

Central Area Committee Update

At the last meeting of this Committee, a number of issues were raised that required further investigation:-

Ref No	Issue	Progress	Officer Details
16/10 (Minute 216/10)	Taking up of concern about temporary fence in part of the bridle path at the Clements Hall end of Park Gardens with the Rights of Way Officer at Essex County Council. (Issue raised by a resident during the community forum.)	A Modification Order has now been made under Section 53 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and will be advertised during the week commencing 9 January, the effect of which will be to upgrade footpath 23 between Hawkwell Park Drive and Park Gardens to bridleway 36 and delete the line of bridleway 36 added by a previous Definitive Map Modification Order 253.	Garry White Essex County Council 01245 437563
22/10 (Minute 218/10)	Concern that statistics requested by a resident from the Primary Care Trust (PCT) in relation to practice based commissioning indicated that all investment was going to the Southend-on-Sea Borough area and that there are indications that the PCT announced a significant investment in the Westcliff area. The PCT to be asked for a more substantive response to this issue and invited to attend a future meeting of the Central Area Committee to address concerns raised. (Issue raised by a resident during the Central Area update.)	There is still uncertainty about the future shape of health services pending the outcome of consultation on the recent White Paper, including the aspect of where responsibility for estates will sit. There is also a major financial challenge in terms of finding efficiencies. The PCT is currently agreeing with local partners a South East Essex plan that seeks to improve quality and deliver efficiencies (QIPP Plan). Many services are being reviewed with the aim of ensuring best value. These reviews are applicable to the entire locality. In addition, there are a number of pilot schemes being implemented to reduce inappropriate hospital attendances. The PCT is continuing with its plans to improve primary care premises.	Ian Stidston NHS South East Essex 01702 224600

Ref No	Issue	Progress	Officer Details
23/10 (Minute 286/10)	<p>What is the legal position around entitlement to own and drive a mobility scooter?</p> <p>What is the legal position around mobility scooter drivers allowing children to sit at the front of the scooter while driving the vehicle around the streets? (Issue raised by a resident during the Community Forum.)</p>	<p>The Police representative will respond to this question at the meeting.</p>	<p>T/Inspector A Clarkson Essex Police 01268 775533</p>
24/10 (Minute 286/10)	<p>Can the Council help us to ensure London Quadrant Housing Association maintain their boundary fence between Parklands and Ashingdon Gardens Block G, Lesney Gardens, Rochford as, due to constant criminal damage to this boundary fence, London Quadrant feel they no longer have the funds to continue to maintain this fence. When this fence has not been in place, anti-social behaviour and criminal damage to our property has risen dramatically. (Issue raised by a resident during the Community Forum.)</p>	<p>A check has been made on the original consent for the development (Application No. ROC/056/90). Unfortunately, there is no condition on that consent requiring the retention or maintenance of boundary fences.</p> <p>That being the case, there is very little that can be done from a planning perspective to resolve the problem. However, a report has been sent to the Local Strategic Partnership Officer to see if it might be possible to do some work with the police and the housing association to determine whether there may be a solution, perhaps by specifying a different type of fence along the boundary.</p>	<p>Shaun Scrutton Rochford District Council 01702 318044</p>

Ref No	Issue	Progress	Officer Details
<p>25/10 (Minute 286/10)</p>	<p>As an owner of a new house in Ironwell Close, Rochford why is it that Ironwell Lane is still a byway and not a now needed highway for maintenance reasons. When can it be reclassified? Is Ironwell Close now adopted? If not, when would it be? The verges at the top of Ironwell Lane, along Ashingdon Road, are not cut frequently enough and cause a hazard when driving from Ironwell Lane into Ashingdon Road. Can the frequency of cutting be increased? Parent parking in Ironwell Lane/Ironwell Close is proving a constant problem between 2.45 to 3.45 pm. Can a new single yellow line restriction be put in place? (Issue raised by a resident during the Community Forum.)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Status of Ironwell Lane – Ironwell Lane is a byway, and that means it benefits from full highway rights. That does not mean the road will be improved and brought up to adoptable standards along its length – this is highly unlikely ever to be the case. However, County Highways have indicated that consideration is being given to the option of upgrading the short stretch of Ironwell Lane from Ashingdon Road to Ironwell Close from a byway to an unclassified road, though no decision has yet been taken or budget allocated. A change in status would mean this short stretch of Ironwell Lane would be subject to an inspection regime and the potential to qualify for maintenance funding. It should be noted there is no intention to change the byway status beyond Ironwell Close to include the railway bridge. 2 Adoption of Ironwell Close – It is understood the developer of the houses in Ironwell Close does intend to offer the close for adoption by County Highways. No specific date has been set, but it seems the initial maintenance period for the close expires in May 2011, and it is likely adoption will proceed thereafter. 3 Flooding under railway bridge - The County Highways Public Rights of Way (PROW) team 	<p>Shaun Scrutton Rochford District Council 01702 318044 in consultation with County Highways</p>

