuit at Pride Park. This had come about following an assessment of the city's existing facilities by PMP Genesis which identified a number of deficiencies in the Council's current leisure provision. In response to this a leisure strategy was developed to provide two iconic sports hubs, of county and regional significance. The Cabinet subsequently approved the scheme and £50m to fund the project. The architect for the scheme was likely to be appointed in August 2011 with planning permission expected in December 2011. The Director stated that construction of the facility was planned to begin in July 2012.

Councillor Davis asked if the £50m would be match funded and if any additional funding was expected. The Director of Leisure and Culture stated that she was optimistic that additional funding would be secured. The overall cost excluded the cost of using the land at Pride Park which the Council owned.

Councillor Rawson asked what other sites were considered for the multi-sports arena in the city centre. The Director of Leisure and Culture stated that a number of sites were considered but these were discounted during the evaluation process.

Councillor Richards raised concern with the amount of traffic this development would create. The Director of Leisure and Culture stated that this was the least complicated in terms of traffic generation. The Wyvern Site, which was considered, would have required significant capital investment.

### **A. Resolved to note the presentation**

### **Waste Disposal**

The Director of Streetpride, Tim Clegg, gave a brief presentation to the Commission on the disposal of the Council's waste. He stated that the planning permission for the proposed waste management facility in Sinfin had been well documented and had now been referred to the Secretary of State for reconsideration. RRS were now drawing up alternative proposals and technologies with which they could dispose of the residual waste. But, there would be an impact both financially and environmentally. The Head of Waste Management, Mick McLachlan, stated that the other element of waste disposal was recycling. This was split into two parts. Green

waste was processed by Vital Earth in Ashbourne. This was then composted down. The consumable goods were handled by Green Star at their Victory Road site. This company has been subsequently taken over by Biffa. The consumables were taken to a recycling plant for processing and the Council makes a certain amount of money dependent on their market value. Both recycling contracts were set to expire in 2015. He said that the Council would then need to decide how they wanted to handle their waste long term once the contracts expired as there was a lot of procurement involved. The Director of Street Pride informed the Commission that changes in regulations coming into force this winter would mean that cardboard would no longer be able to be placed together with the green waste. The Head of Waste Management stated that it would be a budget pressure so options were being considered to accommodate this change to the service.

The Chair suggested that the Commission could visit Vital Earth's facilities to observe the process. The Head of Waste Management stated that he would be happy to arrange a visit.

Councillor Rawson stated that some London councils placed all their recycling in one bin and asked if this could be applied in Derby. The Head of Waste Management stated that this would be very expensive. Every time an item was handled there was a cost to the authority. The more the residents did the less cost to the Council. However, there was obviously a balance to strike otherwise residents would not put in the effort to recycle. Councillor Rawson asked when the recycling programme was going to be rolled out to the remaining properties in Derby. The Head of Waste Management stated that 7,000 properties did not yet have access to recycling facilities. All the addresses had been catalogued and as of mid-September officers would be working with residents as well as neighbourhood boards to come up with workable solutions to suit their recycling needs.

Councillor Troup asked if the city's supermarkets had replaced their recycling centres that the Council used to provide. The Head of Waste Management stated that most large sites had replaced their centres as they had to demonstrate their commitment to the Government. Councillor Troup asked if the smaller sites had seen an increase in fly-tipping if as there was no longer a station there. The Head of Waste Management said that he had received no reports of any increases in fly-tipping at these areas and recycling rates in Derby had risen back up to 48 percent. Councillor Troup asked if scrap metal merchants were being inspected for their licences. The Head of Waste Management said that this would be enforced by environmental health.

## **B. Resolved to note the presentation and for a visit to Vital Earth by the Commission be arranged**

### **Highways Asset Management Plan**

The Director of Streetpride, Tim Clegg, supported by the Highways Principal Design Engineer, Lincoln Smithers, gave a brief presentation on the Highways Assessment Management Plan. He informed the Commission that the city's highways were the Council's most valuable asset. It was valued at £81.25m but if you were to replace the whole infrastructure it would cost £1.1b. He explained that the problem with the highway was that it could not be sold, it was difficult to borrow against and costly to

maintain but it was vital to keep the city running. The cost of maintaining the highway network at its present level, not to improve it, was £6m a year. That did not even take into account the effect of the harsh winters of recent years. Therefore a balance needed to be struck between pro-active and re-active works. He added that the key message was that if the highways did not receive right level of investment then it may become impossible to close the funding gap.

*Councillor Roberts entered the meeting*

Councillor Roberts asked if officers carried out inspections by bicycle when they reviewed the highway. The Highways Principal Design Engineer stated that inspections were also carried out by bicycle so that officers shared the same experiences as all road users.

Councillor Troup asked if any calculations had been made into the lifespan of a road. The Highways Principal Design Engineer stated that it was 40 years so long as it was supported by a comprehensive maintenance programme. If the severe winters continue then that lifespan would be dramatically reduced.

Councillor Roberts stated that more needed to be done to encourage cycling in Derby, one of the ways would be to ensure that the road they used was in a suitable condition.

## **C. Resolved to note the presentation**

### **Core Strategy**

Principal Planning Officer, Steven Lee, gave a short presentation to the Commission explaining the Core Strategy process. He informed the Commission that the strategy replaced the Derby Local Plan and decided how the city would grow and develop in the next 15-20 years. Housing would be a major priority of the strategy which was being developed with Amber Valley and South Derbyshire councils. Officers were trying to involve residents as much as possible by getting the neighbourhood boards and forums to come up with suggestions for the number and location of the housing. He added that the strategy would be submitted to the Secretary of State for inspection in June 2012 and was expected to be adopted by the end of 2012.

