

**AREA PANEL THREE – UPDATE REPORT**

**FOR 22 JUNE 2005**

**THE VOICE BOX, FORMAN STREET**

**Area and Neighbourhood Unit**

**David Dring, Area Coordination Manager, telephone 258500**

**Vickie Butler, Information and Communications Officer, telephone 258529**

**Minicom 01332 258522**

---

## CONTENTS PAGE

Community Issue	Page No.
1. Ref: 304012 – Unauthorised change of use at 51, Mount Street - received 17.03.04 .....	3
2. Ref: 304031 – Railings – Mount Carmel Street - received 14.07.04 .....	4
3. Ref: 304034 – Traffic issues – Normanton and Pear Tree - received 14.07.04 .....	5
4. Ref: 304038 – Graffiti in Crompton/ Gerard Streets - received 08.09.04 .....	6
5. Ref: 303053 – Removal of telephone boxes in the City - received 19.11.03 .....	8
6. Ref: 304048 – Area Panel Papers - received 10.11.04 .....	10
7. Ref: 304050 – Railings, St Chads Road and Whittaker Road - received 10.11.04 .....	11
8. Ref: 304051 – Hartington Street Renewal Area - received 10.11.04 .....	12
9. Ref: 305002 – Derelict Building, Dashwood Street / Normanton Road - received 19.01.05 ....	14
10. Ref: 305006 – Cameron Road Homezone improvements and wheelie bins - received 19.01.05 .....	15
11. Ref: 305009 – Parking outside Normanton Infant School, Browning Street – received 30.03.05 .....	16
12. Ref: 305010 – Chatham Street, Concern about impact of Homezone improvements – received 30.03.05 .....	17
13. Ref: 305011 – Request for provision of additional car parking facilities on land on corner of Kenilworth Avenue and Village Street – - received 30.03.05 .....	18
14. Ref: 305012 – Street lighting in Derby City centre – -received 30.03.05 .....	19
15. Ref: 303045 – Baseball Ground, Leacroft Road – raised 17.09.03 – new petition presented 19.01.05 .....	20
16. Ref: 304027 – Petition - Molineux Street – one way street - received 12.05.04 .....	23
17. Ref: 304045 – Petition - Raven Street - requesting a one-way system received 08.09.04 .....	24
18. Ref: 304047 - Petition – Activ8 Project, Mount Carmel Street- received 08.09.04 .....	25
19. Ref: 304054 – Petition - Renal Street and Avondale Road – request for a one-way system to improve traffic flows - received 26.09.04 .....	26
20. Ref: 305007 – Petition – St Giles Road – request for a one-way system - received 19.01.05 .....	27
22. Ref: 305015 – Petition relating to Anti-Social Behaviour on Corner of Abbey Street and Monk Street – - received 30.03.05 .....	30
23. Ref: 305016 – Petition requesting One Way Road System on Wilfred Street, Sale Street and Molineux Street, Normanton. – - received 30.03.05 .....	31

**1. Ref: 304012 – Unauthorised change of use at 51, Mount Street - received 17.03.04**

Issue

Concern was raised about the Apples Garage, on Mount Street/Mill Hill Lane being turned into 'Floors to go'. A major retail organisation it has enormous lorry deliveries at least three times a week. There is also a forklift truck that goes on the pavement. This has been reported to the planning department – who say that this is an unauthorised change of use, as they do not have planning permission. It has also been reported to the police about when the lorries are there. This is a major junction and local residents feel that something needs to be done.

Action reported at the meeting on 30 March 2005

Planning Application DER/205/147 has been received. Immediate neighbours and complainants to be notified in due course.

Public response at the meeting on 30 March 2005

Council response at the meeting on 30 March 2005

Given that an application has now been received the Chair suggested that this item would be closed. However, a member of the public said that she thought that this item should remain open until the planning application is determined.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 30 March 2005

Provide an update on the outcome of the planning application at the June meeting.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 22 June 2005

15 April 2005 - Planning Application DER/205/147 refused.

25 April 2005 - Letter received from Floors 2 Go's agent stating that it is currently their intention to submit another, revised planning application addressing the reasons for the refusal of DER/205/147.

6 April 2005 - Councils Legal Section instructed to commence enforcement action. Enforcement Notice to be served in due course. Should a second planning application be received, any Notice served will be put into abeyance until the determination of that application.

Responsibility

Laurence Rayner, Planning and Enforcement Assistant, Development and Cultural Services,  
telephone 255947

## 2. Ref: 304031 – Railings – Mount Carmel Street - received 14.07.04

### Issue

A resident raised concerns about dangerous railings on the steps at Mount Carmel Street – there is a piece missing, and one dangerous piece. This was initially reported 3 years ago and residents feel that they are no nearer to getting these replaced. They are not asking for a replacement just a repair.

### Action reported at the meeting on 30 March 2005

The railings have now been repaired. The Council will arrange to have the railings repainted.

### Public response at the meeting on 30 March 2005

It was noted that the railings have been repaired but pointed out that the repainting works are still outstanding.

### Council response at the meeting on 30 March 2005

### Actions agreed at the meeting on 30 March 2005

### Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 22 June 2005

These railings are to be repainted. We hope that this will be done by the end of June 2005.

### Responsibility

Stewart Corbett, Highway Manager, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 715008.

