

# Castle Community Meeting

**Your Community, Your Voice**

## **Record of Meeting and Actions**

**6:30 pm, Thursday, 22 July 2010**

**Held at: Watershed Youth Centre, Upperton Road**

Who was there:

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

Councillor Lynn Senior
------------------------

## INFORMATION SHARING – ‘INFORMATION FAIR’ SESSION

The following information stands were sited in the room. Members of the public visited the stands and were given an opportunity to meet Councillors, Council staff and service representatives.

<b>Ward Councillor and General Information</b>  Local councillors were present to discuss general queries	<b>Police Issues</b>  Local Police were present to discuss any concerns or general enquiries.
<b>CitizensEye</b>  Representatives were present from this organisation in which young people produced newsletters on community issues.	<b>City Warden</b>  The local City Warden was in attendance to talk about local environmental issues.
<b>Planning Management and Delivery</b>  Planning Officers were present to discuss any matters of concern that residents had on planning matters.	<b>Anti – Graffiti</b>  Details about new developments in anti-graffiti measures were presented.

At the conclusion of this informal session members of the public were invited to take their seats and take part in the formal session of the meeting.

## **FORMAL SESSION**

### **1. ELECTION OF CHAIR**

Councillor Patrick Kitterick was chair for the meeting.

### **2. MINUTE SILENCE - COUNCILLOR PHILIP GORDON**

A minute silence was held in memory of former Castle Ward Councillor, Philip Gordon who sadly passed away following the last Community Meeting.

### **3. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Councillor Neil Clayton gave his apologies for the meeting.

### **4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillors were asked to declare any interests they may have in the business on the agenda.

Councillor Senior declared a personal interest as her partner worked for the Highways and Transport Division in the Council, this was in case of any highways matters being raised at the meeting.

Councillor Senior declared a personal interest in the budget application for the Queens Road Autumn Fair as her employer was Age Concern and they had a shop on Queens Road.

Councillor Senior also declared a personal and prejudicial interest in the Proposed Health Centre, Victoria Park Road item due to a friendship with one of the agents involved in the development of the Health Centre. She left the meeting for discussion on this item.

### **5. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

RESOLVED:

that the minutes of the Castle Community Meeting held Wednesday 24 March 2010 were agreed as a correct record.

### **6. SERVICES FOR YOUNG PEOPLE**

Councillor Kitterick introduced this item, noting that it came about as a result of enquiries by local residents about what services were available for young people in the ward.

Danielle Williams, Strategic Lead for Participation at Leicester City Council gave the meeting a brief outline of the work that she undertook and the ways in which young people could engage in the decision making process about matters which affected them. This included:

- User groups at each youth centre
- Young People's Council
- A project which involved young people who were looking to 'youth proof' meetings such as this one to ensure they were accessible to them.
- The Youth Parliament which has local representatives.
- The Children's Council
- The Advisory Boards for the forthcoming Integrated Service Hubs – venues where a range of services would be provided for young people.

Danielle said that people were welcome to contact her about any of these or other areas where young people could become involved in the decision making process in areas which affected them.

Fiona Bedford, Area Youth Work Manager gave the meeting some details about the numbers of staff and types of facilities which were available to support young people's activities in the Ward.

Stacey Beazer, Senior Youth Support Worker gave details of the dance related activities which she was involved in providing. This included:

- Dance classes,
- Choreograph work,
- Dance for deaf young people
- 'Night Owl' sessions.

An event at the Athena venue would be taking place on the 26 August where young people could showcase their skills.

Sarah Vernon, from the Inclusion Project gave details of the wide timetable of events that were taking place at the Watershed. She offered to provide details of these to enable them to be disseminated.

Dominic McCarthy, Music specialist outlined the music facilities available at the Watershed and the different types of sessions provided such as those aimed at young people with mental health difficulties; those not in employment education or training; and those who were excluded. The aim of the sessions was to improve self esteem and help develop useful career skills, and to work towards special events such as when a showcase took place with professional session musicians. Developing websites for promoting music was also undertaken.

Councillor Senior raised a query about how young people could find out about these activities. It was noted that promotion of them took place in schools, but also the Activities 4 You website contained details of all of the available activities. It was agreed to include details of the timetable for the Watershed with the minutes.

