

ROTHER VALLEY SOUTH AREA ASSEMBLY
held on the Harthill Village Hall,
7th October, 2002

Present:-

Rita Alderton	South Anston Resident
Councillor Carl Barton	Borough Councillor Ward No. 13
Councillor Sid Bennett	Borough Councillor Ward No. 1
Fran Blanksby	Disability Group
Alice Booth	Wales Parish Council
J. Bishop	Harthill Resident
Councillor Ann Britton	Borough Councillor Ward No. 13
Colin Britton	Kiveton Park Resident
Brian Cottam	Dinnington St. John's Parish Council
Michael Gazur	Anston Parish Council
Councillor Audrey Gilbert	Borough Councillor Ward No. 13 (in the Chair)
Graham Greaves	Thorpe Salvin Parish Council
Brenda Howarth	North Anston Resident
Barbara Justice	ACE Project
R. Kearsley	Dinnington Resident
S. Matthews	South Anston Resident
Jack MacKay	Harthill with Woodall Parish Council and South Rotherham Rural Transport Executive
W. Nuttal	Woodall Resident
Jan Poucher	Harthill with Woodall Parish Council
S. Sampson	Woodall Resident
R. Stephenson	Kiveton Park Resident
Councillor Robin Stonebridge	Borough Councillor Ward No. 1
Councillor Clarence Swindell	Borough Councillor Ward No. 18
Sue Thomson	Anston Parish Council
W. Thompson	Harthill Parish Council
Alan Vickers	Anston Parish Council
Ken Ward	Woodsetts Parish Council
R. Waller	Todwick Resident
A. Whiteway	Kiveton Park Resident

By invitation :-

Mark Fisher	Highway and Traffic Engineering Group (RMBC)
Mary Smales	Adult Services – Social Services (RMBC)
David Stevenson	Adult Services – Social Services (RMBC)

Together with :-

Kyley Gains	Area Assembly Support Officer (RMBC)
Gordon Smith	Area Assembly Officer (RMBC)
David Tyrrell	Principal Democratic Services Officer (RMBC)

46. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were submitted by Peter Blanksby (Wales Parish Council); Councillor Derek Chapman (Borough Councillor Ward No. 18); Nigel Lee (Firbeck Parish Council); Roy Newman (Dinnington and District Conservation and History Group); Clive Pantry (Todwick Parish Council); Councillor Iain St. John (Borough Councillor Ward No. 1); Trevor Stanway (Laughton Parish Council); Councillor Philip Wardle (Borough Councillor Ward No. 18) and Alan Yates (South Anston Resident).

47. MINUTES

Agreed:- (a) That the minutes of the meeting held on 2nd September, 2002 be received and approved.

(b) That, further to the minutes stated it be noted :-

- the Japanese Knot Weed problem was still being pursued (Minute No. 39(e))
- that Anston and Woodsetts Parish Councils had objected to the name of 'Lindrick' as their new Ward name (Minute No. 40 (b))

48. HIGHWAYS – A 57 IMPROVEMENT SCHEME

The meeting received Mark Fisher of the Highway and Traffic Engineering Group who explained the background to proposals to improve a section of the above highway between Orchard House and the existing Todwick Crossroads.

It was recognised that there were problems with the highway which led to the Highways Agency preparing a Stage 1 report in 1996 which identified that flows were in excess of recommendations for a single carriageway road. On line improvement was investigated but rejected. A stage 2 Study was then commissioned which identified the preferred solution. This was to dual the highway between and in the area stated, resisting right turn movements across the road. This would entail a new left in left out junction at both Goosecarr Lane and the entrance to Todwick Grange and a roundabout replacing the traffic lights at Todwick Crossroads. The preferred scheme was approved for funding in December, 2001 subject to the completion of statutory procedures.

A plan was produced and explained showing the schematic highway layout explaining that this was subject to detailed design and of course full consultation. This was the commencement of that process.

