

Rother Valley South Area Assembly Meeting
7th April 2008, 6:00pm
Anston Parish Hall, Anston

Present;

Cllr Jenny Whysall (Chair)	RMBC Elected Member
Cllr Iain St.John	RMBC Elected Member
Cllr Jo Burton	RMBC Elected Member
Sgt. Craig Charlesworth	South Yorkshire Police
Rita Alderton	Anston Parish Council
Judy Dalton	Anston Parish Council
Sue Thompson	Anston Parish Council
Brian Cottam	Dinnington St.Johns Town Council
Nigel Lee	Firbeck Parish Council
Richard Swann	Woodsetts Parish Council
Carol Cockayne	Woodsetts Parish Council
Robert Woodhead	Woodsetts Parish Council
K. Ward	Woodsetts Parish Council
Roy Mugglestone	Dinnington Town Council
Pauline Davies	Dinnington Town Council
Trevor Stanway	Laughton-en-le-Morthen Parish Council
Felicity Roe	Clarence Howard TARA
Brian Roe	Clarence Howard TARA
Margaret Marshall	Greenlands TARA
S. Wallhead	Anston TARA
Kim Bottomley	Dinnington Resident
Adam Bottomley	Dinnington Resident
David Cocking	Dinnington Resident
Yvonne Wood	Laughton Common Resident
Paul Streets	Laughton Common Resident
Mavis Streets	Laughton Common Resident
Tina Meekins	Laughton Common Resident
Graham Bell	Laughton Common Resident
Malcolm Hindley	Laughton Common Resident
Barbara Turner	Anston Resident
Beryl Howarth	Anston Resident
Phillip Ellis	Anston Resident
John Humphrey	Letwell Resident
Alan Newby	Harthill with Woodall Resident
J. Thomas	Resident
Thomas Fenoughty	Councillor Candidate
Darren Hughes	Councillor Candidate
Robert Rastrick	RVCP Customer Forum
Beverley Alderton-Sambrook	RMBC Planning
Lynne Rowan	2010 Rotherham Ltd.
Gareth Dennison	Dinnington Guardian
Phil Harris	RMBC Neighbourhoods
Garry Kemp	RMBC Streetpride
Steve Finley	RMBC Streetpride
Rebecca Atchinson	Rotherham PCT
Hena Aravindakshan	RMBC Greenspaces
Nosober Latif	RMBC Area Partnership Manager
Andrea Mason	RMBC Community Planning Officer

1. Apologies;

Cllr Stonebridge, Cllr Havenhand, Cllr Falvey, Audrey Gilbert, Peter Lee, Pete Blanksby, Ian Lloyd, Barry Deakin, Clive Pantry.

2. Minutes of 04/02/08;

The minutes were passed and agreed as a true record.

3. Matters Arising;

Rebecca Atchinson informed the meeting that the Patient Liaison Group has had it's second meeting and the PCT have also met with the Practice. The PCT has funded 2 part time receptionists to improve telephone access to Dinnington and Anston Practices. The Patient Liaison group will be meeting again in 2 months time and they will review membership of the group at this meeting.

Graham Bell informed the meeting that Cllr Falvey's statement at the Area Assembly meeting on 4th February regarding Laughton Common residents choosing to be part of Thurcroft Parish Council is untrue. Nosober Latif confirmed that Laughton Common is part of Rother Valley South Area Assembly and there is a Parish Review taking place at the moment.

4. Steve Finley

The roads which are due to be resurfaced in the area are Worksop Road, Ryton Road to The Baulk, including a section of the footway.

Resurfacing in Letwell has been put on hold as flood damaged roads have taken priority. The Government are only providing 25% of the costs of repairing flood damaged roads however RMBC has applied for some capital funding.

Officers carry out visual inspections on roads and the road is then given a ranking. This ranking establishes which roads are given priority on the resurfacing schedule.

Ken Ward asked what the guidelines were for filling in potholes. Steve confirmed that potholes are filled in if they are 20mm deep on the footway or 40mm deep on the roads.

Nigel Lee asked if Lamb Lane was due to be resurfaced. Steve confirmed that the potholes will be repaired on Lamb Lane but it does not meet the criteria for resurfacing. John Humphrey asked when the roads in Letwell were going to be resurfaced as Lamb Lane has been in a poor condition for 8 years and even when the potholes are repaired the tarmac is too fine and it either sinks back into a pot hole or the weather wears it away. Steve confirmed that he is aware there are a number of roads which require repair however he has to work within the budget he is given and he tries to allocate this budget to the roads most in need of repair. The Streetpride Area Co-ordinators will arrange for pot holes to be filled within 24 hours of a report, if this isn't sufficient then patching work is done. If this isn't sufficient then Steve has to try and work the road into the full scheme as soon as possible.

Action: Steve Finley to confirm the ranking of Lamb Lane.

