



Council Meeting  
Tuesday 6 March 2018

Public and Member Questions  
and Responses



Derby City Council

**COUNCIL – 6 March 2018**  
**PUBLIC AND MEMBER QUESTIONS**

Questioner	Respondent	Subject
------------	------------	---------

**Public Questions**

<b>A</b>	Dorothy Skrytek	Councillor Afzal	Air quality management area
<b>B</b>	David Gale	Councillor Banwait	Response to public questions
<b>C</b>	Simon Bacon	Councillor Afzal	Trade waste income
<b>D</b>	Ms P Mawbey	Councillor Afzal	Removal of blue bin collections
<b>E</b>	David Gale	Councillor Afzal	Church Street pavement width
<b>F</b>	Simon Bacon	Councillor Afzal	Trade waste agreement
<b>G</b>	Ms P Mawbey	Councillor Afzal	Bins on streets

**Councillor Questions**

<b>H</b>	Councillor Skelton	Councillor Russell	EHCP reporting
<b>I</b>	Councillor Graves	Councillor Raju	Alvaston Park
<b>J</b>	Councillor M Holmes	Councillor Shanker	Moorways operating subsidy
<b>K</b>	Councillor Harwood	Councillor Afzal	St Peters Street cycle lane
<b>L</b>	Councillor Poulter	Councillor Shanker	Standards recommendations
<b>M</b>	Councillor Naitta	Councillor Afzal	Community policing
<b>N</b>	Councillor Care	Councillor Rawson	Footpath planning requirement
<b>O</b>	Councillor Roulstone	Councillor Russell	EHCP data
<b>P</b>	Councillor Willoughby	Councillor Russell	EHCP quality control
<b>Q</b>	Councillor Skelton	Councillor Russell	EHCP reporting discrepancy
<b>R</b>	Councillor Graves	Councillor Afzal	Canal path
<b>S</b>	Councillor Care	Councillor Afzal	Sinfin waste plant testing
<b>T</b>	Councillor Roulstone	Councillor Russell	EHCP banding criteria
<b>U</b>	Councillor Willoughby	Councillor Russell	SEND consultation
<b>V</b>	Councillor Graves	Councillor Afzal	City Point path
<b>W</b>	Councillor Care	Councillor Shanker	Council House energy usage
<b>X</b>	Councillor Graves	Councillor Afzal	Church Street reconstruction
<b>Y</b>	Councillor Graves	Councillor Afzal	Highways maintenance
<b>Z</b>	Councillor Graves	Councillor Rawson	Northridge House highways impact



# Public Questions



**a. Question from Dorothy Skrytek to Councillor Afzal**

**Sinfin now has two incineration plants pumping nitrogen dioxide and particulates into the air, the wood-pellet burner on Victory Rd and the gasifying incinerator, currently burning through thousands of gallons of diesel on Sinfin Lane (claims of it being 'steam' are incorrect, as steam is not dark-grey and smelling of diesel).**

**How and when will the city council, as part of its duty of care, be installing monitoring equipment for particulates, reinstating the Air Quality Management Area for particulates and ensuring Sinfin is one of the UK Government's six Clean Air Zones?**

Both the CEG wood gasification plant at Trafalgar Park and the Sinfin Waste Treatment Facility located on Sinfin Lane have been modelled for potential releases of particulate air pollution. Neither of these operations are predicted to contribute significantly to particulate air pollution within the locality.

Levels of particulate air pollution (PM<sub>10</sub>) which led to the declaration of the Victory Road Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) have been demonstrated through monitoring to have considerably reduced to levels which are significantly below the National Air Quality Objectives and EU Limit Values. This justified the revocation of the Victory Road AQMA, which was formally approved by DEFRA. Any particulate emissions from the two above-mentioned operations are extremely unlikely to cause any future breaches.

Regarding Clean Air Zones, the Council is currently completing extensive feasibility and scoping work in order to design a detailed package of air quality improvement measures which will benefit the city as a whole. Furthermore, the Council is concurrently developing a Low Emission Strategy which will contain additional air quality improvement measures. Both packages of measures will benefit air quality in the Sinfin area.

