

AREA PANEL THREE – UPDATE REPORT

FOR 8 SEPTEMBER 2004

DALE COMMUNITY SCHOOL, PORTER ROAD, NORMANTON

Area and Neighbourhood Unit

Sarah Edwards, Area Panel Manager, telephone 255636

Vickie Butler, Information and Communications Officer, telephone 258529

Minicom 01332 258522

CONTENTS PAGE

| Community Issue | Page No. |
|---|----------|
| 1. Ref: 303045 – Baseball Ground, Leacroft Road – raised 17.09.03 | 3 |
| 2. Ref: 303005 – Crossing at Sainsburys' island, Kingsway - received 22.01.03 | 5 |
| 3. Ref: 303055 – Car Park on Colwyn Avenue and Warwick Avenue - adjacent to Normanton Park - received 19.11.03 | 6 |
| 4. Ref: 304008 – Pedestrian crossing request, Walbrook Road - received 21.01.04 | 8 |
| 5. Ref: 304012 – Illicit retail organisation, Mount Street - received 17.03.04 | 9 |
| 6. Ref: 304022 – Phase 3a – Connecting Derby - received 12.05.04 | 10 |
| 7. Ref: 304024 – Advertising signs - received 12.05.04 | 12 |
| 8. Ref: 304029 – Waste technology - received 14.07.04 | 13 |
| 9. Ref: 304030 – DRI –Reduction in Health Hopper Bus Service route- received 14.07.04 | 14 |
| 10. Ref: 304031 – Railings – Mount Carmel Street - received 14.07.04 | 15 |
| 11. Ref: 304033 – Yate Street - received 14.07.04 | 16 |
| 12. Ref: 304034 – Traffic issues – Normanton and Pear Tree - received 14.07.04 | 17 |
| 13. Ref: 304035 – Arrangements for Monitoring and Evaluating CCTV- received 14.07.04 | 19 |
| 14. Ref: 304033 – Yate Street - received 14.07.04 | 20 |

Petitions

| | |
|--|----|
| 15. Ref: 304036 – Procedure for petitions- received 14.07.04 | 21 |
| 16. Ref: 303044 – Petition - One way system for Stockbrook Road and Westbury Street – raised 17.09.03 | 22 |
| 17. Ref: 303048 – Petition – Parking on Sutherland Road - received 15.10.03 | 24 |
| 18. Ref: 303060 –Petition - Anti-social behaviour on the Austin Estate- received 30.11.03 | 26 |
| 19. Ref: 303059 – Park Gates at the end of Chatsworth Street - received 19.11.03 | 27 |
| 20. Ref: 304021 - Petition – Request for improved parking for residents on Moore Street- received 8.01.04 | 28 |
| 21. Ref: 304014 - Petition - Manor Road Junction - received 17.03.04 | 29 |
| 22. Ref: 304016 - Petition – To install flashing lights on Portland Street- received 17.03.04 | 30 |
| 23. Ref: 304017 - Petition – Parking restrictions, Pear Tree School - received 17.03.04 | 31 |
| 24. Ref: 304018 - Petition – Installation of a weight restriction on Portland Street- received 17.03.04 | 32 |
| 25. Ref: 304019 - Petition –Anti-social behaviour and prostitution at garages on Balfour- received 17.03.04 | 33 |

1. Ref: 303045 – Baseball Ground, Leacroft Road – raised 17.09.03

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.

Action reported at the meeting on 14 July 2004

It was reported that there was not sufficient progress to report to the meeting, but it was confirmed that a detailed plan of proposed restrictions would be supplied for the September Area Panel meeting.

Public response at the meeting on 14 July 2004

None.

Council response at the meeting on 14 July 2004

None.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 14 July 2004

To make sure that a detailed plan of the proposed restrictions is supplied for the September Area Panel meeting.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 8 September 2004

A plan of the existing and proposed restrictions will be displayed at the September Area Panel meeting. Officers have also been asked to provide information about the forthcoming consultation process and how people can comment on or object to the proposals at the meeting.

Responsibility

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

2. Ref: 303005 – Crossing at Sainsburys' island, Kingsway - received 22.01.03

Issue

Concern about inadequate pedestrian facilities for safe pedestrian crossing at the island at Sainsbury's at Kingsway. It has been clarified that this land has not been adopted by the Highway authority and is in private ownership. The Council has written to the site owners on several occasions asking for their co-operation in improving the pedestrian facilities.

Action reported at the meeting on 14 July 2004

It was reported that Onyx – the site owners – had indicated that they are willing to restart negotiations with the council to explore whether an agreement can be made for the Council to adopt the slip road. The traffic management section will follow this up and discussions will include the possibility of pedestrian improvements.

Public response at the meeting on 14 July 2004

A resident raised concern that the council are putting vehicles before pedestrians, and emphasised that this was not a safe crossing. He also questioned why large amounts of money had been spent on cycle paths, which, in his opinion, rarely used. He explained that he had originally spoken to Councillor Williamson who himself asked for a pedestrian crossing, but he felt that Chief Officers do not seem to listen to the requests.

Council response at the meeting on 14 July 2004

Sarah agreed that this was a difficult place to cross, but confirmed that pedestrian crossing cannot be installed on any site unless it meets the DCC pedestrian crossing criteria. She confirmed that the Council acknowledged the need for pedestrian improvements on the slip road.

Councillor Burgess said that he felt it would be far safer to have a crossing further down the slip road. He confirmed that the Council will make every effort to work with the site owners Onyx to improve the pedestrian facilities.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 14 July 2004

To provide an update.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 8 September 2004

The Council recognizes that the Kingsway development is now extremely busy. The new stores, including Marks and Spencer and Boots are generating an increased demand for pedestrian access and current pedestrian facilities fall some way short of what would ideally be required. In addition, there is some concern about the fact that vehicles are often queued back from the development onto the traffic island at Kingsway. It has been suggested that this is in part due to the difficulty faced by vehicle drivers in being able to turn into the parking area in front of Curry's.

The Council has recently invited Onyx to attend a meeting on 9 September 2004 to discuss how improvements in pedestrian and vehicle access can be delivered for the benefit of those visiting the retail park. One of the issues that will be discussed is the potential adoption of the slip road by the City Council. Officers have given a commitment to keep the panel and Mr Clayton informed of any future developments with Onyx.

It is proposed to close this item following the September meeting. Residents are invited to contact David Gartside on telephone 715025 for updates in future.

Responsibility

David Gartside, Head of Traffic, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 715025

3. Ref: 303055 – Car Park on Colwyn Avenue and Warwick Avenue - adjacent to Normanton Park - received 19.11.03

Issue

A member of the public reported that residents of these roads were regularly kept awake in the early hours of the morning by loud noise and music made by people using the car park. He reported that several agencies in the City were aware of this issue and had considered putting a barrier on the car park at night to tackle this. He understood that the Anti-Social Behaviour Team were going to put a barrier up and wished to know why this had not been done to date.

This matter was referred to Dawn Dagley in DCC Parks and Craig Keen in the anti-social behaviour team in November 2003 with a request for them to investigate and report back to the panel.

