

AREA PANEL FOUR – UPDATE REPORT

FOR 28 SEPTEMBER 2005

SILVERHILL PRIMARY SCHOOL, DRAYCOTT DRIVE, MICKLEOVER

Area and Neighbourhood Unit

Richard Smail, Area Panel Manager, telephone 258505

**Vickie Butler, Area Panel Support Officer, telephone 258529. Minicom
01332 258522**

CONTENTS PAGE

Community Issue	Page Number
1. Ref: 402030 - Redevelopment of University of Derby Mickleover campus, Mickleover – raised 27.11.02	3
2. Ref: 404025 – Planning Application at East Midlands Airport, all wards – received 19.05.04	6
3. Ref: 404047 – Traffic Speed and Traffic Quantity on Old Hall Road and the Hollow, Littleover and Blagreaves – raised 17.11.04	8
4. Ref: 404048 – Fence Repairs by Trent Drive/Maple Drive, Blagreaves – raised 17.11.04	9
5. Ref: 404051 – Stenson Road Roadworks, Blagreaves – raised 17.11.04	11
6. Ref: 405004 – Safer Routes to School, St. George’s School, Blagreaves – raised 30.03.05	14
7. Ref: 405007 – Parking problems, Devonshire Drive and East Avenue, Mickleover – raised 30.03.05	16
8. Ref: 405013 – Youth Workers – raised 28.06.05	17
9. Ref: 405014 – Decriminalising Parking Enforcement – raised 28.06.05	18
10. Ref: 405015 – Millennium Wood – raised 28.06.05	19
11. Ref: 405016 – Cycleway Moorway Lane – raised 28.06.05	20
12. Ref: 405017 – Anti Social Behaviour Fresco Drive – raised 28.06.05	21
13. Ref: 405018 – Council tax revaluation – raised 28.06.05	22
14. Ref: 404028 – Petition – Skateboard Park Request, Littleover - received 21.07.04	23
15. Ref: 404045 – Petition - Request for pedestrian crossings, Station Road, Mickleover – raised 29.09.04	25
16. Ref: 404037 – Petition – Road Safety on Havenbault Lane, Littleover – raised 29.09.04	27
17. Ref: 405002 – Petition – Woodcote Way Play area, Heatherton, Littleover – received - 19.01.05	30
18. Ref: 405009 – Petition – Increase in traffic on Church Street, Littleover – received 30.03.05	32
19. Ref: 405010 – Petition – Improved lighting and car parking on Trusley Gardens, Blagreaves – raised 30.03.05	33
20. Ref: 405011 – Petition – Residents privileged parking, Heath Avenue, Littleover – raised 30.03.05	35
21. Ref: 405012 – Petition – Uttoxeter New Road Parking Restrictions – raised 28.06.05	37

1. Ref: 402030 - Redevelopment of University of Derby Mickleover campus, Mickleover – raised 27.11.02

Issue

This issue was raised in November 2002 asking for assurances from the Council that the quality of life for local residents would be taken into account during the future redevelopment.

Action reported at the meeting on 29 June 2005

In **January 2003** it was reported that the site had been allocated for housing in the Local Plan review but no application had been received. Should one be received, then consideration will be given for developing a planning brief, or conditioning any development to comply with the Council's plans and policies.

In **March 2003** it was reported that the latest version of the Local Plan policy requires schemes to incorporate satisfactory access. It was considered that the existing access off Chevin Avenue will not be enough to serve the proposed housing and work will need to be done to improve access. A planning application has now been received from Persimmon Homes. This application refers purely to access arrangements into the development site.

In **June 2003** it was reported that the planning application was refused on the grounds of prematurity. Any application for access to the University Campus site will have to be assessed on the basis of a full transport impact assessment, which takes account of the overall development. This will be the subject of examination at a Public Inquiry into the City of Derby Local Plan, and until the Inspectors report is received we would be unable to encourage a fresh application.

In **January 2004** it was reported that when a planning application is received, the Council would encourage the developers to undertake full consultation on their proposals with local people to make sure the quality of life for local residents is maintained.

In **July 2004** it was reported that the Inspector who conducted the City of Derby Local Plan Review Inquiry is considering the principle of development on this site. The City Council does not expect to receive his report until the end of the year at the earliest. Depending on the Inquiry outcome, a planning application can be expected to follow. The Council would not encourage an application for planning permission on this site until the Inspector has confirmed the housing allocation. The CDLP Review sets out the Council's policy for the development of this site, should the Inspector agree with the housing allocation. He may also recommend changes to the policy. We will therefore need to await this report and consider it before any firm progress, such as making decisions on sports pitches, can be made.

In **September 2004** it was reported that the report could be as late as January 2005. A resident requested an assurance that an equal number – or even more – new, high quality pitches will be created before the use of existing pitches is lost. It was reported that there are football pitches on both sides of the brook. Those on the southern side fall within the development site proposed in the draft CDLP Review. Current policy would therefore permit their development. However the draft plan also requires their replacement on the other side of the brook on land that it is envisaged would be dedicated and laid out as public open space. Early discussions with the Sports Council suggest that the replacement might be best achieved through the provision of a multiuse pitch or similar. The draft plan indicates this. However, the precise nature of this replacement will be subject to further discussions and it is also envisaged that public consultation will take place on any proposals. Policy L7 of the emerging plan, which deals with sports pitches, requires replacement pitches to be provided before commencement of development.

The Council has no powers to require the University to replace pitches it no longer needs at its Mickleover Campus if it simply closed this facility. It is the proposed residential development on part of the site that actually creates the opportunity to secure the replacement pitches. However, it also offers the opportunity to secure the open land to the north of the brook as public open space, including the retention of the pitches on this part of the Campus.

In **January 2005** it was reported that indications from the Planning Inspectorate suggest that we will receive the report in January 2005.

In **March 2005** it was reported that the Inspector's report has now been received. The Council will formally consider these recommendations over the late spring and summer and will bring forward modifications to the Local Plan Review following this. The Inspector has made two alternative recommendations with regard to the redevelopment of the University of Derby Mickleover campus. The first is that in the absence of a satisfactory form of access, the residential allocation at Mickleover Campus is deleted.

The second alternative recommendation is that in the event a satisfactory form of access being identified to maintain the allocation subject to a number of changes to the draft policy. These are to:

- refer to the Council's intention to seek 30% of new houses as affordable houses rather than a set figure of 120 as it currently states.
- seek the retention of public swimming pool facilities on the site. This is intended to allow the pool to be rebuilt on the site rather than the implication of the original policy, which suggested that the existing buildings must be retained. Allowing the pool to be rebuilt allows greater flexibility if the existing buildings are found to be in such poor quality that they cannot be retained. However, this will need assessing as part of further work on the proposal. He also recommends a change to paragraph 5.12 to reflect this.
- reinstate a paragraph from an earlier version of the policy, which provides justification for the inclusion of green wedge land within the proposal.
- include details of the proposed means of access in paragraph 5.11

The rest of the policy would remain as set out in the Local Plan Review – revised deposit version. A member of the public asked whether the football pitches and swimming pool would be replaced once the development is approved. He considered that if the site is sold off for development, and then the developer decides not to replace these facilities, then there is nothing the Council can do about it.

Councillor Care explained that a number of changes are currently being discussed, and Council will agree the final Local Plan in a few months. She stated that the agreement would include conditions that the pool should be kept, unless it is more practical to build a new one. She went on to explain that the developers could go through an appeal process to say it is unreasonable to provide a pool, but this would be on very shaky grounds, as there is a strong expectation from the council that a pool will be provided.

In **June 2005** it was reported that an application for planning permission for the formation of a new access road, including a new junction arrangement, into the site has now been received and will be considered on 23 June. If approved, this will demonstrate that the site can be properly accessed and satisfy recommendations from the Inquiry Inspector to this effect.

The Council is likely to formally consider the Inspector's report in August/September 2005 and consult on Modifications in September/October.

The issue of whether the pool will be retained in its current location or rebuilt elsewhere on site is a matter for negotiation, but retention of the existing building seems most likely at present. This will be secured either by a condition attached to the planning permission or by a Section 106 Agreement with the developer, whichever is the most appropriate mechanism.

Policy L7 of the Local Plan Review states that replacement sports pitches should be implemented before the commencement of development. Replacement of these pitches will either be a condition of any planning application or secured through a Section 106 legal agreement. The Council is likely to seek to ensure a similar arrangement for the pool, particularly if the existing facility is retained.

Public response at the meeting on 29 June 2005
--

A resident asked if planning permission had been approved.

