

**AREA PANEL 4 COMMUNITY ISSUES – UPDATE REPORT
BACKGROUND INFORMATION
31 JANUARY 2007**

For further information contact:

Richard Smail, Area Panel Manager, telephone 258505

E-mail: richard.smail@derby.gov.uk

Or email: area.panels@derby.gov.uk

Contents

1.	Ref: 402030 - Redevelopment of University of Derby Mickleover campus, Mickleover – raised 27.11.02	3
2.	Ref: 406028 – Petition - Removal of Bollards Chatsworth Drive, Mickleover - received 29.11.06	4
3.	Ref: 406001 – Petition, Car parking on Uttoxeter Road, Littleover, - received 18.01.06 and 27.09.06	5
4.	Ref: 406021 – Dog dirt bins, Haven Baulk Lane Park, Littleover - received 27.09.06	9
5.	Ref: 406026 – Development of Littleover Community School, Littleover - received 29.11.06	9
6.	Ref: 406027 – Trees at Post House Hotel Development, Littleover - received 29.11.06	10
7.	Ref: 406029 – Corden Avenue and Uttoxeter Road Junction road surface, Littleover - received 29.11.06	11
8.	Ref: 404025 – Planning Application at East Midlands Airport, all wards – received 19.05.04	11

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

Responsible officer(s) for more information:

Ian Woodhead, Group Leader, Regeneration and Community, telephone 255083

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.

Previous key points / action taken:

January 2003 - the site had been allocated for housing in the Local Plan review but no application had been received.

March 2003 - 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.

June 2003 - the planning application was refused on the grounds of prematurity. Any application for access to the site will be assessed on the basis of a full transport impact assessment. This will be the subject of examination at a Public Inquiry into the City of Derby Local Plan.

July 2004 - The City Council does not expect to receive Inspectors report until the end of the year. The Council would not encourage an application for planning permission on this site until the Inspector has confirmed the housing allocation.

September 2004 - A resident requested an assurance that an equal number – or even more – new, high quality football 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. The precise nature of replacement will be subject to further discussions and it is also envisaged that public consultation will take place on any proposals. 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 creates the opportunity to secure the replacement pitches.

March 2005 - 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 regarding this site. 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.

June 2005 - planning application for a new access road into the site 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 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. 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.

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.

November 2005 - A number of developers working with the University held an open day for the community on 11 November 2005. Plans for the site were available for viewing and discussion.

A planning application has now been received by the Council and will be considered on 26 January 2006. Details of the plans can be viewed at Roman House and all comments are invited by December 23.

June 2006 – the planning application had not been decided. Agreed to report back in January 2007 on progress.

Response on 29 November 2006

None.

Actions agreed:

Update progress with planning application.

Update:

A summary of the activity over the last year is as follows:

- The planning application was reported to the City Councils Planning Control Committee on the 2 February 2006.
- The Committee Members resolved to notify the Secretary of State that the City Council was minded to grant planning permission for the development, subject to the applicants entering into a legal agreement.
- The requirements of that Section 106 agreement relate to affordable housing, mobility housing, public open space, major open space and replacement pitches, education, swimming pool, scout hut, highways and public art.
- On 24 March 2006, we received confirmation from the Government Office for the East Midlands that the Secretary of State did not intend to call the application in and that the City Council were able to determine the application.
- Since March 2006, negotiations have been on-going between the City Council and the Consortium of Developers to reach agreement over the terms of the section 106 agreement. These negotiations are not yet finalized, therefore a decision has not yet been issued on the planning application.

Regarding the future of the swimming pool, the City of Derby Local Plan Review's policy for the housing redevelopment of the Mickleover Campus requires the 'retention of the swimming pool facilities on the site'. It is therefore the developers' responsibility to ensure that the swimming pool is retained and remains open for a set period of time. The Section 106 Agreement being negotiated on the planning application will make sure that this happens.