Councillor Keith stated that it was unreasonable to ask residents where to locate new houses and the quantity. The Principal Planning Officer stated that the consultation would not have happened in this way previously. Before officers would have made a decision and asked the public to comment. He hoped that this form of consultation would make residents think more about what was going on in their locality.

Councillor Rawson expressed concern that years had been wasted developing strategies instead of building homes for the people who need them. The Principal Planning Officer stated that officers were also frustrated with the process but there were deadlines they had to meet. And if the strategy was not compiled correctly then it could be challenged. Councillor Roberts echoed Councillor Rawson's comments and his frustration at the delay to the strategy.

Councillor Davis expressed concern that officers were moving responsibility on to residents for the strategy during the consultation process. She also asked if the boundaries would change. The Principal Planning Officer stated the boundaries of the city would be dealt with by the Boundary Commission if it was required. He added that responsibility always lay with the Council but he hoped this way would engage more residents.

**D. Resolved to note the presentation and to request regular updates to future meetings on the progression of this strategy.**

**Museums Transformation**

The Director of Museums Transformation, Stuart Gillis, gave a short presentation on the plans for the city's museums. He said Derby's image needed to be rejuvenated but it should draw on the wealth of heritage at its disposal. There were two strands to the plan. One was to revive the mothballed Silk Mill which was closed after £390,000 of Government funding was cancelled. This building was the first factory in Britain and was the centre of the Industrial Revolution. This museum should be a focal point and inspiration for the community and this was what he was trying to create. The second strand was to create a 10 year campaign to build and use the reputation of Joseph Wright who sat astride the Industrial Revolution and the Age of Enlightenment. The resources of Derby City Council, the Tate Gallery, the British Museum and the Paul Mellon Centre (Part of Yale University that houses the second largest collection of Joseph Wright paintings) would be pooled to create the largest exhibition of a generation starting in Derby before going worldwide. These two major projects were set against the backdrop of creating an organisation to manage the city's museums and art galleries that had a strategic relationship with the Council.

Councillor Rawson asked if the Silk Mill would reopen. The Director of Museums Transformation stated that the Silk Mill would not reopen in its current format. It was going to have a complete change of image to turn it into a major attraction before it was re-launched.

Councillor Roberts expressed deep concern with the mothballing of the Silk Mill because of its historical significance. Councillor Roberts then proposed the following motion to Cabinet; that this Commission believes that above all enterprises in the city the Silk Mill is critical and it should be retained for the future of Derby. The Chair proposed that this could be better dealt with by placing it for consideration. Councillor Roberts agreed with this approach.

**E. Resolved to note the presentation and that the Museums Transformation be added as an agenda item to the next meeting**

**12/11 Waste Rounds Review**

The Head of Waste Management informed the Commission that the review started eight weeks ago. A project team was set up to manage the process and so far it had been a success. Since the initial teething problems had been solved the teams now emptied 52,000 bins daily with an average of only 100 missed. He said he was very proud of the combined efforts of the crews and the trade unions.

Councillor Keith said the complaints he received about the changes to the rounds had begun to tail off. He said that his only issue was the order in which the bins were emptied. Often the recycling bags would be emptied by one team and the next team may arrive later. As recycling bags were not weighted it would be easy for them to blow away. The Head of Waste Management stated that it was difficult to co-ordinate the crews exactly. Each crew on a typical day emptied around 1,500 bins. He added that he would do his best to improve the co-ordination of the recycling collections.

**Resolved to note the presentation and to congratulate everyone involved in the review**

## **13/11 Work Programme and Topic Review**

The Commission considered a number of suggestions for their work programme and topic reviews for the municipal year. These included:

- The proposed multi-sports arena
- The way the Council assesses museums against art galleries as well as the proposed Joseph Wright exhibition and the Silk Mill
- The Street Lighting PFI

Councillor Rawson informed Members that the Planning and Transportation Commission had carried out a number of reviews into this topic which may aid their work. The Director of Streetpride stated that the implementation of the PFI ended in autumn so that may be an opportune time to carry out the review.

The Chair requested that the Core Strategy be a standing item to provide the Commission with regular updates.

**Resolved:**

- A. to carry out a topic review on the proposed multi-sports arena, with a scoping report commissioned by the Overview and Scrutiny Co-ordination Officer; and**
- B. to request a report to a future meeting on the Street Lighting PFI; and**
- C. for the Commission to receive regular updates on the Core Strategy**

## **14/11 Libraries Topic Review**

The Commission considered the completed Libraries Topic Review. The Chair informed the Commission that Councillor Redfern, who had taken part in the review, had submitted a number of extra recommendations. Following a discussion about each of Councillor Redfern's proposals it was decided not to amend the draft report.

**Resolved:**

**To recommend the report to Council Cabinet**

## **15/11 Retrospective Scrutiny**

There were no items of retrospective scrutiny proposed by the Commission.

## 16/11 Forward Plan

The Overview and Scrutiny Co-ordination Officer highlighted to the Commission the items on the Forward Plan under their remit and asked them to suggest any items which may be of interest to investigate.

## 17/11 Responses to any reports and enquiries of the Commission

Councillor Roberts urged the Commission to register their regret with the decision of Council Cabinet on the Community Transport report. Councillor Keith stated that the report had been called-in, reviewed by Council Cabinet and had been the subject of a long discussion at full Council. He felt that it had been discussed at length and the Commission did not need to resurrect the matter.

Councillor Roberts proposed a motion that the Commission register its regret on the Council Cabinet's decision to continue with their reduction in funding to Community Transport. Councillor Rawson seconded the motion. The motion was rejected by the Commission.

**Resolved to note the minute.**

## 18/11 Matters referred by the Council Cabinet

There were no items referred by the Council Cabinet.

MINUTES END