A question and answer session ensued with issues raised including :-

- Todwick Road leading to Dinnington – the improvement of this road was not part of the A57 highways improvement scheme. The

developers of the former Dinnington Colliery site would have to undertake a Traffic Impact Assessment should they wish to develop the whole of that site.

- Length of the scheme – it was intended to apply for planning permission shortly and commence construction in 2005 with the works taking an estimated one year
- Implications for surrounding villages – motorists were already using roads through surrounding villages to avoid the A57 causing nuisance and concern was expressed about problems during the works. It was explained the scheme could be undertaken, in the main, without significantly affecting flows on the existing highway
- The Lead Hill, Todwick Road visibility problems – this problem had been recognised and the new scheme would resolve this issue
- Could there be any hold up in the projected timetable – Should any Compulsory Purchase Orders be required it could take up to eighteen months but not interfere with the overall projected timescale
- Could a large lay by be included for i.e. heavy goods vehicles – this could be examined. However, in general, lay bys were not popular with local residents.
- Was provision to be made for cyclists – It is proposed that a 3m shared cycle / footway be included on North side of the A57. Investigations are also looking at widening the hard strip to 1.5m and using this as an advisory cycle lane for cyclists wishing to stay on carriageway.
- Could any temporary measures be taken in the meantime to ease the problems being experienced in surrounding villages – this could be considered.

Agreed:- That the overall scheme be welcomed and the public consultation exercise be undertaken to enable appropriate local views to be addressed and this Assembly kept informed of developments.

49. AGED PERSONS HOMES – STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT

The meeting received Mary Smales and David Stevenson of Adult Services of the Borough Council's Social Services who reported on the consultations process being undertaken around the proposed Modernisation Strategy for Older Peoples' Services. They commented on the initial findings of the exercise and on further action being recommended.

The strategic outcomes were :-

1. To modernise existing services for Adults to ensure the provision of a range of sustainable services that promote independence, prevent unnecessary or premature admission into residential or nursing care.
 2. To develop services that meet the test of Best Value and the requirements of the National Care Standards Commission.
 3. To meet the assessed needs and aspirations of local people.
 4. To satisfy the requirements of both Local and Central Government.
- Details were given on the consultation process itself which had and was being undertaken and feedback to date from residents, relatives, staff, the general public and other 'stakeholders'.

It was explained in summary, that :-

- The consultation to date has been helpful in raising relevant and challenging questions
- These will inform the current proposals and help to reshape the strategy in response to the strong feelings and wishes of local people.
- It is hoped that a revised strategy can both meet the desired outcomes for the Council and address the concerns of local people.

Following debate at the appropriate Scrutiny Panel of the Borough Council they were recommending:-

1. That Members commission further work to address the questions raised following the initial consultation process.
2. That Netherfield Court, Eastwood, be taken out of this process and dealt with separately.
3. The proposed strategy be reviewed in the light of the issues raised.
4. A revised strategy be presented to Members for consideration and approval in principle.
5. A second stage of consultation be carried out on more detailed proposals and reported back to Members for decision.

A question and answer session then ensued with issues raised including :-

- the strategy was to be widened to include other issues i.e. including disabled so that it could become a strategy for Adult Services. Whilst Rotherham was already in the top twenty quartile of Social Services within the country they wished to continue to examine how they could serve the community better

- the need to ensure that the democratic process was fully used and Parish Councils given all relevant information and, consulted, with presentations made to them if required
- did the Service receive many complaints. It was explained a high level of satisfaction was recorded but that a complaints system was in place and operation
- the implications of core standards – whilst a minimum room standard of 10 sq. metres with facilities was required an element of flexibility was being allowed at this stage of 9.3 sq. metres and above with adequate communal facilities
- at present 75% of beds purchased were in the private sector with 25% in the public sector. Any new homes currently being provided were in the private sector
- it was recognised that much could be learned by visiting local areas and speaking to local people
- the general view of the meeting was that intermediate care was far better in Rotherham than in surrounding areas
- there was a large shortfall in ground floor accommodation in the south of the Borough and it was recognised in providing care in the community that this was an important element. Housing was now included in debate on the issue together with Health to ensure a more holistic approach
- a concern was expressed as to the operation of the warden's service and explained that particular concerns raised had been addressed. It was fully accepted that it was vitally important to deal with people with dignity and respect. Again the general view was that it was an excellent service

Agreed:- That the presentation and information be received and developments following full consultation be awaited.