March 2004

The site was monitored by DCC Parks and the Anti Social Behaviour Team and they reported that there was not currently a problem at this site. It was agreed that the reason for this was that the problems actually occur largely during the summer months.

The Anti social behaviour team had suggested a one stage that it may be in a position to fund the provision of a barrier but this would be costly for the Council to maintain and to open and close. The resident confirmed that he himself is happy to enter into an agreement with the Council, and supply staff from his business to open and close the barrier.

Chris Williamson asked the panel to agree that a barrier be installed. He accepted that there were issues about implications and asked Cabinet to issue an instruction to Parks to make sure the barrier is opened, or enter into an agreement with the resident.

May 2004

The Area Panel Manager met with DCC Parks, and the Anti-Social Behaviour - ASB team on 6 April 2004 to discuss this issue and consider the feasibility of installing a barrier. At this meeting, DCC Parks and the ASB team confirmed that reports were received last summer concerning noise nuisance in the early hours at the car park located at the junction of Warwick Street and Colwyn Avenue. Parks, Derby Homes and the Police monitored the problem and consideration was given to the installation of a barrier to restrict access to the car park. The ASB Team initially agreed to fund this work in conjunction to other interventions.

Although the ASB Team initially agreed to fund the installation of a barrier, after a rigorous and extensive investigation of this option, it became clear that it would be extremely problematic. There are serious issues including access to the sports facilities, legal liability and long term financial implications that mean that the installation of a barrier cannot be recommended.

However, if an anti-social behaviour problem is identified again in the forthcoming summer months, Parks, Police and the ASB Team have given a commitment to work together to identify those responsible and to intervene to stop the nuisance reoccurring.

The Panel resolved to recommend to the Council Cabinet the installation of a barrier at Colwyn Avenue car park and that the Park Department make arrangements to open and lock the barrier at suitable times in accordance with the needs of the community living in the area. A report will be taken to Council Cabinet later in July to discuss the Panel's recommendation to install a barrier.

Action reported at the meeting on 14 July 2004

A report is currently being prepared and will go to Cabinet in August.

Public response at the meeting on 14 July 2004

None.

Council response at the meeting on 14 July 2004

None.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 14 July 2004

To note that a report will be taken to Cabinet in August.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 8 September 2004

John Winters, Director of Commercial Services will submit a report to the Council Cabinet on 7 September. Cabinet will consider whether or not a barrier should be erected.

Responsibility

Craig Keen, Anti-Social Behaviour Team Leader, Community Safety Partnership Telephone 256840
Ian Wheatley, Grounds Maintenance Manager, Commercial Services, telephone 716530.

4. Ref: 304008 – Pedestrian crossing request, Walbrook Road - received 21.01.04

Issue

A member of the public raised her concern that there was only a pelican crossing at Portland Street and that traffic coming down Walbrook and Thomas Road at speed proposed a safety issue. A request was made for a pedestrian crossing on Walbrook Road.

Action reported at the meeting on 14 July 2004

It was reported that an initial site visit was carried out on 27 May, and on the basis of this a formal pedestrian and vehicle count had been requested. Formal counts generally take place a month or so after being requested, and in this case there will be a slight delay due to the Whitsun break, as counts cannot take place during school holidays. A further update will be brought to the September Area Panel meeting.

Public response at the meeting on 14 July 2004

A member of the public reported that they had received a letter from Mr Astell stating that there would not be a crossing on this path, due to the results of the counts that had taken place. The resident asked if a recount could be carried out, as the figures stated in the letter does not tally with what actually happens on the street.

Council response at the meeting on 14 July 2004

Actions agreed at the meeting on 14 July 2004

The Panel asked Sarah Edwards to ask officers in D& CS, to do a recount.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 8 September 2004

Requests for the installation of pedestrian crossings are assessed using criteria based on national guidance. The guidance is used to assess all types of pedestrian crossing facilities and ensures budgets are used to target areas in greatest need.

A 12 hour pedestrian and traffic survey was undertaken on Monday 28 June 2004 during term time. The survey counted the number of pedestrians crossing Walbrook Road over a 100m length near to St Thomas Road. The survey showed that the degree of conflict between pedestrians and traffic fell well short of the threshold that the Council has adopted. The traffic signals at the nearby Portland Street junction naturally create gaps in traffic where pedestrians are able to cross the road. However, it is appreciated that pedestrians may have to wait a short time for a gap in traffic before they can cross at busy times.

The pedestrian/vehicle ratio for the highest frequency hour (1500-1600) was 0.221 which is well short of 0.51 which would be needed in order to be consider the installation of a pedestrian crossing facility. The Director of Development and Cultural services believes that the survey represents a typical day and would not normally repeat the survey unless there is evidence of a significant change in travel patterns.

Responsibility

Nick Rule, Senior Traffic Signal Technician, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 716063.

5. Ref: 304012 – Illicit retail organisation, 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. It has been reported to the planning department – who reported that this is illicit and they have no right to retail. It has also been reported to the police about when the lorries are there. This is a major junction and something needs to be done.

Action reported at the meeting on 14 July 2004

It was reported that the Planning Enforcement Officer had spoken to both Mr and Mrs Underhill on 25 May to update them on the action taken so far and to discuss their concerns about the site. Following this discussion, he made contact with the landowner and his surveyor and it became apparent that the situation is far more complex than it had initially appeared. The key points are that:

- the freehold owner of the site granted a 25-year lease to a company that is part of the Kwik-Fit group in 1989.
- In April 2003, Kwik-Fit solicitors requested the owners consent to sub-let the property to the company that trades as Floors to Go.
- The landowner had concerns about this request and no formal lease appears to have been agreed
- Despite these concerns and without consent from the owner, Floors to Go have moved into the site and they are occupying the premises under a form of license agreement between themselves and Kwik-Fit.
- The owner's solicitor has been trying to unravel this situation since last year, with a view to having Floors to Go removed from the premises.

The City Council is currently taking legal advice about service of a Planning Enforcement Notice. In the meantime, the Council has been notified on 28 May that the leaseholder now intends to submit a planning application within 28 days to retain the unauthorised use.

Public response at the meeting on 14 July 2004

A member of the public asked if a planning application had actually been submitted, as she had not received any letters to state this. She explained that on the bottom of the report it stated that a planning application would be submitted within 28 days.

Council response at the meeting on 14 July 2004

None.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 14 July 2004

Sarah Edwards agreed to ask the planning officer to contact the resident by phone to let her know.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 8 September 2004

Sarah has given the planning officer the residents contact details and asked him to contact the resident by phone to provide her with an update. The planning enforcement officer has arranged to meet Floors to go on 2nd September. He has been asked to provide a verbal report about the outcome of the meeting prior to the meeting of AP3 on 8 September.

Responsibility

Laurence Rayner, Planning and Enforcement Assistant, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 25594

6. Ref: 304022 – Phase 3a – Connecting Derby - received 12.05.04

Issue

Chris Woodward expressed concern about levels of pollution following Connecting Derby Phase 3A. He reported that he had previously been told that Phase 3A had been designed to take only existing levels of traffic and he asked what the expected maximum traffic flowing and result in Nitrous Oxide levels would be from the approved Eagle Centre and Riverlights Schemes. He asked whether the figures would be revised when other elements of the City Scape had been approved.