Another resident asked if the new junction with Uttoxeter Road would have traffic lights and if so, he believed this would create traffic chaos when combined with the traffic lights at Corden Avenue.

Council response at the meeting on 29 June 2005

Councillor Care confirmed that the new access planning application was approved on 23 June and that the new junction would have traffic lights.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 29 June 2005

None.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback at the meeting on 29 June 2005
--

Council Cabinet approved modifications to the City of Derby Local Plan Review on 6 September 2005. Full Council approved Cabinet's decision at the meeting on 14 September 2005. It was reported that a satisfactory access to the site had been identified and so the Mickleover Campus proposal is to be retained within the Plan. Minor modifications to the policy recommended by the Inspector were also agreed. These relate to the provision of affordable housing - expressed as a percentage of total dwellings rather than an absolute figure, seeking to negotiate the retention of the pool or its replacement on site - to reflect the fact that Section 106 Obligations are negotiated rather than imposed and to allow greater flexibility in how this facility will be retained, re-instatement of text to explain why the site includes green wedge land and new text to refer to the new junction granted recently planning permission which will provide access into the site.

Responsibility

Andrew Waterhouse, Team Leader – Plans and Policies, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 255023

2. Ref: 404025 – Planning Application at East Midlands Airport, all wards – received 19.05.04

Issue

A resident asked if the Council would be responding to the East Midlands Airport runway expansion planning application and whether the Council will have a permanent watching brief over future developments. He stated that the airport have said the extension would not make any difference to the volume of air traffic.

Action reported at the meeting on 29 June 2005

In **July 2004** it was reported that the Airport's planning application for a runway extension was originally submitted to North West Leicestershire DC- NWLDC, in 2000. The Council submitted a response to the Environmental Statement to NWLDC on 20 May 2004. Officers at the District Council have indicated that they are seeking more information from the applicants and that it is likely to be some time before the application is determined. The District Council has been asked to keep the City Council informed regarding progress.

In **September 2004** the Council was asked to send further representations to Nottingham East Midlands Airport regarding the operational changes to the west side of Derby to reduce noise impact, especially at night.

In **November 2004** it was reported that Julian DeMowbray would coordinate the Council's response to the consultation document on Controlled Airspace proposals and the notes provided by the resident will be considered when the Council responds. The deadline for responses is 10 January 2005 and a copy of the response will be available from Julian DeMowbray after this date.

At the meeting, Neil Robinson from Nottingham East Midlands Airport, gave a presentation about the plans for the airport, the extension to controlled airspace proposals and issues about aircraft noise. He outlined how the airport was developing rapidly, how it was changing its services and working with communities. He responded to the request for Council membership of the Airports Consultation Forum stating that it was not the airport that had refused the Council membership of the Forum but the Forum itself had made the decision as an independent group. He explained that it has a very large membership and that the forum felt if one local authority becomes a member it would mean many more would become members and make the forum too large.

In **January 2005** it was reported that North West Leicestershire District Council have the additional information they were seeking to help determine the planning application. However, there is at present no date for the application to go to Committee – February or March 2005 seems the earliest likely date.

In **March 2005** it was reported that:

- NEMA has now gained approval from the Civil Aviation Authority to instigate the changes, which are expected to be fully operational with effect from 12 May 2005. Although the airport has responded to some of the comments it received, by revising its proposals, the City Council's request for an increased release height for westerly departures has been rejected. NEMA has said that changes will, however, be made to the way it monitors, records and reports on aircraft operations. The ICC - the Independent Consultative Committee - an independent body, will oversee these. The monitoring will be done in partnership with local authorities and will focus on what affect the new routes have on local people and noise. NEMA states that this is being done in response to concerns that the proposed changes would not be properly enforced and monitored and also that they would not achieve the desired result, namely reduced noise levels.
- The council is under no obligation to inform prospective residents about aircraft noise. Land searches use a national standard form that cannot be altered and there is no question referring to traffic or aircraft noise. Similarly, the Council is not in a position to instruct NEMA to issue such advice.

A member of the public stated that the tolerance on the departure path on the west side of Derby was being reduced by 300m to 1200m. This would however, still leave the proposed development

at the edge of Mickleover still under the flight path. He asked if the Council could do anything to make sure that the flight paths are put in the local plan. Councillor Care responded that there would be nothing we could do at this stage with the Local Plan.

In **June 2005** it was reported that a local resident has asked John Prescott MP about flight paths being shown on development plans produced by Derby City Council. The resident has received a response from Margaret Beckett MP that has been provided by the Department for Transport – DfT. The residents opinion on the response is that it is a matter for discretion by relevant local authorities whether to include aircraft flight plans on local plans and therefore Derby City Council is in a position to add departure flight path information to the local development plan.

However, officers in the Plans and Policies section of Development and Cultural Services at the Council interpret the Minister's comments differently. They consider that his comments say that Local Authority's have discretion over what sort of documents they produce and, in preparing these, need to have regard to national planning guidance such as Planning and Noise. Therefore Local Authorities can develop planning policies dealing with aircraft noise where such noise is sufficiently problematic for it to be a planning issue.

However, Environmental Health has confirmed that aircraft noise, in general, is not significant enough for it to be a planning issue and to need specific development plan policies. The Minister acknowledges in his response that Local Authorities 'would not ordinarily be expected to produce planning documents dealing in detail with air traffic routes'. The role of Development Plan Maps is to show areas covered by policies in the Plan. It is not to show information for the sake of it, however useful this may be.

Leicestershire County Council has set up a Joint Working Group made up of local District Councils in Leicestershire and with councils from outside of Leicestershire. In addition, Leicestershire County Council has decided to press ahead with moves to designate the airport, which would allow the number of night flights in to and out of East Midlands Airport to be capped.

Public response at the meeting on 29 June 2005
--

None.

Council response at the meeting on 29 June 2005

None.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 29 June 2005

None.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback at the meeting on 29 June 2005
--

North West Leicestershire District Council anticipate taking this planning application to Committee in September or October 2005.

Responsibility

Rob Salmon, Head of Plans and Policies, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 255020
Julian DeMowbray, Group Leader Pollution Control, Environmental Health, telephone 715228

3. Ref: 404047 – Traffic Speed and Traffic Quantity on Old Hall Road and the Hollow, Littleover and Blagreaves – raised 17.11.04

Issue

A resident raised a concern about the amount and density of traffic using the Hollow and Old Hall Road area. He felt that the approved development of more flats in the area would make the problems worse. He asked that the Council look at traffic management options for the area. The problems are made worse by lack of parking for the school and only one pavement on Old Hall Road and the Hollow.

Action reported at the meeting on 29 June 2005

In **January 2005** it was reported that the investigation had not been completed.

In **March 2005** it was reported that the report should be available to present to the meeting on 29 June 2005.

In **June 2005** it was reported that the surveys are still being carried out to assess the traffic flows and speeds. When this data is received a comprehensive response will be available.

Public response at the meeting on 29 June 2005

None.

Council response at the meeting on 29 June 2005

None.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 29 June 2005

Update on results of the investigation.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback at the meeting on 29 June 2005

An update on this issue is provided in item 5 on the agenda of 28 September in the report titled 'Concerns Over Traffic Volumes on Church Street, Thornhill Road and Old Hall Road, Littleover.

Responsibility

Nicola Weekly, Traffic Manager – Traffic Management Schemes, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 716074.

4. Ref: 404048 – Fence Repairs by Trent Drive/Maple Drive, Blagreaves – raised 17.11.04

Issue

A resident raised concerns about the condition of a Council fence that surrounds a garage between Blagreaves Lane and Trent Drive. She explained that it had been identified during an Estate Walkabout with Derby Homes but no action has been taken yet.

Action reported at the meeting on 29 June 2005

In **January 2005** it was reported that Derby Homes had been informed the fencing is right on the edge of the housing land and garage boundary. Derby Homes visited the site and priced up an estimated cost of £771 to replace several panels and remove redundant wire mesh fencing. Following the visit, Derby Homes contacted Estates again to establish ownership. Derby Homes is likely to be responsible for the boundary because when the garages were sold the records do not show that the boundary responsibility was passed on. However it is not a boundary Derby Homes would usually keep and Estates have suggested a discussion with the garage owners. Estates will continue to investigate the original transfer details to see if there is further information available.

In **March 2005** it was reported that Derby Homes is responsible for the boundary. Derby Homes have investigated the fencing and are obtaining accurate costings for the removal of the chain link fencing and to erect new fencing to complete the boundary. Derby Homes will schedule the work when they have more accurate and full costings.