Judy Dalton asked if the painting of yellow lines on the road came from the same budget as road resurfacing as they are due to paint yellow lines on nursery Road to stop people parking

on the grass verges however the road surface is crumbling away. Steve confirmed that these are from 2 different budgets.

Woodsetts Parish Council asked what residents were to do if their car was damaged as a result of the road surface. Steve confirmed that this should be put in writing to Rotherham Council who will then look into it.

Tina Meekins asked when the pavement on Glaisdale Close would be resurfaced as it is crumbling and has only been patched up with tarmac. Steve confirmed that this had been put on hold due to flood damaged roads taking priority but they were aware that it needed resurfacing.

John Humphrey asked if the Council can cut hedgerows which are privately owned but impeding on the road. Steve confirmed that the Council would normally ask the owner to cut the hedgerow back and in most cases this is done unless the owner is physically unable or there are birds nesting. John informed the meeting that there are issues with a hedgerow on Rotherham Baulk.

Action: Steve Finley to inform the relevant department about the issue with the hedgerow on Rotherham Baulk.

Paul Street asked if residents would be given a reduction in their council tax if they are not satisfied with the services they are receiving. Steve responded that this matter may be raised with your local Councillor.

Alan Newby asked what had happened with the resurfacing of Walseker Lane as this was started 4 years ago and was only partly completed. Steve confirmed that surface dressing had been done on part of Walseker Lane however the other section of the road cannot be redressed and the road doesn't rank high enough for a full resurface.

Graham Bell asked if there were any laws regarding the length of time a road should be left before it is resurfaced. Steve confirmed that there are no laws determining this and it is based on the condition of the roads which are visually checked regularly.

Action: Steve Finley to confirm the ranking of Walseker Lane.

5. Feedback from the Chair

The Co-ordinating Group met on 3rd March and the following issues were discussed:

- Patient dissatisfaction with the Dinnington Practice is still a concern. A letter has been received from Rotherham PCT regarding these issues;
- There will be a reduced allocation of the Streetpride Devolved Budget this year. Letters will be sent to Cllrs, Parish Councils and residents on the Area Assembly mailing list when the amount is confirmed;
- The Co-ordinating Group will be attending Disability Awareness Training on 28th April.

The Young Peoples Task Group meets monthly, current activities include:

- Meetings will now be held on a bi-monthly basis;
- The group has changed it's remit to include Children and Young People;
- The Young People's Area Assembly is currently being planned and will be held at Dinnington Comprehensive.
- The group are also planning the Dinnington Youth Festival and will produce a booklet of Summer Holiday activities for young people.

Progress on the Neighbourhood Action Group priorities;

- Scarsdale Street, Leicester Road and surrounding streets – Alleygates have been installed on Victoria Street and Scarsdale Street and keys are being issued to residents. Consultation will be taking place on the Dinnington Masterplan.
- Laughton Road, Dinnington – The Safer Neighbourhood Team have continued to patrol this area and a mobile CCTV camera has been installed outside Tesco.
- Parking issues outside Wales Primary – The measures which were agreed are currently being implemented and the Traffic Management Working Group will monitor these.
- Laughton Common – Youth Nuisance has reduced in this area however the Safer Neighbourhood Team are continuing with their patrols. The temporary youth shelter has been installed on Hangsman Lane and the feedback from young people has been very positive.
- Anston Greenlands Park – A public meeting was held last week and a number of actions were agreed. A follow up meeting will take place at the end of April.
- Woodall – Nosober Latif met with a Woodall resident to discuss issues and a follow up meeting will take place in May.

Update from the Traffic Management Working Group

- The second meeting was held on 20th March;
- The next meeting will take place in May and will focus on School safety Zones.

Update from the CCTV Project Group

- Discussions around the future working of the mobile CCTV cameras will take place at the next Co-ordinating Group meeting;
- Residents can still request locations for the mobile CCTV cameras.

Update from the Youth Shelter Project Group

- The group will meet during April and will be monitoring the effectiveness of the permanent and temporary youth shelter.

5. How can we use the Planning process to benefit our area?

Beverley Alderton-Sambrook – RMBC Planning Officer

Beverley informed the meeting that she has worked as a Senior Planning Officer for 7 years and is now working for the Neighbourhood Involvement Scheme looking at housing delivery especially affordable housing.

Planning Obligations

- Most commonly referred to as Section 106 agreements;
- These are agreements between Local Authorities and Developers and are linked to planning permission to negate the impact created by development however this does not apply to all developments;
- Planning obligations are dealt with by the Development Control Case Officer and they consult with specialist officer from other areas such as transportation, green spaces, etc.

Planning obligations can be:

- Prescriptive – stipulating specific requirements such as an allocation of affordable housing;
- Compensate for Loss/Damage – For example, play areas, open spaces and future maintenance;

- Mitigate impact – This can include highway improvements or extending school facilities in the area;
- There is no standard list for planning obligations and they are specific to each development.