**3. Ref: 304034 – Traffic issues – Normanton and Pear Tree - received 14.07.04**

Issue

A resident raised concern over the bad traffic congestion problems within the area, and commented that there was no room to increase access for traffic. This also affected the air quality. She asked the panel what the Council were doing to apply the Road Traffic Reduction Act of 1997.

Action reported at the meeting on 30 March 2005

The chair concluded that there was no one solution to the problems of congestion on Normanton Road and said that the Council recognised that there is a need to look at the issue of congestion later in the year.

Public response at the meeting on 30 March 2005

Council response at the meeting on 30 March 2005

Councillor Nath commented that this was a long standing issue and that he was disappointed that there was no update on the report. He felt that the Planning and Highways Officers should be working together more actively to find a resolution to this issue.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 30 March 2005

The Panel recommended that Officers should meet Ward Councillors to identify what actions can be taken to address this longstanding issue.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 22 June 2005

David Gartside had a meeting with ward members in May 2005 and a further meeting is scheduled for 10 June.

Responsibility

David Gartside, Head of Traffic– Highways, Transportation and Waste, telephone 715025.  
Pete Price, Transport Policy Manager, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 715034.

#### 4. Ref: 304038 – Graffiti in Crompton/ Gerard Streets - received 08.09.04

##### Issue

Mr Woodward raised concerned about the graffiti on Crompton Street. He has spoken to the Council about this, but was told that it is the landlord's problem as it is private property. In areas such Crompton Street, Gerard Street and the alley way in Marks and Spencer this is becoming a bigger and bigger problem. He is aware that the Council are under funded in this area and unless the graffiti is racist they do not have the resources to remove it. He asked the Council to supply advice on its removal.

November 2004

It was reported that the property in question is a private property. The only solution for removing the graffiti is to paint over it, because the wall is a painted render. The council has written to the owner but have had no reply. Anyone who contacts the council for advice is given it freely. We are currently investigating ways in which we could increase the amount of graffiti removal on Private Property. The problem is identifying who owns property that has got graffiti on and getting them to take some action about it. It is often the case that each graffiti job must be examined before work can take place, no one solution fits all.

A key target for the Anti-social Behaviour Team and partner agencies is graffiti. A recent notable success is the targeting of the tagger known as 'drops'. He has been made subject to a three-year anti-social behaviour order prohibiting him from being in possession of paint materials in public, not to cause graffiti or cause alarm, harassment and distress.

Richard Winters attended this meeting and gave a short presentation about the Council's policies for the removal of graffiti. He also answered a range of questions from residents.

##### Action reported at the meeting on 30 March 2005

The Council has an agreement with the telephone companies to paint over graffiti on the green boxes. If residents have any particular problems with graffiti on green boxes, please contact Richard Winters with details of the precise locations and we will arrange for them to be painted.

An additional £30,000 has been identified by the Council for the financial year 2005/06 to help tackle the problem of graffiti throughout the city.

##### Public response at the meeting on 30 March 2005

A member of the public commented that the response given in the report was not what they were asking. The original questioned they had asked was for the cost to the Council for repainting the NTL boxes on the pavement when they have had graffiti on them. Also why should the Council pay to repaint NTLs property?

Another resident emailed the panel to request thank Richard Winter's office was thanked for the removal of graffiti from the walls to the bottom of Crompton Street. He said that his was done several weeks ago and was happy to report that, so far, none has come back!

##### Council response at the meeting on 30 March 2005

##### Actions agreed at the meeting on 30 March 2005

It was agreed to ask the Director of Cultural and Development Services to give a breakdown of costs to Derby City Council for painting over graffiti on NTL green boxes and to ask why the Council is paying for this from its own budget? The request for details about the content of the legal agreement between the Council and Utility companies is still outstanding.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 22 June 2005
--

To paint a box costs approximately £10. NTL (Stoke-on-Trent Office) have supplied us with the paint. We do not have a record of the exact numbers of boxes we've painted because our contractors will paint over them if they identify one that is in a poor state when they are doing another job near it. The reason we do this arrangement is that it is the most effective way of reducing graffiti in the city.

There is no legal agreement between utility companies and the Council regarding graffiti on green boxes. In the majority of cases, utilities companies do not need planning permission for their small control cabinets, for example cable boxes etc. This is covered under the Permitted Development Order, which is a Statutory Instrument within the Town and Country Planning Act.

There is no real power currently available to the Council to enforce the utility companies to maintain the control cabinets. Recent legislation trialed in 12 Areas has introduced Graffiti Removal Notices. These force property owners to remove graffiti within 28 Days of receiving a notice. The trial is currently being examined to assess the impact on graffiti removal.

Responsibility
----------------

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

## 5. Ref: 303053 – Removal of telephone boxes in the City - received 19.11.03

### Issue

Concern was raised in November 2003 about the perceived reduction in the number of public telephones in the City.

BT Payphones is currently reviewing the provision of payphones throughout Great Britain. The work is being undertaken in several phases over an 18-month period. In a recent letter to the Council stated that they remain *'committed to maintaining a quality public payphone network and meeting our Universal Service Obligations by the adequate provision of payphones across Great Britain. We will not leave any community without a payphone service regardless of the profitability of such payphones.'*

BT has initially identified a number of payphones for removal, which are losing money due to low usage and have an alternative payphone nearby. It is understood that they would normally post a notice in the payphone to mark the beginning of a 42-day consultation period.

If any member of the public is concerned about BT plans to remove a payphone they should contact BT and quote the phone number and location of the kiosk in their correspondence.

This item was closed following the meeting in March 2004 and re-opened following the meeting in September 2004.