The agreement, as drafted at the moment, requires the developers, or an approved body, to be responsible for managing the swimming pool. Should the developer or approved body fail to meet the terms of the Section 106 agreement, the Council will, subject to the total cost of provision being covered by the commuted sum and income generated by the pool, aim to establish a new management agreement with an organisation that is capable of managing the facility.

We will report back to a future meeting when the details have been agreed. Note and put into Outstanding issues table.

2. Ref: 406028 – Petition - Removal of Bollards Chatsworth Drive, Mickleover - received 29.11.06

Responsible officer(s) for more information:

John Edgar, Maintenance Manager, Regeneration and Community, telephone 715067
Duncan Inwood, Group leader, Regeneration and Community, telephone 255926

Issue: A petition was presented to the meeting requesting the removal of eight bollards on Chatsworth Drive. Chatsworth Drive is a small and relatively new development that is not subject to fast moving through traffic. Two sections of the road have been narrowed for the purpose of traffic calming with eight reflective bollards erected on each section – giving a total of 16. Residents feel that there are more bollards than are needed and they have an adverse impact on the visual aesthetics of the development. The Council has not yet adopted the highway and residents consider this an appropriate time to request that the developers remove the eight bollards along with other remedial work outstanding on the footpaths.

Previous key points / action taken:

New item

Response on 29 November 2006

Councillor Hird outlined the residents' requests and explained that they have already contacted Highways officers asking for a solution.

Actions agreed:

To refer the petition to the Cabinet Member for Planning and Transportation and ask officers to investigate and report back.

Update:

We are still investigating the issue and plan to respond to the Area Panel meeting on 28 March 2007. Note.

3. Ref: 406001 – Petition, Car parking on Uttoxeter Road, Littleover, - received 18.01.06 and 27.09.06

Responsible officer(s) for more information:

Neil Palfreyman, Traffic Management Engineer, Regeneration and Community, telephone 716090

Issue:

A petition had been received in December 2005 about the difficulty of getting out of driveways along Uttoxeter Road near to the City Hospital. This is because of cars parked by hospital workers, visitors and contractors between 8am and 5pm. There is very little space to manoeuvre and it is difficult to see oncoming traffic travelling at 40mph. Can the Council install double yellow lines as part of the list of improvements already proposed for the next few weeks.

A second petition signed by 87 residents was received in September 2006 requesting car parking restrictions on Uttoxeter Road between Corden Avenue and the City Hospital roundabout on the left hand side as you travel into the city.

Previous key points / action taken:

January 2006 - A number of residents from Uttoxeter Road who live nearer to Corden Avenue reported that they also have the same parking and access problems caused by the people working at the Hospital for their contractor. It is very dangerous trying to get into and out of driveways and they asked that double yellow lines are provided.

March 2006 – Reported that initial observations in February revealed a significant number of contractors working on the hospital development were parking along this stretch of Uttoxeter Road along with a smaller number of private cars. Skanska confirmed that provision had been made for contractors to park off the highway while working at the hospital and they agreed to take action to reduce the inconvenience caused by their contractors.

Further monitoring over a one month period, at all times of the day, showed that the action taken by Skanska has virtually eliminated contractor parking. However, it also revealed that some parking remained that was a mixture of drivers visiting properties along Uttoxeter Road and drivers who parked and then walked in the direction of the hospital. Some of these drivers have since been identified as hospital staff.

In light of the improvements achieved by Skanska's actions and the minimal parking that remains it is felt unnecessary to install parking restrictions at this time. Therefore the request for parking restrictions along the length of Uttoxeter Road between the Corden Avenue junction and the City Hospital roundabout has been refused. However, officers will advise the hospital that some of their staff may be parking on Uttoxeter Road and will ask them to remind staff to use their car park.

