

**Soar Valley College,
Gleneagles Avenue, LE4 7GY
On Monday, 14 May 2012
Starting at 6:30 pm**

The meeting will be in two parts

6:30 pm – 7:00 pm

Meet your Councillors and local service providers dealing with *:-

- **City Wardens**
- **Community Safety – Police**
- **General Council matters and other issues**

* Other items to be confirmed

7:00 pm – 8:30 pm

Get involved in your area and planning for the future. There will be presentations and discussions on:

- **Sainsbury's Development, Melton Road – Progress Report on Recently Submitted Planning Application**
- **City Wardens Update**
- **Police and Community Safety Update**
- **Community Grant Applications**

YOUR community. YOUR voice.

Your Ward Councillors are:

**Councillor Culdipp Singh Bhatti MBE
Councillor Piara Singh Clair MBE
Councillor Ross Willmott**

INFORMATION FAIR

PLEASE SEE BELOW FOR DETAILS OF SERVICE REPRESENTATIVES YOU CAN TALK TO AT THIS MEETING

You can raise matters of concern, give opinions and find out information which may be of use

City Warden Service The City Warden will be at the meeting to discuss issues in the Westcotes Ward	Community Safety – Police Talk to your local Police officers about Community Safety issues, or raise general queries
Ward Councillors and General Information Talk to your local councillors or raise general queries	

Making Meetings Accessible to All

WHEELCHAIR

Meetings are held in a variety of community venues. We will only hold meetings in venues where there is suitable access for wheelchairs. If you have any concerns about accessing a venue by wheelchair, please contact the Democratic Services Officer on the details provided.

BRAILLE / AUDIO TAPE – CD / TRANSLATION

If you require this agenda or a particular part of it to be translated or provided on audio tape, the Democratic Services Officer can organise this for you (production times will depend on equipment facility availability). In certain cases, subject to the agreement of the local Councillors, translation facilities can be provided at the meeting.

INDUCTION LOOPS – HEARING AT MEETINGS

We provide a loop system at every meeting for people with hearing aids. If you have a hearing aid, please speak to the Democratic Services Officer at the meeting for further assistance if you think you won't be able to hear what's being discussed. There is also a facility which can help people hear better if you don't have a hearing aid but are hard of hearing, again please speak to the Democratic Services Officer about this.

The first part of the agenda covers formal items which the Councillors need to deal with to ensure that regulations on holding meetings are kept to

1. ELECTION OF CHAIR

Councillors will elect a Chair for the meeting.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The first main item on the agenda is Declarations of Interest where Councillors have to say if there is anything on the agenda they have a personal interest in. For example if a meeting was due to discuss a budget application put forward by a community group and one of the Councillors was a member of that group, they would not be able to take part in the decision on that budget application.

Councillors are asked to declare any interest they may have in the business on the agenda, and/or indicate that Section 106 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 applies to them.

4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Appendix A

The minutes of the previous Rushey Mead Community Meeting held on 15 March 2012 are attached and Members are asked to confirm them as a correct record.

This next part of the agenda covers items where input from you on issues that affect your community is welcomed

5. SAINSBURY'S DEVELOPMENT , MELTON ROAD

Appendix B

Representatives of Sainsbury's will be at the meeting to discuss the recently submitted planning application for the development on Melton Road. City Council Planning Officers also will be present.

Notes of the discussion about this development at the Community Meeting held on 12 January 2012 are attached at Appendix B for information. Notes of the discussion at the meeting held on 15 March 2012 are included in the minutes of that meeting attached at Appendix A.

6. CITY WARDENS UPDATE

The City Warden will give an update on issues in the Rushey Mead Ward

7. COMMUNITY GRANT APPLICATIONS

Councillors are reminded that they will need to declare any interest they may have in budget applications, and/or indicate that Section 106 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 applies to them.