It was reopened in September 2004 and BT were invited to attend a future area panel meeting to provide an update on the latest position with their rationalisation programme.

### Action reported at the meeting on 30 March 2005

Terry Johnson from BT has agreed to attend a future meeting to do a short presentation about the BT Rationalisation Programme and to answer questions. He has been asked to attend the June 2005 meeting.

### Public response at the meeting on 30 March 2005

A member of the public asked who authorised planning permission for phone boxes.

### Council response at the meeting on 30 March 2005

It was reported that BT would be attending the June 2005 meeting so any questions people had could be raised with them then.

### Actions agreed at the meeting on 30 March 2005

Agreed to provide an answer to this additional question at the June meeting.

### Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 22 June 2005

The erection of telephone boxes is "permitted development rights" under Part 24 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995. However, the exercise of those rights is subject to a "prior notification" system under which the Local Planning Authority can decide that it wishes to control the location or appearance of the equipment. This is the normal procedure for much telecommunication development. In the case of telephone boxes a challenge to their appearance is not realistic and the only effective control is over siting. This power has been used to prevent siting in locations where they might cause highway problems and has usually only involved moving them by a few metres.



The removal of telephone boxes is development because it is demolition. However, it is development that is unrestricted permitted development under the above Regulations and the Local Planning Authority cannot control it. Control under planning law exists to prevent the installation of telecommunications equipment in unsuitable locations, not to ensure the provision or continuation of a service.

Mr Johnson is to speak and answer questions at the meeting.

Responsibility
----------------

John Stewart, Planning, Development and Cultural Services. Telephone 255934  
Rick Thompson, Project Liaison Office, BT Payphones, PP 06A21, Delta Point, Wellesley Road,  
Croydon, CR9 2YZ. Telephone: 0800 661 610. Email: [btp.authorisation.team@bt.com](mailto:btp.authorisation.team@bt.com)  
Terry Johnson, British Telecom, telephone 01977 598862

**6. Ref: 304048 – Area Panel Papers - received 10.11.04**

Issue

Chris Woodward asked that the changes in the way the Council distributes the meeting papers be raised as a late item in the meeting.

Action reported at the meeting on 30 March 2005

The Leader of the Council took a report to Council Cabinet on the 22 February 2005 recommending that attendance at area panel meetings be monitored for two cycles and if public attendance shows a significant reduction to re-examine its decision on area panel agenda distribution. This item will now be closed.

Public response at the meeting on 30 March 2005

Members of the public were still very concerned about the decision to stop sending out area panel agendas and papers to them before the meeting.

Council response at the meeting on 30 March 2005

Councillor Burgess reminded residents that the decision had been taken for prudent reasons to save money.

The area panel manager reminded residents that if they sign the attendance sheet they can ask to receive a copy of the agenda of future meetings. She confirmed that the attendance list had been reviewed and that it now includes a data protection statement.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 30 March 2005

The Panel agreed to recommend to Council Cabinet that it re-examines its decision on Area Panel agenda distribution now, rather than waiting to see if public attendance at Area Panels reduces.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 22 June 2005

This resolution was considered by Council Cabinet at its meeting on 26 April. Cabinet agreed that this issue would be covered specifically as part of the Area Panel Review which is due to commence in June 2005 but will not be completed until the end of the year. Cllr Williamson referred to promised review of attendance figures after two cycles, which does not fit in with the planned review. We will therefore analyse the actual attendance figures when the two cycles are complete and discuss these with Cllr Samra – Cabinet Member for Community Regeneration, the Leader and Deputy Leaders of the Council.

Responsibility

Jason Spencer, Constitutional and Electoral Services Manager, telephone 255466

**7. Ref: 304050 – Railings, St Chads Road and Whittaker Road - received 10.11.04**

Issue

A member of the public raised concern over the damaged railing around the small garden at the junction of St Chad's Road and Whittaker Road. These railings were paid for by the area panel, but are now in a horrible state of disrepair. She asked if any action was to be taken on this, as she had been informed previously by the Council that they were waiting for insurance details to come through, before any repairs could be carried out.

Action reported at the meeting on 30 March 2005

Unfortunately, we were not able to repair the railings as we had hoped by the end of January. This was due to the contractor experiencing difficulties obtaining replacement railings as they are non-standard. We are actively seeking to get this work done as soon as possible. We expect the work to be completed by the end of March 2005 at the latest.

Public response at the meeting on 30 March 2005

The public raised concerns that this work had still not been done.

Council response at the meeting on 30 March 2005

Councillor Burgess apologised for the length of time that this work was taking to complete. He is actively working with officers to get the work done but there appear to have been some problems in getting replacement railing of the right quality and finish.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 30 March 2005

Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 22 June 2005

These railings are now completed.

Responsibility

John Edgar, Maintenance Manager, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 715067

**8. Ref: 304051 – Hartington Street Renewal Area - received 10.11.04**

Issue

A member of the public asked for more information on where neighbourhood renewal is, with regard to Leopold and Hartington Street. She informed the panel that the owner of the Taj Mahal restaurant on Normanton Road had constructed a large corrugated outbuilding on Leopold Street, but she had never seen an application. She also raised concern over a property that had been bricked up by the Council over a year ago, and to date, nothing further has happened with it.

