

ETWALL AREA MEETING

30th January 2007

**PRESENT:-**

**District Council Representatives**

Councillor Whyman M.B.E. (Chair), Councillor Bale (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Ford, Hood, Lemmon, Mrs. Littlejohn and Mrs. Wheeler.

M. Alflat (Director of Community Services), P. Spencer (Democratic Services) and B. Jones (Helpdesk).

**Derbyshire County Council Representatives**

Councillors Ford and Hood.

D. Tysoe (County Secretary) and A. Bond (Democratic Services).

**Derbyshire Constabulary**

Sergeant A. Wright.

**Council for Voluntary Services**

E. Palmer.

**Parish Council/Meeting Representatives**

C. Foord (Burnaston Parish Council), B. Cowley (Egginton Parish Council), N. Ireland and B. Payton (Etwall Parish Council), L. Nash (Findern Parish Council), C. Thurman (Hatton Parish Council) and L. Kolkman (Hilton Parish Council).

**Members of the Public**

M. Cramp, G. Green, K. Holbrook, K. James, D. Jones, A. Plenderleith, A. Roberts, G. Wale.

EA/19. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence from the Meeting were received from District Councillors Mrs. Hood and Mrs. Walton, R. Buxton (Hatton Parish Council), G. Banton (Hilton Parish Council), Reverend S. Rayner and R. Mathews.

EA/20. **MINUTES**

The Minutes of the Etwall Area Meeting held on 7th December 2006 were noted subject to the following amendments:-

The correct spelling was provided of the surname of Mr. Mathews, who had submitted apologies for the previous meeting and it was clarified that the Catherine Jonathon Playing Field in Egginton had been referred to at that Meeting.

Under Minute No. EA/14 – It was clarified that the replacement bridge referred to was over the A38 trunk road. Mrs. Cowley provided an update

with regard to the problems in Ashgrove Lane, Egginton, due to vehicles running over the verge. She explained that wide vehicles travelling along this narrow lane had little option but to drive over the verge.

**It was agreed to write to Derbyshire County Council's Highways Department seeking a solution and requesting a report back to the next Area Meeting.**

It was also clarified that the weight-restricted area in Hatton was in Scropton Road rather than Station Road.

Mrs. Kolkman gave an update on the information received about Section 106 Agreements associated with developments in Hilton. She clarified the development that this enquiry had related to and had been in discussions with the Head of Planning Services. However, she felt that the matter was still not resolved. The Chair advised that he had pursued this issue through the Council's policy committees and with its Management Team. He gave an update on plans, through the Local Development Framework, to introduce such policies and his efforts to secure arrangements informally in the meantime.

At the last Meeting there had been discussions about the "Pub Watch" initiative and problems at a particular public house in Hatton. The Chair felt that this issue was more appropriate for the Safer Neighbourhood meeting and offered to pursue it accordingly.

#### EA/21. **REPORT BACK ON ISSUES RAISED AT THE LAST MEETING**

The Chair provided further information on recycling issues raised at the last Meeting and reported the feedback received from the Head of Planning Services. The Chair of Hilton Parish Council confirmed the site in question that the enquiry had related to. **After further discussion it was agreed to raise this matter at a meeting in Hilton the following evening.**

Concerns about speeding traffic in the Long Lane/Dalbury area had been raised at the previous meeting. Councillor Bale reported that this matter was ongoing and he was satisfied at present.

A further report was provided on the problems experienced at a public house in Hatton. It had been questioned if the "Pub Watch" initiative could be reinstated and Sergeant Wright agreed to pursue this further. Mr. Thurman of Hatton Parish Council was aware of specialist Police Officers, who had powers to act in such cases. He intended to raise this issue at the local Safer Neighbourhood meeting and the Chair agreed to liaise with him after the meeting to advise of his research on this matter.

The Head of Planning Services had provided a report on parking requirements at schools. In discussing this matter, reference was made to a new school development in Hilton and whether Derbyshire County Council was likely to provide a turning head for the new school block. Mr. Ireland felt the District Council should make appropriate representations when it was consulted on applications being determined by the Derbyshire County Council. It was noted that not all secondary schools were the responsibility of the County Council and an example of this was the John Port School in Etwall, which

was a foundation school. There was a need to consider each individual site and application on its own merits.