In **June 2005** it was reported that on 17 March 2005, letters were sent to both garages that share the fencing boundary to see if they were able to contribute any funds to replace the fencing. A phone call was received from one of the garage owners who said that as they had already fenced the majority of it off with their own fencing, within the boundary, they would not help with the cost. No response has been received from the other garage. On a further inspection with a surveyor it was decided to remove the chain-link fencing complete with concrete posts and not to replace it as the garages had erected their own fencing behind it. The order has been raised with the contractors but there have been some problems over removal of some of the concrete posts that are supporting the garages fencing. The contractor has been instructed to remove all the chain link fencing and any posts that are not acting as a support. They aimed to complete the work by 30 June 2005.

Following its completion, a quote will be obtained from Grounds Maintenance to plant some low maintenance shrubbery in place of the fencing.

Public response at the meeting on 29 June 2005

None.

Council response at the meeting on 29 June 2005

None.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 29 June 2005

Update on progress to install fence.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback at the meeting on 29 June 2005
--

The fencing was removed in May 2005 as requested. On the 05/08/05 a visit was carried out between the Local Office and Grounds Maintenance to look at options to improve the look of the fenced area following removal of the wire mesh.

It was agreed that levelling and either tarmac, paving or gravelling would be the best options. I am waiting for a quote for these.

On 26 July 2005 a concerned resident contacted the office, following the removal of the wire mesh fencing, stating that it had left a gap that children could get through to the garages behind. It looked dangerous and she was worried about them hurting themselves if they tried. Following a conversation with her, a letter concerning agreed actions was sent to the resident.

Following a further site visit, an order was raised to fit a new piece of fencing to bridge the gap on 2 August, which is due for completion by 14 September. A letter was also sent to the garage at the back, advising them of these actions and that any future repairs to the fencing would be their responsibility as it is their boundary. This was also confirmed in a letter to the resident.

Responsibility

Pam Stretton, Local Manager, Derby Homes, telephone 716578

5. Ref: 404051 – Stenson Road Roadworks, Blagreaves – raised 17.11.04

Issue

A resident raised a concern about the continual major road works along Stenson Road and wondered if they will ever be completed. She believes that currently Seven Trent Water is doing some work. The road works have made travelling in and out of Derby very difficult.

Action reported at the meeting on 29 June 2005

In **January 2005** it was reported that over the last 12 months Transco has been carrying out a large scheme of work to replace the gas mains and connections to domestic properties along the whole length of Stenson Road. The Health and Safety Executive has instructed Transco to carry out this works as part of a national programme to renew old style cast iron mains and services.

The work on Stenson Road has been split into a series of sections. The remaining section is from Sunny Hill Avenue to Village Street, this should have been completed this year, however Transco have fallen behind schedule.

From January to July 2005 Severn Trent Water will be working on a flood alleviation scheme that extends across the Stenson Road and Sinfin area. Part of the scheme will require extensive work in Stenson Road between Oaklands Avenue and Nicola Gardens. To accommodate these works safely, Stenson Road will be closed to through traffic for approximately eight weeks. During this period Transco will also be working within the closed section of road.

1. The City Council also needs to carry out essential maintenance to Stenson Road to reconstruct the carriageway between Sunnyhill Avenue and Blagreaves Lane and also to reconstruct the footways between Sunnyhill Avenue and Village Street. This work was identified to be done this year, but has been delayed due to the on-going utility works. The footway reconstruction scheme cannot take place until Transco has finished their works. Unfortunately, because Transco has fallen behind their programme they will have to wait until Severn Trent Water has completed before being able to finish the gas scheme. This means that the maintenance of the carriageway and footways will be delayed again, although the condition of sections of the existing carriageway may mean that essential works may have to be carried out, even though this will lead to levels of disruption higher than we would normally accept.

It is clear from the list of works that there will be continuing works in Stenson Road through much of 2005. All of the work is essential to maintain services to properties, provide a solution to local flooding problems and to provide essential maintenance to roads and footways. There will be disruption to the traveling public and to residents, however we will aim to work with the works undertakers to reduce the level of disruption and to achieve a coordinated approach to all of the planned works. Stenson Road closures start on Monday 10 January for about 3 months, from Oaklands Avenue to Nicola Gardens. All buses are re routed and full consultation has taken place.

2. The City Council already has powers under the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 section 74 to apply charges to works undertakers where works are un-necessarily prolonged. The current system is technical and difficult to apply and there are several simple ways in which works undertakers can avoid being liable for charges.

In October 2004 the Traffic Management Act was passed. This is a wide-ranging piece of legislation, and includes a revision of the way in which works in the highway are planned and managed. Although the primary legislation has been passed, we are still waiting for the details of new powers to be published. It is expected that the necessary secondary legislation and government guidance will be available early in 2005.

It is likely that the current system of charging will be retained, although it will be reformed to make the system less bureaucratic. The charges are also likely to be increased. It is also almost certain that charges will apply to local authority road works and to works undertaken by utility companies, at present only the latter are subject to charges. It is expected that the full regulations on charging mechanisms and the levels of charges will be published in early 2005.

In **March 2005** it was reported that we have continued to monitor the traffic and the process of the Severn Trent Water works in Stenson Road. The signals on Goodsmoor Bridge have been adjusted slightly to avoid possible conflict on the bridge and all of the signal equipment has been checked to ensure that it is working correctly. I have been informed that Severn Trent Water is slightly ahead of schedule for the Stenson Road part of the project. When the work progresses to Grampian Way it has now been confirmed that it will not need to be closed. The investigatory work that STW have been doing over the last few weeks has proved that the whole length of the work in Grampian Way can be done using a tunneling technique. There will be four large compounds, but two way traffic will be maintained at all times. It is possible that two-way signals will be in use for only 12 days.

The original programme has now been changed as a result of the lack of progress by Transco and the change to the detailed design of Grampian Way. Details will be provided when they are available. Please contact Nigel Brien on 715106 if there are any additional concerns or questions. A member of the public informed the panel that they had heard that the works would not be completed until June, and asked the panel if this was correct. They also asked if the contractors are given a time to complete the work by.

The panel were asked if there would be any further works planned for Stenson Road, after all the current works had been completed, or if it would be resurfaced.

A local resident commented residents were told initially that work would be complete by the end of March, and yet people still cannot get down Stenson Road.

A resident explained that the traffic backs up over Goodsmoor Bridge, and drivers cannot get over the bridge, she asked if some temporary lights could be installed at Sinfin Lane to allow traffic to get out.

Resident referred to a very dangerous hole at the top of the hill on Stenson Road, which needed urgent attention.

Councillor Care explained that the timescale of the works, is dependent on timings of other roadworks, and the weather conditions. They are therefore based on a best estimate. She explained that the Council will need to consider other factors, including not resurfacing the road where Severn Trent and Transco will need to dig it up again. She explained that it is a matter of balancing the need to do emergency repairs and still making it practical for travellers.

Councillor Care confirmed that Public Utility Companies have to allow 12 months after a major resurfacing before any other planned scheduled works can be done.

Councillor Marshall, agreed that Stenson Road was in a terrible state and that he had asked for remedial patches on some of the worst parts, but unfortunately nothing can be done until other work on the road is complete.

In **June 2005** it was reported that Transco have completed the work to divert their apparatus and STW are making progress with the large-scale sewerage and drainage work. Stenson Road was opened at the end of May.

The resurfacing scheme for Stenson Road between Sunnyhill Avenue and Blagreaves Lane is being planned for the end of July, to coincide with the start of the school summer holidays. The road will have to be closed for this work to take place.

The reconstruction of the road will be between Blagreaves lane and Sunnyhill Avenue. Work is planned to start on 24 July and complete on 12 August. The road will be closed for this period. Following this work there will be a gas renewal scheme on Stenson Road between Sunnyhill Avenue and Village Street starting this year to allow the footways to be renewed before April 2006.

Public response at the meeting on 29 June 2005
--

None.

Council response at the meeting on 29 June 2005

None.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 29 June 2005

Update on progress.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback at the meeting on 29 June 2005
--

The reconstruction of the road on the section between Blagreaves Lane and Sunnyhill Avenue was completed on schedule on August 12. The road was closed for the total period of the works.

Following this work there will be a gas renewal scheme for the stretch of Stenson Road between Sunnyhill Avenue and Village Street – there is no definite start date for this work, but we are currently working towards mid-September 2005. The scheme needs to be done this year to allow the Council to complete footway renewal schemes before April next year.

Responsibility

John Edgar, Maintenance Manager, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 715067
Nigel Brien, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 715016.