**b. Question from David Gale to Councillor Banwait**

**In persistently failing to properly answer public questions asked in full council meetings, this administration's contemptuous abuse of process continues to bring the city council into disrepute. What is the Council Leader going to do about it?**

I don't agree with Mr Gale's assertion.

**c. Question from Simon Bacon to Councillor Afzal**

**With the proposal to hand the city councils trade waste business to Nottingham City Council how much waste will that involve and what income will the council now be losing?**

The amount of waste collected from commercial premises of course varies. It has been estimated that the minimum amount of waste likely to be collected under the arrangements with Nottingham City Council which will come into effect from April will be 6000 tonnes.

In 2016/17 the commercial waste service generated income of just over £1.6million but this was off set by similar operational and disposal costs.

**d. Question from Ms P J Mawbey to Councillor Afzal**

**The Council is actively promoting the importance of recycling on a regular basis via social media, campaigns, and school visits and on the Council's environmental policy it states: "the Council will minimise waste by encouraging the reduction, repair, and reuse of items and provide more opportunities and facilities for recycling and composting in Derby" and "recycling saves money".**

**How can the Council therefore justify the removal of blues bins and the removal of recycling hubs in Derby which has led to a reduction in the rate of recycling and left many residents with absolutely no facilities to recycle at the same time as promoting the importance of recycling?**

The rationale behind the decision to remove blue recycling bins from some areas of the city have been explained previously and officers have provided an answer directly to Ms Mawbey on the points she has raised.

I will reiterate that the council's decision to remove recycling bins in some streets was taken in direct response to the problems faced in these areas. In these areas the nature of properties and streets mean that residents have struggled to manage with multiple bins and where the contamination of bins has been a significant and ongoing challenge resulting in complaints and excess litter in many locations.

The decision is not a reflection of the council's commitment to recycling.

**e. Question from David Gale to Councillor Afzal**

**In discussions with the developer of the Yews Residential Care Home building works which border Church Street in Alvaston, it appears that, despite my representations to the council, no approach has been made by the council to negotiate a deviation to the planning consent to address the current sub-regulatory standard 0.85 metre footpath on the east side of Church Street. This is a particularly grave safety issue on Church Street due to the heavy bus traffic and the fact that the buses' rear view mirrors overhang the pavement.**

**The developer has recently confirmed that the new railings will follow the line of the existing brick wall which is to be demolished. Given the number of pedestrians using Church Street for school access, there is a potential 'win / win' here if the footpath can be widened through discussions with the owner of the residential care home.**

**Will the council commit to contacting the owner of the residential care home in an attempt to address the urgent matter of public safety that appears to have been ignored by the council?"**

There are two ways in which the Highway Authority (HA) can secure a footway widening as a result of a planning proposal:

1. The council has a published highway scheme where any 3<sup>rd</sup> party land required for the highway scheme is safeguarded from development. In this instance the HA have to meet all the costs for the scheme including land acquisition, or;
2. as a mitigation measure as a consequence of the development i.e. in this case to cater for a significant increase in the number of pedestrians on the footway as a direct result of the proposed development.

In the assessment of this planning application No 13/00101 neither of the above were applicable. Officers have contacted the applicant with a view to pursuing such a widening but this would be a voluntary action from the land owner and not something that the Highway Authority can insist upon.

The narrowness of the footway mentioned in the question is exacerbated by the improvement of the listed building directly opposite. You are hopefully aware that this work has now been completed, easing the burden on those that have been affected by it.

**f. Question from Simon Bacon to Councillor Afzal**

**How much trade waste per year which previously entered the Resource Recovery Solutions contract will now be diverted away from that contract with the handing of the council's trade waste collections to Nottingham City Council?**

The amount of waste collected from commercial premises of course varies. It has been estimated that the minimum amount of waste likely to be collected under the arrangements with Nottingham City Council which will come into effect from April will be 6000 tonnes per annum.

