

ETWALL AREA MEETING

21st January 2008

PRESENT:-

District Council Representatives

Councillor Lemmon (Chairman), Councillor Mrs. Plenderleith (Vice-Chairman) and Councillors Bale, Ford, Mrs. Hood, Mrs. Patten and Roberts.

F. McArdle (Chief Executive), P. Spencer (Democratic Services) and B. Jones (Helpdesk).

Derbyshire County Council Representatives

Councillor Ford.

D. Tysoe (County Secretary) and P. Leigh (Highways).

Derbyshire Constabulary

Sergeant A. Wright.

Parish Council/Meeting Representatives

N. Ireland (Etwall Parish Council), L. Nash (Findern Parish Council), T. Beresford (Foston and Scropton Parish Council), and L. Kolkman and G. Banton (Hilton Parish Council).

Members of the Public

B. Adams, S. Avery, F. Baston, K. Baston, J. Bates, J. Bilbie, P. Bilbie, M. Cramp, J. Degrave, I. Elliot, G. Green, D. Hindley, D. Holbrook, K. Holbrook, M. Jones, S. Savage, B. Smedley, D. Taylor, B. Walton-Knight, M. Walton, G. Wale.

EA/10. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence from the Meeting were received from District Councillor Mrs. Brown, County Councillor F. Hood, K. McIntyre (Derbyshire County Council), Mrs. Cowley (Egginton Parish Council), B. Payton and I. Smith (Etwall Parish Council), C. Thurman and R. Buxton (Hatton Parish Council), J. Clark, H. Hague, M. Littlejohn, Reverend Raynor and V. Stewart.

EA/11. **MINUTES**

The Minutes of the Etwall Area Meeting held on 21st November 2007 were noted.

EA/12. **CONSULTATION ON THE CORPORATE PLAN AND THE BUDGET**

The Area Meeting received a presentation from Frank McArdle, Chief Executive at the District Council. Initially, he explained the purpose of this consultation, to inform and consult on the draft key priorities and actions within the 2008/11 Corporate Plan and the Council's financial position and

budget proposals for 2008/09. A copy of the Corporate Plan had been circulated, together with a questionnaire to seek feedback and he urged residents to complete this and return it by 10th February 2008. Presentation slides had also been circulated, which the Chief Executive spoke to. He explained the Council's Vision and the six Corporate Plan themes, which emerged from extensive consultation with the community and stakeholders. Each year, the Council developed Corporate Plan priorities and actions for each of the themes and feedback was sought on this area.

The presentation then turned to the Council's budget proposals, with information provided on Council Tax and the sources of funding. The Chief Executive explained how resources were spent on Environmental Services, Community Services and Corporate Services. He then touched on the budget proposals for 2008/09, the cost pressures the Council was facing and the overall positive financial position of the District Council. Reference was made to the Council's improved Use of Resources rating and the open committee process on the budget, which the public could attend. He spoke about the ongoing efficiency savings being made by the Authority and the year-on-year improvements. The Council had a minimal amount of debt and its investments were earning interest. He closed by commending the Corporate Plan and sought residents' feedback on this consultation.

In response to a question from Mr. Walton-Knight, further information was provided about fees and charges.

EA/13. **CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chairman publicised two emergency planning exercises that were scheduled for 2008. He referred briefly to a scoping opinion for land at Etwall/Egginton and the District Council would take forward residents' views. In response to questions from Mr. Wale on this topic, the Chief Executive confirmed that there had been no approach from or discussions with Severn Trent Water on the scoping opinion. This consultation was at a very early stage and it would be wrong for the District Council to enter into discussions, as it would deal with this process as a planning authority, at the appropriate time. Mr. Wale also asked about a document from the East Midlands Development Agency on the multi-user rail study. This was not part of the planning process and the District Council had been consulted on it. It was noted that a number of the Members present served on the Council's Development Control Committee and were well placed to represent the north-west of the District.