6. Ref: 405004 – Safer Routes to School, St. George's School, Blagreaves – raised 30.03.05

Issue

A resident raised concern over the road changes that had taken place around Uplands Avenue recently as part of the St. George's Safer Routes to School scheme. The resident was concerned that the proposals would not make the journey to school safer and there had been changes made to the original plans that were viewed 12 months ago, and yet no consultation had taken place.

Action reported at the meeting on 29 June 2005

In **March 2005** a resident stated that she had contacted many people, including Councillor Care, the Chief Constable and Margaret Beckett MP. She confirmed that she had received a reply from Margaret Beckett, and that the letter is now with Jonathan Guest in Development and Cultural Services. She asked Councillor Care where things stand at the moment. She was concerned that during the consultation, a turning circle had been requested, but this was not on the original plans.

Other issues were raised:

- where are the 150 cars that bring children to the school to go. It is not just local children but children from across the city that attend the catholic school.
- if the buses are taken away, then the congestion would be reduced, but this would not stop parents driving to school.
- some drivers go the wrong side of the white line by the chicane
- Ridgeway Avenue road width is less than standard, and if cars park on the pavement, there is no way that a bus can access Ridgeway Avenue.
- the school term begins in just over one week and no signs have been erected regarding the new scheme.
- what consultation had actually taken place with local residents, because the School Travel Plan Forum only includes parents and not residents.

Councillor Care apologised to the resident for not responding earlier. She had spoken to the officer involved with the design and consultation, and it was her understanding that the current plans are the same as the ones shown at the public display and these are what are being implemented. There are no significant changes to the proposed plans and what is actually being developed. She explained that she understood that the buses will only go along Uplands Avenue and not along Ridgeway Avenue and that leaflets had gone out to local residents about the scheme.

She confirmed that it is the responsibility of the school to liaise with parents and to explain how the new scheme will operate, including that they are not to go up to the school gates and that only the buses can access the turning circle. She explained that all three schools have supported the scheme, and if it does not work, then it will be reviewed.

The scheme is all about reducing the conflict between pedestrians, buses and cars and it has to be given a chance to work before condemning the proposals. She stated that there would be highways staff and police available at the start of term to educate parents.

Councillor Care suggested that another meeting is held with officers and residents.

Sergeant Daines informed the meeting that the real issue is educating parents and guardians about taking their children to school. He confirmed that the Police will provide support to make sure the system works

In **June 2005** it was reported that the whole safer routes to school scheme outside St George's, Ridgeway and Gayton Schools was first consulted on in 2004.

A letter including a plan was sent out, to approx 400 residents, local councillors and all staff and parents of the three schools inviting them to one of three exhibitions held on 6 July 2004. During the exhibitions officers of the city council and members of the school travel plan forum sat down with members of the public and explained the proposals. Feedback forms were provided for

comments and all those who left comments on feedback forms were written to once all the comments had been considered giving detailed responses to the comments and outlining the final scheme.

The consultation has proved very successful with the vast majority of people taking part. This has helped to fine tune the scheme with residents, parents and the school. As with all changes not every resident is supportive. We have met those opposed to the improvements and explained the rationale behind the changes.

The scheme is now complete and we will be monitoring the situation over the next 12 months.

Public response at the meeting on 29 June 2005
--

A resident from Uplands Avenue expressed her concern about how the new arrangements had been working. She handed in a letter outlining details of her concern. These included traffic is too fast on Uplands Avenue, traffic is driving on the wrong side of the chicane and cars are doing 3 point turns on the roads. She requested that the results of the observations and monitoring done during the summer term are reported back to the area panel.

She felt the area is a danger to pedestrians and road users. She asked that the Police visit the area between 3.15pm and 3.45pm to enforce traffic regulations.

Council response at the meeting on 29 June 2005

It was confirmed that the scheme is still being monitored and that a response will be provided to the issues raised in the letter.

Inspector Parkin confirmed that if a Police officer believes a traffic offence has been committed they can issue a ticket.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 29 June 2005

Investigate and respond to the issues raised by the resident in her letter.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback at the meeting on 29 June 2005
--

We have replied to Mrs Carter. We are carrying out regular surveys monitoring the safe routes to school scheme which will include the school forum. We feel that this scheme has been one of our most successful safe routes to school schemes to date, and are pleased with the way the scheme is running.

Responsibility

Tony Gascoigne, Traffic Control Engineer, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 715019

7. Ref: 405007 – Parking problems, Devonshire Drive and East Avenue, Mickleover – raised 30.03.05

Issue

A resident asked what could be done to tackle the problems caused by parents parking on the shop frontages, on private property on Devonshire Drive and East Avenue during school pick up times. Parents are ignoring the double yellow lines. He asked if the police could take action because they are causing a hazard by creating a blind spot on the road. He asked the police to visit the area during school pickup time.

Action reported at the meeting on 29 June 2005

In **March 2005** Sergeant Daines stated that it depends whether they are parked on the highway or on private property. If they are parked on private property then the owners will need to take action. If they are committing a traffic offence on the pavement or highway then the police could take appropriate action including fixed penalties. He will ask officers to attend the site.

Councillor Hird reported that the local beat officers were aware of it and had confirmed they would be investigating the problem. It was agreed that the Police would visit Devonshire Drive shops area at school pick up time.

In **June 2005** it was reported that the Police have given attention to this issue and have been visiting the area to enforce parking restrictions

Public response at the meeting on 29 June 2005

None.

Council response at the meeting on 29 June 2005

Councillor Hird questioned whether a car causes an obstruction if it is on the pavement but not on private land.

Inspector Parkin explained that officers will visit the site and determine if a car is causing an obstruction. He explained that while it may be an offence to park on the pavement it is not necessarily always an obstruction. He agreed to ask officers to visit the area again.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 29 June 2005

The Police to visit the area again at the start and end of the school day.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback at the meeting on 29 June 2005

Police officers visited the area during the summer term and issued tickets. They will be visiting the area again now that term has restarted.

Ravensdale Infant and Junior Schools have both requested parents, in their school newsletters, not to double park, park down the school drives or in front of private driveways.

Responsibility

Inspector Gary Parkin, Pear Tree Police Station, telephone 222184.

8. Ref: 405013 – Youth Workers – raised 28.06.05

Issue

A resident asked how to contact the Council Youth Workers to find out what services are available in their area.

Action reported at the meeting on 29 June 2005

New item

Public response at the meeting on 29 June 2005

None.

Council response at the meeting on 29 June 2005

He was advised that the best person to contact was David Finn and the resident confirmed that he had already been in contact with him.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 29 June 2005

None.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback at the meeting on 29 June 2005

No further information to add.

Responsibility

David Finn, Head of Youth Services, Education Services, telephone 716956

9. Ref: 405014 – Decriminalising Parking Enforcement – raised 28.06.05

Issue

A resident reported that he had heard that traffic wardens were being replaced and wanted to know when and he asked for an explanation.

Action reported at the meeting on 29 June 2005

New item

Public response at the meeting on 29 June 2005

None.

Council response at the meeting on 29 June 2005

David Gartside reported that there are proposals to decriminalise parking across the whole city. When introduced it would give powers to the Council to enforce parking restrictions such as on double yellow lines and parking meters. All the money raised by fines would be used by the Council to pay for the cost of enforcing parking restrictions. At the moment the fines collected by the Police are paid to central Government.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 29 June 2005

None.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback at the meeting on 29 June 2005

No further information to add.

Responsibility

Michelle Spamer, Area and Neighbourhood Co-ordinator, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 715064

10. Ref: 405015 – Millennium Wood – raised 28.06.05

Issue

A written question asked about the lack of access to the Millennium Wood site now that the access from Oaklands Avenue has been fenced off by the owners after 20 years of public access. Now that the wood has been there for ten years when will the area be developed to its full potential.

Action reported at the meeting on 29 June 2005

New item

Public response at the meeting on 29 June 2005

None.

Council response at the meeting on 29 June 2005

None.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 29 June 2005

Update on progress.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback at the meeting on 29 June 2005

A presentation on the future of the City Park was made to Area Panel 4 in 2004. Andrew Morgan gave a presentation on the proposals for this new city park. It would be approximately 46 hectares in area. Some of the land planned for the park had already been acquired, however the rest of the site still remained under private ownership as farmland. It was reported that parks surrounding the new park would remain as public open space but would link to the city park. He explained that the park would need £1.5 to £2 million to obtain all of the facilities.

He outlined proposals for a Friends Group in 2005. Parks began the process to establish the Friends Group in 2005, but there was a poor response to the invitation for people to express interest in forming a Friends Group. This is something that does need to be followed up, along with consultation, but it's not possible to put a revised time scale on this.

