

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.