One of the young people who took part in the Dynamise dance group informed the meeting about the activities which she took part in. She praised the wide variety of facilities and sessions which were available, noting that there was strong local interest. She did feel however that funding for singing and dance activities could be a problem.

Councillor Senior asked about how these services could be better promoted to encourage more young people to become involved. Dominic McCarthy commented that the use of social media, such as Facebook and Twitter should be further explored.

Citizens Eye

John Coster, a freelance journalist gave the meeting details about the Citizens Eye news agency which provided a range of opportunities for citizen reporters from a wide range of sectors of society. In particular young people produced ‘The Wave’ publication which was a monthly pullout in the Leicester Mercury. He also gave details of The Soar free magazine which young people were also involved in producing. He also spoke of efforts to recruit 2012 youth reporters to report on local events and to tie it in with the Olympics. Efforts were also being made to involve young people in other activities such as patchwalks and community meetings to report on them.

John further noted that there were meetings every Tuesday morning and evening in the Kona Blue coffee house in the Highcross where people interested could come along and find out what opportunities were available.

John was asked about how he felt that more young people could become involved in Citizen media activities. He felt that engaging with schools & colleges and encouraging them to have their own internal magazine which young people produced. He felt that it was important, not just to listen to young people, but to make sure that they were fully involved.

Trisha Reynolds – Voluntary Action Leicester

Trisha Reynolds outlined for the meeting, details of the project she was heading up, aimed at 16- 25 year olds which sought to get them more involved in matters which affected them. She was currently undertaking a pilot exercise where young people were attending Community Meetings and looking at them from a young people’s perspective, whether they addressed their needs and made them welcome.

Trisha was asked about what she thought could be done to get young people better engaged. She felt that it was about giving young people a real role to play, giving them specific tasks to undertake as part of any engagement.

Action	Officer Identified	Deadline
Provide details of the activities available at the Watershed with these minutes.	Francis Connolly / Anthony Grant	As soon as possible.

**7. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

New Developments – Eastern Boulevard

A resident expressed a number of concerns relating to developments on Eastern Boulevard. They were as follows:

- A 8-14 storey building was originally proposed and a detailed opposition to the development was lodged by residents.
- It was felt that Parking would be a problem with all the new residents.
- Concerns were also expressed about how the new residents would interact with existing residents and where they would spend their amenity time.
- Further concern was expressed about the space available for all the construction related vehicles and materials whilst the building was taking place.
- Disappointment was also expressed about the closure of Rydal Street for six months which has taken place as part of another development and access difficulties this caused for residents.
- The new building would block sunlight from residents houses.

Councillor Kitterick commented that he had objected to the application, but noted that if the Council rejected applications such as this and subsequently a planning inspector approved them; the Council could receive a large fine and court costs. He also noted that as a compromise the height of the proposed building was increased at one end to create a tower and reduced at the other end. This was done to allow more light into existing residents houses.

David Cotton from the Council’s Planning Management and Delivery team was asked to comment on issues relating to problems residents may face during the construction period and other impacts on residents. David stated that once the application had been approved, there was little that the Council could do in terms of the construction of the building. Building Control could ask for some limited screening, but exact details of residents concerns would be needed before any action was taken. David also stated that students would not be allowed residents parking permits when moving into the new buildings. He also noted that tests had been undertaken as part of the planning application which showed that local houses should only be in shade for about an hour as a result of the new building.

Action	Officer Identified	Deadline
Councillor Kitterick asked that officers look into the issues regarding construction materials, vehicles and road closures which may affect local residents as part of the development on the former Brewin Site.	Building Control	Before the development takes place.

## 8. PROPOSED HEALTH CENTRE, VICTORIA PARK ROAD

Councillor Kitterick started off this item by explaining his position in relation to the development of the Health Centre. He explained that he had changed his position and had come to the decision to represent resident's wide range of views, but mostly those who were opposed to the new Health Centre.

