

## RUSHEY MEAD COMMUNITY MEETING

TUESDAY, 21 JUNE 2016

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

NO	<u>ITEM</u>	<u>ACTION REQUESTED AT MEETING</u>
1.	<b>INTRODUCTIONS &amp; APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b>	<p>Councillor Patel, Chair, welcomed everyone and led introductions.</p> <p>There were no declarations of interest.</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Mrs Lucas (resident).</p>
2.	<b>ACTION LOG OF PREVIOUS MEETING</b>	<p>The action log of the meeting held on 7<sup>th</sup> March 2016 was agreed as a correct record.</p> <p>Matters arising:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pavement Parking on Clarke Street – The Community Engagement Officer had met with residents and was in talks with the school.</li> <li>• Litter on Rushey Fields – The City Warden had reported this to the Park Wardens who had indicated they would arrange more regular collections.</li> <li>• YOGA magazine – no further feedback received.</li> </ul>
3.	<b>WARD COUNCILLOR FEEDBACK</b>	<p>Councillor Willmott reported that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Complaints relating to the height of the grass on verges along Gleneagles Avenue/Troon Way had been received.</li> </ul> <p>Action – Community Engagement Officer to report to appropriate service.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alderton Close/Watermead Park, it was recognised there was a serious issue with the conflict of parked cars in this area and the situation was being looked into.</li> </ul> <p>Councillor Clair reported that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There were issues with the “sand” footpath along Troon Way - each time it rained it was creating holes.</li> </ul> <p>Action – Community Engagement Officer to report to appropriate service.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A number of residents had been sent envelopes relating to the parking scheme for</li> </ul>

		<p>Harrison Road area. The Council had selected two areas to pilot a parking scheme that allowed a car to park with two wheels on the footpath, the areas for parking would be marked out and the aim was to maximise parking whilst ensuring space for pedestrians/prams/wheelchairs to pass.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In relation to Braemar Drive area a drop in session had been arranged for Weds 29<sup>th</sup> June 2016 at the Rushey Mead Recreation Centre 5-15pm to 6-45pm.</li> <li>• Old Sainsburys development – it was proposed that some business units would be created and there would be a public consultation in due course.</li> <li>• At the end of July a 10 day event would take place on Rushey Fields leading to a temporary increase in traffic in and out of that area.</li> <li>• Outdoor Gym – the residents/Rushey Mead residents association had been consulted and asked for their preferences on where the equipment should be placed. Officers were keen to complete the installation. A resident suggested that a meeting was taking place on Rushey Fields but details of this were not available to be confirmed at this meeting.</li> </ul>
4.	<p><b>TRANSFORMING NEIGHBOURHOODS SCHEME BRIEFING</b></p>	<p>The Community Engagement Officer informed the meeting that the council was currently reviewing the way it operated local services including community centres.</p> <p>The review was now looking at the North East of the city which included Rushey Mead Ward, Troon Ward, Belgrave Ward, Humberstone &amp; Hamilton Ward and Thurncourt Ward and the Council wanted to work with local people to make services fit for the future.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significant cuts in government funding meant the council would not be able to continue to run services as now.</li> <li>• The council wanted to work with communities to make changes and to deliver effective - joined up services.</li> <li>• The council was reviewing how Neighbourhood services were run to make sure that they were affordable and could respond to local people's needs.</li> </ul>