Once the responsibility for the commercial waste service has been delegated to Nottingham City Council, the responsibility for the disposal of that waste transfers to them. The contract with Resource Recovery Solutions only covers waste which the council delivers to them for disposal purposes.

**g. Question from Ms P J Mawbey to Councillor Afzal**

**Now we have the community enforcement team in place talking to residents and educating them in relation to waste disposal, fly tipping and littering, plus fines for leaving bins on street, why can't they also educate people on recycling and reinstate the blue bins at the same time?**

**One of the reasons for removal of the blue bins was contaminated recycling bins being left on the streets so this won't be a problem now that people aren't allowed to keep bins on the streets.**

The Community Support team are working in partnership with our current Streetpride services to improve the street-scene within some of the inner-city wards. We are working in a targeted approach to engage and educate residents to help them manage their waste appropriately. This team also provide enforcement support when evidence is present in relation to fly-tipping and bins on streets. Streetpride will continue to monitor and review policies in relation to waste collection as and when required.

# Councillor Questions



#### **h. Question from Councillor Skelton to Councillor Russell**

**Derby News website has recently published an article that stated that different figures for the number of Statement to EHCP conversions still to be finalised have been reported to the Department of Education on the one hand and locally to councillors and the media on the other.**

**Which set of figures is correct?**

It is important to outline that the council strongly refutes the assertion by the Derby News website that the council has in anyway been misleading the Department for Education (DfE).

There have been regular and structured meetings between the council and the DfE's SEND Regional Advisor linked to Derby, over the last 12 months.

In those meetings, the DfE has been very complimentary on the council's good progress in relation to conversions, and this was also the case in the latest visit on Wednesday 21 February 2018.

Based on continuing good progress by the council, the next DfE visit is now scheduled for 24 April 2018, in two months' time. This further demonstrates that the DfE are positive with the council's continuing good progress in relation to conversions.

In relation to numbers, the conversion of statements to Education Health Care Plans (EHCPs) is progressing on a daily basis and the correct figures have always been submitted as requested to the DfE, councillors or local media.

**i. Question from Councillor Graves to Councillor Raju**

**You may be aware I am an active volunteer on the Alvaston Park Friends Group where we have made massive improvements to the park and working with the Parks Department to achieve the Green Flag Award year after year.**

**One of the highlights of our calendar is the annual Family Fun Day event, this year July 22nd, (no apologies for the plug, please put it in your diaries!)**

**For many years this event has been organised, cultivated and run by the Alvaston Park Friends and has become the biggest Summer event run by volunteers, especially Rachel Taylor. This year the council has signed an agreement to take over the management of this event on a year by year agreement, working with Alvaston Park Friends.**

**Last year saw the aggressive takeover of the Mad Hatters Café by the council causing a great deal of anger in the community and with park users. Can I have, for the record, an assurance that Alvaston Park Friends will be supported in this event and will not suffer the Mad Hatters Café fate?**

The Alvaston Park Family Fun Day is a credit to the Friends Group who have developed and grown the event, with council support, to become one of the biggest and most popular in the city. As the event has become bigger and more successful the challenges involved in running it have increased.

Following the 2017 event, a debrief session with Alvaston Park Friends took place. The Friends group confirmed that they would require additional support for them to be able to put the event on in 2018. A Partnership Agreement has therefore been agreed for the 2018 event which clarifies that the event will be “Produced by Alvaston Park Friends in association with Derby City Council”. This will enable the increased support required to be provided by the council.

**j. Question from Councillor M Holmes to Councillor Shanker**

**The Labour administration has committed to a new municipal swimming pool on the Moorways site. Can you confirm the latest estimation of the year-on-year tax payer subsidy required as part of overall running costs once opened as follows:**

**Minimum subsidy predicted (best case)**

**Maximum subsidy predicted (worse case)**

**And how the council is planning to deal with this future budget pressure.**

The business case that has been produced showing the latest projections for the facility at this stage of the project is based on the possibility of three operating models for the venue; Council run, New Leisure Trust and Outsourced.

