

**RUSHEY MEAD COMMUNITY MEETING  
TUESDAY, 27 FEBRUARY 2018**

**Harrison Road Methodist Church Hall, Harrison Road, Leicester LE4 6QN.**

Present:  
Councillor Willmott (Chair)  
Councillor Patel

<b>NO</b>	<b><u>ITEM</u></b>	<b><u>ACTION REQUESTED AT MEETING</u></b>
<b>53.</b>	<b>INTRODUCTIONS</b>	Councillor Willmott as Chair, welcomed everyone to the meeting and introductions were given.
<b>54.</b>	<b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b>	<p>Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Clair who was in another meeting. The City Mayor, and the Councillor Kirk Master, Assistant City Mayor for Neighbourhood Services had been invited but had also sent their apologies.</p> <p>An apology for absence was also received from Lee Warner, the Head of Neighbourhood Services.</p>
<b>55.</b>	<b>ACTION LOG OF PREVIOUS MEETING</b>	<p>Members of the community were asked to note the following progress on actions:</p> <p><b>Pavement Parking</b> – an update on the Harrison Road Parking Scheme would be provided during the course of the meeting. A resident complained that no action was being taken about parking problems. Councillors explained that it took a long time to implement changes of this nature; there was a legal procedure to go through. However it could be seen that improvements made in Braemar Drive were working very well.</p> <p><b>Request for larger litter bins</b> – it was reported that officers were dealing with this request and were waiting for safety equipment and for the ground conditions to improve.</p> <p><b>Attendance of Councillor Clair</b> - some members of the community expressed strong concerns and dissatisfaction that Councillor Clair was not present. Councillors reiterated that Councillor Clair had submitted his apologies as he had another meeting to attend. The Chair was asked to report the attendees' concerns to Labour Group as it was the second meeting that Councillor Clair had not attended. The Chair agreed to forward those concerns as requested</p>

but said he was reluctant to hold discussions about someone who was not present. **Action:** Councillor Willmott

**Library books** – an attendee expressed dissatisfaction that his concern expressed at the previous meeting, about the Council paying too much for library books had not been included in the action log, but it was pointed out that this had been recorded under item 49: Transforming Neighbourhood Services Update. In response to a further concern from the attendee, the Chair suggested that he might wish to ask the question at full council.

### **Rushey Mead Library and Recreation Centre**

The Chair read out an update from the Head of Neighbourhood Services which reported that the decision to move the library services into the Recreation Centre was taken in January 2017. Three options for changes to the Centre had been made available for members of the community to view and comment on last year. All comments received had been taken into consideration in order to draw up final plans for the works. Plans with drawings and comments would be made available during week commencing 12 March.

It was not known when the work would start. Councillors had asked the Head of Neighbourhood Services but had not been given that information.

Attendees expressed a number of concerns and raised questions. including the following:

- It did not make sense to spend over £3m on the Haymarket theatre, when it would be competing against another local theatre.
- Residents were not being listened to or supported – Councillors understood the residents’ frustration but he and Councillor Patel had worked hard to support local issues and had challenged the City Mayor and Executive.
- What were the guidelines for councillors to respond to emails and what was the procedure if a response wasn’t sent? The Chair stated that the Rushey Mead Councillors had received hundreds of emails relating to the library, and they tried to

respond to them all. However, it was deemed a response was not required if they were only copied into an email, as the response was required from the main recipient. A complaint against a councillor for not replying to an email, should be sent to the Chief Whip.

- Councillor Master, the Assistant City Mayor was taking into account the views of the user groups but he had not sought the views of other residents.
- The people responsible for taking the decision had attended the opening of the new Belgrave Neighbourhood Centre but were avoiding Rushey Mead residents.
- Residents were not being given any updates from the Councillors. The Chair stated that they had not been given any updates themselves until earlier that day.
- A resident questioned what would happen to the library if it closed. The Chair explained that the normal process would be for the building to be offered to other council departments and if there was no take up, the building would be sold. The council's duty would be to seek best value. In response to queries as to whether the building might be sold to a religious organisation, Councillor Patel stated she had seen it written down that the library would not be sold to a religious or faith organisation.
- Why did Leicester not hold a referendum about changing to the Mayoral system? Councillors responded that they did not want to debate that issue at a community meeting, but members of the public could challenge such decisions through a petition process.
- A feasibility study had previously been requested. Councillors responded that they had tried to access funding to carry out a feasibility study and Councillor Willmott had raised a question at Council, but the decision had been taken and the Assistant City Mayor would not change his mind.
- Could there be another public meeting with all the relevant officers and decision makers present? The Chair responded that Councillors could only invite

		<p>but could not enforce attendance, but the request for a public meeting would be passed on. <b>Action:</b> The Community Engagement Officer / Ward Councillors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Councillors stated that they understood the strength of feeling and had worked very hard on this issue. They were sorry that they had been unable to change the plans for the merger but would continue to keep trying. In the meantime, the community were urged to work together and remain united.</li> </ul>
56.	<b>HARRISON ROAD PARKING SCHEME UPDATE</b>	<p>Attendees were asked to note an update from James Whelan, Transport Development Officer. Points made included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The scheme included streets in the Melton Road and Harrison Road area.</li> <li>• The work had been given to external consultants; the proposals had not yet been received.</li> <li>• The aim was to increase parking and to make junctions safer. It was also hoped to increase parking for shoppers without any detrimental impact on residents.</li> <li>• The Consultants fee was likely to cost approximately £30,000, but they would not be paid until the work was concluded. The Chair added that Councillors supported the use of Consultants. The work needed doing as numerous complaints had been received about parking issues, but there were no officers to do that work.</li> <li>• The plans for the work may be put out for public consultation by the end of the year.</li> </ul> <p>Comments were made that the problem would be eased by the removal of garage businesses on Harrison Road. Councillors explained that some of the garages in the area had been granted planning permission up to 50 years ago and that could not be changed. Councillor Patel stated that they had asked the City Mayor if some of the businesses could be moved into a Business Park so that the properties could be used to provide residential homes. The Chair thanked James for the update.</p>
57.	<b>CITY WARDEN UPDATE</b>	<p>The City Warden was not present at the meeting; he and other Wardens had been temporarily assigned to the site on Hinckley Road where there had been a fatal explosion.</p>