The Chairman explained that information had been circulated on the new "in-vessel" composting scheme. This scheme had been introduced over the past 18 months and had proved to be extremely successful. The 18,000 properties on the existing "green waste" scheme were now being converted to the new scheme and details were provided of the additional materials that could be placed in the brown compost bin.

Mr. Cramp explained that he had approached staff at the Council and been advised that he could place cold ash in the compost bin. He noted that this was not included on the list of items circulated. Mr. Bates, a Hilton resident, explained the recycling arrangements in the City of Derby and he complained about the lack of information received about recycling services since his move

to South Derbyshire. The resident was asked to leave his contact details at the Helpdesk, so that this issue could be pursued.

The Chief Executive agreed to report to the next Meeting with details about the information given to new residents about recycling services.

The Chairman referred to the review of Area Meeting boundaries, discussed at the last Meeting. At other Area Meetings, a preference had been voiced for retaining the current arrangements. It was proposed to keep this matter under review and to work with Police and County Council colleagues.

EA/14. **REPORT BACK ON ISSUES RAISED AT THE LAST MEETING**

Mr. Tysoe, the County Secretary, was invited to provide an update on those issues referred to the County Council at the previous Meeting. A report was noted on the repairs to damaged grass verges at Ashgrove Lane, Egginton.

A detailed report was provided in response to the concerns about cars parking near to schools. Mr. Ireland of Etwall Parish Council pursued this, comparing schools to other businesses and he highlighted the different planning treatment about provision of additional parking. After some discussion, it was clarified that school developments did include extra parking for staff, but there was no requirement to provide parking for pupils or parents.

Concerns were also voiced by representatives of Hatton and Hilton on parking issues affecting schools in those areas. The Chairman noted that this issue would not go away and a solution was needed. Enforcement was discussed and Police Community Support Officers had provided a presence at the Heathfield School in Hatton. A resident explained a joint initiative from the local school and the Parish Council, to publicise the problems in Hatton. County Councillor Ford noted this was a difficult issue faced by many schools. He offered to seek a policy statement from the County Council and reminded of the decriminalisation of parking enforcement, which would lead to more wardens and a possible deterrent through the use of fixed penalty notices. Mrs. Kolkman referred to the “walk to school” scheme in Hilton, but given the size of this Primary School many pupils were still arriving by car. Improvements to public transport and the use of fixed penalty notices were also touched upon.

Mr. Ireland repeated his concerns that there was no compulsory parking provision for students at schools. The current bus services were not sufficient in terms of capacity or timing for sixth form students and those attending examinations. It was noted that improvements to bus services had been requested as part of the proposed Etwall Leisure Centre development. Another resident suggested providing parking just outside the Village framework, so that students could then walk to school. The loss of the Community Transport Scheme was also raised.

A report was provided following the discussion at the last Meeting, about waste disposal site plans in South Derbyshire. Mr. Wale voiced his concerns about the consultation process and the Chairman agreed, stating particularly the need for local Ward Members to be informed. Mrs. Kolkman voiced similar criticism about the scoping report for the site at Etwall/Egginton. There were potential implications for Hilton Village, dependent upon the use

of this site. She confirmed that Hilton Parish Council was preparing a report to the District Council on the Scoping Report. County Councillor Ford requested that other adjacent parishes also be kept informed of progress with the Scoping Report.

Mr. Tysoe then updated a report about flooding problems along the A516. Mr. Ireland noted that Highways Officers had visited this area recently and it was hoped this would address the current problems. Mr. Wale understood that an accident had taken place at this location, which might have been due in part to the flooding. The Chairman provided further information about the flooding of this section of the A516, near to Dee Lane. Mr. Ireland added that there might be some gullies adjacent to hedgerows that were in need of cleansing. Councillor Mrs. Patten spoke about a flooding problem on Heage Lane and the need for the County Council to consider where it sited flood warning signs. Mrs. Smedley also complained about the flooding of the Sustrans multi-user route in the area of the underpass for the Etwall bypass.

Pete Leigh of Derbyshire County Council agreed to look into these matters and a report would be provided to the next Meeting.