Ref No	Issue	Progress	Officer Details
		<p>are developing a small scheme to alleviate the flooding issue under the railway bridge.</p> <p>4 Grass verges - Rochford Council is not the highway authority, but there is an agreement with County Highways for Rochford to undertake verge cutting. The bank in front of the McCarthy and Stone scheme is trimmed close to Ironwell Lane to maintain the site splay, and the outside of the remainder of the bank is flailed, usually twice a year.</p> <p>5 Parent parking – it is disappointing to hear that cars are being parked in Ironwell Close at school finishing time. One of the Ward Councillors has spoken to parents and asked them not to park in the Close. With regard to parking restrictions, this is not something that could be considered until the close has been adopted, but County Highways have indicated that the form of the close (full-width carriageway) means that it would not normally be appropriate for parking restrictions to be applied. In any event, a Traffic Regulation Order would need to be funded and, that being the case, it would be necessary for consideration to be given to the inclusion of the proposal in the ‘localism highway schemes’ for delivery in 2011-12.</p>	

Ref No	Issue	Progress	Officer Details
26/10 (Minute 286/10)	The planning consent for A – C Swaines Industrial Units had privacy glass and adequate soundproofing as conditions. This is not the case – residents from 70 to 104 Lesney Gardens, Rochford are being disturbed with noise. Can planning re-address the noise situation? (Issue raised by a resident during the Community Forum.)	The planning enforcement team has made a check on compliance of Units A-C with the planning consent. Officers are seeking a meeting with the owner to discuss the situation. Looking back at the planning file, following the grant of consent, we received a report commissioned by the applicant from acoustic consultants to provide advice on the arrangements for sound insulation. The report demonstrated that the insulation levels of the building were acceptable, but that works should be carried out to the door and windows. Subsequently, following consideration of the report and consultation with our Environment Health officers, the condition on the planning consent was discharged subject to the specified mitigation works being carried out. With regard to obscure glazing, a number of windows were specified for treatment in the consent – this will be checked at the meeting with the owner.	Shaun Scrutton Rochford District Council 01702 318044
27/10 (Minute 287/10)	Concern that young people may be able to access alcohol from a supermarket via on-line purchase. (Issue raised by a Member during Spotlight Issues.)	The licensing requirement is for the person delivering alcohol to ensure that the receiver is 18+ by asking for proof of age. They should not deliver if there is not an “adult” on the premises. ECC Trading Standards are prosecuting a retailer	John Hull Trading Standards 01245 341974

Ref No	Issue	Progress	Officer Details
		after test purchasing a delivery. The delivery of alcohol was left with a 16 year old and no proof of age was asked for.	
28/10 (Minute 287/10)	The position with regard to canvassing by politicians within 'no cold call zones' (NCCZ's) (Issue raised by a Member during Spotlight Issues.)	<p>NCCZ's are designed to reduce the number of incidents of distraction burglary and rogue trading. They are not intended to prevent the following from calling:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular delivery persons – milk, paper etc. • Regular callers from known catalogue companies. • Utility services such as Gas and Electric companies who call to read the meter. • Political groups canvassing for election purposes and at other times throughout the year. <p>However, it should be borne in mind that 100% of the residents in a NCCZ have elected not to have people cold call on their doorstep. Therefore, it would be a matter of conscience for any legitimate callers who choose to disregard that request. After all, many incidents of distraction burglary or rogue trading will start with what appears to be a legitimate reason for knocking.</p>	John Hull Trading Standards 01245 341974

Ref No	Issue	Progress	Officer Details
29/10 (Minute 288/10)	The latest situation with regard to the replacement of footpaths 8 and 9 adjacent to Brandy Hole on the river Crouch, which have suffered coastal erosion. (Issue raised by a Member during the Central Area Update.)	The situation remains unaltered – no further opportunities for resurrecting the diversion proposal, as first investigated in 1998, have arisen. Landowner strongly objected to the proposal.	Garry White Essex County Council 01245 437563