

## **NOTTINGHAM CITY COUNCIL**

### **ARBORETUM, DUNKIRK AND LENTON, RADFORD AND PARK AREA COMMITTEE**

#### **MINUTES**

of meeting held on **19 SEPTEMBER 2012** at

Loxley House from 5.35 pm to 8.15 pm

- ✓ Councillor S Piper (Chair)
- ✓ Councillor L Ali (Vice-Chair)
- ✓ Councillor M Aslam (minutes 10 to 15 inclusive)
- ✓ Councillor M Bryan
- ✓ Councillor A Choudhry (minutes 10 to 15 inclusive)
- ✓ Councillor D Trimble (minutes 10 to 14 inclusive)
- ✓ Councillor S Williams

✓ indicates present at meeting

#### **Community Representatives and citizens present**

- |                  |   |                                      |
|------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| Mr T Preston     | - | Dunkirk and Lenton Forum             |
| Ms F Carbut      | - | Dunkirk and Lenton Partnership Forum |
| Ms E Millard     | ) | Nottingham Action Group              |
| Ms J Tanvir      | ) |                                      |
| Dr P Milligan    | - | The Lenton Centre                    |
| Miss C Walker    | - | Park Newsletter                      |
| Ms M Farrands    | - | Partnership Council                  |
| Mr P Beynon      | ) | Residents                            |
| Miss C Coutie    | ) |                                      |
| Ms U Dove        | ) |                                      |
| O Godfrey-Carter | ) |                                      |
| Ms D Hampton     | ) |                                      |
| Ms M Kirkham     | ) |                                      |
| Mr T Kirkham     | ) |                                      |
| Mr N Packham     | ) |                                      |
| Mr L Willen      | ) |                                      |
| Mr C Newton      | - | St Paul's Residents Association      |

**City Council Officers and others present**

Miss K Ball	)	
Miss H Barnett	)	
Mrs J Bramble	)	Children and Families
Mr S Oakley	)	
Miss J Pettifor	)	
Mr M Sahota	)	
Mr M Cole	)	
Mr R Gabbitas	)	
Mrs I Iqbal	)	Communities
Mr J Marsh	)	
Mr T Papkiewicz	)	
Mrs L Wright	)	
Ms J Briggs	)	Development
Mr S Hunt	)	
F Slade	-	Nottingham CVS
Inspector R Wilson	)	Nottinghamshire Police
PCSO H Winstanley	)	
Miss L Wilson	-	Resources
Mrs M Futer	-	University of Nottingham
Ms S Green	)	University of Nottingham Students' Union
Mr A Winter	)	

**Please note: except where otherwise indicated, all items discussed at the meeting were the subject of a report which had been circulated beforehand.**

**ACTION**

**10 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Maya Fletcher, John Lee and June Perry.

**11 DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS**

No declarations of interests were made.

**12 MINUTES**

**RESOLVED that the minutes of the last meeting held on 22 May 2012, copies of which had been circulated, be confirmed and signed by the Chair.**

**ACTION**

**13 REQUEST TO GATE A FOOTPATH ADJACENT TO PORTLAND ROAD AND CROMWELL STREET, ARBORETUM**

(Corporate Director of Development)

The Committee was informed that the request for the Gating Order was strongly supported by the Police and residents. The Beat Team would be responsible for the keys as the footpath was not used for entry to houses.

**RESOLVED**

- (1) that the statutory tests, set out in paragraphs 5.1.1 and 5.1.2 of the report and the information in support of the Gating Order, set out in paragraphs 2 to 6 of the report, which satisfied the tests, be noted;**
- (2) that the Area Committee authorise the making of a full time Gating Order, at a cost of £5,500, to be funded through the Area Capital Fund for the Arboretum Ward.**

**14 STUDENTS IN NOTTINGHAM – CURRENT SITUATION AND ACTIONS**

Mr M Cole, Student Strategy Manager, attended the meeting and introduced the presentation covering the following topics:

- the new Student Strategy;
- the Housing Nottingham Plan;
- Community Protection;
- letting boards;
- Article 4 Direction;
- parking permits for students;
- skip project;
- accreditation of privately rented houses;
- Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMO) licensing;
- waste management and recycling challenges;
- crime prevention;
- Weeks of Action;
- marketing and communications;
- student co-ordination.

The following comments were made:

**Noise Nuisance**

- when Councillors submitted noise nuisance as casework it was investigated by the Noise Pollution Team;
- universities should have some responsibility for their students behaviour off the campus;
- it was not clear how all noise complaints could be attributed to student

## **ACTION**

housing;

- contact points for residents to use in relation to noise nuisance were publicised through the Council and local publications;
- most noise complaints went to the anti-social behaviour hotline or the Police but some did get reported direct to the universities and this information could be shared with the Committee;
- there was no noise pollution officer on duty over the weekend so complaints had to be directed to the anti-social behaviour hotline or the Police;
- it would be helpful for the universities to provide support for off campus noise problems;
- Community Protection and Nottingham City Council had carried out a pilot scheme for a 24 hour noise pollution service but, due to budget cuts, this stopped;
- not all noise nuisance in the area was caused by students.