The lead petitioner acknowledged that the problem has reduced but felt there is still sufficient parking by non residents to make it dangerous for residents to drive on and off their drives. She felt that when the hospital is providing its full range of services there will be nothing to prevent staff and visitors parking on Uttoxeter road. She asked that the officers reconsider their decision.

She also asked if the Council could provide white lines to prevent parking across driveways.

The panel recognised that the problem has reduced but were sympathetic to residents concerns about problems in the future. The panel approved the officers recommendation however, on the suggestion of Councillor Care, the panel requested that when the traffic improvements planned for the Uttoxeter Road/Corden Avenue junction are installed a cycle lane is provided on Uttoxeter Road going into the city.

In response to the resident suggestion Richard Smail advised the meeting that any resident can ask the Council to provide the white markings front of driveways, but at a cost to the resident of about £60.

June 2006 - Further cycle improvements are planned for this junction as part of the overall improvements. This scheme is on the reserve list of schemes should funding become available in 2006/07. Skanska have reinstated regular parking patrols in May when some residents noted the problem had become worse. Now that Phase 1 has been completed Skanska now have relatively few contractors still on site. In addition, Skanska have been able to close up the Kings Drive gate once more to reduce the temptation to park on the road.

September 2006 - Officers from Traffic Management met with residents from Kings Drive and some from Uttoxeter Road on 5 July. Officers gave the residents details of a possible controlled parking zone for the area around Kings Drive. The zone did not include Uttoxeter Road. Since then officers have had some feedback from the Cabinet Member, Planning and Transportation, on the work programme priorities for this year 2006/07. As a result we intend to look at Kings Drive and the wider area around the city hospital, including this section of Uttoxeter Road in the 2007/08 financial year. This issue is included in the separate report on the agenda entitled "Consultation on the 2007/08 programme for highways and transport schemes" - see Table 1 on page 5 of the report.

November 2006 - A new petition was received signed by 76 residents requesting car parking restrictions on Uttoxeter Road between Corden Avenue and the City Hospital roundabout on the left hand side as you travel into the city. The lead petitioner explained that previous requests for action had been ignored. He had been passed from officer to officer without anyone taking responsibility. He was also disappointed that the Littleover ward Councillors had not seen the petition.

He confirmed that the issue was all about safety for residents when accessing and leaving driveways. Hospital staff are parking on Uttoxeter Road from 8am throughout the day and into the evening, leaving little space between driveways and sometimes parking on the kerbs. He commented that it was neither staff working for the contractors nor visitors that were the problem. He wanted to know who ultimately decided if any work is done?

He asked why the cycle path marked on the Cycle Network map on this part of Uttoxeter road has not been completed.

A resident, who is a member of the Resident Liaison Group, confirmed that funding of £180,000 had already been provided by the hospital for the work around Kings Drive to be completed and therefore it should be used now by the Council and not retained until next year. He referred to the meeting on 5 July at which officers had shown plans and talked about costs for the Kings Drive scheme. No one had been informed that the planned work was now being stopped. The Residents Liaison Group was still consulting on the plans.

The panel apologised for the petition not being seen by the Littleover Councillors and it was explained that it had been sent in error to the Mickleover Councillors.

Peter Price confirmed that the revised work priorities for 2006/7 have meant that investigative work around the hospital has now been postponed until next years work programme. He explained that there are proposals for the panel to identify their future highways and transportation priorities and this work could be included.

The panel supported the petitioners' views about the parking problems and had recently visited the site. They confirmed that they were not satisfied with the response that the investigations and work to address the issues were now postponed until next year.

Councillor Care confirmed that Councillor Wynn, the Cabinet member with responsibility for Planning and Transportation decides what work is included in the work programme.

Councillor Care explained that one of the reasons for work not being completed this year is a shortage of staff and that employing contractors to complete the work is very expensive and means less work will be done with the contribution from the hospital.

Councillor Care considered that the hospital should have a travel plan and should be doing more to address the problems.

