

## **ASHBY PLACE RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION**

Meeting 26th October 2005  
The Flookersbrook

Present: Jan Barrow, Peter and Judy Bradshaw, Val and Terry Cunningham, Peter Cushing, John and Haf Davies-Humphreys, John (Chair) and Fil Hawkins, Christian Nielsen, Louise and Peter Strickland, Helen Watts.

Apologies from Ruth Ackroyd, Vicki Bulgin, Louise Chan, Kirsten and Stuart Cook, Alex Sharp.

John Hawkins began by saying that the meeting had been called to discuss three items: provision of CCTV, provision of gates across Ashby Place and the renovation of the road. He proposed that we discuss each item and consider if we should form a working group to investigate and report back to the association at a later date.

### **Closed-circuit television cameras (CCTV)**

Questions were asked if fully operational CCTV or just dummy units were to be considered and it was thought that dummy units would be of no use.

The point was raised that CCTV may not to be a deterrent to some people who would just hide their faces or try to damage the cameras. Also cameras may have the opposite effect and provide a challenge to some, and any cameras would need to be positioned carefully. Judy also asked if civil liberties needed to be taken into account.

Simon Sheriff (12 Ashby Place) was put forward as a possible person to contact as he used to work for a security company. Mr and Mrs Chapel (The Poplars) have also had CCTV installed recently and so may be able to help.

The chairman put forward the proposal that we form a working party to look into the possibility of installing CCTV in Ashby Place.  
This was agreed.

**ACTION:** A CCTV working party to be formed.

### **Ashby Place Gates**

The chair suggested that gates would be partly for security and partly to enhance the look of Ashby Place. He described his idea of how gates at the end of Ashby Place could work. He envisaged large radio-controlled gates for vehicular access and a smaller gate for pedestrians with access via a numerical keypad. An illustration was handed round (see APPENDIX) of a possible design similar to the Hoole Park gates.

Questions were asked about how we would allow access for services and visitors and it was felt that these questions would need to be answered by a working group.

Peter Bradshaw asked how the gates would be powered and who would pay for this. The chairman suggested that a body would need to be set up to manage these things and this would be discussed later.

Judy suggested that the gates may be better over the brook but it was agreed that the discussion should keep to Ashby Place for now so as not to complicate matters. In addition it was concluded that gates at the entrance to Ashby Place would create the best barrier as if the gates were placed over the brook the sides would still provide access.

Jan considered CCTV and gates would suggest that we have something worth stealing and would provide a challenge to burglars. Also gates would not be enough and if burglars were determined they would scale the wall or steal the pin number.

The chair suggested that we would need to consider including CCTV at the gate. He thought that the measures may not encourage criminals but that the problem at the moment is that anyone can walk down Ashby Place and this should not be the case if we want to protect and enhance the environment.

John Davies-Humphreys thought that planning permission may be a problem as he was not granted permission to erect gates near his garage.

Val wondered if English Heritage would be able to help. We may be able to persuade the planners if English Heritage are involved.

The chair then proposed that we form a working party to look into the provision of gates across Ashby Place and this was carried.

**ACTION:** A working party to be set up to look into the provision of gates across Ashby Place.

## **The Road**

The third item on the agenda has two main aspects: cost and specification. The cost is the primary concern; the last quotation for the road was about £60,000 and this was just to resurface the road. This estimate would now probably rise to at least £100,000.

Peter Bradshaw asked if the aim would be to resurface the road then hand it over to the council to be adopted so that they would maintain it.

Helen said that this was not possible. Previously enquiries with the council had found that the council will only adopt roads maintained to a specific standard and also only those linked to another public road. Since Ashby Place does not join a public road but instead joins Flookersbrook they would not adopt the road. The Flookersbrook Trust would not agree to adoption.

John Davies-Humphreys described how the gas company could be responsible for the potholes as in the 1980s their subcontractor went bust leaving the road unfinished. Helen added that the gas company did patch the road up but did not do a good job of it.

The chair explained that there is a problem with the storm water drains as these have

collapsed and that the area is in danger of flooding. Also there is a health issue as the sewerage system may be leaking. These have all contributed to the potholes in the roads which are getting worse. So this issue should be of concern to everyone.

The chair outlined a possible way to tackle the problem. He suggested a trust be set up for Ashby Place *e.g.* Ashby Place Residents Trust, this trust would be a unique and separate financial body with trustees.

In theory, each house owner, as part of their curtilage, owns the road in the front of their house up the middle of the road. The part of the road owned by each resident could be "handed over" to the trust under set terms agreed by the residents. The value of the road would then be an asset to the trust and may give the trust enough collateral to raise a loan to pay for the repair of the road. The residents could pay a set amount each year to the trust to repay the loan and provide money for maintenance.

It was discussed whether the bank would lend the money and if anyone else would want to buy the road.

Peter Bradshaw said that for his house, curtilage stopped at his wall.

Was this the case for everyone's house?

The question was raised as to who does own the road.

Jan asked if we got into trouble with the bank could they sell the road and could we lose access? Christian asked who would cover the shortfall if someone pulled out or did not want to pay?

The chair noted that there is risk if the trust defaulted so it would be in our interests make sure everyone was aware of this and joined in. If a property was sold it would be up the vendor to make sure any potential buyers knew about this and that there was a liability of £100,000 between all the residents. If a family did not want to pay then they could be asked to pay a fee to use the road.

Peter Cushing suggested that a different format of trust may be needed - a charitable trust - and then we could apply for grants *etc.* Peter Bradshaw thought that a charity needed to have an annual income but it was possible. Terry thought that we could pay an annual levy as with the Flookersbrook Trust. The chairman thought we need to set up a trust to do any of the things discussed at the meeting.

Therefore at least three things needed to be addressed by a working group:

- setting up a charitable trust;
- getting ownership of the road;
- specification of the road.

It was thought that we need to get legal advice on setting up the trust and ownership of the road.

The chair proposed that we get a working group to look at these matters and the idea was carried unanimously.

**ACTION:** Set up a working group to look into the matters relating to the road.

### **Working groups**

The chair next asked for volunteers and some people volunteered on the night. The chair agreed to try recruiting more volunteers in the next few days as some people who were unable to attend the meeting may be able to help. If there were not enough people to be able to form three groups then one working group for all three topics should be considered.

It was also suggested that we also look into resurrecting the homewatch scheme.

It was agreed to meet again after three months and 26 January 2006 was proposed as the date of the next meeting.

Louise Strickland  
Secretary

## APPENDIX