Action reported at the meeting on 30 March 2005

The private sector renewal team do now produce updates on all housing renewal projects on the Council's website at [www.derby.gov.uk](http://www.derby.gov.uk). Just click on "Living" and then "Area Renewal Projects. I do appreciate your frustration in relation to the continuing eyesores created by the abandoned/derelict houses in the area but can assure you that we are now well down the road in the compulsory purchase process with regard to most of these and will be looking to get the properties back into properly managed use by new owners as soon as possible. In the meantime, we will continue to do our best to make sure that they remain secure against unauthorised entry even though, visually this does nothing to improve the look of the area at the moment.

The issue of the extension at the Taj Mahal does not fall within the Housing Renewal Team's remit and has been referred to officers in Development and Cultural Services for a response.

Henry Cipcer, gave a presentation detailing the current progress on the Hartington Street Renewal Programme.

Public response at the meeting on 30 March 2005

A member of the public asked what was going to be done about the building on the corner of Leopold Street. It had an odd fabric extension, which looks awful and detracts from the regeneration happening in the rest of the area. Henry Cipcer replied that the Council is in the process of applying for compulsory purchase order - CPO for this property building and for a number of other empty buildings on the street.

A member of the public asked whether a sign could be put up at the building on the corner of Leopold Street saying that it is going to be regenerated and for some more general signs to be erected to let them know that the area is getting special attention. The panel agreed that this was a good idea and Henry Cipcer agreed to follow up this suggestion.

Council response at the meeting on 30 March 2005

Councillor Hussain commented that although various regeneration projects were apparent in the area, he was concerned that there was no co-ordination between the various departments involved in the regeneration of the area. Projects are done to regenerate some properties in an area, while other properties were left to run-down. He suggested that the planners should make sure that no more multi-occupancy properties were built in this area for the next few years.

Councillor Burgess gave a word of caution that planning procedures may not allow a blanket refusal of multi-occupancy properties.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 30 March 2005

The Panel resolved to ask Council to ensure that long-term coordinated action is taken by the departments involved in regeneration to stop the proliferation of houses in multiple-occupancy in Arboretum. They also requested a full and detailed report about the action that the Council can take to address this issue.

A response is also needed to the question about the extension on the Taj Mahal.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 22 June 2005
--

The resolution about houses in multiple occupation was considered by Council Cabinet at its meeting on 26 April and action will be determined at the meeting in July. A response will be given to the Panel at its meeting in September.

The owner of the Taj Mahal has been informed that the profile clad extension at the rear of this building is unauthorised and should be removed. The Council has recently granted planning permission for a rear 2 storey extension to the building and the owner has advised that he will be implementing that permission shortly. The unauthorised structure will, therefore, be removed to accommodate the proposed extension. We will, however, be closely monitoring the situation.

Responsibility
----------------

Martin Gadsby, Private Sector Housing Manager, telephone 255236

Paul Clarke, Group Leader, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 255935

**9. Ref: 305002 – Derelict Building, Dashwood Street / Normanton Road - received 19.01.05**

Issue

New question: A member of the public asked about the derelict building at the bottom of Dashwood Street and Normanton Road. This building has been vacant for many years and the resident considered that it is now time for the City Council to take action to get a compulsory purchase order – CPO to ensure that it is brought back into use.

Action reported at the meeting on 30 March 2005

The building has been inspected, and there were no signs of anything that warrants a dangerous structures notice. However, a full appraisal of the building's condition is not possible from the outside and access into the building at the time of the inspection was not possible.

Officers would need the permission of the owner to enter the property, or obtain a warrant from the magistrates court. Legal Services have been asked to undertake a search to establish who owns the property.

The private sector renewal team have confirmed that they cannot seek to bring this property back into use because it is a commercial property. They can only take action with residential properties.

Public response at the meeting on 30 March 2005

A member of the public suggested that a warrant be obtained from the magistrates court now, rather than waiting for the Legal department to attempt to find out who the current owners were. It was noted that this item had been raised at the Normanton Action Group several years ago and that no progress what so ever had been made to resolve it.

Council response at the meeting on 30 March 2005

The panel agreed unanimously to try and make formal progress on this item by the next meeting.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 30 March 2005

Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 22 June 2005

Following advice from our legal section a copy of the Land Register Entry has been received, and the owner has been written to requesting access to inspect the interior of the building. We are meeting the owner on site on 27 June and hope to gain entry at that date.

Responsibility

Martin Gadsby, Private Sector Housing Manager, telephone 255236  
Martin Fryer, Team Leader, Building Consultancy, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 255963

**10. Ref: 305006 – Cameron Road Homezone improvements and wheelie bins - received 19.01.05**

Issue

New question: A written question was submitted to the panel, asking the Council to enforce that wheelie bins are put away by every resident, as they are an hazard on the pavements, particularly for the blind and disabled.

He also asked that the tree guards that are being installed are painted white instead of black, so that they are more visible to car drivers at night.

Action reported at the meeting on 30 March 2005

A response was sent to the resident following the last meeting. This item will now be closed.

Public response at the meeting on 30 March 2005

A group of resident from Cameron Road attended the meeting to hand in a new petition.

Council response at the meeting on 30 March 2005

None.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 30 March 2005

Agreed to get a response on this petition for the June meeting.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 22 June 2005

A report appears on the agenda.

Responsibility

Martin Gadsby, Private Sector Housing Manager, telephone 255236  
Nicola Weekly, Traffic Manager, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 716074

**11. Ref: 305009 – Parking outside Normanton Infant School, Browning Street – received 30.03.05**

Issue

A member of the public raised concerns about the inconsiderate and dangerous parking by parents dropping off and picking up children around Normanton Infant School. It was agreed that the Council should write a letter to the head teacher and to ask the Police to include the school in regular visits by the local beat officer.