Identifying funding for the park: The majority of potential external funding sources were brought to a close during 2005. Their replacement programmes were not announced until recently. The new funding programmes look like they will be open to applications sometime in 2006.

Negotiations with landowners: a meeting was held to discuss purchasing the small farm that was up for auction, but it was agreed not to proceed with a bid because the purchase of this parcel of land did not represent good value for money as it included a residential property which the Council did not want. In addition, the land on offer would not have provided much more additional public open space, as it only comprised a small area.

The land was isolated away from the rest of the existing open space and would not have extended the open space provision until other parcels of land were purchased. It is understood that a new owner has purchased this land, over which the access track runs from Oaklands Avenue to Millennium Wood. Access to the wood from Oaklands Avenue has always been in private ownership and there is no public right of way.

Responsibility

Ken Richardson, Parks Officer, Commercial Services, telephone 716646

11. Ref: 405016 – Cycleway Moorway Lane – raised 28.06.05

Issue

A resident asked when the final 200metres of the cycleway along Moorway Lane would be completed because it is needed to provide a safe route to Derby Moor School. Can it be completed this summer.

Action reported at the meeting on 29 June 2005

New item

Public response at the meeting on 29 June 2005

None.

Council response at the meeting on 29 June 2005

It was reported that it is the responsibility of the Housing developers who are building at Heatherton. The developers are paying for the cycle way and are working with Derby Parks. The panel agreed that it needed to be completed as soon as possible

Actions agreed at the meeting on 29 June 2005

Investigate and report back

Updates on agreed actions to feedback at the meeting on 29 June 2005

We have been negotiating with the developer, which will hopefully result in the path being completed by the end of March 2006.

Responsibility

Tony Gascoigne, Traffic Control Engineer, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 715019

12. Ref: 405017 – Anti Social Behaviour Fresco Drive – raised 28.06.05

Issue

A resident raised a concern about anti social behaviour – ASB, at the end of Fresco Drive opposite Littleover Community School. The Police have attended on three occasions as a result of vehicle damage and complaints about cars speeding. There is also a lot of litter in the area and he wanted to know what the Council is doing about it and who he can contact to get immediate action.

Action reported at the meeting on 29 June 2005

New item

Public response at the meeting on 29 June 2005

None.

Council response at the meeting on 29 June 2005

Councillor Care reported that a new litter bin had recently been installed and that much of this open space was included within the school playing fields. She reported that there have been litter picks arranged in the area and that the highway is regularly swept as part of the maintenance programme.

Councillor Care suggested informing the ASB Team and the Youth Service about the issues of ASB, but information about the times would be useful.

Inspector Parkin confirmed officers have attended.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 29 June 2005

Investigate problems with ASB and report back

Updates on agreed actions to feedback at the meeting on 29 June 2005

The Police and Anti Social Behaviour Team visited the area regularly during June and July. The mobile CCTV camera was used to identify people involved. Officers have spoken to and warned the local young people who have been identified. Officers also visited local residents who had been affected by the anti social behaviour.

While complaints have significantly reduced the local Police beat officers are continuing to visit the area.

Responsibility

Andy Thomas, Derby Community Safety Partnership

Inspector Gary Parkin, Pear Tree Police Station, telephone 222184.

David Finn, Head of Youth Services, Education Services, telephone 716956

Richard Winter, Assistant Waste Management Officer, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 716352

13. Ref: 405018 – Council tax revaluation – raised 28.06.05

Issue

A resident asked when the revaluation of properties will take place and what the criteria are.

Action reported at the meeting on 29 June 2005

New item

Public response at the meeting on 29 June 2005

None

Council response at the meeting on 29 June 2005

It was reported that independent valuers working independently of the Council for the Inland Revenue make the valuations. It was understood that the actual valuers are likely to be contracted by local Estate Agents.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 29 June 2005

Report back when the valuations will take place.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback at the meeting on 29 June 2005

The Valuation Office Agency -VOA is responsible for allocating the correct council tax band to all homes, whether houses, flats, bungalows – even boat moorings and caravan plots. They work for central government, part of the Inland Revenue, rather than for the Council.

Before the election the government decided that the values being used for allocating properties to Council Tax Bands were getting out of date so ordered a revaluation. To be allocated to a band, a property must first be given a value. The VOA is currently valuing all the domestic properties in England. They are using detailed records already on their files and information from the housing market, questionnaires they have issued to some residents and information provided by the Planning Department in each Council. It is not necessary for them to actually visit every properties.

In the valuation the VOA takes account of the size, age and character of the property, and the area where it is located. The value they give a property is worked out as if

- it was sold on the open market on 1 April 2005 and
 - is in a state of reasonable repair, considering the age, character and locality of the property.
- Modernisations are not classed as repairs.

The new bandings for each property will be made public on 1 October 2006 and the new values will affect the amount of Council Tax payable is 1 April 2007. There will be new appeal regulations issued closer to this date.

There are no plans to change the rules on who pays the Council Tax.

At present we do not know whether the bands are going to change – research is still being done and the results are not expected until next year.

The VOA website is a good source of information – www.voa.gov.uk

Responsibility

Marjorie Morrice, Revenues Manager, Finance Directorate, telephone 255771

14. Ref: 404028 – Petition – Skateboard Park Request, Littleover - received 21.07.04

Issue

A petition was handed in to the panel with 50 signatures requesting a skateboard park in the Littleover area. They require a small outdoor skate park, which was available to the whole community in Littleover.

Action reported at the meeting on 29 June 2005

In **September 2004** officers welcomed the submission of the petition and explained the importance of completing a thorough investigation of the request. The investigation will involve work to identify potential sites, consider possible sources for funding and include consultation. It is anticipated that this work will take between 12 and 18 months. The request is linked to other recent requests for information about facilities on open spaces in the Area Panel 4 area and it is proposed that a presentation to draw together these issues is made to the Area Panel 4 meeting on 17 November. It was confirmed that it would take 12 to 18 months for the investigation work, and that there was no allocation of time for the actual build. Councillor Allen agreed with the residents concerns about timescales, but explained that the Council have to identify land, funding and gain planning permission. He went on to explain that if Council Officers identify council owned land, then the process would be much quicker, but it still needs to include consultation with residents.

In **November 2004** a presentation included an update on progress with the skateboard park request. It was confirmed that Parks are looking at the provision of wheeled sports facilities as part of the strategic provision of outdoor youth facilities in the City. Andy Morgan explained that this request is one of many similar requests being received from across the city. He recognised the need for parks like this and the value they have. Over the past year many schemes for youth facilities have been met with opposition from local residents that has led to confrontation and young people missing out on new facilities. He explained that Derby Parks want to change this process and aim to produce guidelines about how new youth facilities are selected bearing in mind need, size, space available and impact. When the guidelines have been adopted the request for a Littleover skateboard park will be considered. There is no funding currently available for a skateboard park and it is estimated to take about two years to attract funding and build a park.

In **January 2005** it was reported that the guidelines on providing youth facilities are still being developed.

In **March 2005** it was reported that it is intended to submit a report to Cabinet in setting out proposals for wheeled sport provision in parks and open spaces.

In **June 2005** it was reported that it had been planned to prepare a report covering the provision of wheeled sports across the city by now. Unfortunately due to other work commitments within the Landscape Section in Parks it has not been possible to progress this as far as desired. Parks have acknowledged the desire and need for a skateboard facility in the Littleover area. The most suitable location is probably somewhere within King George V and Clemson's Park. However public consultation will be required before a decision is made on the preferred location. At the moment there is no funding available for the provision of a skateboard park in Littleover. There may be some opportunities to apply for funding for this type of facility once the new Big Lottery Funding comes on stream later this year and this will be looked at once details of the new funding has been published.

Public response at the meeting on 29 June 2005

A resident asked if the area around the proposed Millennium Park would be considered for a skateboard park.

Council response at the meeting on 29 June 2005

None.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 29 June 2005

Update on progress.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback at the meeting on 29 June 2005
--

No further progress to report.

The Millennium Wood site is not a favoured location for a skateboard park, but can be looked at and assessed along with other options in due course.

There is no programme set for developing proposals at this stage. Possible sources of funding will be looked at once the Big Lottery has announced its new programme, probably in early 2006.

Responsibility

David Finn, Head of Youth Services, Education Services, telephone 716956

Andrew Morgan, Landscape and Development Officer, Commercial Services, telephone 715547

15. Ref: 404045 – Petition - Request for pedestrian crossings, Station Road, Mickleover – raised 29.09.04

Issue

A petition was received requesting two pedestrian crossings on Station Road. The lead petitioner, who was the parent of a child who was injured on this road, raised a concern that Miller Homes intend to build another 500 homes, which will ultimately result in more children using the road. Correspondence from Ian Wallis from Traffic Management, stated that the counts had shown that there was insufficient use.