Simon Gould, from Assura gave a presentation on the proposed health centre. He covered the following areas:-

- Why a new centre was needed – mainly because the existing building was not suitable for current needs.
- Why this site – it was a good location which would be central for both students and residents.
- Why other sites were not possible – they were either too out of the way or due to land values, it wasn't possible to compete with housing developers.
- How the centre would be funded – Assura were a private developer who would purchase the site and build the centre. The Health Centre would then pay a regulated level of rent to Assura.
- Other facilities on the site – there would be an ancillary pharmacy and no other commercial activity at all. The site would have a restricted covenant which would prevent any kind of other use of the site in future.
- Car Parking – the Council had requested an increase in parking spaces from 16 -22. Reconfiguration of double yellow lines on Victoria Park Road was also being considered.
- Sustainability – the building would be built to the BREEAM (the industry sustainability measurement standard) level of 'Excellent' which was the highest possible measure.

Residents raised a number of questions on the following areas:-

**Would the building meet the One Leicester aim of being carbon neutral?**

It wouldn't be carbon neutral, but meeting the BREEAM excellent standard would mean that it would address a wider range of sustainability issues such as ecology, energy use and sustainability. Plus the new building would be more sustainable than the existing building.

**Was there a report available which gave more details about the unsuitability of the existing health centre site?**

Laura Norton from Leicester City Primary Care Trust explained that a survey of all GP surgeries had been undertaken considering 9 issues, such as physical condition, environmental impact and potential for development. This had shown that the

existing Freemans Park health centre was in the worst condition of all health centres in the city. Laura offered to provide the report.

**Is the existing health centre and would the new one would be just for students?**

Practice Manager, Samantha Rogers explained that of the current 15000 patients just under 50% were aged 18-24, the rest were outside of this age group. It wasn't monitored whether they were students or not. Students did not receive preference. The health centre was currently not taking any new patients as it been given clearance not to do so because of its lack of capacity.

**It was queried whether other surgeries in the local area had open lists and whether new patients could be diverted to them?**

Laura Norton said that mainstream GP practices had to accept patients that requested to be on their lists. There was only a limit at Freemans Common because of capacity. Details were also provided of all the GP practices in the Clarendon Park area, it was noted that there were particular capacity pressures in the London Road area.

**A question was raised about the business plan for the new health centre, what numbers of patients it was expecting over the next five years?**

Samantha Rogers commented that the assumption was that patient numbers would remain the same.

**A number of people contested this response – it was felt that there would be more detailed analysis in the health centre's business plan and it was noted that there were public documents which stated that 1500 more patients were expected.**

Simon Gould explained that the 1500 figure referred to additional capacity that was built into the new health centre. It was usual to build in more capacity when a new facility was built.

**In view of this extra capacity it was suggested that other surgeries could leak patients.**

Laura Norton explained that it was the current government's policy to remove catchment areas to allow for competition. However currently most practices were either full or close to full, an excess of capacity was unlikely.

**It was asked why the health centre could not be built on a brownfield site, rather than a greenfield one?**

David Cotton said that when considering a planning application, this would be one of the many factors for consideration and balance of all these factors needed to be achieved. It was not a foregone conclusion that the application would be approved.



Councillor Kitterick explained that this application was not being led by the Council. The Planning Department would respond to the application. The applicant would be responsible for considering which site they proposed to use.

Simon Gould also commented that this site was favoured due to its suitable location between residents and students, also that a number of other sites had been considered, but had not been feasible. Housing developers were able to pay greater amounts for available sites. It could take another five years before another suitable site became available. He confirmed that details of other sites considered was in the planning application.

**A query was raised about whether it was Council land that was being used for the health centre.**

Simon Gould informed the meeting that there would be some tree felling on Council owned land, but these would be replaced. There would be no building works on Council owned land.

**It was felt despite the planned increase in parking spaces, there was still not enough being provided. Further it was felt to create drop off bays on Victoria Park Road would ruin the 'avenue' feel of the area. There would also be increased parking in residential streets.**

Simon Gould agreed that parking and access was one of the big challenges with all developments like this.

**The red line on the overhead photo shown in the presentation of the site area showed that considerable space would be designated as land D1 uses (non residential institutions such as health centres, crèches). Was this all necessary?**

Simon Gould commented that the site area needed to cover all areas where any work was taking place, ie including work such as landscaping as well as building developments. It was intended to undertake a wide package of environmental improvements.

David Cotton confirmed that all of the area within the red line could, in theory be built on for a D1 use (non-residential institution). The best way to address this would be to put a condition on the planning application to restrict the area which could be built on.