Action reported at the meeting on 30 March 2005

Public response at the meeting on 30 March 2005

Council response at the meeting on 30 March 2005

Actions agreed at the meeting on 30 March 2005

Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 22 June 2005

We have made contact with the Head of Normanton Infant School and also the local beat Police Officer. The Head has agreed to continue to monitor the situation and will be including an article in the school newsletter highlighting the issue. The local beat Police Officer will also liaise with the School Head and provide a Police presence.

Responsibility

Michelle Spamer, Area Co-ordination Officer Development and Cultural Services, telephone 715064.



**12. Ref: 305010 – Chatham Street, Concern about impact of Homezone improvements – received 30.03.05**

**Issue**

A member of the public raised concerns over the state that Chatham Street had been left in following the completion of the Homezone scheme. She said that one at the Council would take responsibility for finishing the work off that had been left uncompleted. Photographs were distributed to demonstrate the incomplete works. Concern was also expressed about the lack of kerbedges – especially at the end of streets. Residents present felt that this was potentially very dangerous for pedestrians – especially young children.

Action reported at the meeting on 30 March 2005

Public response at the meeting on 30 March 2005

Council response at the meeting on 30 March 2005

Actions agreed at the meeting on 30 March 2005

Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 22 June 2005

The majority of the scheme is finished, however there are a number of issues that still need to be completed and these should be completed over the next few weeks. This scheme is like any other highway scheme in that following the completion of the work there is a 12-month maintenance period.

The scheme has been carefully designed, including consultation with the local residents, to be in line with Government initiatives to change the way that streets are used. The design aims to improve the quality of life in residential streets by making them for people, not just for traffic. Changes to the layout of the street emphasised this change of use, so that motorists perceive that they should give informal priority to other road users and the scheme is therefore self enforcing. The Road Safety Unit carries out child pedestrian training at schools for Years 1 & 2 and would cover issues such as these.

**Responsibility**

Nicola Weekly, Traffic Manager, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 716074

**13. Ref: 305011 – Request for provision of additional car parking facilities on land on corner of Kenilworth Avenue and Village Street – - received 30.03.05**

Issue

A member of the public asked whether the piece of land on the corner of Kenilworth Avenue and Village Street could be turned into a car park for the local residents due to the lack of parking now available on Sackville Street due to the Homezone .

Action reported at the meeting on 30 March 2005

None.

Public response at the meeting on 30 March 2005

None.

Council response at the meeting on 30 March 2005

The panel agreed to get officers to consider this request.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 30 March 2005

To respond to the question at the next meeting.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 22 June 2005

At the moment it has not been possible to include this investigation in the work programme. This is because the work programme needs to reflect the priorities in the Local Transport Plan. These include safety matters, assisting public transport, providing pedestrian facilities and these need to take precedence over the provision of parking for residents which, in part, is the vehicle owner's responsibility. In addition, at the moment there isn't funding available to provide parking. Under the circumstances, I can only suggest the issue is retained for further consideration should staff resources and funding become available in the future.

Responsibility

Nicola Weekly, Traffic Manager, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 716074

**14. Ref: 305012 – Street lighting in Derby City centre – -received 30.03.05**

Issue

A member of the public commented that he had counted a large number of street lights out on the Wardwick and Uttoxeter New Road.

Action reported at the meeting on 30 March 2005

Public response at the meeting on 30 March 2005

Council response at the meeting on 30 March 2005

Actions agreed at the meeting on 30 March 2005

Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 22 June 2005

We are aware of an ongoing problem with some of the lighting on Uttoxeter New Road, our clerk of works is currently trying to resolve the situation, we will endeavour to get them working as soon as possible.

The Street lighting Engineer has surveyed the Wardwick area. All of the lights on Wardwick were lit, however a couple of the new lighting units on the Strand were out. Since these roads join together, these may be the lights referred to by the resident. These will now have been replaced. However, these new lights were installed as part of Connecting Derby, and the main contractor who did the works has become bankrupt. Unfortunately, this will continue to cause some delays in getting faulty lights working. It is understood that the lights will be 'handed over' to Streetcare in the next few weeks.

Responsibility

Michelle Spamer, Area Co-ordination Officer Development and Cultural Services, telephone 715064

**15. Ref: 303045 – Baseball Ground, Leacroft Road – raised 17.09.03 – new petition presented 19.01.05**

Issue

A member of the public raised the issue of restricted access to rear gardens adjacent to Shaftsbury Road. Parking problems had been created due to no waiting restrictions and residents had received parking fines as a result.

- Councillor Kalia assured the resident that the parking restrictions are being considered urgently and that, once an official order to remove them is received; the restrictions could be taken away.
- Inspector Parkin agreed to look into why residents had received parking tickets, sometimes in the early hours of the morning. He pointed out that this might have been due to road safety issues. He agreed that the restrictions at the Baseball Ground needed to be looked at, as it was not officially the football site any longer.
- David Gartside, Head of Traffic assured those present that because of the issues that residents had raised, the review of parking restrictions in the area had been brought forward.

January 2004

A review of the existing waiting restrictions covering the area around the former football ground is taking place in order to amend the restrictions to take into account the change of use in the area.