		<p>The council would be working with local people and community organisations to look at the best way to deliver services in the future. The options being looked at included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• reducing the number of buildings owned by the council</li> <li>• merging services into shared buildings: this had worked well elsewhere in Leicester and had led to longer opening hours</li> <li>• involving local people in running some services</li> <li>• self-service facilities.</li> </ul> <p>The consultation period was from 6<sup>th</sup> June 2016 to 17<sup>th</sup> July 2016 and residents were encouraged to complete questionnaire forms which were also available online.</p>
5.	<b>HARRISON ROAD PARKING UPDATE</b>	<p>An officer was not available to present this item but information on the Controlled Pavement Parking pilot schemes was circulated at the meeting (as attached.)</p> <p><u>Stafford Street area</u> Residents voiced a number of concerns in relation to parked vehicles in the street and especially those involving a local business. The ensuing discussion included the following comments and responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enforcement officers were not visiting the area consistently. On bin days people were being ticketed but residents were not able to park where they should be able to because of access problems.</li> <li>• A local business was parking vehicles on the street instead of inside its premises area, these vehicles were in various states and not all taxed/MOT'd.</li> <li>• Councillors informed residents that planning regulations had been checked and the council could only take action if the law was broken and there was appropriate evidence to support that.</li> <li>• Residents were asked to provide evidence to support their claims so that the council could take further action.</li> <li>• The City Warden had met with residents and also advised that evidence needed to be collected, diary sheets had been provided for this purpose.</li> <li>• It was important that the diary sheets and any</li> </ul>

		<p>photographs showed the dates and times of incidents as well as details of who witnessed the incident.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residents were worried about reprisals if they gave their names. It was confirmed that whoever produced the evidence would have to be prepared to go to court, people should not fear prosecution if they were telling the truth.</li> <li>• Residents were encouraged to report any threats or intimidation to the Police.</li> <li>• 4 residents agreed that they would be willing to provide evidence to Councillors who could then act on that.</li> <li>• It was claimed that details of individuals who had signed petitions were being disclosed.</li> </ul> <p>Action 1 – Council lawyers to be consulted on whether there was another way that evidence could be collected from residents in the area.</p> <p>Action 2 – Community Engagement Officer to liaise with the Anti-social behaviour team to see if there were any other viable options.</p> <p>Action 3 – Democratic Support Officer to check and report back to Councillors what information relating to Petitions was published.</p>
6.	<b>LOCAL POLICING UPDATE</b>	<p>Leicestershire Police were not present at the meeting.</p> <p>An update on Police issues in the ward to be provided to the next meeting.</p>
7.	<b>CITY WARDEN UPDATE</b>	<p>Mo Patel, City Warden for Rushey Mead ward provided an update which included the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• KinCraig Garages – the open garage that was full of rubbish had been cleared and secured. The whole area was in the process of being cleaned and this would then be monitored to maintain it.</li> <li>• Bath Street – a community protection notice had been served on land owners and they had now completed repairs to the damaged fence. This area would also be monitored to keep the site clean and secure.</li> <li>• There had been an increase in the number of vehicles for sale on the road – this was being investigated.</li> </ul>

		<p>Everyone was reminded to report incidents to the city warden service either by telephone 0116 4541001 or using the Love Leicester App.</p>
8.	<b>WARD COMMUNITY BUDGET</b>	<p>The Community Engagement Officer reported that 6 applications had been considered since the last meeting:</p> <p>Big Stop Day – Grant of £500 Supported</p> <p>Rushey Mead Milap – Grant of £1015 Supported</p> <p>Sandfield Parent Teachers Association (Joint bid) – Grant of £470 Supported</p> <p>Belgrave Allotment Society – Grant of £490 Supported</p> <p>Rushey Fields Residents Association – Grant of £500 Supported</p> <p>GNG Football (Joint bid) – Grant of £500 Supported</p> <p>The Chair encouraged applicants to lodge their applications in advance of the meetings to ensure they were considered.</p> <p>Applicants were also advised that all applications should be submitted online. Those for £500 or less would continue to be fast tracked.</p> <p><u>Update on previously funded bids</u> At the last meeting a bid for benches to be installed along Troon Way/Gleneagles Avenue was supported by Councillors. The Community Engagement officer had completed a walk-around of the area and the bases for the benches had been put in place. It was hoped that the benches would be installed soon.</p>
9.	<b>ANY OTHER BUSINESS</b>	<p><u>AOB1</u> A resident referred to an article in LINK magazine about wi-fi usage in the City. Councillors said that ERDF funding to businesses in the City Centre had been made available to obtain wi-fi access. Councillor Willmott suggested that further information about publicly available wi-fi in the City Centre could be obtained from the Councils website.</p> <p><u>AOB2</u> Mr Sharma raised the issue of CCTV installation in</p>