Councillor Allen explained that there are competing priorities for work across the city and while this piece of work had been put back to next year it would not stop the local councillors lobbying to get the work made a priority.

The panel agreed to write to the hospital asking for a response to the local concerns and asked for progress made by officers to feedback outcomes of 5 July meeting to local residents.

Response on 29 November 2006

A report in response to the petition was presented to the meeting. It stated that a 'No Waiting at any Time' restriction was introduced on some of Uttoxeter Road in November 2005, this restriction extends from the City Hospital roundabout to the junction with Corden Avenue on the south side and from the roundabout for a distance of 150m on the north side.

It also stated that the Hospital Trust were asked what actions they had recently taken to minimise their impact on the surrounding road network and this included the hospital:

- actively discouraging on street parking; staff who offend are reprimanded by their managers
- providing patients with information about car parking at the hospital and transport alternatives
- opening a new 120 space car park in a few months adjacent to the Kings Treatment Centre
- continuing to support the introduction of the Kings Drive area Controlled Parking Zone.

Skanska considered their employees now have little impact on the parking situation because workers have to clock in at a new security office located near to the subway under Uttoxeter Road which is some distance away from the section of Uttoxeter Road where cars are parking. In addition their workforce had reduced from almost 2000 to about 250.

The report proposed officers undertake investigation and consultation with residents about the introduction of residents only parking and other waiting restrictions in Kings Drive and the surrounding area in the 2007/08 financial year, providing the Area Panel feels that this should be a priority.

Residents made comments and raised concerns in response to the report:

- Residents on Uttoxeter Road counted 1,756 vehicles using the road in one hour with 30 cars parked on the road
- Police have issued tickets for parking without lights on Uttoxeter Road
- The petitioners started the Police, Ambulance service and Trent Buses have all informed them they would support double yellow lines on Uttoxeter Road
- Residents Liaison Group have recently canvassed local houses and all but 4 have shown support for a residents parking scheme.

- Is it right that a traffic regulation order will take at least six months so the earliest any changes can be implemented will be at the end on 2007?
- Five cars are being parked on Muirfield Drive and the drivers using the local bus service
- Is there enough parking for staff and visitors at the hospital
- Is the car park open at the weekends?
- Springfield Road cannot be accessed by emergency vehicles because of parked cars
- More services will come to the hospital so the issue will get worse
- Why are the double yellow lines on Kings Drive not being enforced?
- Why are cars being allowed to park on the junctions?
- The work needs to be a priority
- Why has the work that was started been put back?

Councillor Allen referred to non local cars parked on Muirfield Drive and Heron Way and that action is likely to displace parking to another area, so it was important to identify what area was being included in the investigation

The Littleover Councillors confirmed that this issue will be one of their priorities for highway and transport schemes in 2007/8.

Councillor Wynn, Cabinet Member for Planning and Transportation replied and stated:

- Consultation was originally planned to start before Christmas but a strategic review of city wide highway and transport issues meant it has been put back
- Traffic regulation orders take six to nine months
- Blue badge holders are often those responsible for parking on double yellow lines and while they are allowed to for up to three hours, they cannot park by junctions or return to their cars to change the time on their badges.
- The Police will be asked to monitor the parking on junctions
- The Parking Enforcement section will be asked to target the area as a priority
- The money, for the resident parking scheme and improvements provided by the hospital, is in place but what is not yet available is the officer time to investigate and implement the proposals. The Council does not have sufficient highway engineers to complete all the schemes at one time.
- As the Littleover councillors have confirmed the scheme is one of their priorities he will make it one of his priorities and will aim to start consultation in January, implement any ensuing Traffic regulation orders as soon as possible and aim to have started work on the solutions by September 2007.

The panel thanked Councillor Wynn for his commitment to making the issue a priority.

Actions agreed:

Noted the response.

The panel approved the proposals that investigations into resolving the Uttoxeter Road issues are included within the investigations into the Kings Drive area scheme.

