

JOINT HIGHWAYS FORUM

11th December 2008

PRESENT:-

Representatives of South Derbyshire District Council

Councillors Bladen (Chairman), Mrs. Farrington, Lane, Rhind, Southerd and Mrs. Wheeler.

Representatives of Derbyshire County Council

Councillors Jones and Mrs. Lauro.

Officers

South Derbyshire District Council

M. Alflat (Director of Community Services), M. Chell (Technical Administration Manager) and D. Townsend (Democratic Services Officer).

Derbyshire County Council

J. Seymour (Policy and Programmes Manager).

Parish Council Representatives

G. H. Fowler (Church Broughton Parish Council), C. Childs (Coton-in-the-Elms Parish Council), P. Woolrich (Egginton Parish Council), H. Coyle (Elvaston Parish Council), N. B. Ireland and J. Patten (Etwall Parish Council), T. Beresford (Foston and Scropton Parish Council), C. Dobson (Hartshorne Parish Council), M. Cramp (Hatton Parish Council), R. Paulson (Repton Parish Council) and R. Statham (Woodville Parish Council),

JHF/5. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence from the Meeting were received from M. Todd, M.P., Councillors Bambrick, Ford, Harrison, Mrs. Lane and Taylor (South Derbyshire District Council), L. Brown and B. Cowley (Egginton Parish Council), C. Thurman (Hatton Parish Council) and L. Kolkman (Hilton Parish Council).

JHF/6. **MINUTES**

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 26th June 2008 were received. It was noted that C. Dobson (Hartshorne Parish Council) was also in attendance.

It was requested that J. Waite (Derbyshire County Council Area Network Manager) be asked to contact Coton-in-the-Elms Parish Council with regard to further signage, and also to provide further information to the next Meeting on the Hilton bypass, as per Minute No. JHF/3.

An update was also given on the relief road around Woodville, which was currently being maintained by the developer. However, the Parish Council had received notice that the developer was not able to grit this area during adverse weather conditions. It was also apparent that Leicestershire County

Council was gritting it's section, however, Derbyshire County Council were not.

J. Seymour agreed to investigate this and report back to the next Meeting.

Further to Minute No. JHF/3, it was reported that there had been no further information with regard to the third traffic calming hump in Hilton.

J. Seymour agreed to look into this and report back to the next Meeting.

JHF/7. **COUNTY COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO THE REGIONAL SPATIAL STRATEGY**

J. Seymour (Derbyshire County Council – Policy and Programmes Manager) gave an overview of his role within Derbyshire County Council.

He advised those present that spatial planning involved the current land use planning system, which revolved around the Regional Plan. He advised that a draft plan existed for the East Midlands, and Central Government had proposed certain changes. The Regional Plan should be in place in 2009. He advised that within the strategy, many pressures had to be taken into account, for example, the provision of housing and the Regional Transport Strategy. In addition there was also the issue of the growing population, and the increase in vehicular movements.

It was asked if the reintroduction of the train line at Drakelow (the Ivanhoe Line) could be considered. J. Seymour responded that Central Government was proposing that local authorities looked at the strategic transport structure as a totally separate issue. It was important that they considered the challenges, what was required, and then considered the solution. East Midlands Region needed to look at their needs and requirements and then consider the role of the railway.

JHF/8. **ROAD INFRASTRUCTURE**

J. Seymour advised that the highways and transport capital budget was currently £25 million per year. More than half of this was spent on maintaining existing networks and the remainder was thinly spread around the County of Derbyshire. He added that road safety and reduction of casualties on the roads were high priorities.

With regard to major schemes, he advised that it was very unusual for expensive schemes to be delivered, due to pressures on the budget. However, a separate budget had occasionally been made available from Central Government for major schemes in excess of £5 million. Submissions for major schemes would be made by February 2009. There were no major schemes planned at the moment and he confirmed that the completion of the Woodville to Swadlincote relief road was still an aspiration, but not planned at present.

The Region was currently considering an allocation of money to go to housing market areas for development of the road infrastructure.

It was asked if the County Council had started to look at the roads within the Urban Core that would be affected by future housing development. J. Seymour responded that the County Council was not able to carry this out

with any great precision in Swadlincote as no modelling tool existed, and they were relying on Officer knowledge. They were expecting to look at this more in detail in the near future.

It was suggested that most development of roads in South Derbyshire had been the result of planning gain. However, the County Council seemed to be reluctant to carry out schemes, even when developer contributions were available. J. Seymour responded that the County Council might not have been so successful at this, but had tried to encourage developers into Derbyshire, and had not asked for as large contributions as they should have. However, this was now changing, and the County was looking to develop its understanding of what was required from developer contributions.

It was pointed out that the link between the A511 and the A50 needed to be considered strategically (across county boundaries). J. Seymour responded that the County Council needed to consider the problem and minimise the effect on the highways network.

In response to a question, J. Seymour provided an update on the completion of the relief road (Occupation Road). It was reported that the County Council understood the requirement for this to be completed, and was looking at a funding package. However, there were no timescales available at the current time. An update was also given on the Hatton bypass, and it was reported that there were currently no plans for this scheme. The County Council had looked at the feasibility, but it was not a scheme that was being promoted. Councillor Mrs. Wheeler responded that EMDA was dealing with a feasibility study for this.

It was asked if the County Council had any influence within the public transport sector, i.e. bus and train companies. J. Seymour responded that the County had very little authority within this area. However it did consider looking at public transport in conjunction with future developments attractive to them. The Chairman added that it was very difficult to look at strategic transport when there was no influence or partnership with privately-owned transport companies.

It was suggested that local transport operators be invited to the next Meeting.

JHC/9. **DEVELOPMENTS SURROUNDING FINDERN**

J. Seymour reported that development surrounding Findern would emerge from the Local Development Framework and although there was potential for development, no decisions had as yet been made. The Director of Community Services also advised that the outcome of the conjoined inquiry would be made public shortly, which would provide further information on any future development.

JHC/10. **SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE DISCUSSION ITEMS**

The following items were suggested:

- Gritting responsibilities of the County Council.
- Public transport operators – the effect of new homes on their policies, plus clarification of the commercial reasons for running route and placing of bus stops.

(It was requested that M. Todd M.P. be present for this item if possible).

- How Government rail franchises impact on local services (it was suggested that the Rail Policy Officer be invited to attend if this item took place).
- The aspirations of the Highways Agency within South Derbyshire District.

JHC/11. **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

To be confirmed.

J. BLADEN

CHAIRMAN

The Meeting terminated at 11.35 a.m.