

# ITEM 4

Time commenced 6.00 pm  
Time finished 8.18 pm

## **PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION 5 NOVEMBER 2007**

Present: Councillor Dhindsa (in the Chair)  
Councillors Care, Jennings, Lowe, Repton and Tittley

### **34/07 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies were received from Councillors Chera and Berry.

### **35/07 Late Items Introduced by the Chair**

There were no late items.

### **36/07 Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Jennings declared a personal interest in minute number 45/07 as he looks after looked after children.

### **37/07 Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 24 September 2007 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

### **38/07 Call-In**

There were no items

## **Items for Discussion**

### **39/07 Performance Eye**

The Commission considered the items on the Performance Eye. As requested in the previous meeting, all items showing as red and declining were brought before the commission. No further items were identified as need attention.

### **40/07 Performance Eye Indicators requested at the last Planning and Transportation Commission Meeting**

The Commission received updates on items in Performance Eye which had been showing as red and declining. The Commission recognised that there were some problems with the way that data was entered into Performance Eye which made it difficult to see what targets were to be achieved, although they did acknowledge that

the addition of the commentary to the Performance Eye made the indicators more valuable.

**BV165 - % of Pedestrian Crossings with facilities for the disabled**

It was reported that External Audit had surveyed 34 crossings and 2 had failed as it was understood that the kerb was more than 15mm. This had been extrapolated to give a Quarter 2 score of 89%. It was reported that there had initially been some problems in monitoring crossings, but these were now included with routine checking. Plans were in place to upgrade all non-compliant crossings, and it was believed that the indicator would soon be back to the position it was in at the start of the year. It was noted that some of the remedial work was not on simple sites and so the resultant costs from road closures may be problematic.

**BV99i – Number of Road Accident Casualties**

It was reported that this indicator was based on the 2006 calendar year, and so it was already known that by the year end this indicator would be showing as green.

**BV5.2di – Number of Secure cycle undercover places at schools and colleges.**

It was reported that the figures shown in this indicator were corporate plan indicators and not best value indicators, and as such the indicator should show as green rather than red. It was reported that the year end target should be 300 places and the year end forecast is 390 places

**BV102 – Local Bus Service Passenger Journeys per year**

It was reported that at the end of Quarter 2 journeys were up by 117,000 compared to this time last year, and that Quarter 3 is the busiest time of year for bus journeys. The opening of Westfield had helped meet this target, with an additional 10 services operating as a consequence. It was anticipated that further usage of buses would occur as Westfield created further footfall throughout the city. It was noted that other schemes were also likely to have contributed to the rise in numbers, including Park and Ride Schemes, growth in uptake of the Gold Card, and more bus lanes improving reliability of services. It was noted that it was not possible at the current time to link the numbers to particular schemes as the figures were provided by bus companies and DCC had no control of these.

**Resolved:**

1. to note the updates
2. for Tony Gascoigne to feedback the Commissions comments regarding data entry into Performance Eye to his Performance Eye team.

**41/07      Retrospective Scrutiny**

The commission identified the following item for Retrospective Scrutiny:  
Cathedral Green bid to be a growth point.

**42/07      Section 106 Supplementary Planning Document**

The Commission received a report from Malcolm Amatt, Implementation Team Leader regarding S106 Supplementary Planning Document. The document consolidates the existing 106 regulations from last year, and also incorporates some

new regulations. It was reported that this was a valuable document for developers so that they would know what to expect when submitting planning applications in Derby City. The document had been approved by Cabinet on 30 October 2007 to go to consultation. The Commission noted that they would like to see consultation with Councillors added to the proposed consultation plan.

It was reported that the S106 document had attempted to give levels of input that would be acceptable to developers, as well as providing benefit to the communities they were developing. Thresholds had been set at a level to make potential developers able to afford developments in the City. The Commission raised the issue of the impact on healthcare, as many areas (for example Chellaston) were losing health centres as a result of developments, which were not being replaced. It was reported that while the regulations had no impact on facilities being closed down, they did make provision for land for alternative facilities to be provided. This was felt by the Commission to be a strategic weakness of the proposals.

The Commission remarked that there seemed to be no consistency in terms of residential development contributions and the number of units that were built.. It was felt that a development on any scale should provide contributions towards community developments. It was reported that the document used 10 units as the lowest threshold. This was because S106 regulations take a long time to process and if they were applied to all single unit developments then all planning applications would be seriously delayed. It was noted that the planning department do pick up on multiple single unit developments in a particular area which would collectively amount to a development of 10 or more units. It was reported apply the regulations to single unit developments would mean that they would no longer be viable to the developer.