The projected revenue positions for the facility after year 5 of operation – including lifecycle costs and excluding loan repayments; if outsourced or operated by a new Leisure Trust is a surplus of up to £162k; if operated by the council the projected subsidy is £825k.

The council will be carrying out more detailed assessments of the options for operating this facility, as the detailed facility design progresses. The current MTFP includes a budget of £400,000 per year for operational costs and this will be refined through future budget planning as required.

**k. Question from Councillor Harwood to Councillor Afzal**

**Many safety concerns have been raised around the proposal to permit cycling along the length of St Peters Street pedestrian zone in the City Centre during certain times.**

**What arrangements have been made for enforcement action to be taken to ensure the permitted times are not breached and to deal with incidents of inconsiderate / dangerous riding.**

**Which agency holds the power to enforce the regulations?**

**Have detailed risk assessments been carried out to assess the dangers to pedestrians and other users to evaluate the risk of litigation against the Council in the event of accidents / injuries involving cyclists?**

Consultation has taken place with various statutory bodies and key stakeholders. The project team has engaged with various equality/ disability groups and several visits have been made to Leicester, who has successfully integrated pedal cycles into their pedestrianized zones in the heart of their city.

An Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) was carried out to ensure that the scheme does not have a negative impact on all footway users including wheelchair and mobility scooter users, deaf and partially sighted.

The proposed Traffic Regulation Order permits pedal cycles to cycle in both directions on St Peter's Street and Corn Market between the hours of 5pm and 10am. During these times goods vehicles are servicing businesses and therefore pedestrians will understand and be more likely to accept the inclusion of pedal cycles on St Peters Street and Corn Market.

Permitting pedal cycles to cycle along St Peters Street and Corn Market will provide a north/ south cycle link through the city centre, which will improve journey times, connectivity and permeability and help to promote a sustainable mode of transport.

Derbyshire Constabulary are solely responsible for enforcing moving vehicles restrictions such as the prohibition of vehicles in pedestrianised zones. Additionally, the police have the powers to deal with cyclists that are deemed to be riding inconsiderately or endangering other highway users. The police are aware of these proposals and can take positive action as part of their city centre activities.

Various measures will be implemented (such as temporary signage and publicity) to highlight the changes to the restrictions and encourage compliance and considerate cycling.

Once the scheme has been implemented, monitoring will take place to determine the level of compliance and gauge the number of cyclists that cycle along St Peter's Street/Corn Market legitimately. We will continue to work with the user groups as part of the Equalities Impact Assessment already carried out.

**I. Question from Councillor Poulter to Councillor Shanker**

**On 18 July 2017, the Standards Committee considered a referral from the Monitoring Officer in relation to Cllr Nawaz's inappropriate involvement in a taxi licensing matter. The committee unanimously concluded that he had breached the Code of Conduct for Councillors and made the following recommendations.**

***Resolved:***

***1. to agree that the following sanctions be imposed, as per paragraph 12 of the procedure for considering complaints:***

- recommend to Councillor Nawaz's Group Leader that he be removed from any or all Committees or Sub-Committees of the Council***
- recommend the Monitoring Officer to arrange Code of Conduct training for Councillor Nawaz; and***

***2. to agree that the Chair of the Standards Committee and/or Monitoring Officer write a letter to Councillor Nawaz's Group Leader outlining the seriousness of this interference with taxi licensing.***

**Can the Cabinet member confirm that Cllr Nawaz has subsequently completed the required Code of Conduct training?**

**Can he also confirm that a letter was sent to and received by Cllr Nawaz's group leader outlining the seriousness of this interference with taxi licensing?**

Yes, and yes.

**m. Question from Councillor Naitta to Councillor Afzal**

**At the public meeting held in Blagreaves ward you stated that you would secure additional resources to help police to catch these people that are breaking into peoples houses.**

**Could you tell me what extra resources you have secured?**

Thank you for the question – this is a good news story which demonstrates superb partnership working between the police, community activists and myself as Cabinet Member, which have resulted in a positive outcome.