- a) An update on the 2011/12 Community Meeting budget will be provided.
- b) The following grant applications are submitted for consideration:-

Project: Ladies Milan Mandar

Applicant: Mrs Kundanben Tejura & Kamlaben Shah

Amount requested:

The following amounts are for 6 months:

Item	Cost (£)	Estimate/ Actual cost?	Request to Ward Meeting (£)
Trips	500	Estimate	200
Meals	600	Estimate	200
Guest Speaker & Yoga	400	Estimate	200
Miscellaneous	200	Estimate	0
Rent	0	Actual	0
TOTAL	1,700		600

Summary:

The group is currently based at Rushey Mead Recreation Centre. It meets two evenings a week, for 2 hours per meeting, for 6 months of the year. There are approximately 100 members, all of whom are aged 60+.

Funding has been requested to enable the group to take trips around its local area to temples and other religious outings. Some support also is requested for the evenings, for group meals and celebrating religious festivals.

The group also would like to invite speakers to talk about health and wellbeing, and enquiries have been made about having a yoga instructor.

Project: Sakhi Milan Ladies Group

Applicant: Smita Radia & Ramila Puparell

Amount requested:

Item	Cost (£)	Estimate/ Actual cost?	Request to Ward Meeting (£)
Exercise Workshop £30 x 6	180		
Cooking Workshop £30 x 6	180		
Dancing Workshop £30 x 6	180		
Disposable	100		
Trips	300		
TOTAL	940		600

Summary:

Women aged 30 plus will be attending the group, which will be meeting at Rushmead centre on Fridays 6.30 – 8.30 pm.

The group:-

- encourages ladies to come and talk about problems and to socialise;
- celebrates festivals;
- runs exercise workshops with professional people;
- holds health and safety sessions;
- promotes a better understanding of wider communities; and
- organises cooking workshops and promotes healthy eating and well being.

If funding is approved, the group would like to:-

- arrange some trips and outings;
- use outside catering, possibly using voluntary organisations such as The H Café;
- purchase some equipment, such as a CD player, so that dance sessions can be held to help people keep fit; and
- buy a toasty maker and disposable plates and cups.

8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Help us to make improvements!

Please help us to improve Community Meetings by filling in an **Evaluation sheet** to let us know what you thought of the meeting. Thank you.

For further information contact

Elaine Baker, Democratic Services Officer or James Schadla-Hall, Members Support Officer, Resources Department, Leicester City Council, Town Hall, Town Hall Square, LEICESTER, LE1 9BG

Phone 0116 229 8806 / 8896

Fax 0116 229 8819

Elaine.Baker@leicester.gov.uk / James.Schadla-Hall@leicester.gov.uk

www.leicester.gov.uk/communitymeetings

Your Community, Your Voice

Record of Meeting and Actions

6:30 pm, Thursday, 15 March 2012

Held at:

Northfield House Primary School, Northfield Road, LE4 9DL

Who was there:

Councillor Culdipp Singh Bhatti MBE

Councillor Ross Willmott

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.

City Wardens Service	Community Safety
Care and Repair Home Improvement Agency	Ward Councillors and General Information

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.

12. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillors were asked to declare any interest they had in the business on the agenda, and/or indicate if Section 106 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 applied to them.

No such interests were declared.

13. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting held on 12 January 2012 were agreed as a correct record, subject to the first line of minute 5, “Local Policing”, begin amended as follows:

“PC Rob ~~Puntney~~ *Pountney*, Leicestershire Constabulary, ...”

14. CARE AND REPAIR

Steven Chard, Senior Technical Officer in the Care and Repair service, explained that Care and Repair was a non-profit making home improvement agency that helped elderly and disabled people get repairs to their properties. They had a list of recommended contractors that could be used. A Handyman service also was available for a small fee.

The meeting noted that those who had used the service had found it to be very good.

Leaflets explaining the service had been circulated at the meeting and all present were encouraged to pass this information on to anyone who could benefit from the service. Presentations could be made to any groups interested in the service.

15. CITY WARDENS UPDATE

As the City Warden was unable to be at the meeting, this item was not considered.