There are certain planning policies which specifically require Section 106 agreements. The two mandatory requirements are:

- If there are over 15 dwellings then 15% of the development must be affordable housing, this will increase to 25% in May when the new affordable housing policy is put into practice;
- Enhancing environmental resources.

Planning obligations must be:

- Relevant to the development;
- Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- Directly related to the proposed development in purpose and locality;
- Fairly related in scale and kind;
- Reasonable in all other aspects.

Planning obligations can be:

- Unconditional or subject to conditions;
- Impose any restriction or requirement for an indefinite or specified period e.g. an obligation to end when a planning permission expires;
- Provide for payments of money to be made and require periodical payments to be paid indefinitely or for a specified period.

The problems associated with planning obligations are that the area is complex and very detailed. This can delay the planning process. When there are numerous land owners or policies are unclear it can be difficult for agreements to be reached. It takes around 6 weeks for a Section 106 agreement to be drafted.

Whilst there is no obligations for the public to be consulted on negotiations for planning obligations there is a need for the public to know what is going on in the area. People can contact their local Development Control Officer for further details.

To ensure the section 106 agreement is completed monitoring takes place. This has tended to be reactive as opposed to proactive due to workloads however they are currently going back through the Section 106 agreements which have been made to ensure they were delivered.

Phillip Ellis informed the meeting that he has written to Planning on numerous occasions regarding the issues with drainage in his rear garden. As a result of other properties being built in the locality it has caused flooding in his garden. Beverley confirmed that drainage is not taken into account as a planning consideration however it could come under building regulations. This would be a matter for the drainage company. John Humphrey commented that the issue of drainage is intrinsic in development however Beverley responded that building regulations are controlled by separate legislation and it is the responsibility of the water company.

Graham Bell asked what had happened to the section 106 agreement for Laughton Common. Beverley asked him to speak to her after the meeting about specific agreements.

Graham also commented that he did not feel the residents opinions were taken into account by the Planning department. Beverley asked him to make a note of what the residents requested and speak to her after the meeting.

Paul Streets asked about the Oaksbury Homes development which is planned for Station way in Laughton Common. This was originally rejected by the planning board however the developer appealed against the decision which he did not feel was fair as residents do not get the opportunity to appeal. The application was re-submitted and passed. Cllr St.John commented that the Planning board has to make a decision and although it is not always the decision that people want it is a democratic process. Beverley confirmed that the Planning Department will make a recommendation to the Planning Board and decisions are then made based on the recommendations. If residents feel that that their issues have not been taken on board then they can report this to the ombudsman.

Trevor Stanway asked how conditions were enforced. Beverley responded that this related to planning permission as opposed to planning obligations and there are 2 enforcement officers covering the whole borough.

Trevor also asked about drainage as Laughton-en-le-Morthen also takes in Thurcroft and the Environment Agency said they have made recommendations which have been ignored. Beverley responded that she would disagree with this.

Cllr Burton commented that there is quite a grey area in section 106 agreements e.g. a play area may be desirable but is it classed as necessary. Beverley confirmed that the refreshed planning obligations will be more detailed.

Sue Thompson commented that there are some countries which require a play area to be built for every 60 new properties. Beverley confirmed that that the development plan is currently outdated and is being reviewed.

Robert Rastrick asked if all new housing is required to have a play area. Beverley confirmed that it depends on what is available locally. Robert asked who keeps the section 106 monies if they are not used. RMBC holds the funds however they are given back with any interest accrued if not used within 5 years.

6. Open Question Time

Kim Bottomley informed the meeting that she has 2 sons aged 13 and 8 and they would like to be able to play sports in the area where they live but there is currently no facilities on the McLeans estate. This is a family estate however some residents will complain to Police if young people are playing in the street. The young people don't want to cause any distress but they would like a caged area, which is well lit, where they can play ball games. There is a grassed area but people currently use this to walk their dogs and there is a dyke so it is unsafe.

Cllr Whysall agreed that this is an issue. Nosober confirmed that the area Assembly will work with Green Spaces to look at the site and see if it is suitable then consult with residents and young people.

Action: RVS Area Assembly to contact Green Spaces re: site visit to McLeans estate.

Mrs Turner informed the meeting that the culling of trees on nursery Road affects the wider area however it is only residents who are directly next to the area that have been informed and this was only after work had started. She asked if it was possible for tree preservation

orders to be used in the area to allow for public involvement. Cllr St.John responded that the trees are diseased and therefore there is too great a risk to people using the area. A site visit will be taking place on Wednesday at 2pm with the Arboriculturist from RMBC so further information can be provided to residents.

Action: RVS Area Assembly to enquire about Tree Preservation Orders.

7. Any Other Business

Cllr Burton informed the meeting that there is now a Hang out Club at Woodland Drive Family Learning Centre on Saturday evenings for 12-16 year olds and admission is £1.

The meeting closed at 7:55pm

Date and time of next meeting

10:00am – 12:00pm

2nd June 2008

Wales Village Hall (New)