**It was agreed to write to Derbyshire County Council requesting consideration of enhanced parking provision for students and parents when determining applications for new school buildings and extensions.**

An update was provided on the assistance from Planning Services following the request from Egginton Church representatives for additional external lighting. A report had also been provided by the Head of Planning Services about the use of Section 106 monies associated with development of a site at Station Road, Etwall. The Chair explained that for residential developments of five or more units or industrial developments above a certain size, developers would be required to make a contribution towards health and education provision. He referred to the recently approved protocol on such agreements and gave examples of the benefits that could be secured, related to development.

Councillor Lemmon confirmed that the new protocol would come into force on 1st February 2007. The Chair added that for some time, Members had sought a codified process for determining Section 106 Agreements. He felt that local Members should have an input, given their local knowledge of the potential impact of development. This new protocol gave a trigger for the Council to talk to the developer, to see if impacts could be ameliorated. He also explained how this protocol would work separately from the determination of the planning application.

Mr. Ireland questioned when local parish councils or schools would be invited to contribute to the process. The Chair confirmed there was a wish to give local representatives the opportunity to have an input. The local Ward Member would act as the link to the community, but it was noted that parish councils were also a statutory consultee for planning applications and they could take the initiative. Further clarification was provided on how this would operate, in response to a question from Mrs. Kolkman. She considered that the District Council did not listen to local views. The Chair hoped that this was not the case and he gave an outline of the various factors that had to be weighed, when determining planning applications. It was noted that 95% of applications were dealt with under delegated powers. Councillor Mrs. Littlejohn reminded those present that District Councillors were able to request such delegated matters to be referred for Member determination at the Development Control Committee. Councillor Bale added that this protocol also applied to commercial developments of 1,000 square metres or more. The Chair explained that the District Council was viewed as an exemplar by the County Council for the way it undertook the development control process.

**It was agreed that if the Section 106 Protocol was now in the public domain, copies be circulated to all parish councils and parish meetings in South Derbyshire.**

A report had been provided by the Head of Planning Services, following the concerns about traffic exiting from Witham Close onto Egginton Road in Hilton. Mrs. Kolkman described the problems being experienced, due to the lack of a pavement in this area, which meant that pedestrians were having to walk in the road. There was a Tesco store in the vicinity and traffic concerns,

including larger vehicles and poor visibility at this location. **It was agreed to continue monitoring this problem.**

At the last Meeting, there had been a discussion about the County Council's call centre and the confusion caused for residents through different departmental incident numbers. Mr. Cramp provided further information on this problem and the lack of effective transfer of enquiries from the contact centre to other departments. The Chair read the reply received from Derbyshire County Council.

**The County Secretary was asked to refer this matter back to Derbyshire County Council for further consideration.**

A report was also provided on the abuse of weight restrictions in Hilton and at Scropton Road in Hatton. The Chair referred to the local Speed Watch Initiative and it was suggested that representatives of Hatton Parish Council pass information to the County Council on the traffic problems experienced at Scropton Road, during peak times.

EA/22. **COUNCIL FOR VOLUNTARY SERVICES (CVS) – SOCIAL CAR SCHEME**

The Area Meeting received a presentation from Ellen Palmer about the CVS Social Car Scheme. An outline was given of the Scheme, which assisted clients who experienced difficulties in getting to appointments and were not able to access public transport. At the CVS offices, there was a contact who co-ordinated the 38 volunteers across South Derbyshire. There was a known shortfall in volunteers in the north-west of the District and it was hoped that further volunteers could be attracted to the scheme. Leaflets were available giving more information on the project. Car owners who acted as volunteers would be paid 40p per mile for their expenses. A question was submitted on insurance liability and the resident was asked to contact the CVS for further information on this.

**It was agreed that copies of the information leaflet be distributed by the CVS to all parish councils and meetings throughout South Derbyshire.**

EA/23. **PUBLIC QUESTION TIME AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE LOCAL DISCUSSION ITEMS**

Mrs. Cowley of Egginton referred to the "Ideas Into Action" feedback and particularly the provision of spring bulbs. It was questioned whether any additional bulbs could be obtained, but it was considered it might be too late to plant them for this year.

Mr. Foord of Burnaston referred to travellers occupying land at Green Lane and spoke of the concerns for local residents. He had been in touch with the local authorities and was assured that appropriate action was being taken. As there were designated sites within South Derbyshire, he questioned why the Constabulary could not move travellers on more speedily. Mark Alflat, Director of Community Services at the District Council gave a brief summary of the legal position. He spoke about the site provision, the reform of legislation in place and the change in the law, which meant the process could now take between three and four weeks to move travellers on. County Councillor Hood confirmed that its Liaison Officer had visited this site as travellers' vehicles were blocking a safety access.