Action reported at the meeting on 29 June 2005

In **November 2004** it was reported that the Council has written to the petitioners to acknowledge receipt of the petition. It is not yet clear when the investigations will be concluded. However we recognise the sensitivity of local concerns and will give the work as much priority as we are able to. If we are not able to conclude investigations by the January meeting we will update the Area Panel on progress.

In **January 2005** it was reported that the Council have commissioned 12-hour traffic and pedestrian counts. These are programmed to be completed in January 2005. Once complete we will assess the results and report back.

In **March 2005** a written report was presented to the Area Panel. It outlined that requests for the installation of pedestrian crossings are assessed using criteria based on national guidance. The criteria is used to assess all types of pedestrian crossing facilities and ensures budgets are used to target areas in greatest need. The adopted criteria uses a minimum threshold below which no further action is recommended. Above the threshold other factors such as the mobility and age of pedestrians, and the speed and composition of traffic are considered. Typically the minimum threshold is comparable with 50 pedestrians crossing an hour against traffic flows of 1000 vehicles. On the 9 December 2004 on Station Road between Onslow Road and Mill Lane, the highest hourly level of pedestrians was 17 between 15:00 and 16:00. Traffic flows were 910 vehicles an hour. In total 91 pedestrians crossed in the 12 hour period. On the 10 January 2005 on Station Road near to East Avenue. The highest hourly level of pedestrians was 43 between 15:00 and 16:00. Traffic flows were 790 vehicles an hour. In total 297 pedestrians crossed in the 12 hour period. A review of the accidents at the two locations over the last 5 years shows that there were no recorded pedestrian injury accidents at the East Avenue junction and one pedestrian injury accident recorded at the Onslow Road junction. This accident involved a 12 year old girl crossing the road. Whilst any accident is regrettable it is not considered that the introduction of pedestrian crossings at either location would necessarily lead to accident reductions. However, it was recognised that school catchment areas have changed and it is proposed to review the petition requests in 2006 and consider pedestrian crossings as part of the Safer routes to school schemes in the area.

In **June 2005** it was reported that a local resident stated his disappointment that no pedestrian crossing was being installed. He considered that 300 people crossing at East Avenue sufficient to have a pedestrian crossing at that point and because there is nowhere to cross we are just waiting for an accident to happen. He considered that the speed of traffic also needs to be considered because there is insufficient time to cross safely

Richard Smail referred to the report, and confirmed that the recommendations are based on the criteria for pedestrian crossings, he reported that officers balance the number of pedestrians and the number of vehicles using the road.

Councillor Winter expressed her concern about refusing the request for a crossing and explained that many people now drive down the road, rather than walk, as they do not feel safe to cross the road. She considered that a pedestrian crossing is needed at this end of Station Road, particularly with the amount of houses at the bottom of the road.

Councillor Hird stated that something has to be done to support people to cross the road safely. She considered that the commitment to review needs to be earlier than 2006. She referred to the Safer Routes to School scheme and asked residents and parents to contact their local schools to lobby them to take part in the scheme. It was suggested that officers consider a central refuge as an alternative to a crossing, but it was recognised the road may be too narrow the City Council's criteria for pedestrian crossings covers investigations into signal controlled crossings, zebra crossings and pedestrian refuges. The threshold values remain the same, the type of crossing installed being dependent on local influences.

When assessed this location fell short of the Council's criteria for a crossing facility and therefore a refuge has not been considered. Investigations on Station Road have shown that the carriageway is too narrow for the installation of a refuge in this area. A local resident stated his disappointment that no pedestrian crossing was being installed. He considered that 300 people crossing at East Avenue sufficient to have a pedestrian crossing at that point and because there is nowhere to cross we are just waiting for an accident to happen. He considered that the speed of traffic also needs to be considered because there is insufficient time to cross safely.

Richard Smail referred to the report, and confirmed that the recommendations are based on the criteria for pedestrian crossings, he reported that officers balance the number of pedestrians and the number of vehicles using the road.

Councillor Winter expressed her concern about refusing the request for a crossing and explained that many people now drive down the road, rather than walk, as they do not feel safe to cross the road. She considered that a pedestrian crossing is needed at this end of Station Road, particularly with the amount of houses at the bottom of the road.

Councillor Hird stated that something has to be done to support people to cross the road safely. She considered that the commitment to review needs to be earlier than 2006. She referred to the Safer Routes to School scheme and asked residents and parents to contact their local schools to lobby them to take part in the scheme. It was suggested that officers consider a central refuge as an alternative to a crossing, but it was recognised the road may be too narrow
The number of children transferring from Silverhill School to Murray Park School in September this year will be 30, with three of these being from outside the normal Murray Park area. There will, therefore, be up to 27 extra pupils crossing Station Road at school arrival and dispersal times, although some final year pupils will of course have moved on so the actual increase in numbers is likely to be less than this. In view of the uncertainty of the change, we propose to have the site re-evaluated in September 2005 to assess the new situation.

Public response at the meeting on 29 June 2005
--

None.

Council response at the meeting on 29 June 2005

None

Actions agreed at the meeting on 29 June 2005

To update on proposals to reassess the pedestrian crossing request

Updates on agreed actions to feedback at the meeting on 29 June 2005
--

The survey will be done during September 2005. We will report back on the findings to the November meeting.

Responsibility

Tony Gascoigne, Traffic Control Engineer, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 715019.

16. Ref: 404037 – Petition – Road Safety on Havenbault Lane, Littleover – raised 29.09.04

Issue

A resident of Havenbault Lane informed the panel that they had recently formed the Havenbault Area Road Safety Campaign Group, as they were concerned about the increase in speeding traffic and heavy goods lorries. She commented that the only time the road was quiet, was when it was at a total stand still.

Action reported at the meeting on 29 June 2005

Residents wanted to know what had happened to the speed limit signs and the HGV 7.5 tonne limit signs, as they had disappeared. Concern was raised about the increase in HGVs using the road as a thoroughfare and not for access purposes.

Residents informed the panel that discussions had already taken place with Councillor Care, who had informed them that they need more accidents before any traffic calming measures can be taken – which was quite concerning. They asked the Councillors for their support with this issue. Councillor Allen confirmed that he has spoken to the Police who have assured him that more routine patrols will be carried out on the road. He explained that the amount of traffic will not be addressed by this, and therefore need to look at highways improvement.

In **November 2004** it was reported that the 7.5 tonne weight limit signs indicate a weight restriction imposed for environmental reasons rather than for a structural problem with a road or bridge. This type of restriction covers the majority of residential roads within the City and has been introduced to keep large vehicles on the most appropriate roads across the City. On most roads however access by Heavy Goods Vehicles will always be required for delivery wagons to local shops, refuse vehicles, skip wagons to residential properties and to service local businesses, so an 'except for access' clause is generally built into these types of Traffic Regulation Order. This Order is reliant upon enforcement by the Police but it is often difficult to distinguish between local HGVs and HGVs using a road as a through route. Regarding Havenbault Lane, Tesco lorries and Petrol tankers could be accessing Uttoxeter Road, which is within the environmental weight restriction itself, so they can legitimately use Havenbault Lane.

We have written to Tesco's to ask if they can use a more appropriate route especially in the early hours. We are also working on a Freight map with Derbyshire County Council, which highlights the City's weight restrictions and the most appropriate routes for HGVs to enter the City. We hope this will lead to some improvements.

Inspector Parkin has confirmed that he has spoken to residents in the Safety Campaign Group and set up an ongoing dialogue. The Police are aware of the issue and have arranged to monitor the situation.

In **January 2005** it was reported that because the petition was very detailed, it required some investigation work and the report would not be ready for January 2005. However, traffic readings for speed began in November/December 2004 and, further readings would be taken after 19 January 2005.

In **March 2005** it was reported that the petition covers some complex issues. Investigations are still underway. We will report back to the next meeting on 29 June 2005.

Councillor Care explained that the Council could provide a response after a very quick investigation and come up with an unsatisfactory solution, or conduct a more thorough investigation to increase the likelihood of an effective solution. A thorough investigation is what the area deserves. She went on to explain that it is more complex than it may appear because the junction with Rykneld Road was having design work done as well. In addition, petitions provide additional workload for officers above the programmed work and it is important to manage the impact on the existing work programme.