		<p>the Rushey Mead area. Councillors referred Mr Sharma to responses provided at previous meetings.</p> <p><u>AOB3</u>  Mr Weston of the Thurmaston Times referred to comments made about the Thorn Lighting sculpture. Councillor Clair advised that the money to purchase this had come from Sainsburys under section 106 regulations. An artist had originally been commissioned who produced the first design which was estimated at £3/4 million. Another artist was commissioned who produced the current design at a much lower cost. It was not possible to site the sculpture on the original site because of the Sainsburys development. The plinth was generally considered a good idea and local children had been consulted on the words.  A “heritage” information board was also due to be installed that would show the history and legacy of the site.  Mr Weston suggested that it would be appropriate for a Blue Plaque to be put on the Sainsburys site. Councillors indicated they would support that if Mr Weston made the application.</p> <p><u>AOB4</u>  From July 26<sup>th</sup> to August 2<sup>nd</sup> a cultural event was planned on Rushey Fields for the Recital of Hindu Scriptures. This would be broadcast live. The organisers raised the possibility of funding towards waste collection. Councillor Clair referred to email correspondence that had taken place between the organiser and the council. The council were not able to fund religious activities.  Residents asked that the long grasses and area to rear of Rushey Fields park be cleared before the event took place.  Action – City Warden to look at area and make request to Parks Service</p>
<p><b>10.</b></p>	<p><b>DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS</b></p>	<p>Future meetings to take place as follows:  Tuesday 4<sup>th</sup> October 2016 at 6.30pm at the Rushey Mead Recreation Centre.</p> <p>Tuesday 28<sup>th</sup> February 2017 at 6.30pm at a venue to be confirmed.</p> <p>The meeting closed at 8.20pm</p>

# Minute Item 5

## Controlled pavement parking – Rushey Mead pilot schemes

Short Update Briefing – Ward Meeting 21<sup>st</sup> June 2016.

### General:

In recent years the council have received many complaints from pedestrians (especially vulnerable pedestrians) who have been put at risk by drivers who park vehicles in a way that obstructs the pavement. Two areas in Rushey Mead have been identified as possibly suitable to pilot measures to control pavement parking. The areas were chosen because many residents are currently parking on the pavement. However, they are generally doing this in a disciplined way. This shows that although most residents feel they needed to park on the pavement to keep the carriageway clear, they are aware that pedestrians do have to use the pavement too. Therefore, the council recognise that by introducing controls to regularise the existing parking situation it would minimise any disruption to responsible residents in those areas. At the same time, the council would then be able to *encourage* those who persist in parking in a way that obstructs the pavement (ie <1m) by using their civil enforcement powers to issue parking tickets. There is also the option that where the problem is particularly acute physical barriers could be employed.

### Braemar Drive Area:

A leaflet describing the issues and possible control measures was distributed to this area in January.

The council received a 38% response to the questionnaire attached to the leaflet. Overall 65% of respondents were in favour of some form of control of pavement parking. Although very few wanted to see physical barriers used.

After considering these responses the ward councillors felt that it would be helpful to residents to see a possible scheme in more detail and to be able to discuss this with their councillors and council officers. A draft scheme has been raised for discussion and a drop-in session has been arranged for Wednesday 29<sup>th</sup> June at the Rushey Mead recreation centre on Gleneagles Avenue. Residents are welcome to drop in anytime between 5:15pm and 6:45pm.

### Harrison Road area:

A leaflet describing the issues and possible control measures was distributed to this area in May.

The council received a 17% response to the questionnaire attached to the leaflet. Overall 90% of respondents were in favour of some form of control of pavement parking. Only a minority supported the use of physical barriers.

There were also comments received regarding dustbins being left out on pavements and calls for a residents parking scheme in the area.

Councillors and council officers will now consider the response in detail and what form and extent (if any) of controlled pavement parking scheme may be suitable. Further consultation on this will take place with residents in this area later in the year.