### Letting Boards

- some neighbourhoods weren't included in the scheme but had an issue with the number of lettings boards on display;
- the size of the area approved for the scheme was unprecedented. The scheme went live on 17 October and it was important to make a success of the areas already approved before extending it;
- the scheme was valid for 5 years, with the possibility of extension;
- the Community Protection Officers would report any non-compliance with the scheme to the Planning Enforcement Team who would issue a notice which gave landlords 48 hours to remove the letting board. If the board wasn't removed the Council had the powers to remove it. Repeat offenders would be prosecuted which incurred a £2,500 fine.

### Article 4 Direction

- the relaxed planning regulations could potentially have an affect on small HMOs through permitted development rights. The impact would be clearer once the Government released confirmation of what the relaxed regulations would be;
- what could be controlled through conditions when a HMO licence was granted was being explored;
- the Article 4 Direction did not affect any HMOs that were in existence prior to March 2012. Any since March 2012 had to have planning permission;

## **ACTION**

- HMOs were defined as having 3 or more unrelated people living together;
- as a way of monitoring lawful use of properties being used as HMOs, checks were carried out with Council Tax to see if any exemptions had been granted to students living in the property;
- it would be beneficial if Council Tax colleagues could notify the Planning Team when new exemption requests were received so that any unlawful use of a property as a HMO could be detected. This held the risk of creating a lot of work so parameters would need to be set;
- the Article 4 Direction did not convert current HMOs back to family housing, but stopped more HMOs being created in saturated areas.

### Parking Permits

- 700 student parking permits had been applied for this academic year, which was a significant decrease;
- for student parking permits, students were asked to provide the certificate of motor insurance with them as a named driver, which was illegal. It was called fronting and insurance companies would not pay out on claims. Insurance documents needed to confirm that they were the owner of the car and not just a named driver;
- the permit fees were discriminatory against students and the Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) of the policy needed to be reviewed;
- it was right that the City Council discouraged students from bringing their cars as residential roads did not have sufficient parking to accommodate them and they were not allowed to bring them onto the university campus’;
- the City had a good public transport system which linked to both universities;
- students parking prevented residents from parking outside their properties and they often had to park some distance away from their home;
- excessive on-street parking caused problems when trying to clean the streets. It meant cleaning the channels had to be cleaned manually instead of mechanically which took more time;
- students were exempt from Council Tax which meant they didn’t contribute to the costs of cleaning the streets where they parked their cars, even though the costs of cleaning were increased by having to do it manually because of their cars being parked there;
- on-street parking also caused an issue for bin collections, but this was a city wide problem, not just in student areas;

## **ACTION**

- the Lenton triangle had an 80% student population so problems in that area could be not be attributed to residents;
- if students couldn't use their cars to travel to university, there was no point in them bringing them to the city;
- even HMOs were restricted to 2 full time parking permits and 1 visitor permit;
- permits were only needed to park on the road so some properties had taken down the wall/fence to use the front garden for parking;
- emergency vehicles struggled to get down some roads because of the number of cars parked.

### **Waste Management and Recycling Challenges**

- some student areas were still a mess, with rubbish at the front of properties. The cleansing team did a good job but more work needed to be done on prevention and education;
- improvements in prevention were being made through new recycling schemes, etc;
- the removal of extra rubbish from student properties did have a financial impact for the service;
- there was a big clean up drive at the beginning and end of each academic year;
- most refuse collectors put bins back after they had been emptied as students had a tendency to leave them on the street;
- enforcement action needed to be taken against landlords dumping rubbish outside their properties when they were refurbishing them;
- clearing up fly tipped rubbish diverted resources from other jobs and the transient population of students put pressure on front line resources.

### **Student Co-ordination**

- the City Council welcomed students in the City but also had to look after the permanent residents. It was important for students to be respectful and help keep the City tidy.

## **RESOLVED**

- (1) that Mr Cole be thanked for his presentation;**
- (2) that Executive Board be asked to consider the possibility of the Council Tax Team informing the Planning Enforcement Team of**

**any requests from students for Council Tax exemption to enable them to check for any unlawful HMOs;**

- (3) that Executive Board be asked to ensure the legality of student parking permits requiring them to provide a certificate of motor insurance with them as a named driver only.**

**15 CHILDREN'S PLAY AND YOUTH PROVISION IN AREA 4**  
(Director of Family Community Teams)

Mrs J Bramble, Family and Community Team Manager, presented the report and circulated updated appendices which also gave a break down of the attendees per Ward.

