

**AREA PANEL 4 COMMUNITY ISSUES – UPDATE REPORT  
BACKGROUND INFORMATION  
18 JANUARY 2006**

**For further information contact:**

Richard Smail, Area Panel Manager, telephone 258505

E-mail: [richard.smail@derby.gov.uk](mailto:richard.smail@derby.gov.uk)

Vickie Butler, Area Panel Support Officer, telephone 258529

E-mail: [vickie.butler@derby.gov.uk](mailto:vickie.butler@derby.gov.uk)

Or email: [area.panels@derby.gov.uk](mailto:area.panels@derby.gov.uk)

**Contents**

1.	Ref: 405015 – Millennium Wood, Blagreaves – raised 28.06.05	3
2.	Ref: 405026 – Bendall Green path, dog sign and overgrown land, Blagreaves– raised 28.09.05	5
3.	Ref: 405031 – Housing developments in Blagreaves – raised 30.11.05	6
4.	Ref: 405033 – St George’s Travel Plan, Blagreaves – raised 30.11.05	7
5.	Ref: 405034 – King George V Playfield, Littleover – raised 30.11.05	8
6.	Ref: 405007 – Parking problems, Devonshire Drive and East Avenue, Mickleover – raised 30.03.05	9
7.	Ref: 404045 – Petition - Request for pedestrian crossings, Station Road, Mickleover – raised 29.09.04	11
8.	Ref: 405019 – Petition - Residents only parking, Warner Street, Mickleover – received 28.09.05	13
9.	Ref: 405030 – Housing development on Station Road, Mickleover – raised 30.11.05	14
10.	Ref: 404025 – Planning Application at East Midlands Airport, all wards – received 19.05.04	15
11.	Ref: 405027 – Recycling, all wards – raised 28.09.05	17

**1. Ref: 405015 – Millennium Wood, Blagreaves – raised 28.06.05**

**Responsible officer(s) for more information:**

Ken Richardson, Parks Officer, Commercial Services, telephone 716646

**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.

**Previous key points / action taken:**

**September 2005** - A presentation on the proposed City Park was made to Area Panel 4 in 2004. Proposals indicated it would be about 46 hectares, some land planned for the park had been acquired. The rest of the site is under private ownership as farmland. It would cost £1.5 to £2 million for all the facilities. Parks began the process to establish a Friends Group in 2005, but there was a poor response to forming a group. This needs to be followed up, along with consultation, but it's not possible to put a revised time scale on this. New funding programmes look like they will be open to applications sometime in 2006. Consideration was given to purchase the small farm, that was up for auction, but agreed not to proceed because it did not represent good value for money for a small area.

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.

**November 2005** - The City's Rights of Way Officer has confirmed that there are no recorded public rights of way, on the definitive map, between Oaklands Avenue and Moorway Lane. A public right of way could formally be created if serious demand could be shown. The residents concerned about the access have been informed how they can start the process to introduce a public right of way. This involves applying to the Council for a Modification Order to be made. Evidence to support the application needs to be provided. All landowners would need to agree to any footpath. The timescale would be long, as agreements about the path route and maintenance responsibilities would have to be arranged.

**Response on 16 November 2005**

A resident commented that while there is only one access point to the park, off Moorway Lane, it reduces use and makes it a less safe area for residents to visit. He asked that the Council provides a second access point and he stated that when asking Councillor Dhindsa to support this request he was told it would be a priority.

Another resident commented that since the fire in the woodland, a couple of years ago, there has been no investment to put back what had been damaged. Investment was essential.

Councillor Care commented on the need to establish an active community group to support any long term developments.

**Actions agreed:**

To confirm whether a second access point could be provided

**Update:**

The Council has a duty to produce a Right of Way Improvement Plan – ROWIP, for Derby under Section 60 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000. A progress report will be included within the second Derby Joint Local Transport Plan - LTP2. The final ROWIP will be published in late summer 2006 and will form a strand of the final LTP2.

We are required to assess within the ROWIP:

- the extent to which local rights of way meet the present and likely future needs of the public;
- the opportunities provided by local rights of way (and in particular by footpaths, cycle tracks, bridleways and restricted byways) for exercise and other forms of open-air recreation and the enjoyment of their area;
- the accessibility of local rights of way to blind or partially sighted persons and others with mobility problems;
- and such other matters relating to local rights of way as the Secretary of State may direct.