16. UPDATE ON SAINSBURY'S PLANS FOR FORMER GE SITE

The Chair reminded the meeting that Sainsburys was about to submit a formal planning application to develop the former GE site. Consultation events had been held and Sainsburys had provided an update on their plans for the site.

The Chair presented the update, which had been prepared by Mr Bob Keys of Sainsbury's:-

- The Sainsburys team had met local ward groups and Thurmaston Parish Council since the proposals were announced;
- The proposals had created a high level of interest and Sainsburys had responded to suggestions and comments as far as possible in progressing the plans. Consequently, amendments had been made to the store design, landscaping and highways safety involving the scheme at Rushey Mead;
- Sainsburys also had been working closely with planning officers in addressing local issues and considering suggestions from local residents regarding what community benefits could arise from the scheme. The meeting was reminded that it was the Council that prescribed what community benefits should be delivered, as there were practical as well as legal constraints on what could be provided. For example, the Council would have to meet on-going costs;
- The planning applications for Rushey Mead and Belgrave Road would be submitted before the end of the month;
- Once submitted, both the GE site and Belgrave Road schemes would be subject to formal consultation and Sainsburys would continue to engage with both communities. For example, further meetings would be held;
- Sainsburys would arrange further ward briefings during April. These would be confirmed by Council officers. In the meantime, Sainsburys could still be contacted on 0800 975 5299 or by visiting www.sainsburys-leicester.co.uk. Alternatively, residents were welcome to contact Ward Members.

Concern was raised that it already was difficult for pedestrians to cross the road at the proposed development site, especially when crossing Troon Way. To assist with this, it was suggested that it would be useful for there to be pedestrian entrances at the back of the proposed store. It was noted that the main entrance on Melton Road would lead on to one of the busiest junctions in the City, so pedestrian crossings also would be needed there.

It was noted that plans for the proposed store would be made available on the City Council's website when submitted. Sainsburys also would publicise them.

The Ward Members reminded the Meeting that no response had been received to date on the request for community facilities to be provided. Ward Members would continue to press for such facilities, but it was noted that the running costs of anything provided would have to be borne by the City Council.

It was noted that Sainsburys had suggested holding a joint meeting with Belgrave Ward on this application, which was welcomed in principle, although there was some concern that the meeting could be too large to enable anyone to get their views heard properly. Consideration would need to be given to where a potentially large joint meeting could be held.

17. PRINCES TRUST PRESENTATION

As no representatives of the Prince's Trust were able to come to the meeting, this item was not considered.

18. POLICE AND COMMUNITY SAFETY UPDATE

PC Rob Pountney, Leicestershire Constabulary, gave an update on local policing in Rushey Mead.

There had been a slight increase in the number of major crimes from 28 to 32. This was mainly due to an increase in the number of burglaries, which was a concern to the Police. As a result, reducing the number of burglaries had become a priority issue for the Police.

Residents were reminded that:-

- The Police hoped to be able to repeat a recent project under which window shock alarms could be bought for £2.50 each from the Police, which was cost price. These stuck to the glass and made a high pitched piercing sound when the window was jolted;
- Window shock alarms were still useful if a house already had a burglar alarm;
- The Police should always be telephoned if an alarm was heard. If an alarm at a property went off continuously the Police would visit that property and request that the alarm be repaired / altered;
- If anyone suspicious was seen, or came to your property, residents could telephone 101 and a Police officer would attend as soon as possible. If the people seen were acting very suspiciously, residents should dial 999;
- If someone visited the house claiming to be offering a service, one way of checking if they were genuine could be to ask them to return at another time;
- Burglars currently were often looking for gold that was kept in homes.

PC Pountney also advised that the number of thefts from motor vehicles had risen from 1 to 3, but robberies and burglaries of non-dwellings had both reduced.

It was noted that leaflets on home security were available at the meeting, as were UV markers that could be used to write a postcode on items of property as a deterrent to burglars.

19. COMMUNITY MEETING BUDGET

The Chair explained that:-

- A written policy was followed in the making of decisions on grant applications. For example, projects had to be of benefit to local people and could not be for on-going costs such as salaries;
- A lot of the grant funding was given to voluntary groups and volunteers to help realise projects that otherwise would not happen;
- Applications for grants were determined by the Ward Councillors; and
- A newsletter was being prepared to advise residents on what funding was available.