Sergeant Daines confirmed that Safety cameras go to specific sites that are approved by the Derbyshire Safety Camera Partnership where they will reduce speed related accidents. They are governed by strict guidelines. They are only designated as a mobile camera site when accident and casualty data is analysed, a speed survey has been completed and the road surveyed to

check it is suitable. Sites with cameras are surveyed to see how the presence of the cameras is effecting the speeds. He stated that there is currently a backlog of getting road surveys done. A member of the public asked why there had not been a response to this issue for five months, because he does not believe it is that complex. He also informed the panel that he regularly sees safety camera vans on Burton and Uttoxeter Road, but never on Havenbault Road, and asked why this was the case

In **June 2005** the Panel received a report in response to the petition requesting traffic calming measures on Havenbault Lane. The report outlined the work completed as part of the investigation including vehicle speed measurements undertaken in September 2004 and January 2005 at two different locations and Derbyshire Constabulary have undertaken a similar measurement at a third location. A range of 85th percentile speeds between 32mph and 41mph were recorded. The 85th percentile speed is the 85th highest out of 100 measured and is the nationally recognised method for assessing compliance with speed limits. It is recognised that many road users are travelling significantly in excess of the 30mph speed limit. Derbyshire Constabulary's Traffic Management Officer has reported that Officers have been asked to conduct speed checks on Havenbault Lane, but he has also suggested that the Council should consider the installation of traffic calming measures as he feels the route does not meet the criteria for the erection of permanent speed cameras.

As outlined in the Authority's Local Transport Plan traffic calming measures provide the most benefit where there is a history of reported injury accidents in which high vehicle speed is a contributory factor or vulnerable road users, pedestrians and cyclists, are involved.

While Derbyshire Constabulary's accident statistics reveal that there were two accidents reported on Havenbault Lane during 2002, both involving cyclists, there have been no accidents during 2003 and 2004. While it is clear from the vehicle speed surveys that most road users perceive that the 30 mph limit is inappropriate, it does not follow that traditional traffic calming measures are required that would reduce vehicle speeds to 20 or 25 mph.

Investigations have been taking place into the feasibility of reducing the speed limit on Pastures Hill from 40 mph to 30mph. It is important to note that the Department for Transport will not permit the erection of 30 mph repeater signs on a lit street as they consider that the system of street lighting serves as an adequate reminder that a 30 mph speed limit exists, unless otherwise signed. It is considered that measures that prove effective for Pastures Hill could be considered for implementation in Havenbault Lane and The Hollow as a means of reinforcing the existing limit. Obviously, public consultation would take place prior to the introduction of any changes.

It has been observed that many children use Havenbault Lane as part of their route to school. This has prompted some residents to explore the possibility of working with Brookfield Primary School to promote safety improvements. This positive approach led to the organisation of a meeting between an Officer of the Authority's Road Safety and Travel Awareness Team, the school Head and a member of the Havenbault Area Safety Group. It was agreed that a School Travel Plan should be investigated and, to this end, arrangements were made to distribute questionnaires to survey the thoughts of pupils, parents and staff. Following analysis of the results, a further meeting was held with the school Head, governors and parents on 8 June 2005. The following actions were agreed at the Travel Plan meeting:

- to run a Walk to School Week commencing 4 July
- some cycle training will be carried out for year six in September
- another meeting will be arranged for parents during the day to encourage more support for the Travel Plan and
- a site meeting is to be held with the School Travel Plan forum soon so they can identify problem areas on their school journey and possible solutions.

It is proposed to consider measures to reinforce the 30 mph speed limit on Havenbault Lane and The Hollow, as resources permit.

Public response at the meeting on 29 June 2005

Local residents expressed their dissatisfaction with the response not to install any traffic calming measures such as more 30mph signs, speed cameras and yellow boards warning about speed. Another resident commented that the Police appear to be trying to take action with the use of cameras but that the Council do not appear to consider the issue as a priority. A resident asked where on the list of priorities Havenbault Lane is and what specific action is the Council taking.

Council response at the meeting on 29 June 2005

David Gartside showed part of the Derbyshire Camera Safety Partnership video explaining how the organisation works. He also showed a map indicating the fatal, serious and slight accidents in the city for 2002/3/4. This map indicates where there are concentrations of accidents and this information informs the Local Transport Plan traffic calming measures. Havenbault Lane had had one slight and one serious accident out of a total of 2,446 accidents recorded.

He also explained the changing trend with speeding notices moving away from being issued by Police officers to being issued as a result of a camera. All 15,000 notices issued in 1999 were by Police officers whereas in 2003 of 67,800 notices just 2,300 were issued by Police officers. David explained about the work being done with Brookfield Primary School and their Travel plan Forum to improve safety for children and their parents.

Inspector Parkin confirmed that there will continue to be enforcement by the Police but it will be done by their road police monitoring the area and not by static or mobile cameras.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 29 June 2005

Update on requests to provide more visual evidence of 30mph limit on the road.
Update on travel plan proposals.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback at the meeting on 29 June 2005

Regarding more visual evidence of the 30mph limit the Department for Transport will not permit the erection of 30 mph repeater signs on a lit street as they consider that the system of street lighting serves as an adequate reminder that a 30 mph speed limit exists. It is also worth noting that rumble strips are not considered suitable in residential areas as they cause a great deal of noise for residents.

We are planning the actions agreed in the report and will continue to liaise with the travel plan forum, which includes some of the petitioners, to develop the initiative at Brookfield Primary. Capital funding is not currently available this year but consideration will be given to funding further physical measures in future years.

Responsibility

Nicola Weekly, Traffic Manager – Traffic Management Schemes, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 716074.
Inspector Gary Parkin, Pear Tree Police Station, telephone 222184.

17. Ref: 405002 – Petition – Woodcote Way Play area, Heatherton, Littleover – received - 19.01.05

Issue

A petition has been received from 20 residents asking that the Woodcote Way play area is completed. Residents have been living in the area for three years and there is little sign that the play area that was marked on the plans is being installed. The petition stated that residents are unhappy that the play area off Woodcote way has not been finished. Some of us have been in our new properties for over three years and we are still waiting. This play area was clearly marked on plans both builders and also designated on council plans. Without an extensive walk, which is not insignificant for toddlers, there is no other suitable facilities for the area. Considering the Government is trying to encourage an increase in activity levels in young children to reduce the prevalence of obesity the lack of such facilities is unacceptable. The area is currently an eyesore and unsafe as it is covered with builders rubbish. Our children are growing up and we would like this play area now.

Action reported at the meeting on 29 June 2005

In **January 2005** it was reported that the request would be investigated and report made at the next meeting.

In **March 2005** a report was presented to the area panel that stated it is a requirement that this site is laid out as incidental public open space as part of the housing development. The proposals for the open space include a small play area with play equipment aimed at younger children and a grassed dog free area, all enclosed within bow top fencing. The play area is located alongside proposed footpaths and cycleway and a minimum of 10 metres way from adjacent residential property boundary and 20 metres from nearest habitable room in accordance with the guidelines the Council follows for locating play areas. The Council has considered all the views received and has taken the decision that the play area should be provided by the developer as required by the agreement for the housing development. The Council is now in the process of agreeing with the developer the final design of the play area and open space with a view to having the work completed as soon as possible.

The Council is now waiting for the developer to submit detail designs of the play area for approval by the Council.

The Area Panel approved the report.

In **June 2005** it was reported that the developer is still in progress of revising the play area design. We anticipate the revised design to be submitted by the end of July.

Public response at the meeting on 29 June 2005

A resident asked how much longer people had to wait for the play area to be installed because the equipment planned for the site was shown on drawings issued many years ago.

Council response at the meeting on 29 June 2005

Councillor Troup reported that the progress was dependant on a section 106 agreement that outlined how the play area would be developed.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 29 June 2005

None.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback at the meeting on 29 June 2005
--

The developer has submitted detail proposals for play area. The developer has been notified of the need for some alterations, but overall the play area design is now acceptable and a programme for installation has been requested.

Responsibility

Ken Richardson, Parks Officer, Commercial Services, telephone 716646

18. Ref: 405009 – Petition – Increase in traffic on Church Street, Littleover – received 30.03.05

Issue

A petition has been received from residents that are concerned about the amount of traffic using Church Street, Littleover as a convenient route through the village. Church Street is narrow and when cars park on one side it becomes difficult and dangerous especially at school starting and finishing times. Residents are aware of a current traffic management survey and ask the Council to consider a proposal to install a 'no left turn' sign at the Old Hall Road junction and a 'no right turn' from the Hollow. This will make Church Street one way from its junction with Shepherd Street.