**2. Ref: 405026 – Bendall Green path, dog sign and overgrown land, Blagreaves– raised 28.09.05**

**Responsible officer(s) for more information:**

Ken Richardson, Parks Officer, Commercial Services, telephone 716646

**Issue:**

A resident from Bendall Green Neighbourhood Watch, asked the panel for an update regarding cutting back the hedges and undergrowth at the bottom of Bendall Green. Also he asked what was happening about the holes in the new pathway and when the new no dogs sign was to be installed.

**Previous key points / action taken:**

**November 2005** - Work has started on managing the overgrown area at the bottom of Bendall Green. We are removing some shrubs to open the area up, but we will retain some blackthorn and hazel to retain wild life interest. The intention is to reduce the overall density of shrub growth so there is less growth in which to build dens and have hiding places.

The area will be managed to maintain wildlife interest but reduce the extent of undergrowth. The areas around the hedges will be maintained as wild flower/long grass and flailed twice a year to prevent areas becoming overgrown and shrubs growing back out. The hedges/shrubs will be trimmed once a year to keep them under control. This is a compromise solution, as a scorched earth policy of keeping everything cut short up to the base of the hedges is not considered acceptable from an environmental and wildlife perspective.

The dog signs have been manufactured and arrangements are being made to install them on site.

The contractor has inspected the path and has reported back that he feels there are no holes that need repairing on the path.

**Response on 16 November 2005**

A resident thanked the Panel for the installation of the signs, however, he was concerned that the inspection of the path had not identified the 4"x2"x1" hole. He offered to send a photograph to officers for them to see the problem.

Councillors asked for details of the exact location of the problem from the resident.

**Actions agreed:**

The resident offered to send a photograph to officers in Parks for their comment.

**Update:**

Officers will be visiting the site in the next few weeks as part of the end of defects period inspection for the whole contract. The repair of the hole will then be carried out once it has been established whether the hole is a defect under the contract or due to other reasons. Propose to close.

**3. Ref: 405031 – Housing developments in Blagreaves – raised 30.11.05**

**Responsible officer(s) for more information:**

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

Peter Price, Transport Policy Manager, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 715034

**Issue:**

A resident was concerned about the impact on traffic in the area resulting in the proposed 200 houses to be built around Stenson Road and Blagreaves lane junction. There are already major traffic problems in the area and what is being done to address the impact?

**Previous key points / action taken:**

New item.

**Response on 16 November 2005**

A resident asked what is proposed for the Stenson Road and Blagreaves Lane junction when the new houses are built. He considers the junction needs to be changed to make it safer for pedestrians crossing the roads.

Another resident was concerned about how close the new buildings, built on the former Posthouse site, were to the existing trees. He asked the panel that if a similar proposal was put forward again would they be able to lobby against it.

Councillor Skelton referred to recent changes in planning rules that allow greater density on housing developments. She explained that it is difficult to stop developments if they are within guidelines but lobbying can influence the decision.

Councillor Troup proposed that officers should be invited to explain how the impact on the environment caused by planning applications is taken into account.

**Actions agreed:**

To invite an officer to attend a future meeting to outline how residents can influence planning applications and how the Council addresses the impact on the environment including traffic.

**Update:**

An application for about 20 properties was approved on 8 December 2005 on the south side of Blagreaves Lane. However no planning application has yet been made for any larger development involving 200 properties. As and when an application is submitted a transport assessment of the resulting impact of any development will be made.

An officer has been invited to attend a future meeting

**4. Ref: 405033 – St George's Travel Plan, Blagreaves – raised 30.11.05**

**Responsible officer(s) for more information:**

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

**Issue:**

A resident commented that the substantial amount of money spent on the major physical improvements had not made a difference to the traffic problems both before and after school. The changes mean that access roads are now cut off, cars park on pavements, block drives and drivers cannot see at junctions. She was concerned that during the consultation stage it was parents rather than residents that were consulted and involved. She asked what the Councillors plan to do to resolve the problems.

**Previous key points / action taken:**

New item.

**Response on 16 November 2005**

Councillor Skelton explained that it is a long process to change peoples behaviour. Sergeant Bria explained that the area is policed when possible and leaflets have been distributed in the area. It was confirmed that the scheme is being monitored.

**Actions agreed:**

To confirm details of the monitoring process.

**Update:**

All local residents were invited to a consultation day at St. Georges on 6 July 2004. A colourful newsletter was hand delivered to all the residents in the area with a plan on the back. We split the day into three sessions so all residents had an opportunity to attend.