Mr. Thurman referred to the earlier discussions on the Section 106 Protocol and he asked about the timing of negotiations. The Chair explained that for larger applications, discussions took place between the developer and Officers before the matter was referred to committee. He gave further information about the new protocol. Councillor Ford commented that the protocol now gave a clear message to developers on the Council's expectations. The Director of Community Services explained that compared to many local authorities, the Council achieved significant contributions from developers through its negotiations. The Chair reminded of historic problems from developers maximising site value and leaving residual problems for the community. This would not happen in the future and developers must now work in partnership with the community and the District Council.

Councillor Ford voiced his thanks for assistance to resolve traveller problems in Findern and it was requested that these thanks be conveyed to both the District and County Council Officers involved.

Mr. Cramp referred to the reinstatement of the refuse freighter service, but he felt that this service had not been discontinued. He gave a list of those items that could not be placed in the freighter and these items tended to be the ones fly tipped around the District. It was clarified that the Parish Council had funded the refuse freighter service in recent years. The District Council also had a bulky collection service, although a charge was levied to residents using this service. **The Chair offered to take this issue back to the District Council and would report back to a future area Meeting.**

The Director of Community Services agreed with the idea to "join up" services, but he explained why some things could not be collected on safety grounds. He spoke about the lobbying being undertaken by the District Council for another Civic Amenity site within South Derbyshire. The Council had listened to the community's feedback through the "Ideas Into Action" initiative. Funding for the refuse freighter service had been reinstated and parish councils would no longer have to pay, unless they wanted additional visits. Questions were submitted on the frequency and the areas that the freighter visited.

**It was agreed to circulate a map and frequency details with the Minutes of the Area Meeting. It was requested that a copy of this information be passed to all Members.**

The possibility of varying the freighter service, so that it could visit a larger number of settlements was also being considered. Mr. Ireland noted this idea, but he was mindful of the vehicle's capacity, which meant that only two loads could be collected on a typical morning's visit.

EA/24. **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The date and venue of the next Etwall Area Meeting would be confirmed in due course.

EA/25. **RESPONDING TO YOUR VIEWS**

The Area Meeting received a report about the consultation undertaken with local people, on improvements they wanted to services and to South

Derbyshire as a place to live. The Council had, in January 2006, asked the public to prioritise some of the ideas being considered for inclusion in the Corporate Plan. In October 2006, ideas were requested from the public through the initiative “Ideas into Action”.

The Area Meeting was advised that the Corporate Plan 2006/09 had six themes and the Council had acted on the proposals prioritised by the public. The most significant issues identified by the public for action were :

- Litter/Cleanliness
- Graffiti
- Better recycling facilities/collections
- Untidy sites
- More trees, flowers and spring bulbs
- Highway maintenance and improvements
- Support for Neighbourhood Watch
- Better facilities for children and young people.

The report detailed the suggestions where immediate action had been taken by the Council. These included action to clear litter from private land, to remove prominent graffiti where it was visible to the public and the Council had launched a grant scheme for parish councils, to plant spring bulbs or other planting to improve the look of public areas. The Council was working with Derbyshire County Council, to seek improved access to civic amenity sites.

Financial support would be provided to Rosliston, who would represent South Derbyshire in the national Britain in Bloom competition in 2007. The Council would also contribute to an urban landscape scheme, promoted by Groundwork and the Parish Council in Melbourne.

Mr. Cramp referred to methods of weed control and there was a discussion on the arrangements for public rights of way and for footways at the side of the highway. The non-selective weed killing chemicals could not be used in certain locations. Mr. Cramp referred to a specific site in Hatton where conflicting advice had been received.

**It was agreed to investigate this matter and to report back to the next Area Meeting.**

The Chair thanked Mr. Ireland and other representatives present for their feedback during an earlier budget consultation, which had led to the “Ideas Into Action” initiative. He reminded that previously, the consultation was not considered to be early enough. This process would be refined even further for future years. The Chair also publicised the forthcoming Hatton Safer Neighbourhood Meeting.

**It was agreed that the report be noted.**

B. WHYMAN M.B.E.

CHAIR

The Meeting terminated at 8.25 p.m.

Page 6 of 6