Action reported at the meeting on 14 July 2004

We can confirm that all existing committed developments -those with planning permission have been included in the development of Connecting Derby. This means that the Connecting Derby proposals have taken into account the increased traffic that will result from both the Riverlights and Westfield developments.

For information, new roads of this scale require an Environmental Impact Assessment - EIA and all impacts, including air quality, noise, traffic, townscape, archaeology are considered in this process. The EIA is then submitted as part of the Planning Application.

The submission of the planning application has been delayed until the end of June. As a result the consultation period is now running from 26 June to 31 July. The revised dates and times of the public events are as follows:

- 22 July, main exhibition at Market Place, 10 am to 7 pm
- 23 July, main exhibition at Market Place, 10 am to 5 pm
- 24 July, main exhibition at Market Place, 10 am to 4 pm
- 26 July, at Becket Primary School, 3 pm to 8 pm
- 29 July, at Pickford House, 5.30 pm to 9 pm
- 31 July, at The Polish Club, 10 am to 4 pm

A newsletter will be distributed to people on the mailing list in mid July. It will also be available in various locations around the city. Residents will also receive invitations to attend their local exhibition. Details of the events will be published in the Derby Evening Telegraph and on the Connecting Derby web page www.derby.gov.uk/hires/travel/connectingderby

Public response at the meeting on 14 July 2004

A representative for Chris Woodward confirmed that the comment made about the environmental statement is accepted. He did however raise two points regarding this issue:

1. The road from Stanford Street to Burton Road is currently a 2 lane road – can this be converted to a dual carriageway without any further planning application
2. With regard to the consultation dates – in his view, the council have a bad record of consultation - he stated that all of the dates coincide with holiday periods – is there any plans to extend the consultation period so that more people are likely to be able to attend.

Council response at the meeting on 14 July 2004

Councillor Burgess agreed to consider this, and explained that the consultation prior to the planning meeting in October should give some chance for other events to take place in September.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 14 July 2004

To provide a response to these questions and observations at the next meeting.

| |
|--|
| Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 8 September 2004 |
|--|

In response to question 1:

The proposed road link from Stafford Street to Burton Road is shown on the drawings as a single carriageway road. If planning permission is granted, the permission will relate to that proposal and not to any other.

If the road is built and a future Highway Authority wanted to widen it, whether planning permission would then be required is a complex question to answer. In theory, road widening is "permitted development" under planning law but that is hedged with Environmental Impact Assessment considerations. Apart from that it is very doubtful if any Highway Authority would wish to pursue the concept of widening, in urban areas, beyond the original highway limits without planning permission.

In response to question 2:

These consultation dates were selected to make the consultation as convenient as possible for as many people as possible, but we are always available to talk to people about their concerns at other times.

The Connecting Derby planning application and plans that accompany it are available to view at the Council's Roman House reception on Friar Gate during normal office hours.

The Environmental Statement is currently being corrected by DCC as applicants and the corrected Environmental Statement will be readvertised by the City Council as Local Planning Authority once it is received. Because of the need to allow an adequate time for debate, a special meeting of the planning control committee will be held, provisionally on either 21 October or 4 November, to consider the Connecting Derby planning and related applications.

In the meantime, you want to talk about any aspect of the project, please call Andy Smart, Project Co-ordinator on 01332 715131 or email him on andy.smart@derby.gov.uk

You can also contact Cassandra Shardlow, Consultation Officer on 01332 716216 or email her on cassandra.shardlow@derby.gov.uk

Queries in relation to the Council's rôle as Local Planning Authority should be addressed to John Stewart, Principal Planner, on 01332 255934 or e-mail john.stewart@derby.gov.uk

| |
|----------------|
| Responsibility |
|----------------|

Andy Smart, Connecting Derby Project Co-ordinator, Development and Cultural Services, telephone: 715131

7. Ref: 304024 – Advertising signs - received 12.05.04

Issue

A member of the public raised concern over the danger of advertising signs being left on public highways, particularly on Normanton Road and Mount Street. He stated that this used to be illegal, and that the Council did previously remove them. He asked the panel if these could be moved.

Action reported at the meeting on 14 July 2004

We are working with the disability groups to establish a new policy for street advertising. In the past we have tried to establish a policy, and a lot of work has gone into it, but it has been difficult to come to agreement due to the clash of interest between pedestrians and businesses.

At the moment the Council's Streetcare officers intervene where an advertising sign restricts footway widths to less than 1.2 metres or if it creates a specific danger, such as restricting drivers' visibility at junctions.

On this basis, we have investigated the signs on Normanton Road and Mount Street and have found no cases where we feel justified in taking action. We have also noted that the Floors-to-Go board is on their own forecourt.

If anyone is concerned that an advertising sign is causing specific danger, please ring the Streetcare Hotline on 01332 715000 and they will investigate.

Public response at the meeting on 14 July 2004

The report states that the advertising signs are on their own forecourt – they are in fact located on several streets including Leopold, Charnwood, Burton Roads, and Bradshaw Way.

Council response at the meeting on 14 July 2004

None.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 14 July 2004

To ask officers to investigate this issue more fully.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 8 September 2004

The streets identified at the July Area Panel meeting were checked on 12 August. The highway inspector noted a couple of A boards on the Burton Road junction with Abbey Street. They were positioned sensibly enabling pedestrians to pass. No action was therefore required.

Responsibility

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

8. Ref: 304029 – Waste technology - received 14.07.04

Issue

A resident asked if the council was aware that the SWERF technology does not work and neither does the Waste Recycling group technology? She also asked if the councillors interested in this or do they want to give tax payers money to large companies for no reason?

Action reported at the meeting on 14 July 2004

New item.

Public response at the meeting on 14 July 2004

None.

Council response at the meeting on 14 July 2004

Councillor Burgess responded that he was aware of the problems with the SWERF technology and that it seemed unlikely that this company would be used by the City Council. He stated that the Council was currently talking with the government for possible Private Finance Initiative funding to work with the city council. He also reported that at the Council Cabinet meeting on 6 July 2004, had considered a report which included the Environment Agency's guidelines on waste disposal.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 14 July 2004

To provide a more detailed response to the question at the September area panel meeting and to also respond directly to the questioner who left her name and address.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 8 September 2004

The Solid Waste to Energy Recycling Facility (SWERF) process is owned by Brightstar who are in turn owned by EDL (Energy Developments Ltd of Australia). The process involves heating mixed waste in the absence of air. Gas is produced that can be used to create further energy, for example to power a generator to make electricity.

The Council has entered into a contract with Brightstar whereby the Council agreed to supply Brightstar with waste if Brightstar built a plant to process it. As the contract expires in March 2005 and this plant has not yet been built, it is becoming increasingly unlikely that the contract will be fulfilled. We are awaiting further action from Brightstar. We are aware that they are seeking a partner to finance the completion of their technology.