The following comments were made:

- it would be helpful for the Family Community Teams to engage with Nottingham Community and Voluntary Service to increase people's awareness of the youth and play provision;
- if there were issues with children and young people congregating in a particular area/street this could be reported to the Family Community Teams so that activities/outreach work could be developed in that area;
- it was important to talk to young people to establish the activities they wished to participate in;
- outreach work was invaluable and needed to be increased;
- a review of youth and play provision in the Central Locality would be undertaken. This included a review of partnership working to try and increase resources;
- there was a wealth of people doing work in the area but this needed to be more visible, and it was felt that partnership work would help this;
- targeted work for specific cultural/religious needs needed to be investigated;
- youth work was not a statutory provision but it was important to maintain a level of service;
- stability amongst the teams working in the area was crucial to build relationships and gain the trust of the children and young people they worked with;
- the Nottingham 62<sup>nd</sup> Scouts, Beavers and Cubs had been missed off the list for the Lenton area.

The Chair informed the Committee that the Dunkirk and Lenton Councillors

**ACTION**

wanted to use some of their Ward Councillor Budget to provide uniforms for scouts, etc in the area and to help parents/carers with the first year's fees.

**RESOLVED**

- (1) that the report and appendices be noted;**
- (2) that the following be noted:**
  - (a) that the Family and Community Teams were working with the Partnership Council to support them in developing sustainable play and youth provision at Tennyson Street Adventure Play Centre site in September 2012;**
  - (b) that the Family and Community Teams were trying to identify sustained funding to continue the transitional play session currently held at Radford Primary School;**
  - (c) that the Family and Community Teams were trying to identify an agency to develop services for play/youth provision around Colville Street, Arboretum;**
- (3) that the Chair of the Committee send a letter to the Portfolio Holder for Children's Services to request stability of the team in the area to ensure that they could build relationships and gain the trust of the children and young people they were working with.**

**Councillor  
Piper**

**16 STREAMLINING INVESTMENT TO THE VOLUNTARY AND COMMUNITY SECTOR**

(Director of Quality and Commissioning)

Ms K Ball, Head of Service for Early Intervention and Market Development presented the report and circulated amended appendices.

The following comments were made:

- the funding was allocated on an area basis, as ward level made it too complicated for the Voluntary and Community Sector and locality level was too large;
- the Central Locality was different to others as it had lots of groups based in the area that worked city wide, rather than locally. This would make it difficult to appoint representatives to participate in a workshop to identify area priorities;
- there were a minimum of 20 different communities within the area and each needed to be represented so the groups needed to decide who would be the representatives involved in the workshop;
- the funding detailed was money that the Area Committee did not



**ACTION**

know was being spent in the area and the new process gave the Committee the chance to influence how it was spent;

- the Commissioning Team would be present at the workshop to guide participants, including community representatives, Councillors and residents, through the process of developing area priorities.

**RESOLVED that the following be noted:**

- (1) **the new model for streamlining funding to the Voluntary and Community Sector, that included Area Committees as a geographical basis for the dissemination of funding;**
- (2) **the current spend detailed in the Area Funding Schedule (Appendix 1 to the report).**

**17 AREA CAPITAL FUND AREA APPROVALS**  
(Director of Neighbourhood Services)

Mr R Gabbitas, Neighbourhood Development Officer – Radford and Park Ward, presented the report and circulated details of two additional schemes for the Radford and Park Ward that had been supported by the Ward Councillors since the report had been published.

**RESOLVED**

- (1) **that the Area Capital Fund programme of schemes for the Arboretum Ward, Dunkirk and Lenton Ward and Radford and Park Ward, as detailed in Appendix 1 to the report, be approved;**
- (2) **that the following additional schemes for the Radford and Park Ward be approved:**

<u>Scheme</u>	<u>Estimated cost</u>
Graham Street access improvements	£4,000
Poulter Close/Maun Avenue lighting columns	£8,000

**18 ACTIONS TAKEN UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY**  
(Director of Neighbourhood Services)

**RESOLVED that the actions taken under delegated authority, as listed in Appendix A to the report, be noted.**

**19 WARD PERFORMANCE REPORT**  
(Director of Neighbourhood Services)

Mr J Marsh, Central Locality Manager presented the report and circulated ward performance reports on the first three themes for all three wards.

**RESOLVED that the initial Area Committee Ward Performance Report, as outlined in Appendix 1, be noted.**

**ACTION**

**20 DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

**RESOLVED that the Area Committee meet at 5.30 pm on the following Wednesdays:**

**2012**

**21 November**

**2013**

**27 February**