We monitored the situation when the bus turning circle was opened in May 2005. The School Travel Plan forum are going to monitor the area again in February 2006. The travel plan forum have set up three walking buses and have just started to liaise with the local beat police to help with patrolling the area outside the school. The next School travel plan meeting is 3rd Feb 2006. If any of the residents would like to attend they are welcome to join us at the meeting. Further details of the meeting are available from Andy Culshaw, Safer Routes to School Officer, telephone either 01332 715146 or e-mail [andy.culshaw@derby.gov.uk](mailto:andy.culshaw@derby.gov.uk)

**5. Ref: 405034 – King George V Playfield, Littleover – raised 30.11.05**

**Responsible officer(s) for more information:**

Ken Richardson, Parks Officer, Commercial Services, telephone 716646

**Issue:**

A resident was concerned that the sign by the path across King George V playing fields said cycling is allowed and as a result pedestrians find it difficult to use the path. He was also concerned that the flowerbeds have been grassed over because he had been told there was no funding, but money is available to plant up other flower beds in the city.

**Previous key points / action taken:**

New item.

**Response on 16 November 2005**

A resident cyclist commented that some pedestrians make it difficult for cyclists to use the path because their dog leads are so long.

Councillor Care explained that the main cost of flower beds is the ongoing maintenance costs rather than the initial cost of the plants. The priority has been given to prime city centre locations rather than parks in the suburbs.

**Actions agreed:**

None.

**Update:**

As stated at the last meeting, the main cost of flower beds is the ongoing maintenance costs rather than the initial cost of the plants. The priority has been given to city centre locations rather than parks in the suburbs.



**6. Ref: 405007 – Parking problems, Devonshire Drive and East Avenue, Micklegate – raised 30.03.05**

**Responsible officer(s) for more information:**

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

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

**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.

**Previous key points / action taken:**

**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.

**June 2005** - the Police have given attention to this issue and have been visiting the area to enforce parking restrictions.

**September 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.

**November 2005** - Work is ongoing as part of Road Safety group carrying out surveys and ultimately drawing up a School Travel Plan for Ravensdale Infant and Junior School. Once the Travel Plan has been taken forward, consideration could be given to any work necessary to reinforce the travel plan.

**Response on 16 November 2005**

A resident explained how drivers continue to park and drive along pavements and recently he was nearly hit. He asked that officers visit the area and enforce the parking restrictions urgently to prevent a serious accident.

Councillor Winter agreed to inform the local Police officers and ask them to visit again.

**Actions agreed:**

Update on Council proposals to enforce parking.

Update progress to develop Ravensdale School Travel Plan

**Update:**

The Police have confirmed that the local beat officers will visit the area during school pickup time.

It is intended that the Council will take over responsibility from the Police for the enforcement of parking restrictions in July 2006. However, issues such as obstruction of the highway or hazardous parking will continue to be the responsibility of the Police.

Unfortunately, congestion caused by parking outside schools is a common problem. The only

long-term solution is to assist schools develop their own travel plan. We are currently working towards signing off the Ravensdale Schools Travel Plans by April 2006. School Travel Plans encourage parents, pupils, teachers and local residents and agencies to work together in partnership with the Council. The main aims of a travel plan are to :

- reduce congestion by promoting alternatives to the car for school journeys
- improve the safety of pupils and parents when travelling to school, especially those walking and cycling
- strengthen links between the school and local community.

The Ravensdale Travel Plans will then be developed over the coming years and we will monitor their progress. We will also continue to encourage parents and children to choose sustainable travel options to reduce car use.

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

**Responsible officer(s) for more information:**

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

**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.

**Previous key points / action taken:**

**November 2004** - 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.

**January 2005** - 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.

**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.

**June 2005** - 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.

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

**November 2005** - Councillors and residents may be aware that there was a fatal accident on Station Road on 20 October. We would like to offer our sympathy to relatives, friends and neighbours of the lady involved in the accident. The Police are investigating and at the moment we are not fully aware of the circumstances surrounding the accident. We were on site conducting the traffic count survey on the day of the accident and were not able to complete the survey. We will reschedule a survey and report back our findings to the area panel as soon as our investigations can be completed. We anticipate that a report will be available for either the January or March 2006 meeting.

#### **Response on 16 November 2005**

A resident referred to the recent fatality and asked if this tragic event would make it more likely a crossing will be installed? He explained that his son struggles to cross the road each day to get to school. He asked if pedestrian crossings are linked to the Safer Routes to School plans and if so, why cant more be done to get the local schools developing their plans.

Councillor Winter referred to the Pedestrian Crossing criteria and that unless the location in question achieves the criteria, a crossing will not be installed. She confirmed that accidents as well as amount and speed of traffic as well as number of pedestrians are all taken into account.

