

Derby Road Fund

**Committee Meeting 17 July 2019 at 7 pm
Held at 25 Derby Road**

Present:

Sean Mitchell (Temporary Chairman)
David Moro (Treasurer)
Paula Benham (Minutes Secretary)
Jamie Harcourt
Julie Mills
Simon Scaddan
Gillian Vooght

██████████ resignation had been received with regret and a letter had been sent acknowledging her invaluable contribution to the Committee. SM had spoken to her neighbour in Mander Court, ██████████, who explained ██████████ had major issues with her health. ██████████ would ask ██████████ if it would be in order for SM to deliver items to MC in the future.

JH mentioned that his neighbour, ██████████ DR, had been involved with Motor Neurone Disease and he would ask her for guidance on the type of support we might be able to offer ██████████.

It was agreed that flowers would be sent to ██████████ to the value of £30.

GV

The Minutes of the Committee Meeting held on 19 June 2019 had been approved, after amendments suggested by DM and then seconded by GV.

Pinch Point Questionnaire:

JM said that 82 completed forms had been received out of 200+ delivered, an increase from 50 replies six months ago. There had been 3 replies via email/telephone but these would not be included. It was noted that a majority of 84% were in favour of the PP being closed at times and by implication were in favour of it being retained.

Question 1:

Do you feel there is a need to reduce the number of non-resident vehicles using DR?

80 responses + 2 abstentions

57 or 71% said a lot

18 or 22% said a little

5 or 6% said not at all

Question 2:

How much has the PP helped reduce the number of non-resident vehicles using DR?

73 responses

41 or 56% said a lot

28 or 38% said a little

4 or 5% said not at all

9 did not know

Question 3:

Are you in favour of the PP being closed at various points during the year?

82 responses

44 strongly agreed and 19 agreed or 77%

6 or 7% neutral

2 disagreed and 11 strongly disagreed or 16%

Question 4:

Are you in favour of the PP being closed on 3 or 4 consecutive days:

32 strongly agreed + 15 agreed or 57%

7 or 9% neutral

14 disagreed + 14 strongly disagreed or 34%

Question 5:

Are you in favour of DR being closed on the same day/days as GR is closed?

32 strongly agreed + 8 agreed or 49%

20 or 24% neutral

7 disagreed + 15 strongly disagreed or 27%

Question 6:

Are you agreeable to restricting availability of information about closure dates to the 95% of households which have chosen to pay their fees?

32 strongly agreed + 15 agree or 59%

12 or 16% neutral

5 disagree + 15 strongly disagree or 25%

3 adamantly against

JM distributed copies of comments added to the questionnaire sheets, together with two emails. DM would reply to the two emails due to past knowledge. **DM**

In summary, it was noted that 34% of votes were against the PP being closed on 3 or 4 consecutive days, with most saying a maximum of 2 days. However, it was agreed to propose closures on one day per week from 1 September to 31 December, with the aim of coinciding with GR closure. **SM** would look at fresh dates for this period. JH felt strongly that both roads should be closed at the same time. [REDACTED], the Chairman of GR, had stated the intention of increasing their number of closure dates. **SM**

Signage: DM had looked into this and was waiting until after these results. He presented a print out of his suggestion and the sign would be positioned above the existing DR street sign in three locations. Cost was in the order of £117.00 each. **DM.**

There had been a query as to how the location of the PP had been decided and DM explained that several factors had been taken into account: street light, turning points (FV and EC), speed hump, verge restrictions, visibility splay and visibility from each end of Derby Road.

DM explained that the PP's height was limited to 1.2 m under planning consent and highway restrictions, that planning permission had been granted and members were fully covered by insurance for decisions taken relating to the road.

GV supplied copies to JM of all the relevant emails in connection with the emergency services.

It had been mentioned that there was lack of visibility for residents driving out of FV. It was felt this was caused mainly by a large lime tree

It was noted that a ramp needed to be provided for wheelchair users and cyclists when the PP was closed.

Several people had asked for an EGM to discuss the PP again, but it was unanimously agreed that would serve no purpose.

It was agreed the Committee would have another meeting on **24 July**, giving everyone time to think about all of the above and then to meet with the intention of agreeing on the format of a letter to go to all residents. It was felt this letter, with detailed conclusions and proposals, should go out hopefully within two weeks. The results would also be posted on the DR FB page. **This would be held at 3A DR.** In the meantime, **SS** would meet with **JM**.

SM thanked JM for the tremendous amount of work she had put in to the format of the questionnaire, together with the collation of data retrieved.

JM mentioned a post on FB from [REDACTED] of DR in connection with a letter re non payment to the DRF and GV thought this might have been shared by [REDACTED] who had sold her property, owing fees. [REDACTED], estate agent, confirmed they had informed the purchaser of the debt on the property. [REDACTED] had misinformed the purchaser that the annual fee was voluntary. DM had photocopied the deeds to prove this was not the case and the new owner had said she was happy to pay.

With regard to the DR FB page, JM had asked residents to write to her via the DRF email address, rather than posting only on the FB page. There were 77 residents on FB. **GV** would give JM the names of people whose names should be removed, as they now had no connection with DR.

The meeting closed at 8.40 pm.