**Was the pharmacy strictly necessary as there were already local ones? if it wasn't included the health centre would take up less space? The pharmacy seemed to be rather big in size?**

Laura Norton commented that it was good practice to include a pharmacy in health centres now. It would mean that unwell patients would have easy access to a pharmacy. A local pharmacist could run the pharmacy.

With regard to the size of the unit, Simon Gould commented that it would need a sales area, storage and preparation area as well as a consulting room. Further he commented that it was the intention for the pharmacy to be closed, when the medical centre was closed.

**A resident commented that they were in favour of the health centre being built.**

Councillor Kitterick thanked him for his comments, but said that at the Planning and Development Control Committee he would be taking up the objectors points of view as this was the majority opinion which had been expressed to him. This would however cover a wide spectrum of opinions from those who opposed out of principle and those who just felt that changes were required.

David Cotton said that all representations, for or against would be reported at the Planning and Development Control Committee.

**Residents raised concerns about a discussion they had attended with the Primary Care Trust, which it was thought suggested that the premises could be used, out of hours for commercial activities such as a botox clinic.**

It was confirmed that this would not be the case. It would only be NHS services provided at this site.

**If the development went ahead, would there be training opportunities for young people as part of the construction of the health centre.**

Simon Gould said that he would be very happy to explore opportunities with the City Council, if they had existing schemes running which could involve training / employment opportunities for local people.

Action	Officer Identified	Deadline
Provide copies of the survey report into the state of the existing Freemens Common Health Centre.	Laura Norton	As soon as possible.
Raise with the Council's economic regeneration team about potential training / employment opportunities for young people in the construction of the health centre.	Francis Connolly / Trevor Mee	September

**9. CITY WARDENS**

This item was deferred.

## 10. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS

A resident expressed concern that people were having barbecues on Victoria Park and this was not being addressed.

Action	Officer Identified	Deadline
Find out from the Parks Service what action can be taken to address the problem of barbecues on Victoria Park.	Francis Connolly / Richard Welburn	September 2010

## 11. BUDGET

Francis Connolly, Member Support Officer outlined the position with the Community Meeting budget, noting that there was a total of £17,000 available at the beginning of the financial year, but a previous commitment to fund a project at a meeting last year meant that there was now £14,814 left in the budget for the current year.

The following applications were considered and decided upon at the meeting.

- B1) Centre for Indian Classical Dance – a request for £4,533 (the project also covered the Spinney Hill and Stonegate Wards) to support an administrator to support a programme of workshops which aimed to give education on how to lead a healthy way of life and develop cultural exchange.

### RESOLVED:

That the application be rejected as it wasn't felt that the project was feasible and didn't provide suitable obvious benefits for the Ward's residents.

- B2) Wimbledon Fever – a request of £307 to support a tennis coaching programme.

Members proposed to reject this application because it didn't demonstrate obvious benefits for Castle Ward residents, however a refined future application which did meet this concern would be considered.

### RESOLVED:

That the application be rejected on the basis that there were not clear benefits to the residents of the Castle Ward.

- B3) Highfields Area Forum – a request of £2,666.67 (the project also covered the Spinney Hill and Stonegate Wards) for the funding of a consultant to undertake the development of an area plan for Highfields.

Councillor Kitterick commented that whilst it was only a small part of the ward, there were a number of issues in South Highfields which did need addressing.

### RESOLVED:

That the application be supported and a sum of £1000 be allocated, from the Community Cohesion budget subject to final approval from the Cabinet Lead for Front Line Service Improvement and Neighbourhoods and the Leader of the Council.

- B4) A Taste of Africa – a request for £475 for a programme of cultural events, through food, readings and music to promote the cultural heritage of Africa.
- B5) Leicester Interfaith Gardening Work Project – a request of £1,320 to, carry out a programme cultural events and to host visitors from overseas.

For both the B4 and B5 applications Councillors felt that the applications didn't specifically outline how the residents of Castle Ward would benefit from these proposals and that they didn't address a specified need within the ward. It was also commented that the Community Meeting budget would not always be the most appropriate means of funding all projects. John Coster commented that he was happy to work with projects to enable identify funding opportunities.

**RESOLVED:**

that that applications be rejected at this point, but further details were welcomed about how the projects would benefit residents of the ward.