## Area Panel 4 – Community issues background information – 18 January 2005

---

It was confirmed that the survey work had resumed.

**Actions agreed:**

Update on travel plan progress with Ravensdale, Silverhill and Murray Park schools.  
Report back on result of survey and outcome

**Update:**

A report responding to the petition can be found in Item 6 on the agenda

**8. Ref: 405019 – Petition - Residents only parking, Warner Street, Mickleover – received 28.09.05**

**Responsible officer(s) for more information:**

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

**Issue:**

A petition was handed in at the meeting, requesting residents only parking on Warner Street in Mickleover. Individuals using local shops, businesses and the community centre use Warner Street as a place to park. It causes congestion, difficulty for residents wishing to park and danger to pedestrians and car users

**Previous key points / action taken:**

**November 2005** - We are still investigating the issue raised and will report back to the Area Panel 4 meeting on 18 January 2006.

**Response on 16 November 2005**

None.

**Actions agreed:**

Report back on result of investigation

**Update:**

A report responding to the petition can be found in Item 6 on the agenda

**9. Ref: 405030 – Housing development on Station Road, Mickleover – raised 30.11.05**

**Responsible officer(s) for more information:**

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

**Issue:**

Residents raised concern over the proposed development on Station Road, where two bungalows were to be demolished and replaced with flats. The panel were asked what they were doing to prevent the over development and destruction of Station Road. The Mickleover Councillors were asked to attend a residents meeting on 5 December 2005.

**Previous key points / action taken:**

New item.

**Response on 16 November 2005**

A resident raised concerns about a letter distributed by the Planners indicating a change to the application and asking for comments to be sent to the planners within 14 days. He commented that the 14 days would not be up until after the Planning Control meeting on 8 December when the application was due to be considered. He asked if the decision would be deferred to another meeting.

A resident asked what the Council has done to assess the overall impact to the surrounding area that the many small developments along Station Road have had and will have in the future.

A resident asked that members of Planning Control visit the site before making a decision.

Councillor Winter explained that she has visited the site and the surrounding area, and confirmed that she would be raising concerns at the planning meeting on 8 December. She stated that she too was extremely concerned about the amount of developments in the Mickleover area. She had spoken to Ian Woodhead about the recent letter asking for comments within 14 days and he had confirmed the application would still be considered on 8 December.

Councillor Troup urged any resident to make their views known directly to the Planners before the Planning Control meeting.

**Actions agreed:**

Respond to the request to outline the way the Council assesses the impact on an area caused by a variety of housing developments.

**Update:**

The application was withdrawn, although it is expected that another application will be submitted.

**10. 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, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 255020  
Julian DeMowbray, Group Leader Pollution Control, Environmental Health, telephone 715228

**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 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.

**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.

**Response on 16 November 2005**

Councillor care reported that the Airport is producing a Masterplan that will be out for consultation in about April 2006. It was suggested to ask the airport to attend a future meeting.

**Actions agreed:**

Invite East Midlands Airport to attend the meeting on 29 March 2006.

**Update:**

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](http://www.nottinghamema.com)



**11. Ref: 405027 – Recycling, all wards – raised 28.09.05**

**Responsible officer(s) for more information:**

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

**Issue:**

A Littleover resident asked if there were any studies being undertaken to extend what can be included in the recycling scheme, with particular reference to cardboard, rechargeable batteries and hazardous items such as florescent lights and batteries.

**Previous key points / action taken:**

**November 2005** - We are always looking at expanding the materials we collect at the kerbside and are mindful of changes that the packaging industry makes as well.

All plastic bottles are now included in the kerbside collections and there are also facilities for them at our recycling sites. Cardboard should be able to go into the brown bin from next year. We are currently building a facility to handle cardboard.

The operators of Raynesway are currently trialling containers for household batteries, and also florescent tubes.

Changes in legislation from Europe are making producers more responsible for their products and packaging, which will change the way things are collected and paid for in the future.

**Response on 16 November 2005**

A resident commented on continuing problems with fly tipping at the recycling site on Blagreaves Lane. It is regularly reported and while it is then cleared, fly tipping continues. Can this site be closed now there are additional door to door collections?

**Actions agreed:**

Investigate what is being fly tipped and respond with how the issue is being tackled.

**Update:**

This site is checked and litter picked every week. We are aware that approximately one month ago some black bags were dumped. Removing the recycling banks would mean that the site would be taken off the regular cleansing schedule and so could make the problem worse.

This site is well used by the public and we collect around half a tonne of recycling per week. We will continue to monitor the site. Propose to close.