

AYLESTONE COMMUNITY MEETING

THURSDAY, 27 APRIL 2017

Held at: St Edward the Confessor Catholic Church, 633 Aylestone Road,
Aylestone, Leicester, LE2 8TF

ACTION LOG

Present:

Councillor Clarke
Councillor Porter

<u>NO.</u>	<u>ITEM</u>	<u>ACTION REQUESTED AT MEETING</u>
20.	INTRODUCTIONS AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	<p>Councillor Porter was elected as Chair and led introductions.</p> <p>Councillor Clarke and Councillor Porter declared their interests concerning their involvement in agenda item 4 (Franklyn Fields Update) and item 5 (Sanvey Lane/Marsden Lane update).</p> <p>Councillor Porter specified that his interests were as follows, he had;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• campaigned against the development of Franklyn Fields;• presented a petition to the Council regarding Franklyn Fields;• friends and supporters in relation to the site who were involved in the petition had contributed time and funds towards his campaign; and• campaigned with residents to ensure that any improvements at Sanvey Lane/Marsden Lane were appropriate.
21.	APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE	<p>There were no apologies for absence.</p>
22.	ACTION LOG OF LAST MEETING	<p>The Action Log of the previous meeting held on 29 September 2016 was agreed and noted.</p>
23.	FRANKLYN FIELDS UPDATE	<p>Grant Butterworth (Head of Planning) gave an update on the Franklyn Fields site.</p> <p>He referred to the previous action log, which had noted that an application for the site was expected. It</p>

was confirmed that since the previous meeting an application had been received and that this would be determined in due course by the Council's Planning and Development Control Committee.

The application was currently subject to a period of consultation. The requirements on the Council to advertise the application were clarified. It was reported that site notices had been displayed, advertisements had been published and over 60 individual letters had been sent to residents neighbouring the site. Councillors also reported on their efforts to ensure that residents were aware of the proposals and understood the process of the consultation prior to the Committee's consideration of the application.

In this regard the active consideration of consultee submissions was discussed and it was noted that comments made at the previous meeting and other representations concerning the use of the land made prior to the application had also been noted.

In response to a question relating to the impact of petitions, it was reported that although petitions were always considered, individual representations that addresses specific objections would have greater effect.

Although the statutory period for receiving representations had closed in January, it was confirmed that the City Council's policy was to consider all representations received prior to the Committee meeting. It was expected that due to the significant number of representations already received, and the complexities of those representations, the application would not be at a stage for the Committee's determination for several months.

It was reported that this timeframe would be extended further should any significant revised plans be submitted by the applicant, it being noted that applicants often submitted revisions to plans to try to satisfy objections before the Committee's determination. In response to a question it was confirmed that if revised plans significantly altered a proposal, a further consultation exercise would be required.

In terms of the Committee meeting, it was reported that the Council allowed public speaking and that objectors were allowed a total of 5 minutes to express

their views to members.

Residents raised questions concerning the education provision for the site, the traffic impact of the proposal and access to the site, together with air quality concerns. It was noted that technical responses would be provided. It was noted that the highway and education departments were heavily involved in the consultation process and would make detailed responses.

Having regard to the comments specifically concerning the traffic impact, it was clarified that the applicants would produce technical details of the highway impacts and traffic levels expected from any development of the site, such as at peak traffic times.

This technical detail would be assessed by the Council's highways officers who would also report their findings to the Committee prior to the application being determined.

In respect of the housing types and style of design, it was reported that the Council had no powers to request certain styles or designs of housing, although a proportion of affordable units would be expected.

In terms of any financial contribution expected from the developer, attention was drawn to the addendum to the previous action log that provided details of the S.106 Planning requirements.

In conclusion, concern was also raised by Councillors and residents that the applicants had accessed the site without permission.

In response it was confirmed that applicants were allowed access to sites prior to the determination of applications. In this case, Morris Homes had not obtained the necessary licences from the Council prior to their works to clear the site, once this had been reported the Council's Property Department had acted swiftly to ensure licences were applied for. It was reported that those applications had been considered and licences had been granted retrospectively.

Residents commented that although licences had now been granted, the actions of the applicant to access the site had been seen by many as a tactic to suggest that the application had been approved, in order to prevent any further objections being submitted.

It was clarified that the access to the site was not a

		<p>consideration that could be made as part of the planning process concerning the merits of the application.</p> <p>In closing the item, Councillors encouraged residents to submit their comments and representations on the details of the application to the Planning Department.</p> <p>Grant was thanked for providing the update and answering the questions of residents.</p>
<p>24.</p>	<p>SANVEY LANE/ MARSDEN LANE UPDATE</p>	<p>Robert Bateman (Highways and Traffic Design) provided an update on Sanvey Lane/Marsden Lane.</p> <p>It was reported that as there had been no objections to the advertised Traffic Regulation Order proposals for parking restrictions, the scheme was to progress and works would commence on or around 5 June 2017. A plan showing the extent of works was made available for inspection and information.</p> <p>In terms of other schemes and following reports of rat running in the area, a traffic survey had been undertaken which had confirmed the residents' perceptions that problems existed.</p> <p>Initial options to install bollards at various locations were being considered, however this would inevitably result in disruption to some residents, dependant on the location. Similarly, schemes to introduce short one-way stretches in some locations had been suggested, noting that this could also disrupt some residents.</p> <p>In conclusion, residents were asked to comment on the possible solutions to ensure that a scheme could be implemented without unnecessary inconvenience.</p> <p>It was suggested that a separate meeting be held with Councillors and Traffic Development Officers to further consider the situation.</p> <p>The need to ensure full publicity of the meeting was noted and it was noted that individual letters to houses in the streets involved would be delivered by hand, as was the practice for many Traffic Regulation Order schemes.</p> <p>The situation concerning the Franklyn Fields site was raised and it was considered essential to have this in mind when discussing any improvements to Marsden Lane and adjacent streets. It was noted that a significant volume of extra traffic from any approval of development at Franklyn Fields would have an effect on vehicles exiting Marsden Lane. Residents felt that</p>

