

# Castle Community Meeting

**Your Community, Your Voice**

## **Record of Meeting and Actions**

**6:30 pm, Wednesday, 3 December 2008**

**Held at: Avenue Primary School, Avenue Road Extension,  
Clarendon Park**

Who was there:

Councillor Matt Follett
-------------------------

Councillor Phil Gordon
------------------------

Councillor Patrick Kitterick
------------------------------

## **FORMAL SESSION**

### **31. ELECTION OF CHAIR**

Councillor Kitterick and Councillor Follett were elected as Chairs for the meeting on a co-chairing basis.

### **32. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

None received.

### **33. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillors were asked to declare any interests they might have in the business of the agenda, and/or indicate that Section 106 of the Local Government Act applied to them.

No such declarations were made at this time.

### **34. RESIDENTS PARKING**

Councillor Kitterick and Adrian Friend, Traffic Engineer – Leicester City Council, gave a brief verbal presentation on the findings of the recent residents survey into local parking issues and the possibility of introducing a residents parking scheme. Councillor Kitterick confirmed to the meeting that, of the completed surveys received, 364 households voted against the proposals and 281 voted in favour of the proposals. After briefly explaining the results, Councillor Kitterick confirmed to the meeting that the Council had decided, following the consultation exercise, not to introduce a residents parking scheme.

Councillor Kitterick also introduced Adrian Friend (Leicester City Council) and Kim Lampitt (Social Research Associates) to the meeting.

The matter was then opened up to the meeting. Residents raised the following matters/concerns at the meeting, which were responded to by Councillors and Officers:

- Marked out spaces would help drivers utilise the space better;
- How many other surveys had been undertaken in the City;
- What were the results of the other surveys;
- Concerns regarding the consultation process and how it was conducted, specifically in relation to the seemingly sporadic distribution of the surveys themselves;
- What sense was there in any discussion at this meeting when the decision had already been taken;
- What action could have been taken to address the issue of match day parking;
- Student parking in the area was said to restrict parking in the area if there were a number of students in each property and they all owned a car;
- The negative emphasis towards residents parking in the survey document;

- The absence of discussion or compromise options explored;
- Generalisations drawn from a survey with an overall response rate of 20-25% was flawed;
- The cost of the parking permit;
- Observational Surveys would have complemented the process;
- Increasing volume and number of local planning developments further contributed to the parking issue;
- Insufficient return to get a reliable response;
- The money spent on the consultation could have been spent on more essential services; and
- Whether there were any plans to review the proposals in the near future.

Councillors and Officers responded to the questions/remarks as follows:

- Marked out spaces weren't practical due to the different size of vehicles;
- A survey was conducted in 2002 and indicated that generally if the scheme was free then people were in favour, but if charges were introduced they were against. In general the results showed people were against a residents parking scheme so the matter was dropped at the time;
- A leaflet drop was conducted and arrangements were made where residents could arrange for redelivery of the survey if the occupants were not in;
- The high cost of consultation exercises prevented the Council from gathering more than one opinion per household;
- Restricting parking to residents across the area prevented people commuting to the area and would affect the businesses;
- Local parking issues have and continue to be raised with the local Universities;
- Compromise arrangements would have been possible if the results had indicated strong favour which was localised to certain areas;
- 20% represented a good return rate;
- Discriminating against certain groups of the population wasn't fair;
- The proposed parking fee was designed to cover the administration of the scheme;
- Observational surveys were conducted;
- Future park and ride facilities would prevent fans from parking in and around the area; and
- Residents parking would not be reconsidered for the 5/6 years.

### **35. ADULT EDUCATION**

Due to Officer illness this item was deferred to a future Community Meeting.

### **36. CITY WARDENS AND 10,000 TREES UPDATE**

#### City Wardens

Adrian Russell, Environmental Services, gave a verbal presentation on the introduction of City Wardens and their responsibilities, which were explained as:

- Direct enforcement action (litter, graffiti, flyposting, unauthorised distribution of printed material in defined areas, bins on pavements, dog control and dog fouling);
- Indirect action, i.e. working with colleagues, to address matters such as abandoned cars, unsightly gardens and graffiti.

Residents raised queries in relation to leaves on the roads in the area and the difficulties that highways obstructions cause for disabled people. Adrian Russell, Environmental Services, confirmed that Street Cleansing representatives would be at the next Community Meeting and that the City Wardens had no powers to deal with highways obstructions but that may be an area of future work.

<b>Action</b>	<b>Officer / Councillor</b>	<b>Deadline</b>
Investigate the accumulation of litter on and around Freemans Common.	Adrian Russell, Environmental Services.	Not determined.
Street Cleansing Officers and City Wardens to be available at the next Community Meeting.	Kate Owen, Members Support Officer.	Date of the next Community Meeting.

### 10,000 Trees

Adrian Russell, Environmental Services, explained the scheme to residents and agreed to take suggestions for possible planting locations from residents at the end of the meeting.

### **37. AVENUE ROAD TRAFFIC CALMING SCHEME**

Mark Korczak, School Travel Plans Officer, gave a brief presentation on the proposals for the Avenue School Traffic Calming Scheme. Plans showing the proposals were made available at the meeting. It was also confirmed that further consultation events were due to take place. Details of these events were also provided at the meeting.

Councillor Kitterick remarked on the need for the scheme, that it was a good scheme and that it was well overdue.

### **38. COMMUNITY MEETING BUDGET**

Councillor Kitterick explained to the meeting that two funding applications had been received. Councillor Kitterick also explained how the funding applications would be considered and that should the applications be supported they would be recommended to the relevant Cabinet Member for approval.

In response to residents concerns about the Ward Community Fund rules that prevented any successful applicants from repeat applications, Councillor Kitterick

and Councillor Follett stated the matter would be raised with the relevant Cabinet Member.

#### Funding Application - Queens Road Christmas Lighting

**RESOLVED:**

that it be agreed that the funding application for £2,676 be supported, subject to the condition that the applicant understood that the then present Ward Community fund rules prevented repeat applications being considered the following year.

#### Funding Application – St Andrews Play Association Theatre Visit

**RESOLVED:**

that it be agreed that the funding application for £586.90 be supported, subject to the condition that the applicant understood that the then current Ward Community fund rules prevented repeat applications being considered the following year.

### **39. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

The minutes of the Castle Community Meeting dated, 9 September 2008, as circulated, were approved as a correct record of the meeting.

### **40. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

#### Planning Application – 18 Victoria Park Road

A resident raised concerns about the above planning application, and in particular wanted to know why it was approved.

Councillor Kitterick acknowledged the residents concerns, explained that Officers took the decision under delegated powers, and that the matter has been taken up with the relevant Officers.

#### Community Meeting Publicity

A resident raised concerns over the lack of publicity of the meeting, as they did not find out in a reasonable amount of time.

Councillor Kitterick and Councillor Follett acknowledged that the publicity and communication of the Community Meetings was a concern and that it was being addressed.

#### **41. FUTURE MEETINGS**

The next meeting will take place on 12<sup>th</sup> March 2009 at a location to be confirmed.

#### **42. CLOSE OF THE MEETING**

The formal part of the meeting closed at 7.48pm.