We are not aware of any specific technology chosen by or recommended by the Waste Recycling Group (WRG). We have no contact with them other than for the existing contracts that they operate for us, namely disposal of waste to landfill and operating the Raynesway Recycling Site.

All our future disposal of residual waste is likely to go through a Private Finance Initiative (PFI) contract which will call for the contractor to offer technologies that will meet our diversion of bio-degradable waste from landfill targets. We have not chosen any particular technology and neither have we ruled out any technology at this time.

Mel Bradfield will write to the resident who asked the question outlining this response.

Responsibility

Colin Stewart, Contract Development Officer, Streetcare and Waste Management
Mel Bradfield, Transportation Policy Team telephone 01332 716096

9. Ref: 304030 – DRI –Reduction in Health Hopper Bus Service route- received 14.07.04

Issue

A member of the public read out the following question:

“The Derbyshire Royal Infirmary has recently announced that their car parks are too small, not long after having slashed the Health Hopper routes and services. The service does not run through Normanton anymore, which is one of the most deprived areas. What is the Council doing - if anything - about expanding the Health Hopper service so that it runs through as many areas and suburbs of Derby as possible, as the DRI surely has a Green Travel Plan, which the Council is supposed to be assisting the Health Authority with and the Primary Care Trust, together with the City Council has recently issued a policy to improve the health of the community through having regard to air quality issues”.

Action reported at the meeting on 14 July 2004

New item.

Public response at the meeting on 14 July 2004

None.

Council response at the meeting on 14 July 2004

Councillor Burgess expressed his disappointment that this was being withdrawn by the hospital trust. He commented that the Health Hopper was subsidised by the hospital and that the new routes had been found to be better utilised than the original ones. He stated that the Council has a Working Group, which works in partnership with bus companies to improve bus services. He also pointed out that the Council was currently constrained by legislation, which meant that private companies were responsible for provision of bus services.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 14 July 2004

To provide a response at the next area panel meeting.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 8 September 2004

The former Health Hopper bus service was ended earlier this year because the Health Trust found that the cost of the service, when compared to patronage, was very high. The use of public money in this way was not felt to be providing good value for money, so the Trust revised the service to provide a direct link between the two main hospital sites. This service is linked to the city centre to give opportunity for interchange with other bus routes, in particular those from Alvaston, Sinfin and Chellaston, which also go to The Spot. Both the Trust and Council recognise that some areas have lost direct hospital links as a result of this change, but the new Hospital Link service does give a more direct, and hence attractive, link to more people who wish to get to the City General Hospital.

There is no indication at present that any operators are interested in commercially serving those links to the City General Hospital that were severed by the loss of the former Health Hopper bus. The Council has a duty to consider the issues of access to bus services, and will consider providing revenue support for such a service in the future, if funds become available.

Mel Bradfield will write to the resident who asked the question outlining this response.

Responsibility

Mel Bradfield, Transportation Policy Team, telephone 01332 716096.

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

Issue

Action reported at the meeting on 14 July 2004

New item.

Public response at the meeting on 14 July 2004

Dangerous railings 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.

Council response at the meeting on 14 July 2004

Actions agreed at the meeting on 14 July 2004

To respond to this question at the next area panel meeting.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 8 September 2004

The railings have been inspected and an order has been placed for the missing and damaged pieces to be replaced.

Responsibility

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

11. Ref: 304033 – Yate Street - received 14.07.04

Issue

A member of the public raised concern over the one way system on Yate Street. She confirmed that this had been an issue for some 20 years. Councillor Burgess had visited the site and taken photographs. She confirmed that a no entry sign was required at one end of the road and that it is difficult to access the road, as there are people coming out of the junction, including taxis, post office vans and large lorries. Vans are there all the time, parked on the pavements, and people cannot get by.

Action reported at the meeting on 14 July 2004

New item.

Public response at the meeting on 14 July 2004

New item.

Council response at the meeting on 14 July 2004

Actions agreed at the meeting on 14 July 2004

Inspector Parkin agreed to look at how many accidents had taken place on the street, and to assign the full time traffic wardens to this street.

City Council to respond to the concerns about the signage and safety.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 8 September 2004

Last year the signage was reviewed - all the signs are in place and illuminated (where appropriate) in order for the police to be able to enforce. No Entry carriageway markings and Give Way lines will be repainted, completion date to be confirmed. Abuse of the No Entry by drivers is a Police enforcement issue. This will be raised at the next DCC Police Liaison Meeting on the 30th September.

Inspector Parkin has confirmed that traffic wardens have patrolled Yates St and issued tickets. Within the period there has been no reported road traffic collisions.

Responsibility

Mel Bradfield, Transportation Policy Team telephone 01332 716096
Inspector Gary Parkin, Derbyshire Constabulary, Peartree Police Station, telephone 209100

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

Issue

Action reported at the meeting on 14 July 2004

New item.

Public response at the meeting on 14 July 2004

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.

Resident made comment on Maurice's statement regarding bigger roads to get traffic out – on A52 – the main car park at pride park was full – this is the only park and ride on that side of town. Why not put better systems in place to get people to leave their cars, instead of trying to get them to drive through?

Another resident raised concern that there was a lot of money being spent on the Eagle Centre to try and bring more people into the City, and yet, Councillor Burgess stated that they are in fact trying to reduce traffic in the city. This was a felt to be a contradiction.

Council response at the meeting on 14 July 2004

Councillor Burgess informed residents that the Road Traffic Reduction Act 1997 puts an obligation on citywide things, and doesn't give specific local areas. The Council have two targets in the local transport plan regarding the Road Traffic Reduction Act (RTRA) / Local Transport Plan (LTP). These are:

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| LTP Objective | <i>TM/Obj3 - Influence and manage transport demand by using measures to restrain car use</i> |
| RTRA Target | <i>Stem the rate of traffic growth across the outer cordon (city boundary) to at least 1% below National Road Traffic Forecast, NRTF central growth forecasts by 2006</i> |
| Indicator | <i>TM/Pi1^{area} – Peak hour flows of vehicles across the outer cordon</i> |
| Progress | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• on track to meet our target.</i> <i>• the LTP target for traffic growth is based on a 1998 base year</i> <i>• the target for traffic growth across the outer cordon between 1998 and 2003 is eight percent</i> <i>• observations of the outer cordon have shown that, between 1998 and 2003, there has been a fall in traffic of three and a half percent in the AM peak and an increase in traffic of seven percent in the PM peak.</i> |

| | |
|----------------------|---|
| LTP Objective | <i>TM/Obj3 - Influence and manage transport demand by using measures to restrain car use</i> |
| RTRA Target | <i>Stem the rate of traffic growth completely across the inner cordon (inner ring road), with total peak hour traffic volumes in 2005/06 no greater than those in 2000/01.</i> |
| Indicator | <i>TM/Pi2^{area} - Peak hour flows of vehicles across the inner cordon</i> |

Progress

- *not on track to meet our target.*
- *combined morning and evening peak hours have shown a growth of 1.69% over the baseline*
- *progress on stemming traffic growth across the inner cordon will be made easier by the completion of the Inner Ring Road in phases 2 and 3a of Connecting Derby*
- *this scheme includes various junctions which will help buses to access the city centre more easily, and replace one way systems that currently cause buses a lot of delay*
- *improved accessibility for buses should therefore enhance their reliability, which combined with bus priorities and quality bus partnerships, should encourage more car drivers to switch mode for more journeys, thereby contributing towards achieving the target.*

The RTRA targets apply to the areas identified above. Individual targets for areas within the city, apart from the city centre, have not been set and are not a requirement of the RTRA.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 14 July 2004

None.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 8 September 2004

There is nothing further to add to this item at this stage. As a full response has been provided to the original question no further action is required, this item will now be closed. It has not been possible to send a copy of this response to the person who asked the question as we do not have a contact address or telephone number for her.