EA/15. **PUBLIC QUESTION TIME AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE LOCAL DISCUSSION ITEMS**

It was reported that Mr. Wale had given notice of two questions and these were read by the Chairman, together with the responses received from the District and County Councils. The first issue concerned changes to waste disposal legislation, particularly about fluorescent tubes and televisions. A Hilton resident pursued this issue commenting about the implications of disposing of certain items by landfill. Mr. Wale referred to recent press articles. Residents should take these items to the Civic amenity site for recycling, but he noted that residents in the north-west of the District had to travel to a site in Newhall, unless they used the City Council's facility at Raynesway. The Chairman confirmed that there were reciprocal arrangements with both Derby City and East Staffordshire Borough Councils for the use of civic amenity sites. It was hoped that the District Council would monitor this waste disposal issue and it was requested that the District Council's Members lobby on this matter.

The Chairman agreed to refer this matter for consideration at the Environmental and Development Services Committee.

It was noted that mercury was used in various items including rechargeable batteries. Many countries now made arrangements for the recycling of mercury, as there was a predicted worldwide shortage of it. The Chairman advised that the District Council was seeking tenders for its recycling contract and inviting the market to come back with innovative ideas. It was noted that in France, supermarkets had battery recycling points. A resident suggested having a recycling receptacle fitted to the side of refuse vehicles. Mr. Cramp of Hatton added that last year, he had suggested placing battery recycling banks in rural post offices. The Chief Executive appreciated the feedback and assured those present that the issue would be pursued. The Chairman also reported on Mr. Wale's other question about the County Council's former Area Meeting arrangements and the revised arrangements for governor appointments.

Mr. Wale then referred to the out-reach sessions for re-registration of the “Gold Card” travel passes. He explained the difficulties experienced and confirmed the details of a further photograph session to be held in Etwall. He had prepared an additional poster to publicise the details of this session and copies would be available from him after the Meeting.

Mr. Banton of Hilton Parish Council requested an alternate recycling centre for the Village. This issue had been raised previously and there appeared to be no progress. Another resident questioned whether there was a schedule for emptying the recycling bins and whether this could be improved. This site was overloaded frequently and there was a particular problem at Christmas. There was a consensus that the size of this recycling facility was insufficient to meet demand. The Chief Executive explained that, as the Council had no suitable land of its own, it would need to work in partnership with the private sector, possibly through a Section 106 planning agreement to identify a suitable site. It was questioned whether signage could be provided of the nearest alternate recycling facilities. Councillor Mrs. Patten requested that local Members be kept informed of developments. Councillor Ford was proud of the District Council’s recycling achievements and he referred to the review of the contracts for recycling. When the banks were full, residents were urged to telephone the District Council, so that arrangements could be made to empty them. Mrs. Kolkman added that when waste was left at the side of overflowing recycling banks, this became classed as waste and had to be sent to landfill. There were also concerns about commercial waste being left at this facility.

Councillor Mrs. Plenderleith referred to the adoption of drains and used a specific example where a drain had collapsed. She questioned the County Council’s policy regarding the adoption of drains. Mr. Leigh of the County Highways Department confirmed that developers were encouraged to make up highways and drains to an adoptable standard, so that they could be adopted by the County Council. Until such time as drains were adopted, the responsibility remained with the developer for maintenance. Mrs. Plenderleith replied that the development of Shady Grove in Hilton took place some 40 years ago, but the drains had never been adopted. Mr. Ireland questioned whether such developers could be refused planning consent for further developments, but it was confirmed that each planning application had to be determined on its own merits. The Chief Executive added that normally, developers looked to complete sites and have the roads and drains adopted. He did not think that the local planning authority could influence this matter.

A further issue in Hilton was signage along the Mease. There were a number of developer notices placed on the street light columns, in one case obscuring a speed limit sign. This did not appear to be regulated. Mr. Leigh confirmed the arrangements in place where developers could apply to display temporary signage. However, the majority did not make such application and it was a matter for the County Council to remove signs if they obscured traffic signage.

J. LEMMON

CHAIRMAN

The Meeting terminated 8.35 p.m.

Page 5 of 5