The applications were then considered as follows:-

a) More People Canoeing More Often (Leicester Outdoor Pursuits Centre)

AGREED: that the request for funding of £1,220 be supported.

b) Celebration of Outdoor Life (Leicester Outdoor Pursuits Centre)

AGREED: that the request for funding of £820 be supported.

c) Mamta Ladies Group

AGREED: that the request for funding of £1,050 be supported.

d) Get Together and Fun Days (Oshwal Association of UK)

AGREED: that the request for funding of £600 be supported.

e) Yoga Sessions at Rushey Mead Recreation Centre (Mr Rajiv Shah)

AGREED: that the request for funding of £700 be supported

f) Birth Celebration of Shri Guru Ravidass Mahary Ji (Shri Guru Ravidass Temple and Community Centre)

It was questioned whether this celebration was confined to one community. In reply, it was noted that the Ward Members had some concerns about this application and that grants towards religious activities were not usually approved.

AGREED: that the application be rejected as it was a religious activity and not for the sole benefit of people in the Ward.

g) Don't Just Kick It (Owen Johnson)

Owen Johnson addressed the meeting, explaining that he worked as a league football coach in Leicestershire, using sport to mentor and coach children in life skills. This included working with football academies, but it was noticeable that it was often the children with access to higher levels of funding that were able to progress through these. This project therefore aimed to address this situation.

AGREED: that the request for funding of £1,000 be supported.

h) Communal Meeting Hut (Harrison Road Allotment Gardens)

The Treasurer of the Harrison Road Allotment Gardens Sub-Committee addressed the meeting, explaining that people with ages ranging from 21 to 83 used the allotments, some of whom were disabled. Work also was done with the neighbouring school, to encourage the children there to grow things. However, there currently was nowhere on site for allotment users to meet. Garden huts therefore were to be used, but they were not suitable to use in bad weather.

It was noted that a committee member had agreed to lend the Sub-Committee the money needed to provide a communal meeting hut. Various fund raising activities were being organised to repay this, including an open day on 23 June.

This was the first application that the Sub-Committee had made for funding from the Community Meeting budget.

AGREED: that the request for funding of £1,000 be supported.

i) Additional Requests

The Meeting noted that requests for funding also had been received from Sandfield Close Primary School, towards flower planting, and for funding to be provided to repair potholes in Strathaven Road.

AGREED: that funding towards flower planting at Sandfield Close Primary School and the repair of potholes in Strathaven Road be supported in principle, the final amounts awarded to be agreed by the Ward Members under the Council's "fast track" procedure.

20. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

a) Frequency of Meetings

In response to a question, it was noted that Community Meetings were held on a regular basis, the venue moving around different parts of the Ward.

They were publicised through the Leicester Link and leaflets distributed around the Ward.

b) Leicester Link

It was noted that residents in Glencoe Avenue were not receiving Leicester Link. This would be investigated.

21. CLOSE OF MEETING

The Chair thanked all present for attending and reminded them that they were welcome to contact the Ward Members if they needed help with any issues.

The meeting then closed at 7.50 pm.

This page is left blank intentionally.

MINUTE EXTRACT

RUSHEY MEAD COMMUNITY MEETING

Your Community, Your Voice

Record of Meeting and Actions

6:30 pm, Thursday, 12 January 2012

Held at: Rushey Mead Recreation Centre, Gleneagles Avenue

Who was there:

Councillor Culdipp Singh Bhatti MBE
--

Councillor Piara Singh Clair MBE

Councillor Ross Willmott



1. ELECTION OF CHAIR

Councillor Willmott was elected as Chair

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Rt Hon Keith Vaz MP.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations were received.