Responsibility

Mel Bradfield, Transportation Policy Team, telephone 01332 716096.

13. Ref: 304035 – Arrangements for Monitoring and Evaluating CCTV- received 14.07.04

Issue

A member of the public asked why the issue of CCTV installation had not been included in the update report, when Councillor Burgess attributed the loss of phone boxes to vandalism.
Want a comprehensive report on monitoring and evaluation of the effectiveness of CCTV.

Action reported at the meeting on 14 July 2004

New item.

Public response at the meeting on 14 July 2004

Council response at the meeting on 14 July 2004

Actions agreed at the meeting on 14 July 2004

Sarah Edwards explained that she had spoken to a number of officers about this request already and would ask for a report about CCTV to be brought to a future meeting. She also agreed to add this item into the community update report as requested.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 8 September 2004

The On street traffic operations manager has been asked to provide a report for the November 2004 meeting.

Responsibility

Nigel Brien, On Street Operations Manager, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 715106
Mel Bradfield, Transportation Policy Team, telephone 01332 716096.

14. Ref: 304033 – Yate Street - received 14.07.04

Issue

A member of the public raised concern over the one way system on Yate Street. She confirmed that this had been an issue for some 20 years. Councillor Burgess had visited the site and taken photographs. She confirmed that a no entry sign was required at one end of the road and that it is difficult to access the road, as there are people coming out of the junction, including taxis, post office vans and large lorries. Vans are there all the time, parked on the pavements, and people cannot get by.

Action reported at the meeting on 14 July 2004

New item.

Public response at the meeting on 14 July 2004

New item.

Council response at the meeting on 14 July 2004

Actions agreed at the meeting on 14 July 2004

Inspector Parkin agreed to look at how many accidents had taken place on the street, and to assign the full time traffic wardens to this street.

City Council to respond to the concerns about the signage and safety.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 8 September 2004

Last year the signage was reviewed - all the signs are in place and illuminated (where appropriate) in order for the police to be able to enforce. No Entry carriageway markings and Give Way lines will be repainted, completion date to be confirmed. Abuse of the No Entry by drivers is a Police enforcement issue. This will be raised at the next Police Liaison Meeting.

Inspector Parkin has reported that the traffic wardens have patrolled Yates Street since the last meeting and issued a number of tickets. Within the period there has been no reported road traffic collisions.

Responsibility

Mel Bradfield, Transportation Policy Team telephone 01332 716096
Inspector Gary Parkin, Derbyshire Constabulary, Peartree Police Station, telephone 209100

15. Ref: 304036 – Procedure for petitions- received 14.07.04

Issue

A member of the Public raised concern over the way in which petitions were received and considered by the Area Panel. She felt that the current procedure and process was unclear.

Action reported at the meeting on 14 July 2004

New item.

Public response at the meeting on 14 July 2004

None

Council response at the meeting on 14 July 2004

None

Actions agreed at the meeting on 14 July 2004

Sarah will prepare a short guide to the petitions procedure for general use by area panels

Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 8 September 2004

A copy of the Procedure for petitions contained within the area panel good practice guide is attached to this report as Appendix A.

Responsibility

Sarah Edwards, Area Panel Manager, Policy Directorate, telephone 255636.

16. Ref: 303044 – Petition - One way system for Stockbrook Road and Westbury Street – raised 17.09.03

Issue

A member of the public presented a petition to the Panel in September 2003 asking for a one-way system between Westbury Street and Stockbrook Road. He felt that this would prevent accidents and that near misses were a daily occurrence. This was causing pollution, noise and general disturbance for local residents.

November 2003– Council officers provided a response to the petition following their investigation into the request for a one-way street. At present, traffic using Westbury Street and Stockbrook Road is required to negotiate parked vehicles and to give way to oncoming traffic. This reduces vehicle speeds and to some extent deters drivers from using these roads as a through route. Site observations indicate that two-way traffic, including the 33-bus service negotiates the parked vehicles on Stockbrook Road safely. Given that both Stockbrook Road and Westbury Street form part of a wider network of roads, it was felt that a one-way system on Stockbrook Road and Westbury Street would push all the morning peak and afternoon peak hour traffic onto adjacent streets.

In addition, both streets currently have good safety records, according to Derbyshire Constabulary's database of all recorded personal injury accidents; there were no personal injury accidents on either Stockbrook Road or Westbury Street over the three years to July 2003. It was therefore not considered appropriate to introduce a one-way restriction that may lead to increased vehicle speeds and have an adverse impact on neighbouring residential streets. The petitioners and ward councillors were not satisfied with this response and asked for further investigations to be undertaken.

January 2004 - Following further investigations, the Director of Development Services still considered that there was little benefit in terms of road safety of introducing a one-way restriction on these streets. Further, as a scheduled bus service operates in both directions on Stockbrook Road, the adverse effects on public transport of complying with this request could lead to a public inquiry. This is a further significant reason for refusing the request. However, given the strength of residents' opinion, it was suggested that further consultation would take place to determine how to proceed.

March 2004 - In February 2004, 154 questionnaires were distributed to all residents living in properties fronting Westbury Street, Stockbrook Road and Westbury Court were invited to complete a questionnaire stating whether or not they supported the introduction of a one-way restriction. A total of 60 responses were returned, a response rate of 39%. Based on these responses, the results of the consultation was:

- 28 residents supported the suggestion of introducing a one-way restriction and 19 residents were opposed.
- The number of positive response to the questionnaire represents 18% of the properties surveyed.
- It appeared that a significant number of residents did not feel the need to express a view.

May 2004 - The Panel resolved to request the Director of Development and Cultural Services to investigate the feasibility of introducing a one-way system for Stockbrook Road and Westbury Street.

July 2004 - Cabinet resolved that further consultation about the need for a one-way restriction should be carried out at Stockbrook Road and Westbury Street.

Action reported at the meeting on 14 July 2004

It was reported that this matter had been considered by Cabinet meeting on 6 July. Cabinet resolved that further consultation about the need for a one-way restriction should be carried out at Stockbrook Road and Westbury Street.

The Council hopes to carry out further consultation with local residents at the end of August 2004.

| |
|--|
| Public response at the meeting on 14 July 2004 |
|--|

None.

| |
|---|
| Council response at the meeting on 14 July 2004 |
|---|

None.

| |
|---|
| Actions agreed at the meeting on 14 July 2004 |
|---|

None.

| |
|--|
| Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 8 September 2004 |
|--|

A consultation letter has been written and this will be sent to all residents. However, ward councillors are being consulted on its contents before it is distributed.

| |
|----------------|
| Responsibility |
|----------------|

Tara Nield, Traffic and Parking Engineer, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 7150256.