Late application) Queens Road Autumn Fair – a request of £3000 to fund road closures, security, first aid, decoration etc for an autumn fair to be held on Queens Road, for an event which aimed to integrate the new student arrivals to the area.

Councillors indicated that they supported this application as it responded to a need in the ward, which was about the sometimes difficult relations between residents and students. It would also strongly involve both local residents and traders on Queens Road. The organisation of the event would need to be community led to make it happen successfully.

John Coster suggested that ways of linking up this event with the Leicester Marathon which is on the same day should be considered.

**RESOLVED:**

that the application be supported and a sum of £3000 be allocated from the Ward Action Plan budget subject to final approval from the Cabinet Lead for Front Line Service Improvement and Neighbourhoods and the Leader of the Council.

## **12. CLOSE OF MEETING**

The next meeting would be held in the City Centre and would be considering issues relating to licensing, particularly in relation to pubs and other late night establishments.

The meeting closed at 9.05pm.



This page is left blank intentionally.

# WATERSHED Youth Centre

UPPERTON ROAD, BEDE ISLAND, LE2 7AU, 0116 2232399

<b>MONDAY</b>	<b>Young Parents Peer Education</b> 11am-1pm (closed session) Grant, Rita	<b>Young Parents Stay &amp; Play</b> 3:00pm -5:00pm 13-25 years Rita	<b>Break Dancing</b> 5pm-7pm 13-19 years Rollo	<b>Open Session</b> 6-8pm 13+ years Jamie, Rita	<b>Senior Basketball</b> 7pm - 8.15pm 14 + years (closed session) Dave Harris	<b>Open Music</b> 6pm - 8pm 13 – 25 years Graham, Dom	
<b>TUESDAY</b>	<b>Understanding Yourself</b> 12:30- 4:30pm Babita	<b>NEET Music</b> 1:30pm-3:30pm 16 -25 years Dom, Graham	<b>Free 2 B Club</b> 5.00pm-7.00pm School years 7 & 8 Babita, Graham, Aearon				
<b>WEDNESDAY</b>	<b>Piers Art</b> 1-3pm (closed session) Kate, Partnership	<b>Girls Group</b> 5-7pm 11-19 years Babita, Rita	<b>Junior Basketball</b> 5pm-6pm (closed session) Dave Harris	<b>Basketball</b> 6pm-8pm +13 years Jahsiah			
<b>THURSDAY</b>	<b>Ellesmere</b> 9am - 12pm (partnership) Sue	<b>Wings</b> 10:30am-12.30pm (closed session) Dom, Graham	<b>Piers Music</b> 1 - 3pm (closed session) Graham, Dom	<b>Inclusion Club</b> 3:30 -5.30pm 11-25 years Sarah, Jamie, Kerry, Karen, Graham	<b>Dancercise</b> 5 – 7pm 13 - 19 years Stacey	<b>Basketball</b> 6:30pm – 8:30pm 13+ years Jahsiah	<b>Open Music</b> 6pm - 8pm 13 – 25 Dom, Aearon, Graham
<b>FRIDAY</b>	<b>Wings</b> 10:30am-12.30pm (closed session) Dom, Graham	<b>Ellesmere</b> 2 - 3pm (partnership) Sue	<b>Transition</b> 3.30pm-5.30pm School years 5 &6 Jamie, Rita	<b>LDCS</b> 7 -9pm (closed session) Glenda, Christine, Stacey	<b>L8 Lounge</b> 8.30pm-Midnight 16 – 25years Dom, Stacey, Aearon		

For all sessions young people need an up to date registration form. For more information or to request a registration form please contact Watershed Youth Centre on 0116 2232399 or 0116 2232363.

This page is left blank intentionally.



## PROPERTY DETAILS

Property Details | 9 Facet Analysis

## Property Details

Property Ref:  Name of Practice:

Property:

Address:

Town:

Post Code:  Year Construction:

Locality:  GIA M sq:

Survey Date:

Surveyor:

Last Update:

## Brief Description of Site:

The large detached listed property was built in 1856, originally the cottages for the Freeman of Leicester. The building is currently used as a GP practice for the students and teachers of the University. The building is owned by the university and is within its grounds. The university are trying to take back the building to develop it for educational use.