The Littleover Ward Councillors agreed to prioritise this issue as one of their priorities for the 2007/08 highways and transport schemes as part of the report in item 10 on the agenda. Also that should any scheme be implemented that officers monitor the situation on Uttoxeter Road. To update on progress at the meeting in January 2007.

Update:

The parking enforcement team undertake regular patrols around the City Hospital. As part of their enforcement effort they check for misuse of disabled persons' blue badges, taking action where appropriate, and this will continue to be the case.

Council Cabinet will make a decision about the 2007/8 highways and transportation programme in February 2007 and a report brought back to the panel in March 2007. Note.

4. Ref: 406021 – Dog dirt bins, Haven Baulk Lane Park, Littleover - received 27.09.06

Responsible officer(s) for more information:

Ken Richardson, Environmental Services, telephone 716646

Issue:

A local resident raised concern over the large amount of dog waste on Haven Baulk Lane Park. She stated that there is only one sign telling people to pick up dog waste. She asked the Panel for more signs to be erected, to encourage dog walkers to collect the dog waste, and for more dog waste bins to be installed.

Previous key points / action taken:

Councillor Care confirmed that a new dual waste bin has recently been installed nearby on Haven Baulk Lane by the A38 bridge.

The request for a bin and signs on the park will be forwarded to officers

Response on 29 November 2006

Environmental Health Officers visited the park to identify additional places to install more 'no dog fouling' signs. Two old signs have been replaced and two new signs have been provided near to the play area.

Regarding dual waste dog bins, Environmental Services are undertaking a rolling programme of replacing existing litter bins and dog waste bins within Parks and Open Spaces with dual purpose bins.

However, the present policy regarding requests for extra bins on these sites is to advise that they can be provided only if funding can be allocated to purchase and install the bins plus 5 years revenue costs for emptying. It costs £259 to supply and install one dual bin on open space and a further £303 to cover the revenue costs for emptying the bin for 5 years. Therefore the panel would need to agree to allocate £562 to fund the installation of one new dual waste bin.

Alternatively the request for these bins can be added to a list of extra bins for which there are currently no financial resources available.

Actions agreed:

The panel noted the erection of the new signs.

The panel agreed to use its budget to fund a new dual purpose dog waste bin at a cost of £562.

Funding application to be submitted.

Update:

Application for funding has been submitted to the meeting on 31 January. Decide and close..

5. Ref: 406026 – Development of Littleover Community School, Littleover - received 29.11.06

Responsible officer(s) for more information:

Rob Salmon, Head of Plans and Policies, Regeneration and Community, telephone 255020

Simon Longley, Assistant Director, Children and Young People 's Services, telephone 716879

Issue:

A resident commented on the possible development of Littleover Community School in response to the planned Rykneld Road housing developments. He asked when it would be known whether the school would have to expand onto its playing fields or a new school would be built to cater for the demand.

Previous key points / action taken:

New item

Response on 29 November 2006

Councillor Allen confirmed that the school is full and that either a new school is built or Littleover Community school extended. He reported that conversations are taking place between the City Council and County Council because many of the houses planned will be in South Derbyshire for which the County Council is the Local Education Authority.

Councillor Wynn confirmed that for every 100 houses built it results in four additional children joining each school year group. He confirmed a new primary school is planned for the area but there is little opportunity for Littleover Community School to be extended.

He confirmed discussions with the County Council are ongoing.

Actions agreed:

Update on developments to address the need for additional space for secondary school age children in the area in response to new housing developments.

Update:

Children and Young People 's Services have no more information to add to the response given on 29 November that Littleover Community school is full and that a new school is needed because there is little opportunity for it to be extended, that conversations are taking place between the City Council and County Council and a new primary school is planned for the area.