17. Ref: 303048 – Petition – Parking on Sutherland Road - received 15.10.03

Issue

In October 2003 the Council received a petition signed by 115 residents who ask for the parallel, kerb side parking on Sutherland Road to be retained and in supporting information submitted with the petition ask for consideration to be given to a one way traffic restriction and residents only parking.

November 2003 - Neil Palfreyman, Traffic Management Engineer responded to the Sutherland Road petition. He pointed out that Sutherland Road forms part of the second phase of the Normanton Home Zone and that consultation with residents will start in January 2004. Residents and businesses owners will be invited to design workshops and given opportunities to participate in the design process to ensure that they manage the way their street is improved. The requests for parallel parking and a one-way restriction will be taken into account at this time.

January 2004 -A number of residents of the street who were at the meeting expressed their opposition to the Home Zone project. Mr Harrison – the lead petitioner and other residents said that they did not want the consultation to take place at all, as they did not want the Home Zone scheme in their road. They felt very strongly that the number of signatures on the petition reflected the strength of views of the residents. They had raised the petition to stop the consultation from going ahead and felt that their petition was being ignored.

March 2004 - it was reported that in the light of this petition, and further representations made by residents at the Area Panel meeting on 21 January 2004, Sutherland Road would be excluded from the proposed Normanton Home Zone. A letter was sent to every household on the street to tell them about this decision.

Action reported at the meeting on 14 July 2004

It was reported that if the majority of residents wished to see Sutherland Road included in the scheme, consideration would be given to this once consultation had been completed for Phase 2 in September 2004. This would give residents the opportunity to begin to assess the scheme being installed for Phase 1, which will start in June 2004 and is due for completion in December 2004.

The scheme would be designed around what the majority of residents wish to see included. Once the outline design is drawn up, we can confirm that residents would be given the option to say whether or not they would like to see the scheme taken forward. A decision would be taken on what the majority of residents who respond to the consultation process wanted.

For information, Phase 1 - Cameron Road and Havelock Road is proposed to begin in June 2004. The consultation process for Phase 2 - Randolph Road and Sackville Street began in April 2004.

Note on publicising Home Zones

The consultation process has included Community Open Days, two workshops, the setting up of a working group to lead on the design process, a regular newsletter and the appointment of a Home Zone co-ordinator. These measures are all designed to get the message across. This consultation has been far in excess of any other traffic management related scheme. It has been carried out in accordance with the Derby City Partnership's Quality Standards for Consultation and it has been made clear all through the process how the information gained from the consultation will be used in the decision making process. At all stages it has been stated that 'diagonal parking' does not have to be a part of the process.

In taking forward the design process for Phase 2 the co-ordinator will again carry out door to door discussions with residents to get a feel for the types of schemes that the majority of residents support. An exhibition/meeting is scheduled for Saturday 26 June 2004 to discuss with residents the options for Phase 2 and to give residents of phase 1 an opportunity to ask officers further questions on the

detail design. Information on traffic management schemes is currently being drawn up for inclusion on the Council's web site and will include information on Home Zones.

| |
|--|
| Public response at the meeting on 14 July 2004 |
|--|

There was a heated debate and the members of the public who were present had opposing views on whether or not Sutherland Road should be included in Phase 2 of HomeZone. There was also some confusion as some people assumed that they would not be involved in any further consultation meetings. One resident handed in a letter that they had all received stating that they would not be part of the home zone scheme. Another resident handed in a letter from a resident who was opposed to the Home Zone proposals but was unable to attend the meeting in person.

However, another resident clarified that a second petition had been submitted to the Area Panel containing approximately 87 names asking for Sutherland Road to be re-included in Phase 2 of the Home Zone consultation. She confirmed that the residents were only against the diagonal parking, and not the actual home zone scheme. The panel was asked if they could look at the full options available to them and clarify whether they will be included in Phase 2 of the Home Zone consultation process.

| |
|---|
| Council response at the meeting on 14 July 2004 |
|---|

Sarah Edwards agreed to pass the letter onto the relevant officer, but emphasised that the residents concerns about Home Zone needed to be raised at the relevant Home Zone meetings that will be taking place over the next six months.

Councillor Nath confirmed that originally the panel did make a decision to exclude it from the Home Zone, but they now need to investigate this again, since a second petition was submitted.

Councillor Burgess confirmed that currently the road was not in the home zone – but this was not to say that this would not changed in the future – this is a local initiative, and should be kept local.

| |
|---|
| Actions agreed at the meeting on 14 July 2004 |
|---|

To provide the panel with a response to the second petition and let the residents of Sutherland Road know whether the street will be included in Phase 2 of Home Zone or not.

| |
|--|
| Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 8 September 2004 |
|--|

A petition was received in May 2004 signed by residents of 64 of the 118 properties in Sutherland Road. The petition stated that the residents wished to be consulted about improvements to their street under the Home Zone scheme. It also stated that some residents had signed the previous petition in October 2003 that led to the exclusion of Sutherland Road in the Home Zone scheme. The residents stated that they thought the first petition was asking for the 'diagonal' parking to be excluded from the Home Zone proposals not that Sutherland Road would be totally excluded. The first petition was signed by residents of 78 of the 118 properties and 35 also signed the second petition. Due to the fact there seems to be no clear majority of support either way it has been agreed to consult Sutherland Road residents on possible improvements. This will include a letter to all residents as has been the case with all the other roads in the Home Zone area. The scheme will be drawn up working together with the local residents. Once the proposals have been finalised all the residents will be consulted and a decision made whether the majority wish to take the scheme forward to implementation.

Once implementation work is underway on Phase 2 -Randolph Road part of and Sackville Street, consideration will be given to the remaining streets in the Home Zone area. Subject to receiving the necessary funding, residents in the remaining streets (including Sutherland Road) will be written to and consultation carried out on the type of scheme they wish to see taken forward. This will probably take place in autumn 2004.

| |
|----------------|
| Responsibility |
|----------------|

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

18. Ref: 303060 –Petition - Anti-social behaviour on the Austin Estate- received 30.11.03

Issue

A petition was received at the end of November 2003 requesting the Council and its relevant partner organisations to address the problem of anti-social behaviour in the Austin Estate neighbourhood, particularly around Browning Circus by installing CCTV cameras. The petition has been passed to the Anti-Social Behaviour team for action.

Action reported at the meeting on 14 July 2004

It was reported that work to tackle problems on the Austin Estate would be co-ordinated through the Community Safety Priority Area Project. This project would directly involve residents. The specific issue of CCTV will be investigated and we will consult the community. CCTV can only be effective as part of a wider strategy to tackle the underlying causes of crime and disorder. Andy Thomas provided additional feedback at the meeting, and gave a presentation to the Panel. He is keen to generate more resident involvement for the project.

Public response at the meeting on 14 July 2004

A member of the public asked why there was no police available in the local police house.