You were aware, Councillor Naitta, that there were some issues with burglaries, and that I have been working closely with the police to highlight the necessity for additional resources and direct intervention. When these were brought to my attention I added it to the agenda as a priority issue for my regular meetings with the chief superintendent.

I am pleased to report that following my intervention, the police swiftly utilised those resources to take effective action. A number of individuals were arrested and held in custody.

This is evidence of how we work together in Derby. We share information, co-ordinate with our partners and ensure that we keep our city a safe place to live, work and visit. I am proud of the role that I personally played in making this a high priority issue, and prouder still that it resulted in the issue being tackled directly.

**n. Question from Councillor Care to Councillor Rawson**

**Conditions of the planning approvals DER/01/13/0084, DER/04/13/00382 and DER/09/13/01105 (point 10) required the proper construction of the footway before occupation of these new homes. These requirements have not been met, meaning that there is no proper pavement in front of these properties. Requests to rectify this situation have so far failed. How do you intend this situation to be resolved?**

The applicant and owners of each of the properties appear to be in breach of their planning permission and therefore liable for formal breach of condition action which ultimately can result in a fine in the magistrates court. This is an on-going complaint that officers are seeking to resolve with the threat of such formal action hanging over the land owners if action is not forthcoming.

**o. Question from Councillor Roulstone to Councillor Russell**

**Can the Cabinet Member provide updated figures on the latest status of EHCP conversions along with the number of new ECHP requests, including details of the number of refused requests year to date with comparable year-on-year figures?**

- Number of New EHCP Requests during 2017 calendar year: 451;
- Number of assessments refused during 2017 calendar year: 79.
  
- Number of New EHCP Requests during 2016 calendar year: 277;
- Number of assessments refused during 2016 calendar year: 112.

**p. Question from Councillor Willoughby to Councillor Russell**

**Given the large amount of EHCPs that are required to be completed and extra staff working on this, what steps are being made to ensure these are of the required quality to ensure re-working is not required due to mistakes subsequently identified by parents?**

In relation to the conversion process, and ensuring high quality, there is a quality checking system built in at every submission point: when initial drafting; when sending EHCPs for writing; when on receipt and when sending again to parents, carers and educational establishments.

**q. Question from Councillor Skelton to Councillor Russell**

**Please state the figures for conversions of Statements to EHCPs still to be finalised and agreed with parents, that you have reported to the Department of Education for each month from January 2017 to the present day, and the figures you have reported locally to councillors and the media from January 2017 to the present day.**

- April 2017: 941
- May 2017: 932
- June 2017: 928
- July 2017: 904
- August 2017: 875
- September 2017: 861
- October 2017: 972
- November 2017: 847
- December 2017: 737
- January 2018: 653
- February 2018: 502

**r. Question from Councillor Graves to Councillor Afzal**

**You may have been aware of a recent incident on the Canal Path, at the Harvey Road end, in the very cold weather where new tarmac was not correctly laid, whereby water retention resulted. On a very cold morning this had turned to ice and become a hazard to cyclists and pedestrians. One lady broke her wrist slipping on the ice.**

**The council's response was that the path had not been finished, which is a poor response as the section highlighted is a purportedly 'finished' section. The matter was made worse in that the 'ponding' had been reported to the council by users.**

**Can you ensure that the path is re-tarmacked properly to a proper standard? Can you also ensure that the rest of the path which is due to be completed does not have the same problems?**

Improvements have been carried out to the former canal cycle path between Harvey Road and London Road, this has included widening it to five metres and improving accessibility to the path from connecting routes.

The section of path between Harvey Road and Wetherby Road has been widened and the surfacing works completed. This has been built to standard specifications used for path construction works.

The works carried out to date were all checked as the scheme progressed, and inspected upon completion. No safety hazards were identified at that stage. Following the reported incident we will revisit the site to consider if any remedial works need to be carried out.

It is intended to apply a new surface to the outstanding section of path when weather conditions improve.