50. ASSEMBLY OFFICERS REPORT

The Area Assembly Officer submitted a report commenting on the following issues :-

- (a) Community Skips – The Assembly had been the first to utilise its full allocation of forty five skip days
- (b) Proposed Development of business and industrial units at Rotherham Road, Dinnington – it was explained that a stated developer wished to erect units on the reclaimed former gas works site and was seeking

support in their application for European funding. There was a recognised need for such units in the area.

Agreed:- That, subject to proper consideration of planning matters, this Assembly welcomes the proposed development of business and industrial units at Rotherham Road and supports the developer's application for assistance from the European Regional Development Fund (Objective One).

(c) Fly Tipping

Action taken with regard to the Railway Access Land, Cramfit Road, North Anston and at Letwell and Firbeck was outlined.

(d) Hot Spots

The notes of a meeting of the Environmental Sub Group held on 18th September, 2002 were submitted at which possible environmental action had been considered.

(e) Community Plan

The Area Assembly Officer reported on the continuing work being undertaken on the preparation of the first Community Plan. Draft copies were made available and representatives asked to forward any additional/further comments as soon as possible.

51. QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

(a) Harthill with Woodall Pedestrian Crossing Facilities – Concern was expressed at the lack of pedestrian crossing facilities despite the fact that pavements were very narrow in some places making it very difficult for e.g. mothers with young children / prams.

(b) Station Road, Kiveton Park road junction – the difficulty in egressing from this junction due to growth on the adjacent rail land affecting visibility was referred to.

(c) High Street, South Anston – It was explained that traffic calming elsewhere had led to an increase of traffic, particularly heavy goods vehicles on this road. It was noted that the road was still a classified 'B' road and suggested that declassification was required to assist the problem.

(d) Doe Quarry Lane, Dinnington – it was queried whether there were any proposals for traffic calming on this road.

(e) Services for Young People – It was queried if any update(s) were available following the presentation to the Assembly on 10th June, 2002.

(f) Kiveton Park Traffic Calming – a request was made for appropriate measures but not including speed humps.

(g) Woodall Farm, Woodall – concern was expressed at the activities taking place at this Farm for which planning permission had not been granted. It was explained that should any such use be not approved but continue, enforcement action could then be taken.

Residents referred to the burning of materials and parking and manoeuvring of heavy goods vehicles which could take place between early in the morning till late at night. Whilst Environment Agency Officers had attended problems persisted.

Concerned people were asked to keep a record of all nuisance incidents and to telephone the general reporting number of the Environment Agency 0800 807060 as all calls were logged/monitored enabling them to build up a better picture as to the extent of the problems.

(h) Ryton Road, North Anston Quality Bus Corridor – reference was made to the need to ensure that works were co-ordinated as Yorkshire Water were due to commence water mains works in November.

(i) Rural Development Area Consultation Forum – comment was made on the timing of the next meeting of this body.

(j) South Rotherham Rural Bus Challenge 2002 – it was noted that the bid was about to be submitted.

(k) Northern College Community Day – It was noted that an event was to be held on Tuesday 29th October, 2002 and suggested a note be forwarded to all Parish Councils.

52. NEXT MEETING

Agreed:- That the next meeting of this Assembly be held in the Firbeck Village Hall on Monday 4th November, 2002 at 2.00 p.m.