Proposals are currently being considered to:

- retain a number of the 'at any time' restrictions -double yellow lines on the grounds of junction safety and to ensure adequate carriageway width for access by larger vehicles and through traffic
- remove the 'no waiting restrictions' between the hours of 10am and 6pm on Saturdays and between the hours of 6pm and 10pm on Wednesdays between 1 August and 31 May' as there is no longer a need to maintain an emergency access route to the former football ground
- retain the - no waiting restrictions from Monday to Saturday between the hours of 8am and 6pm in Portland Street on the east side to ensure the free flow of traffic during the day which will help to ensure the safe and efficient operation of the traffic signals junction.

These proposals are subject to consultation with the Police, councillors and other statutory consultees.

March 2004

There is a three-week consultation period legally required for Traffic Regulation Orders. Officers will ensure that three-week period is co-ordinated to enable members of the public to view the plans at one of the planned Area Panel 3 meetings. Details will also be provided at the meeting on how people can object to the proposals. The initial meeting with police has yet to take place so it is not yet known when the consultation period will be, but the Area Panel will be kept informed of progress.

May 2004

It was reported that it is taking some time to gather the necessary information due to the size of the area. Officers are currently gathering information to draw up a detailed proposal to deal with the historic parking restrictions associated with the Baseball Ground.

A number of the 'at any time' restrictions -double yellow lines are likely to be retained on the grounds of junction safety and to ensure adequate carriageway width for access by larger vehicles and through traffic. It will be proposed that the Wednesday and Saturday restrictions associated with the football ground are removed, as there is no longer a need to maintain an emergency access route to the former football ground.

November 2004

Statutory consultation on the proposed amendments to waiting restrictions is currently taking place with the emergency services and road haulage associations. It is anticipated that the proposals will be advertised for public comment - on street and in the local press - by the end of the year.

**Action reported at the meeting on 30 March 2005**

The panel considered a report of the Director of Development and Cultural Services which stated that a petition had been received from residents of Leacroft Road seeking off-road parking facilities at the rear of the properties. A number of issues needed to be addressed in considering the request. It was proposed that the petitioners request be examined in detail within the context of the masterplan currently being prepared for the regeneration of the wider Baseball Ground site and to bring a further report to a future meeting.

**Public response at the meeting on 30 March 2005**

Residents pointed out that they had been asking for off –street parking for 25 years and were keen to get a response to their latest request. They do not want to miss the opportunity presented by the redevelopment of the Baseball Ground. They are keen to be involved in the development of the masterplan and not merely told what is in after it has been agreed.

It was noted that there was also another Lea Croft Road petition about housing improvements. The area panel manager said that the response for this would be done through the update report at the June area panel meeting.

**Council response at the meeting on 30 March 2005**

Councillor Williamson pointed out that the report gave a commitment to consult residents about the draft masterplan. This should provide the opportunity for residents to influence the final plan.

**Actions agreed at the meeting on 30 March 2005**

The panel resolved to get feedback on progress with the masterplan for the next meeting. The area panel manager pointed out that the Council had responded to a petition about housing improvement last year and agreed to provide a further response to the latest petition about housing improvements in the update report.

**Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 22 June 2005**

The funding set aside for the Council's Renewal Area Programme is fully committed for at least the next 2 years on works in our two current priority areas – the Hartington Street Renewal Area and the Osmaston Housing Improvement Zone. Thereafter, subject to Cabinet approval, the next area to be dealt with is likely to be Crewton.

Because Government funding for Housing Renewal is limited, the Council has to target the resources it has at those areas with the greatest concentration of poor housing conditions. Leacroft Road has benefited significantly from Government funded housing grant programmes in the past. More recently it was included in a scheme, funded through the Single Regeneration Budget, to improve home security, insulation and undertake basic home maintenance work. Grants also remain available, as they do citywide, for older, low-income homeowners whose properties are in need of repair.

At present therefore there are no proposals to include Leacroft Road within the current Area Renewal Programme. The programme will however be subject to review later this year when the outcome of a citywide private sector housing survey, being undertaken over the course of the next few months, is known. This will establish where the Council will need to focus its future area based activity in order to meet the Government's recently established targets in relation to decent homes within the private sector.

Work by Walbrook's consultants on the draft Masterplan is well advanced. The consultants have been asked to consider the issue of rear servicing to Leacroft Road. The next step will be a public consultation exercise on the draft Masterplan, which is expected to take place very soon.

Responsibility
----------------

Rob Salmon, Head of Plans and Policies, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 255020  
Martin Gadsby, Private Sector Housing Manager, telephone 255236

**16. Ref: 304027 – Petition - Molineux Street – one way street - received 12.05.04**

**Issue**

Residents of Molineux Street presented a petition asking the Council to take steps to reduce traffic congestion. They say that the volume of traffic and parking on both sides of the street is making driving conditions virtually impossible. They have requested that the street is made one-way with traffic flowing down Molineux Street from Rosehill Street.

In July 2004 it was reported that as the Council had also received a request to make Wilfred Street one-way, this request would be considered together with Wilfred and Sale Street. This will require a detailed investigation including vehicle counts and speed surveys. Due to a high number of similar requests, and in order to avoid doing these counts during school holidays, it is likely that this investigation will take place in September.

**Action reported at the meeting on 30 March 2005**

A report is currently being prepared. This will be presented at the June 2005 area panel meeting.

**Public response at the meeting on 30 March 2005**

**Council response at the meeting on 30 March 2005**

**Actions agreed at the meeting on 30 March 2005**

Provide full response to petition at June 2005 meeting.

**Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 22 June 2005**

Officers are currently working on a report to address all these requests. Consideration will be given to the pros and cons of installing one ways, the reasons for introduction and possible recommendations to solve any identified areas of concern. Surveys are currently being organised for all the roads. We expect that a report will be available for the September Area Panel meeting.

**Responsibility**

Nicola Weekly, Traffic Manager, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 716074

**17. Ref: 304045 – Petition - Raven Street - requesting a one-way system received 08.09.04**

Issue

The council received a petition signed by 117 residents in August 2004. It concerned the installation of a one-way system and the lead petitioner was invited to present a petition to the area panel on 8/9/04.

*'We the undersigned residents are concerned about the traffic problems in Raven and Percy Streets and therefore petition the Council to create a one-way system using these two streets, for the benefit of all.'*

Action reported at the meeting on 30 March 2005

Initial investigations undertaken – will report on progress at next area panel meeting.

Public response at the meeting on 30 March 2005

None.

Council response at the meeting on 30 March 2005

Actions agreed at the meeting on 30 March 2005

Provide full response to petition at June 2005 meeting.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 22 June 2005

A report appears on the agenda.

Responsibility

Neil Palfreyman, Traffic Management Engineer, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 716090.



**18. Ref: 304047 - Petition – Activ8 Project, Mount Carmel Street- received 08.09.04**

Issue

A petition was received about anti-social behaviour of residents in the Activ8 Project on Mount Carmel Street. This has been referred to the Council's Housing Strategy Unit and to the Chief Executive of Stonham Housing Association.

Action reported at the meeting on 30 March 2005

The housing association has met with local residents to discuss the petition. They are working together to try to find mutually agreeable arrangements that will provide sustainable solutions to the problems outlined in the petition.

Public response at the meeting on 30 March 2005

Stonham Housing Association are having regular meetings with local residents and local ward councillors to try to find a resolution to the ongoing problems. A full response to the petition will be presented at the June area panel meeting.

Council response at the meeting on 30 March 2005

It was reported that Ian Fullagar had been in contact with residents and had reported that the plan was to install a concierge at the building, subject to approval. It was noted that a full response to the petition would be presented at the next meeting.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 30 March 2005

Provide full response to petition at June 2005 meeting.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 22 June 2005

A report appears elsewhere on the agenda.

Responsibility

Ian Fullagar, Housing Strategy and Performance Manager, Housing Strategy Unit, telephone 255185

**19. Ref: 304054 – Petition - Renal Street and Avondale Road – request for a one-way system to improve traffic flows - received 26.09.04**

Issue

The Council received a petition signed by 31 residents in September 2004. It concerned the installation of a one-way system to improve traffic flow and the lead petitioner was invited to present a petition to the area panel on 10/11/04.

The petition has been referred to the Director of Development and Cultural Services to provide a full response at a future area panel meeting.

Action reported at the meeting on 30 March 2005

A full response to the petition will be presented at the June area panel meeting.

Public response at the meeting on 30 March 2005

Council response at the meeting on 30 March 2005

It was noted that no update was available on this item and again Councillor Nath raised his disappointment that no report was available on this item.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 30 March 2005

To provide a formal response to this petition at the next area panel meeting in June 2005.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 22 June 2005

Officers are currently working on a report to address all these requests. Consideration will be given to the pros and cons of installing one ways, the reasons for introduction and possible recommendations to solve any identified areas of concern. Surveys are currently being organised for all the roads. We expect that a report will be available for the September Area Panel meeting

Responsibility

Neil Palfreyman, Traffic Management Engineer, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 716090.

**20. Ref: 305007 – Petition – St Giles Road – request for a one-way system - received 19.01.05**

Issue

The panel received a petition requesting a one-way traffic system on St Giles Road because of traffic congestion. The petition was referred to the Director of Development and Cultural Services to provide a detailed response. The lead petitioner was invited to present the petition to area panel 3 on the 21 January 2005.

Action reported at the meeting on 30 March 2005

A full response to the petition will be presented at the June 2005 area panel meeting.

Public response at the meeting on 30 March 2005

Council response at the meeting on 30 March 2005

Actions agreed at the meeting on 30 March 2005

To provide a formal response to this petition at the next area panel meeting in June 2005.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 22 June 2005

Officers are currently working on a report to address all these requests. Consideration will be given to the pros and cons of installing one ways, the reasons for introduction and possible recommendations to solve any identified areas of concern. Surveys are currently being organised for all the roads. We expect that a report will be available for the September Area Panel meeting.

Responsibility

Nicola Weekly, Traffic Manager, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 716074

**21. Ref: 305014 – Petition requesting closure of footpath, Western Road to Gordon Road (St Chads School) – - received 26.1.05**

Issue

New petition.

Action reported at the meeting on 30 March 2005

The panel considered a report of the Assistant Director, Highways Transportation and Waste Management, which stated that a petition had been received, to request the closure of the footpath between Western Road and Gordon Road leading to St Chads School. A copy of the petition was also sent to Derby Community Safety Partnership. They were consulted during the investigation of this issue; their view was that all that could be done to improve safety and security had been done. A number of site visits were carried out during the preparation of the report, to observe the state of the footpath and to assess whether there was sufficient justification to close it as requested by the petitioners. There was no evidence to support the closure of the footpath using either section 116 or 118 of the Highways Act 1980. As the footpath was so well used it could not be considered to be either unnecessary or 'not needed for public use'.