The City of Derby Local Plan Review identifies land either side of Rykneld Road for 980 new houses. Consultation recently took place on more detailed guidance for this development. There will need to be a Section 106 agreement negotiated between the developers and the City Council before any planning permission is granted to ensure that adequate additional secondary school capacity is provided at the developers' expense to meet the new needs arising.

Planning applications have been submitted to South Derbyshire District Council for about 1,200 houses at Highfields Farm just outside the City boundary. The developers have appealed against the non-determination of these applications and a planning inquiry will now be held, probably commencing in May 2007. If planning permission is eventually granted, there will again first need to be a Section 106 agreement negotiated ensuring that adequate additional secondary school capacity is provided. Note and close

6. Ref: 406027 – Trees at Post House Hotel Development, Littleover - received 29.11.06

Responsible officer(s) for more information:

Ian Woodhead, Group leader, Regeneration and Community, telephone 255926

Issue:

A resident commented that he had heard that the trees adjacent to the new housing development on the old Post House Hotel site are going to be cut down. He asked if this was true.

Previous key points / action taken:

New item

Response on 29 November 2006

Councillor Carr reported that there are no plans to remove the trees and understood that there is a £20,000 fine payable should they be removed.

Actions agreed:

Confirm that the trees are protected.

Update:

A group Tree Preservation Order covers the larger trees in question. However we have agreed to the removal of many of the poorer or smaller trees but the main trees are all to remain. The removal of any trees covered by the tree preservation order is a criminal

offence and fines could be in the region suggested at the last meeting.
Note and close.

7. Ref: 406029 – Corden Avenue and Uttoxeter Road Junction road surface, Littleover - received 29.11.06

Responsible officer(s) for more information:

Michelle Spamer, Area Coordination officer, regeneration and Community, telephone 715064

Issue:

A resident commented that the tarmac on the road surface around the Corden Avenue and Uttoxeter Road junction was in a poor state and had been due for repair. He asked what can be done to tackle the problem.

Previous key points / action taken:

New item

Response on 29 November 2006

Councillor Care reported that work on the junction improvements had been on the reserve list for 2006/7 but funding had not been available.

The Littleover Councillors agreed to include the junction improvements as part of the Littleover ward priorities for Highway and Transport Schemes for 2007/8.

Actions agreed:

Investigate and report back

Update:

The resurfacing of Uttoxeter Road including the Corden Avenue junction is down on the provisional highways maintenance programme for 2007/08. The programme will be agreed by Cabinet in February 2007 and will be reported back to the Area Panel in March 2007. Note.

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

Responsible officer(s) for more information:

Rob Salmon, Head of Plans and Policies, Regeneration and Community, telephone 255020

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.

Previous key points / action taken:

July 2004 - 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.

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.

November 2004 - 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.

January - 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.

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.

June 2005 - 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 resident's 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 Authorities 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.

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

November 2005 - North West Leicestershire now do not expect to determine this application until early next year.

January 2006 - East Midlands Airport have been invited to attend but they have declined the invite because their strategy to promote the Masterplan is based around arranging 10 exhibitions across the East Midlands. The Derby exhibition is on Tuesday 14 February from 9am to 5.30pm in the Eagle Centre. Details of other exhibitions are available on their website www.nottinghamema.com Councillor Care confirmed that Derby City Council has now been granted a place on the airports Independent Consultative Committee and a councillor will be selected to represent the Council. Richard Smail reported that the airport had agreed to arrange an extra local meeting in the Littleover/Mickleover area in February to discuss their masterplan. Details of the extra meeting will be available from the airport website.

March 2006 - Progress on the planning application is reported to be slow. A decision is not expected before April 2006.

June 2006 - There had been no further progress with the planning application and it was agreed to report back in January 2007 on progress.

Response on 29 November 2006

None.

Actions agreed:

Update on planning application

Update:

North West Leicestershire District Council report that they are awaiting a revised Environmental Statement and that there is no specific timescale for determination of the application. Note and put into outstanding issues table until more information is known.