**s. Question from Councillor Care to Councillor Afzal**

**The waste plant on Sinfin Lane has, I understand, started testing. From reports of smell and vermin in the area this appears to include having waste on site. What checks are being made, or advice given on management of this waste, to minimise impact on neighbours and passers-by?**

In recent weeks the Sinfin waste treatment facility has begun commissioning activities. This has been well publicised both locally and within the media.

The commissioning process has included testing of the waste processing equipment within the plant. Waste has been delivered to the plant for this purpose.

I am aware of suggestions of odour emanating from the plant. This has been raised with the plants operator and with the Environment Agency. An investigation into the cause of the odour is underway and I am pressing for this to be concluded quickly.

**t. Question from Councillor Roulstone to Councillor Russell**

**What steps are being taken to ensure that the banding criteria for EHCP provision are applied consistently, given the large amount of staff working on these?**

Following consultation with schools, the council has taken the decision to introduce single SEND fund bandings for Special Schools and Enhanced Resource Schools from April 2018.

The new SEND bandings have been established to simplify the way in which funding is allocated to Special Schools and Enhanced Resource Schools, creating a more transparent and consistent funding system. They should also result in increased funding stability for schools, supporting budget setting processes. This also helps ensure consistency for all schools and staff involved with the SEND assessment process.

Overall, the new bandings will result in additional SEND funding of £911,000, over a three year period, a significant increase in investment in our schools in the city.

Exceptional needs funding will, of course, remain in place for those pupils with highly complex needs.

**u. Question from Councillor Willoughby to Councillor Russell**

**Can the cabinet member please advise why there has been such a delay in the production of the final report on the recent consultation regarding SEND in Derby?**

The council outlined from the outset the importance of carefully considering all consultation responses to improve SEND provision in Derby.

A range of responses have been received through our consultation on the specialist provision proposals, which the council is now very carefully considering. In view of the large number of responses received, it is now likely that a report on the consultation outcome and proposals will be presented to Council Cabinet in June 2018. This is to allow sufficient time to carefully consider, in detail, all of the responses.

**v. Question from Councillor Graves to Councillor Afzal**

**There is a path from Good Hope Court, City Point, Wilmorton, through to Alvaston Park across land which is expected to become part of the park once the council and the developers can agree an adoption.**

**We have two problems that have been highlighted many times but has not yet been resolved.**

- The 'public' bin is not being emptied on a regular basis. The council has taken the line that it is not adopted space and so should not empty the bin. How can we ensure a regular emptying takes place?**
- The path is built to a substandard design. A large section suffers from flooding and was reported many months ago. The developer is responsible for this and I know the council have been in negotiations. However, this is now used as a public path and the public need to be able to use it safely. What reassurance can you give?**

As part of their legal obligations in the S106 agreement the developers, Barratt Homes have laid out an area of amenity open space on the City Point site with a footpath that connects the housing development with a new play area on the site and Alvaston Park. The land is currently in the ownership of the developer although it is open to public use.

Barratt Homes have previously acknowledged that the standing water on the footpath is not acceptable and passed the complaint on to their contractor for comment and action. An officer request for an update has been sent out to Barratt Homes for their immediate attention in an effort to obtain assurances that the drainage problem on the footpath will be rectified.

A request will be made to Barratt Homes to ensure that the bins are emptied regularly. Until the land is transferred to the council there is no obligation on the council to take on this responsibility. To do so would set a precedent and the council could be held liable if it enters on to and carries out any operations on private land.

Officers will not start the process of adoption of the open space until they are confident that all outstanding remedial works have been completed.

**w. Question from Councillor Care to Councillor Shanker**

**How is the Council House performing, energy-wise, against predictions for it since refurbishment?**

The Energy Performance Certificate (EPC) provided as part of the design process indicated the refurbished building would have an energy rating of A+. However, the current Display Energy Certificate (DEC) indicates the building is operating with a rating of D. However, various documented reasons exist for this discrepancy, these are;

- An EPC does not take into account 'plug-load' consumption such as IT equipment, kettles and mobile phones.
- The buildings occupational density has increased along with footfall though the building.
- Staff demands on the heating and cooling of the building.
- Aging equipment and the decline in efficiency and performance.
- The EPC and DEC calculation methodology are not consistent in their approach

The complete data set requested could not be compiled within the Council Questions timeframe due to collating the energy data and previously compiled reports, this would provide a far better response to the question asked and could provide a percentage increase over the years since the building was occupied.