6. PROPOSED SAINSBURY'S STORE MELTON ROAD (FORMER GE LIGHTING SITE)

Bob Keys and Tim Watkins, Sainsbury's, attended the meeting to discuss the proposal of a new Sainsbury's store on Melton Road. It was reported that in addition to this store the existing store on Belgrave Road was being redeveloped. Sainsbury's were in attendance at the meeting to gain feedback from the local residents regarding the proposal and noted no planning application had been submitted. There was to be a public exhibitions on 20 January (1pm-7pm) and 21 January (9am-1pm) at St Theodore's Church. Suggestions and views through the consultation process could influence the final plans to be submitted.

The Chair explained that Sainsbury's would need to make a financial contribution (section 106 agreement) to the area if their planning application was approved. Where the funding was allocated it would be influenced through the planning process and community input was needed. Sainsbury's requested that suggestions for what was needed in the area be passed to the ward councillors.

The following was discussed at the meeting:

Section 106 agreement

- Sainsbury's indicated that as part of the overall redevelopment of the site and the current store site on Belgrave Road they would be prepared to fund the demolition of the Belgrave Road flyover.
- Residents considered that priorities in the Rushey Mead ward were:
 - The provision of community facilities (possibly a community centre)
 - Improvements to the Troon Way-Melton Road junction to take into account current safety issues and future increased traffic flows.
- Residents expressed concern that the impression was given that the Council needed the Section 106 funding for projects in the area and that this need for funds would drive the application rather than local need for a new store. Members explained that the section 106 agreement was part of any large planning application as provision would need to be made for the local community and would not influence other planning considerations.

Traffic issues

- Concern was raised regarding existing traffic problems and road safety at the Troon Way junction, as well as traffic access and volumes once the store was open.
- It was requested that the Council's and applicant's traffic studies be made available to local residents and groups, which should not be based on surveys taken in holiday periods or other low traffic volume times.

Development phase

- Following the disturbance to residents neighbouring the site during the demolition of the GE lighting building concern was expressed that traffic, noise, dust and disruption would have an impact during construction. It was requested that the Council be involved in the needs of the local residents.
- There was concern about the impact of parked cars around the site, whether on grass verges or in side streets and the need to enforce parking and obstruction of traffic regulations.
- It was suggested that a pedestrian crossing might be needed in Jacklin Drive during construction.

Operational phase

- Concern was expressed that the store would attract anti-social and criminal behaviour. PC Puntney commented that security needed to be built into the design and consultation was needed at a local level. Sainsbury's commented that it had a strict policy on anti-social behaviour and criminality at or around its sites.
- As 24 hour stores were expensive to run Sainsbury's did not run them in the Midlands and had no current plans to implement a change.
- There would be 600 jobs across both stores.

Planning and development consideration

- Access to the site was a cause of continuing concern to residents regarding how access would be placed off Melton Road and the number of access points.
- Sainsbury's reported there was no access to the new store off Troon Way. Detailed consideration would be given on safe, efficient and easy access to the store. This would need to be balanced against the requirements of existing and future traffic, local, commuter and store-generated traffic.
- Concern about increased overall traffic levels caused by aggregated traffic.
- Great care would be taken, in particular during the planning and development phases, to minimise local impact from the business units, however the site had industrial planning permission and jobs would be created beyond those relating to the superstore and associated petrol station.
- Concern was expressed for local retailers and it was queried what protections the council would offer long-term local businesses who were effected. Sainsbury's commented that they looked to work positively with local businesses and could help to retain or improve the diversity of local outlets, based on experience in other areas.
- The store would be a one storey building development.
- Sainsbury's noted design concern regarding the proposed removal of protected trees to the south east of the site and the indicative routes across the green council-owned band to the east of the site.

- It was noted the outline proposals to remove trees had been made on the basis of advice from planning officers and on consideration of security and personal safety. Further investigation was needed to resolve this and other issues. Security by design should also underpin the industrial units development.
- Tree planting for screening and environmental purposes would need discussing further with the applicant and with local residents and interest groups.

Residents from the Townsend Close area requested a meeting with Councillor. It was agreed the Councillors would meet with the residents. It was also suggested that planning officer attend the next meeting to answer further questions.