Council response at the meeting on 14 July 2004

Andy Thomas explained that a petition had been received regarding antisocial behaviour on the Austin Estate around Browning Circle. He reported that a commitment had been made by Derby Homes to match Urban Funding. Since then the Community Safety Partnership and the Police have been given home office funding to use on this. He reported that serious crime in the area is falling, but the fear of crime has increased. Over the next five months they would try to understand why this is so, and look at ways of reducing this.

He reported that due to this, the installation of CCTV had been put on hold, until a full consultation exercise has taken place with residents. He explained that where CCTV has been put in place in other parts of the city, youths have worn covered masks to conceal their identity – which could be more frightening to people.

Inspector Parkin explained that there were two beat officers who work in the local police office, but emphasised that this was not a 24 hour run site, but there is a reactive unit at Pear Tree. The beat officers are available during their work time.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 14 July 2004

None

Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 8 September 2004

The Austin Estate has been designated as a Community Safety Priority Area for the Community Safety Partnership - CSP and they have increase resources to deal with community safety issues in the area. They have agreed to make direct contact with the petitioners and to work with them to find a resolution to this issue. The lead petitioner has been sent a letter to let him know what has been agreed and to provide him with a contact name and number at the CSP It is therefore suggested that this issue is closed.

Responsibility

Andy Thomas, Anti-Social Behaviour Team, Community Safety Partnership, telephone 256910
Annabelle Barwick, Derby Homes, telephone 718755

19. Ref: 303059 – Park Gates at the end of Chatsworth Street - received 19.11.03

Issue

A petition was received requesting the park gates at the end of Chatsworth Street to be re-erected.

Action reported at the meeting on 14 July 2004

It was reported that there had been a delay to manufacture of gates but the supplier confirmed that they would be completed by 14 June 2004.

Public response at the meeting on 14 July 2004

A member of public raised concern over the length of time this had taken, and stressed that residents had no confidence in the gates actually being installed.

Council response at the meeting on 14 July 2004

Sarah Edwards confirmed that the gates would be installed at the end of July / early August. She explained that there had been difficulties in casting gate posts

Councillor Burgess further explained that the firm that do the castings had three attempts at doing them, but they have not been right. One is ready, but the second is still to be done. Also had problems with the quarry to get the stone for the railing – this is now ready, but we need the uprights. Apologised for this delay, but emphasised that we are very much dependent on the suppliers.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 14 July 2004

To let the panel know at the September meeting if the gates have been installed.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 8 September 2004

The gates are currently being installed and the work should be completed by 20 August. Ian Wheatley has been asked to let the area panel manager know as soon as the work is complete.

Responsibility

Andy Higginbottom, Planned Maintenance Manager, Derby Homes 711065
Ian Wheatley, Grounds Maintenance Manager, Commercial Services, telephone 716530.

**20. Ref: 304021 - Petition – Request for improved parking for residents on Moore Street-
received 8.01.04**

Issue

The Council has received a letter signed by 16 residents requesting that improvements are made to the residents parking arrangements on Moore Street. Residents are particularly concerned about getting fixed penalty tickets and have asked the Council investigate the possibility of introducing a residents parking scheme.

Action reported at the meeting on 14 July 2004

The Council's legal department is currently working on notices that will be placed in the local press and on the street. The notices will be posted for three weeks and assuming there are no objections, the order will be made shortly after and the road markings will then be removed. When we have a definite date for posting the notices, we will update the Area Panel.

Public response at the meeting on 14 July 2004

None.

Council response at the meeting on 14 July 2004

None.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 14 July 2004

Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 8 September 2004

The legal order is progressing and the markings will be removed in the near future.

Responsibility

Adrian Martin, Traffic Section, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 715031

21. Ref: 304014 - Petition - Manor Road Junction - received 17.03.04

Issue

The Council received a petition from residents with a letter from Mr John H Riley on the 6/2/04. This petition was forwarded to the Council's Traffic Section with a request for them to investigate the issues of concern and to provide a detailed response to residents and the area panel.

The lead petitioner was invited to attend the area panel meeting on the 17 March to present the petition and Mr Steve Grundy also presented a detailed report on the road safety issues for consideration. This report was passed directly to the traffic section to accompany the petition with a request for them to look at the report as well as the petition and to respond at a future area panel meeting.

Action reported at the meeting on 14 July 2004

It was reported that an origin destination survey would be carried out around 1 July. This would consist of tracking vehicles across the area in order to establish the volume of vehicles and the route used as well as journey duration. Speed surveys would also be carried out to establish the speed of vehicles. A full report would be available at the September area panel meeting.

For information, there have been an extremely high number of requests recently, which has put significant pressure on our equipment and staff resources. In addition, the nature of this data collection exercise requires deployment of large numbers of staff, and therefore takes some organisation.

Public response at the meeting on 14 July 2004

A member of the public raised concerned that after some five months after the presentation to the panel, and six months since sending the letter and petition there had been little or no progress made. They emphasised that safety is a priority, and that we don't want to wait for something to happen. They want to see some progress. They asked the panel after six months what progress had been made, and what tangible evidence do they have to show for it.

Council response at the meeting on 14 July 2004

Councillor Burgess acknowledged that this was frustrating, but explained that things do take time to get through processes, to find money, highways clearance, necessary surveys done etc. He asked residents to be patient with this, and not to give up, and assured them that things were happening in the back ground, and emphasised that it was frustrating for Councillors has well.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 14 July 2004

To ensure that an update on progress and a response to the petition is provided at the September meeting.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 8 September 2004

There is a separate report and response to this petition on the agenda. See item 7.

Responsibility

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

22. Ref: 304016 - Petition – To install flashing lights on Portland Street- received 17.03.04

Issue

A petition was handed in requesting the installation of yellow flashing lights on Portland Street, to alert motorists to the schools.

Action reported at the meeting on 14 July 2004

It was reported that a speed survey had been carried out between the hours of 8.15 am and 9.15 am, and between 2.30 pm and 3.30 pm. It was confirmed that investigations are almost complete, and a report would be brought to the September Area Panel meeting.

Public response at the meeting on 14 July 2004

None.

Council response at the meeting on 14 July 2004

None.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 14 July 2004

To bring a full report and response to the September Area Panel meeting.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 8 September 2004

There is a separate report on the agenda. See item 7.

Responsibility

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

23. Ref: 304017 - Petition – Parking restrictions, Pear Tree School - received 17.03.04

Issue

A petition was received requesting the enforcement of parking restrictions around the Pear Tree School.

Action reported at the meeting on 14 July 2004

Officers have considered this petition and will be referring it to Derbyshire Constabulary, as it is a policing issue.

Public response at the meeting on 14 July 2004

A resident asked if a CCTV camera could be installed on the road.

Another resident asked the Council if they could impose a bylaw stating that there should be no parking within 100 yards of a school. Agreed to investigate this.

Council response at the meeting on 14 July 2004

Inspector Parkin acknowledged that school parking across the city is a problem – especially around 9am and 3pm, but explained that the Beat Officers will be tasked to investigate the problems highlighted in the petition. They will visit the site, advise and give out tickets as necessary. Once the beat officers have looked at it, then it can be passed over to the traffic wardens. He emphasised that their priority is to make the roads as safe as possible.