**x. Question from Councillor Graves to Councillor Afzal**

**Can you advise the chamber if you have budgeted for the reconstruction of Church Street Alvaston once the scaffolding, on the now infamous cottage, is removed?**

**In ten days time it will be the third anniversary of temporary traffic lights and scaffolding, forcing all the traffic onto one side of the road. The rutting is quite severe and double decker buses now lean towards pedestrians.**

**You last advised the scaffolding would be removed in December last year.**

The surface on Church Street has been assessed and the most appropriate treatment is to surface dress along with pre-patching where necessary. This work is programmed in for the summer of 2018/19.

We will continue to inspect Church Street on a regular basis and any defects that breach our intervention levels will be repaired.

**y. Question from Councillor Graves to Councillor Afzal**

**Derby roads are in a poor state of repair, generally. I do not think it is an exaggeration to say that every road has a pot hole. The claims against the council are high as a result.**

**Although the motorist is one of the highest payers of taxation, a great deal of which is supposedly for the upkeep of our infrastructure, roadway condition is also important for the safety of pedestrians, cyclists and wheelchair users.**

**Alvaston, like other wards, are in dire need of a programme of urgent repair. The likes of London Road, Baker Street, Brighton Road, Harvey Road, Radford Street, Raynesway, Shardlow Road are some of the arterial roads that are in poor condition. Not to mention the smaller residential roads.**

**With many of your 'pledges' that are failing or severely restricted and this deterioration taking place over many years, is there any light at the end of the tunnel for our roads?**

Like all authorities Derby is suffering from a significant gap between the levels of funding we receive from the Government and what we actually need to just maintain the roads in a steady state, let alone improve the overall condition.

The latest figures show that we need an additional one off figure of £15.5million to improve the roads to an acceptable standard; this then needs to be followed with an additional £4.9million each year. We currently receive around £2million, plus occasional pothole grant funding.

The Highway Maintenance team work hard to manage the network with the limited resources available; it is often a difficult balance between carrying out preventative works such as surface dressing and larger, more costly, resurfacing schemes.

The hard work of the team is reflected in the insurance figures. Over the last 3 years the Council has paid out £34,114 in compensation payments despite facing claims totalling nearly £1.3million, paying out just 2.6% of the total value claimed.

We recently had our claims reviewed by an Actuary who confirmed that compared to our peers at cities such as Leicester and Doncaster, our data was significantly better. On top of this our current repudiation rate in relation to highway claims is currently between 85-90%, this is significantly above the national average.

**z. Question from Councillor Graves to Councillor Afzal**

**The recent planning application Northridge House Raynesway involving an 8 storey block of flats and 122 dwellings was very controversial. The passing of the application was unfortunately, passed on party lines and the casting (2nd) vote forcing it through despite hundreds of residents (437) objecting.**

**For clarity and for the record, can you provide the official council view on what impact you believe will be on the traffic congestion both on Raynesway and surrounding local roads?**

The assessment of transport impacts resulting from proposed residential developments considers the AM Peak Hour (0800-0900) and PM Peak Hour (1700-1800) weekday commuter peak.

The Entrada development is predicted to generate 50 two-way vehicle trips in and out of the development during the AM Peak and 72 during the PM Peak. Compared to background two-way traffic flows on the Raynesway Link of 2,624 vehicles in the AM Peak and 2,948 in the PM Peak, the impact on the operation of the surrounding highway network is predicted to be minimal.

The National Planning Policy Framework is very clear that in planning terms, the impact of traffic can only be used as a reason for refusal if it is deemed severe. Also, development should be located where there is opportunity to maximise sustainable travel modes. As such, in planning terms there is no reason on transport ground to refuse this development. The predicted impact of this development is not considered severe and the development is located close to Alvaston District centre where there is access to key services and sustainable transport options.