		<p>the introduction of the 24hr bus lane had also caused an impact on the situation.</p> <p>It was therefore suggested and agreed that the meeting to discuss traffic issues in the Marsden Lane area be convened following the determination of the planning application at Franklyn Fields.</p> <p>Residents also discussed the poor levels of Park and Ride use, use of bus services, congestion charging, the workplace parking levy, an increase in commercial traffic, and a lack of enforcement of TRO's already in place.</p> <p>Robert was thanked for his attendance and update.</p>
<p>25.</p>	<p>POLICE ISSUES UPDATE</p>	<p>PO Rykki Townsend (Leicestershire Police) was introduced to the meeting. He provided an update on the following matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Speeding problems at Aylestone Drive / Milligan Road had been reported and enforcement action had been undertaken, the problem existed particularly at times when children were walking to schools. • Other 'speed gun' enforcement activities were noted and it was noted that some cars were also taken off the road as it was evident that the drivers had no insurance. It was reported that this was a labour and resource intensive activity. • The use of unlicensed motorbikes, and quad / mini bikes in Aylestone Meadows and on the Great Central Way was also continuing to cause problems. It was noted that due to the nature of the activity, the problem was extremely difficult for the police to enforce. The use of CCTV on the Great Central Way and its renewal or replacement was being discussed at the Police Safety partnership meetings, together with many other enforcement issues. <p>Rykki was thanked for his report and update.</p>
<p>26.</p>	<p>CITY WARDEN</p>	<p>Noel Cazley (City Warden) provided an update on environmental and enforcement activities in the Ward.</p> <p>He reported on the following key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dog fouling had continued to cause problems and stencilling to attract people to the situation and to prevent repeat instances were being

		<p>used.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The use of the LoveLeicester app was promoted as an effective mechanism should residents need to report any issues. It was reported that a phone or other mobile device that had GPS would immediately locate any issue reported, which in turn assisted Cleansing Services or other departments to deal with problems. • Fly-tipping was being dealt with at a number of areas and warrants had been issued to local businesses following reports from residents. • Community Protection Notices (CPNs) could be issued to swiftly enforce environmental matters; an example was given where a rental firm had inconsiderately parked a number of vehicles. • Commercial waste disposal had become an issue with a number of businesses attempting to dispose of waste in public waste bins. Work to ensure the removal of commercial bins from streets to storage areas was also increasing. • The LoveLeicester app was promoted as <p>Noel was thanked for his report and update.</p>
27.	WARD COMMUNITY BUDGET	<p>The Community Engagement Officer reported that 9 applications had been received and considered by Councillors.</p> <p>7 had been supported, 1 not supported and 1 withdrawn.</p> <p>At year end, a remaining balance of £1800 could be carried forward to the 2017-18 financial year. It was confirmed that the first round of applications for the new financial year would open on 10 April 2017 and close on 31 May 2017 and applications were welcomed.</p>
28.	ANY OTHER BUSINESS	<p><u>Cricket Floodlights</u></p> <p>It was reported that permission had been granted to extend the occasional use of floodlights. It was noted that due to the cost implications, it was not expected that there would be a significant amount of use.</p> <p><u>Vacant Properties</u></p> <p>The Council's 'Empty Homes Strategy' was discussed as many vacant properties were in an untidy condition</p>

		<p>or falling into disrepair.</p> <p>It was reported that as Council Tax was being received for many vacant properties the houses were not categorised within the strategy and the Council did not have powers to intervene. The City Warden was able to serve notice where there was a statutory nuisance or where public safety was compromised.</p> <p><u>Parks Services – volunteering .</u></p> <p>Kim Hawksworth and Neil Harris (Volunteer Leaders, Neighbourhoods and Environment) presented details of their work and encouraged residents to volunteer for projects in the Ward.</p> <p>The links to the excellent work undertaken by the Aylestone Meadows Appreciation Society were recognised and options for increasing publicity were noted.</p> <p>Forms for residents to complete and register as volunteers were made available.</p> <p><u>Post Office</u></p> <p>Residents asked that their thanks and appreciation be recorded in view of contribution made by the former owners/operators of the Post Office (Baz and Mina).</p> <p><u>Packhorse bridge</u></p> <p>It was noted that following previous works to remove weeds at the bridge, the problems had returned. It was reported that weeds had caused damage and that they could not be sprayed with herbicide due to the proximity of the watercourse.</p> <p>The position was noted and Parks Services officers present agreed to refer the matter to the appropriate department.</p>
29.	CLOSE OF MEETING	The meeting closed at 8.40 pm.