## Picture:



## Contact Details

Name:

Phone No.:



# PROPERTY DETAILS

Property Details | 9 Facet Analysis

## 9 Facet Analysis

Element	Comments	Score
Physical Condition:	Externally the property is in reasonable condition, there is of evidence major structural defects. There is an odour and evidence of damp within areas. The single glazed timber windows require replacement as many are rotten and have	C
Functional Suitability:	The building is not ideal for modern healthcare provision. Access is restricted with change in levels, narrow doors and corridors, low ceiling heights, sloping floors and rooms to the first floor, the environment is not particularly inclusive for patients	DX
Space Utilisation:	The building is fully utilised by the practice, there is no capacity within the current building to offer more services or develop the practice further. The use of 2 floors for clinical use is not ideal but necessary in order to maintain the level of service	D
Statutory and Non Statutory Requirements:	FIRE - compliance is generally good with clearly signed and unobstructed evacuation routes. The university landlords are responsible for the fire compliance. H&S   Asbestos has been identified in areas throughout the building, a register is	DX
Energy Performance:	The premises are single glazed with secondary glazing to the front elevation windows; the age of the building suggests it is unlikely that wall and roof installation. is present as loft installation is not. The university controls the central	D
Development Capacity:	There is no development capacity for the practice as the building is leased from the university. The only alternative for the practice is to relocate, a relocation off the university grounds would also benefit local residents as the practice could	C
Service Capacity:	The current catchment area for the practice is anywhere within the Leicester ring road, as they cover students registered at the university. The practice has a very high number of patients 12,098. There are 8 GP's with 5.8 WTE's. The limited	C
Location:	The current building is ideally located to the main users, within walking distance of the university and student halls accommodation.	B

Quality	
Element	Score
Amenity (Comfort):	
Comfort Engineering:	
Design (appearance):	
Score:	
Quality Category:	D
Comments	
The overall quality of the property is poor owing to the age and inflexibility of the building. The facilities for patients and staff are not suitable for modern healthcare and working conditions.	

## Key

### **Physical Condition**

<b>Code</b>	Description
A	As New
B	Sound, Operationally Safe
C	Operational, Major Repairs Required within 3 years
CX	Operational but Impossible to Improve Without Replacement
D	Risk of Imminent Breakdown
DX	Risk of Imminent Breakdown Impossible to Improve Without Replacement

### **Functional Suitability**

<b>Code</b>	Description
A	Very satisfactory with no change needed
B	Satisfactory with minor change needed
C	Not satisfactory with major change needed
D	Unacceptable in present condition
DX	Unacceptable in present condition. Total rebuild or relocation req.

### **Space**

<b>Utilisation</b>	Description
--------------------	-------------

## Code

E	Empty
F	Fully Used
O	Overcrowded
U	Under-Used

## Statutory Compliance

Code	Description
A	Complies with all statutory requirements & relevant guidance
B	Requires action to comply with all statutory requirements & guidance
C	Falls short of B rating for statutory requirements & guidance
CX	Falls short of B rating, Improvements impractical or expensive
D	Falls dangerously below B rating
DX	Falls dangerously below B rating, Improvements impractical or expensive

## Energy Performance

Code	Description
A	Complies with current energy performance requirements
B	Does not comply with current reqs, but double glazing & efficiency measures
C	Does not comply with current reqs, double glazing, no efficiency measures
D	Does not comply with current reqs, no double glazing or partial glazing only

## **Development**

### **Capacity**

#### **Code**

#### Description

A	Capacity for a footprint of over 500 Sq. M
B	Capacity for a footprint of 251 to 500 Sq. M
C	Capacity for a footprint of up to 250 Sq. M
D	No capacity for extending the facility

## **Service**

### **Capacity**

#### **Code**

#### Description

A	Full multi-function primary care resource centre for locality
B	Integrated primary care for practice population
C	Separate GP or community health services for practice population
D	Less than separate GP or community health services for practice population

## **Location**

#### **Code**

#### Description

A	Inside or immediately adjacent
B	Within walking distance or easy travel by public transport
C	Can be reached by public transport with some difficulty
D	Can be reached by public transport only with extreme difficulty

Of the GP premises surveyed at the time, Freeman's Common Health Centre received the second highest score i.e, only one practice had poorer premises

This page is left blank intentionally.