Action reported at the meeting on 29 June 2005

In **June 2005** it was reported that changes are being considered for Church Street as a result of the St Peter's School Travel Plan. Consultation is currently underway on proposals. We will provide a full report to the next meeting on 28 September 2005.

Public response at the meeting on 29 June 2005

None.

Council response at the meeting on 29 June 2005

None.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 29 June 2005

To report back in September.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback at the meeting on 29 June 2005

An update on this issue is provided in item 5 on the agenda of 28 September in the report titled 'Concerns Over Traffic Volumes on Church Street, Thornhill Road and Old Hall Road, Littleover.'

Responsibility

Tony Gascoigne, Traffic Control Engineer, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 715019.

19. Ref: 405010 – Petition – Improved lighting and car parking on Trusley Gardens, Blagreaves – raised 30.03.05

Issue

A petition has been received from seven residents of Trusley Gardens asking the Council to improve their environment to make it safer. They are requesting improved lighting along a pathway and car hardstandings in their gardens because there is nowhere available to park cars either off the road or near their properties.

Action reported at the meeting on 29 June 2005

In **June 2005** it was reported that Derby Homes have discussed the proposals set out in the petition with the lead petitioner. Consultation has been completed with the petitioners. Out of seven petitioners, five responses were received, of which four were in favour and one was strongly opposed. Officers in Development and Cultural Services have advised that planning permission would be needed.

A site visit has indicated an estimated cost of up to £30,000 and would benefit only four Derby Homes tenants. Funding for this would be very difficult to secure. It would also leave any future tenants of four properties on Trusley Gardens with no front gardens. There is extensive parking at the bottom of Trusley Gardens and a City Housing Improvement Plan bid has already been agreed for extra parking bays this year.

However, residents approached the main housing contractor, Bramalls, currently working in the area about leaving the access road they had temporarily put down to carry out their work. It has been confirmed that the road will not be left and all the gardens will be re-instated. However, the architect for the scheme has been asked to look at the feasibility of taking away some of the front side garden of one property on Trusley Gardens and providing six off road parking bays, one for each council owned property in the area. Derby Homes are currently awaiting the outcome of this.

Regarding the additional lighting requested, a price will be obtained for next years, 2006/7 City Housing Improvement Plan that will be considered by the Littleover Community Panel.

Derby Homes aim to provide a full report at the 28 September area panel meeting.

Public response at the meeting on 29 June 2005

None.

Council response at the meeting on 29 June 2005

None.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 29 June 2005

Derby Homes to provide report on investigations and recommendations.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback at the meeting on 29 June 2005

Following the suggestion that the front side garden of 17 Trusley Gardens could be cut out to provide five parking bays, the tenant of 17 Trusley Gardens expressed concern at this proposal and requested it did not take place.

As a result, Councillor Skelton, the architect and Liaison Officer from Bramalls were contacted, and it was confirmed that 17 Trusley no longer wanted the parking bays but just wanted a parking space for their own vehicle. The tenant of 17 Trusley gardens was happy with this outcome.

The lead petitioner has been informed that the original parking proposal would only benefit three out of the four properties in agreement - the lead petitioner does not have a car - and that it was not a cost effective option at approximately £30,000. All the petitioners were sent a letter on 24 August confirming that hardstandings will not be provided for each property. However, new extensive parking at the bottom of Trusley Gardens has been approved and will be completed by April 2006.

Regarding the additional lighting requested, a price will be obtained for next years, 2006/7 City Housing Improvement Plan that will be considered by the Littleover Community Panel.

Responsibility

Pam Stretton, Local Manager, Derby Homes, telephone 716578

20. Ref: 405011 – Petition – Residents privileged parking, Heath Avenue, Littleover – raised 30.03.05

Issue

A petition had been received from residents of Heath Avenue requesting a resident's privileged parking scheme on Heath Avenue. There have been parking problems on Heath Avenue for some time and residents believe they will not be resolved until some action is taken.

Action reported at the meeting on 29 June 2005

In **June 2005** the lead petitioner explained that parking is a constant problem because staff and customers of businesses on Burton Road parking there all day up until 10 pm. They not only take up all the on road parking but they also block people's access to their own driveways. He explained that all residents have been canvassed and 80% want a residents only parking scheme similar to other streets. He reported that residents are very committed to finding a solution and one option that they have considered is unadopting the road. He asked if the Council can inform him of the procedure to unadopt the road.

Councillor Allen agreed that the parking problem on Heath Avenue is very serious. He clarified that South Avenue does not have a residents parking scheme but it does have a yellow line and a sign that says 'access only', which is often ignored.

The Panel received a report in response to the request that Heath Avenue is restricted to Residents' only parking to prevent non-residents from being able to park on the avenue. The report outlined the content of the Parking policy document produced by the Council setting out the two basic criteria that must be satisfied for residents' privileged parking schemes. They are:

1. Schemes will not be considered in areas where more than 50% of households have, or have the potential for, off-street parking facility.
2. Schemes will only be implemented where, following public consultation, more than 75% of respondents are in favour.

The first basic condition has not been satisfied in this instance and therefore it is not possible to consider a residents parking scheme on Heath Avenue.

With regard to the unadoption of Heath Avenue as requested by the lead petitioner, 'unadoption' means that the street would remain highway with public rights of way over it, however it would not be maintainable by the Highway Authority. To prevent members of the public using Heath Avenue, it would require a 'stopping up' order to be made by the Magistrates' Court. In the case of Heath Avenue, diversion is not an option and therefore before making an application to the Magistrates' Court to stop up the street, the City Council must be wholly satisfied and be able to demonstrate that the street is unnecessary for public use and therefore should not be maintained at the public's expense. To satisfy this requirement there has to be evidence that the highway is not longer in use by the public. There is no such evidence.

Public response at the meeting on 29 June 2005

The lead petitioner was disappointed with the initial response in the report but welcomed the new proposal and was willing to consider and respond to it when he had received the details in writing. Another resident was concerned that the problem would get worse with the construction of a new house on the avenue.

Council response at the meeting on 29 June 2005

David Gartside introduced an alternative recommendation that offers a way forward. He explained that rather than introducing a 'Residents Only' parking scheme there is an opportunity to consider

'Limited Waiting Restrictions' scheme that could have the desired outcome. He explained further work would be needed to identify resources and consider the impact of the proposals to decriminalise parking in 2006 and therefore there would be a delay in confirming this alternative solution until 2006. He explained that the advantages and disadvantages of any action is considered and any knock on effect they may have.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 29 June 2005
--

To provide a written response to the lead petitioner confirming the waiting time alternative proposal outlined by David Gartside at the meeting.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback at the meeting on 29 June 2005

There was only one option discussed at the area panel meeting on 29 June, which was the limited waiting restriction which will include an exemption for permit holders. To develop this proposal in more detail a meeting took place on 22 August with Highway officers and Heath Avenue residents to discuss the waiting restriction idea. A useful discussion took place including clarifying residents concerns and explaining how waiting restrictions work and the process to introduce them.

A number of short term suggestions were considered:

- Residents erecting their own signs. Residents can fix a sign of no more than 0.3 square metres to their wall with text no higher than 750mm and not illuminated.
- Residents requesting Protective Entrance Markings, which are white lines to show an access point to a garage or a drive. It costs £60, which includes all future maintenance costs
- Residents applying to the Council for disabled parking bays for Blue badge drivers who meet certain conditions.
- Replacement of 'no through road' signs to Heath Avenue. We have assessed the existing signs and because they are old and faded they will be replaced.

We will investigate the provision of limited waiting restrictions with an exemption for permit holders, around the residential streets surrounding Littleover district centre. Until we carry out a full consultation in the area we will not have details such as the time limits of the waiting restrictions and the streets affected. As stated in the letter to the lead petitioner, Parking Services will include this in the 2007/8 Parking Services Business Plan, and the consultation will commence once Decriminalised Parking is introduced in 2006.

Responsibility

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

21. Ref: 405012 – Petition – Uttoxeter New Road Parking Restrictions – raised 28.06.05

Issue

A petition was presented to the Area Panel on 29 June outlining residents concerns about the difficulty in parking their cars in the lay by near to the City Hospital on Uttoxeter New Road.

Action reported at the meeting on 29 June 2005

New item

Public response at the meeting on 29 June 2005

None.

Council response at the meeting on 29 June 2005

None.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 29 June 2005

To investigate and report back to a future meeting.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback at the meeting on 29 June 2005

A report in response to this petition is on the agenda for the meeting on 28 September.

Responsibility

Michelle Spamer, Area and Neighbourhood Co-ordinator, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 715064