**Resolved:**

- 1. to note the Report**
- 2. to request members be consulted on the Report**
- 3. for the following comments to be noted**
  - i. that the provision for healthcare facilities under the regulations were felt to be inadequate**
  - ii. that the evidence gathering stages needed to look at the impact of single unit developments and multiple single unit developments**

## **43/07      Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2006 – Gating Orders**

The Commission received a presentation from David Gartside, Head of Traffic, on Gating Orders. It was reported that Gating Acts had rarely been used in the past. This was because Highways legislation meant that a right of way needed to be protected even if there was reason to close it because of anti-social behaviour in the area. New Government legislation had helped to solve this problem by linking crime to footpaths and making it possible to close footpaths as a result of crime. Derby City Council had not used this power because the Derbyshire Constabulary did not have the information? to link crime to footpaths.

New legislation on Gating Orders enabled a Highways Order to be made to close a footpath, and so Derby City Council had the power to do this. The Assistant Director for Highways was now looking at whether the process for making a decision to close a Highways should be changed.

It was reported that Gating Orders should only be seen as a temporary measure. They should be reviewed regularly and avoided wherever possible. It was necessary to consult with everyone who might have an interest in the Gating Order and to ensure that the Order met the needs of all users – this was not an easy task. It was also reported that using gating orders led to other questions, for example if a gate was locked overnight then who would be responsible for locking and unlocking it.

**Resolved to note the report.**

#### **44/07 Eastern Fringes Forward Plan Item**

The Commission received an update from Steven Lee, Senior Planning Officer, on the work to date for the Eastern Fringes Cityscape Plan. It was reported that a lot of work had been done on this already, but at the same time the preferred option for developing the Eastern Fringes was going to Cabinet in September 2006, two other authorities with similar plans had failed all nine tests of soundness in the planning process. It was then felt that more work needed to be done on Derby's own plans before submitting them to Cabinet, especially in the area of the locality of policy and consequently this plan was not scheduled to go to Cabinet until December 2007.

**Resolved to note the report.**

#### **45/07 Council's Transport and Procurement Plan**

The Commission considered the report on the development of the Council's Transport and Procurement Operations Service, which went to Cabinet on 30 October 2007. It was reported that there had been some difficulty in filling the position of Transport, Procurement and Operations Group Manager (TPOG). This was due in part to a shortage of specialist knowledge required for this post. The post had now been regarded to a PO5 position, but there was still a possibility that it might not be filled in the future.

**Resolved:**

- 1. to note the report**
- 2. to review the recruitment of a TPOG Manager, and to receive a report back to the Commission should the position not be filled after 6 months.**

#### **46/07 The Council's Travel Plan**

The Commission received a briefing from Karen Jewell, HR Project Officer, on the Council's Travel Plan. It was reported that the Council's original travel plan, Journeyscope which began in 2003, had started well but had encountered problems due to funding difficulties. Plans were now in place to restart the Council's travel plan

as the current year's Corporate Plan required an action plan for Carbon Emissions. The travel plan was therefore looking at ways to provide incentives for employees to use more sustainable methods of transport.

The proposed action plan would begin in December. The action plan would be communicated to employees and a travel survey which would be an update on the survey conducted in 2001, would be commenced. Also, it was intended to produce a measure for Carbon Emissions for Staff travel.

In April 2008, the team were hoping to introduce two salary sacrifice schemes to

1. enable employees to lease to bicycles
2. enable employees to purchase bus season tickets, which could be used for business or leisure purposes

These schemes would be cost neutral to Derby City Council, which was important as there was no funding available for them. It was reported that in addition to these incentives, it might also be necessary to look at other means of encouraging sustainable travel.

It was reported that Trade Unions and the legal team were being consulted on all of the travel plans, and they were also considering the eligibility criteria, of which some would be dictated by Government legislation.

The travel plan was scheduled to go to the Board in mid-December and was likely to go to Chief Officers Group, and then to Cabinet.

**Resolved:**

1. to note the briefing
2. to request that the travel plan be brought back to the Commission for input prior to going to Cabinet,.

## **47/07 Work Plan Update**

The Commission received an update on results of the initial scoping report on backland development. It was reported that although the original evidence gathering had been successful in establishing the reasons for the public's objections to backland development, it had not given Members a clear picture of the overall situation. It was felt that although the evidence provided by the officer was factual, the views presented by the public were quite naturally biased against backland developments.

It was suggested that the Commission considered extending the scoping report to gather further evidence on the reasons for backland development. It was hoped that this would allow the Commission to gain a balanced view of the reasons for and against backland development, and it would therefore be in a better position to identify recommendations about the best way to mitigate the impact of backland development on the surrounding area.

The Commission agreed that it was important to expand the scoping report, and felt that there was particular merit in looking at the national picture for backland

development in addition to the local picture. It was noted that it would be difficult to find any neutral commentators and so extra evidence would be advantageous.

**Resolved:**

- 1. to expand the scoping report as suggested, to gather further evidence on the reasons for backland development**
- 2. to include national planners in the evidence gathering sessions**

**48/07 Council Cabinet Forward Plan**

The Commission identified the following item on the Forward Plan for consideration at a future meeting:

There were no items.

**49/07 Responses of the Council Cabinet to any reports of the Commission**

There were no items

**50/07 Matters referred to the Commission by Council Cabinet/Council Cabinet Members**

There were no items.

MINUTES END