With regard to the bylaw, it was agreed to investigate this.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 14 July 2004

The Panel agreed that the Council should investigate the possibility of introducing a bylaw stating that there should be no parking within 100 yards of a school.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 8 September 2004

The school Keep Clear -Zig Zags are not enforceable on their own. With a Traffic Regulation Order – TRO they are enforceable. The TRO can only cover a Zig Zag that is adjacent to road and a pedestrian access, it can't go on a vehicular access such as a school car park. This is because children need to have a clear view of the street from a pedestrian access. Commonly a TRO would take 6 months to put in place but the issue of main concern is the availability of resources for ongoing enforcement. .

Responsibility

Nicola Jagers, Traffic Manager, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 716074
Inspector Gary Parkin, Derbyshire Constabulary, Peartree Police Station, telephone 209100

24. Ref: 304018 - Petition – Installation of a weight restriction on Portland Street- received 17.03.04

Issue

A petition was handed in requesting the introduction of a weight restriction to prevent vehicular access along Portland Street for heavy vehicles accessing S&A Foods. The petitioners suggest that there are some more appropriate alternative routes that could be used if this was done.

Action reported at the meeting on 14 July 2004

In response to the initial request, we can report that the area is already covered by a weight restriction in relation to the ring road. However, we have noted the concerns regarding heavy goods vehicles and will write to S&A Foods to raise awareness of the situation. We will also investigate the need to install positive signing to the Sir Francis Ley Industrial Estate from the ring road. The aim of positive signing would be to direct vehicles to access the industrial estate along the correct route. We will bring a full response to the September Area Panel meeting.

Public response at the meeting on 14 July 2004

A resident asked the panel that if a weight restriction was put in, how would this effect large vehicles actually visiting the road. He also asked for confirmation as to whether there is in fact a general weight restriction within the inner ring road and if so how this is enforced.

Council response at the meeting on 14 July 2004

Actions agreed at the meeting on 14 July 2004

It was agreed to provide a response to this issue in the update report in September.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 8 September 2004

A verbal update will be provided at the pre-meeting.

Derby and Derbyshire Freight Quality Partnership Lorry map is currently being produced. The map will not show Portland Street as an access Road to the Francis Ley industrial estate, which may help alleviate inappropriate vehicles using Portland Street and Pear Tree Crescent area.

Responsibility

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

**25. Ref: 304019 - Petition –Anti-social behaviour and prostitution at garages on Balfour-
received 17.03.04**

Issue

A petition was handed in March 2004 expressing concern about the garages on Balfour Road being used for prostitution and other anti-social behaviour. It called on the Council to erect better fencing and other deterrent measures to stop this problem, which is causing such a nuisance for residents living on Balfour Road and ruining the enjoyment of the park for other local people. This petition was forwarded to the Derby Community Safety Partnership Anti Social Behaviour Team in March 2004 with a request for them to investigate the issue and report back to the area panel.

Action reported at the meeting on 14 July 2004

The Derby Community Safety Partnership Anti Social Behaviour Team has inspected the site and could not find evidence of any problems. They wish to get further clarification from local residents. Andy Thomas will be attending the area panel meeting in July and residents will have an opportunity to speak to him and clarify the nature of the problems.

Public response at the meeting on 14 July 2004

None.

Council response at the meeting on 14 July 2004

None.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 14 July 2004

None.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 8 September 2004

Andy Thomas and his team have agreed to contact with Cllr Williamson to discuss this petition as he presented it to the panel on behalf of the residents. The ASBO team have also agreed to make direct contact with the residents who actually signed the petition to clarify the nature of the problems that they area experiencing. They will then work with the residents and other agencies to find a resolution to the issues. The area panel manager has sent a letter to the lead petitioner to let them know the position and to give them a name and contact at the Community Safety Partnership. This item will now be closed.

Responsibility

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

14. Procedure for petitions

This section explains how the Council deals with petitions that are referred to area panels. Petitions received by the Council are referred in four different ways depending on the nature and content of the petition.

- Petitions about local issues are referred to area panels.
- Petitions about council-wide issues are referred to the Scrutiny Management Commission.
- Petitions about anti-social behaviour of tenants living in council-owned properties are referred to the Board of Derby Homes.
- Petitions about anti-social behaviour of private tenants are referred to the Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Social Inclusion and Youth and Community.

Petitions on local issues

Petitions on local issues are referred to area panels and must:

- be signed by at least five Derby residents and include their addresses
- include the name and address of the lead petitioner, this can be in a covering letter
- be about matters relevant to a local area
- not contain personal information such as the name and address of a neighbour.

Petitions about the anti-social behaviour of a named neighbour would be included in the anti-social behaviour category and would be referred either to Derby Homes or the Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Social Inclusion, Youth and Community.

Petitions about issues that are not Council services or responsibilities

When a petition is received about an issue that is not a council service or responsibility, the APM should be informed. The APM will refer the petition to the Chief Executive of the relevant organisation and ask them how they wish to respond. The APM will also give them the option of preparing a formal report and presenting it to the relevant area panel.

Before meetings

When a councillor or an officer receives a local petition, they must notify Members' Services, and send them the petition as soon as possible. Members' Services will:

- send copies of the petition to the ward councillors on the relevant area panel for information
- write to the lead petitioner to acknowledge receipt of the petition
- send the petition to the relevant department
- inform the relevant department of the deadlines and procedures to follow before the next area panel meeting

- invite the lead petitioner to the area panel meeting and let them know the procedures. When it is not clear who the lead petitioner is, contact will be made with the first person signing the petition.

The relevant department will:

- investigate the issues raised in the petition
- prepare a response to give to the lead petitioner at the meeting
- prepare a final report to include on the area panel agenda if the Chair and APM feel this is necessary
- provide information about the Council's response for inclusion in the community update report.

Lead petitioners will be asked to confirm that they will attend the meeting. A copy of the petition itself will not be attached to the agenda because of data protection rules.

During meetings

- all petitions presented for the first time at an area panel will be received under the 'Petitions Received' item on the agenda
- the lead petitioner will be given a maximum of five minutes to present his/her petition informing the area panel of their concerns
- if the petition is presented to more than one meeting, the lead petitioner will have five minutes at every meeting to explain any further points
- officers will present written reports, at that or a future meeting, and explain the action taken to satisfy the issues raised in petitions or provide a response through the community update report.

Area panels can recommend various courses of action in response to a local petition including to:

- support the petition and ask for the support of the Council to implement action
- ask for a site visit
- request further information from officers
- defer consideration of the matter to allow community consultation.

Where there is not enough time for the petition to be investigated and a report presented to the next area panel meeting, the lead petitioner will be informed. The issues raised in the petition will be investigated and a response sent to the lead petitioner by the lead department.

Between meetings

Feedback on the progress of investigations into petitions received is included in the next community updates report. For more information on council-wide petitions, anti-social behaviour petitions about tenants living in council owned properties and anti-social behaviour petitions about private tenants, contact Members' Services, telephone 255468.