Public response at the meeting on 30 March 2005

A member of the public raised concerns about the investigation of this issue and stated that they were fed up with the drug addition, drug dealing and dog fouling regularly occurring in the alleyway. Children had been known to pick up needles in the alleyway. The Area Panel was very helpful 2 years ago getting the extra street lighting but it hasn't helped the problem and has instead just given them better light to deal with.

Some residents commented that they found the final paragraph in Para 1.9 of the Council report very offensive. The report reads as follows: *'The regular use of the footpath, particularly by parents and their children indicates that crime and anti-social behaviour is not a regular occurrence. It is reasonable to suggest that if undesirable or intimidating conduct was happening, people would avoid using the footpath.'*

Council response at the meeting on 30 March 2005

Councillor Hussain commented that the Council should also be checking that the alleyway was being cleaned properly. He felt that a more thorough investigation was needed including proper consultation with local residents and the residents who signed the petition, as part of the process.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 30 March 2005

The Panel resolved to reject the recommendation and ask the Officers to re-examine the issue.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 22 June 2005

Following the request by the area panel to re-examine this issue we have consulted with the City Council's solicitor for highways matters who has confirmed that we have no powers to close the footpath under current legislation. From a traffic management point of view, we would want to maintain such routes on the grounds of maintaining a convenient and direct network of pedestrian routes in the area, and it has been shown that this alleyway is needed for public use.

In response to issues concerning the cleaning of the alleyway, we can confirm that this footway is cleaned twice each week as it falls into an area which receives an enhanced level of cleaning. In addition, the dog wardens visit the alleyway as it is recognised that dog fouling is a particular problem.

We have asked officers responsible for anti-social behaviour and planning to look at this issue and to respond to the area panel.

We would like to assure residents and the area panel that we in no way intended to offend anyone with the contents of the report and apologise if any offence was caused.

Responsibility
----------------

Nicola Weekly, Traffic Manager, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 716074

Andy Thomas, Anti-Social Behaviour Team, Community Safety Partnership, telephone 256910

**22.Ref: 305015 – Petition relating to Anti-Social Behaviour on Corner of Abbey Street and Monk Street – - received 30.03.05**

Issue

The Panel received a petition regarding anti-social behaviour on the corner of Abbey Street and Monk Street. The petitioner pointed out that this is not an occasional event, this happens all day every day of the week. They have requested that an antisocial behaviour order be placed on these individuals to stop them from gathering at this junction. The petition had been referred to the Anti-Social Behaviour team to provide a full response to the next meeting.

Action reported at the meeting on 30 March 2005

A group of residents and traders attended the meeting to express their concern about the impact of anti social behaviour on their businesses and the wider community.

Public response at the meeting on 30 March 2005

Concern was also expressed that there was often a young child present with the perpetrators of the antisocial behaviour. The panel agreed to refer this matter to the Director of Social Services. Residents also suggested that although the police are often called, little is done to resolve the situation.

Council response at the meeting on 30 March 2005

Actions agreed at the meeting on 30 March 2005

To ask the Head of Community Safety Partnership to investigate the issues outlined in the petition and to provide a full response to the petition at the June 2005 meeting.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 22 June 2005

A number of offenders are well known to the Police and the Anti Social Behaviour Team. They are allegedly causing harassment and distress to local people, as a result of street drinking and consequent verbal abuse. The individuals concerned have been moved on a number of times from City Centre locations. They have now congregated at Abbey Street, as this is outside the area designated in the City Centre, where the Police have powers to arrest street drinkers.

The Anti Social Behaviour team are taking a number of actions:

- Anti Social Behaviour Orders are being sought against four individuals. Under the terms of these orders, the individuals can be arrested if they are found drunk in a public place.
- The area of the City Centre Alcohol Free Zone in the City is being extended, to cover this area. When that is done the Police will have powers to confiscate alcohol found on individuals.
- Trees are being cut back to increase the effectiveness of the CCTV cameras in this location
- Shops are being reminded that it is illegal to supply alcohol to individuals who are intoxicated. Test purchases are being proposed.

In these ways, the activities of the offending individuals will be restricted. However, it is important to realise that the individuals are essentially alcoholics, and in need of support. They are denied access to remedial services because of their street intoxication, and are themselves victims of crime and abuse. The longer term solution is the development of a remedial hostel, which is being planned for a location in the City Centre in the next few years.

Responsibility

Andy Thomas, Anti-Social Behaviour Team, Community Safety Partnership, telephone 256910

**23. Ref: 305016 – Petition requesting One Way Road System on Wilfred Street, Sale Street and Molineux Street, Normanton. – - received 30.03.05**

Issue

The Panel received a petition requesting a one way traffic system on Wilfred Street, Sale Street and Molineux Street. The petition had been referred to the Director of Development and Cultural Services to provide a full response to the next meeting.

Action reported at the meeting on 30 March 2005

None.

Public response at the meeting on 30 March 2005

None.

Council response at the meeting on 30 March 2005

None.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 30 March 2005

To ask the Director of Development and Cultural Services to provide a full response to this petition at the June 2005 meeting.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 22 June 2005

Officers are currently working on a report to address all these requests. Consideration will be given to the pros and cons of installing one ways, the reasons for introduction and possible recommendations to solve any identified areas of concern. Surveys are currently being organised for all the roads. We expect that a report will be available for the September Area Panel meeting.

Responsibility

Nicola Weekly, Traffic Manager, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 716074