**58. LOCAL POLICING UPDATE**

Attendees were asked to note an update from Police Sergeant 2210 Yusuf Nagdi . Points made included the following:

In the last three months the crime statistics were as follows:

Burglary from dwellings:	28
Burglaries – on dwellings	18
Robberies	11
Theft of and from vehicles	19

The current Police priority was to tackle burglaries from dwellings; a dedicated Police vehicle was on the streets every evening in the Rushey Mead Ward. Officers had visited every house on those streets which were deemed to be susceptible to being burgled, giving crime protection advice.

Questions and concerns raised from attendees included the following:

- Complaints had been made relating to people drinking alcohol on Cossington Park. PS Nagdi responded that Cossington Park had previously been a key priority for the Police in Belgrave. A covered bench had been removed which had resulted in a very significant reduction in the number of reported incidences. However, when the weather improved it was anticipated that the number of incidences would increase and the Police were planning to meet up with community partners to tackle the issue.
- PS Nagdi was asked for a range of different statistics relating to crime in the ward and stated that he didn't have that information to hand, but if he knew what was required, he could bring those statistics to future meetings. **Action** Councillors to liaise with PS Nagdi re the reporting of statistics at future meetings.
- Neighbourhood Watch – residents were interested in starting up the Neighbourhood Watch again; there had been an incident in Lockerbie Avenue and residents had been frightened to call the Police. A suitable venue was sought to hold the meetings.

PS Nagdi explained that beat surgeries were

		<p>advertised on the internet. The Police would be happy to come along to meetings wherever possible (unless there was an emergency). They would also carry out leaflet drops advertising Neighbourhood Watch Groups.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residents were urged to report incidences to the Police; such reports helped him to target officers to where they were most needed.</li> <li>• Attendees quoted examples of where crimes were reported and nothing happened. PS Nagdi stated on average, there were six officers on duty in Rushey Mead and Belgrave. On 27 February (the day of the meeting) there had been four officers in the area as two had been working on scene preservation duties at the site of the fatal explosion on Hinckley Road.</li> <li>• Councillor Patel commented on a meeting she had held with a resident in one of the parks, to look at areas of concern and suggested that it would be helpful to do this again but with the Police present. PS Nagdi commented that the Police would be happy to attend and other partners, including Parks Officers, the City Warden, Bharat Football Club and Councillors would be invited. <b>Action</b> : Community Engagement Officer</li> <li>• A request was made for an invitation for Lord Bach, the Police and Crime Commissioner to attend a future Rushey Mead Community Meeting. The Chair agreed to send an invitation to Lord Bach. <b>Action:</b> Councillor Willmott.</li> </ul>
59.	<b>COMMUNITY MEETING BUDGET</b>	Attendees were asked to note an update on the community meeting budget. The Community Engagement Officer reported that since the previous ward meeting, seven applications had been supported totalling £6308.00. There was a balance remaining of £4561.00 but Councillors had some applications and committed spends to address.
60.	<b>ANY OTHER BUSINESS</b>	<p>With the sanction of the Chair, attendees raised a number of questions and comments, which included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns were raised relating to delays in receiving responses to questions for Councillors. Councillors said that answers were received but they were not always the answer they hoped for. In</li> </ul>

		<p>addition, Councillors did not have the system of Member Support they used to receive and they had to deal themselves with the many queries they received.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern was raised relating to a response that the Assistant City Mayor for Neighbourhood Services' was said to have given to a supplementary question raised by Councillor Wilmott at full Council. There was some uncertainty as to the actual response and the Chair said he would look into this. <b>Action:</b> Councillor Willmott</li> <li>• Issues were reported relating to parking on Woodbridge Road, which were heightened on Saturdays. There were also parking problems by the Owl and the Pussy Cat Public House. <b>Action:</b> Community Engagement Officer to report to Highways.</li> <li>• Concerns were expressed that the junction on Melton Road / Checketts Road/ Marfitt Street was hazardous and it was suggested that the traffic lights needed a priority right hand turn to protect the safety of pedestrians trying to cross the road. <b>Action:</b> Community Engagement Officer to report to Highways.</li> <li>• A request was made for lighting for the gym on Rushey Mead park. The attendee was advised that this would be expensive and there may not be sufficient funds in the ward community budget to pay for the work.</li> <li>• Problems with dog fouling around the Trevino Drive area were reported. <b>Action:</b> Community Engagement Officer to report to the City Warden. Attendees were also requested to report the problem directly to their City Warden.</li> <li>• Councillors were asked whether the City Council carried out any preventative work in relation to littering. It was confirmed that prevention was an important aspect of the City Wardens' work and they also organised community litter picks.</li> </ul>
61.	<b>CLOSE OF MEETING</b>	The meeting closed at 8.45 pm