

Environmental Services Committee – 11 October 2005

Minutes of the meeting of the **Environmental Services Committee** held on **11 October 2005** when there were present:-

Chairman: Cllr M G B Starke
Vice-Chairman: Cllr Mrs L Hungate

Cllr R A Amner
Cllr Mrs T J Capon
Cllr T G Cutmore
Cllr K J Gordon
Cllr Mrs J A Mockford

Cllr P R Robinson
Cllr C G Seagers
Cllr Mrs M S Vince
Cllr Mrs M J Webster

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs Mrs R Brown and C J Lumley.

OFFICERS PRESENT

S Clarkson	- Head of Revenue and Housing Management
S Scrutton	- Head of Planning Services
M Howlett	- Senior Environmental Health Officer
S Worthington	- Committee Administrator

372 MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 6 September 2005 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman, subject to the insertion of “and consulting with the Leader of the Council on any future consultation documents with similar, tight deadlines” at the end of Minute 327/05.

373 PROGRESS ON DECISIONS

The Committee noted the schedule relating to progress on decisions and in response to Member questions the following was noted:-

Additional Bring Banks (Minute 142/05)

The Waste Management & Recycling Sub-Committee would be considering the report on additional bring banks.

Quys Lane, Rochford

Consultation on the scheme had begun, as scheduled; officers were not aware of any responses having yet been received.

Environmental Issues – the Way Forward

An update would be provided in the Members’ Bulletin on any response from

the Local Government Association with respect to lobbying chewing gum manufacturers.

Essex Schools Organisation Plan 2005 – 2010 (Minute 272/05)

Members expressed concern relating to arrangements for allocating school places. There was a general consensus that there would be merit in requesting details of the process involved in determining school places for children, given that there were known instances of children having to attend school well outside the District.

On a Motion moved by Cllr K J Gordon and seconded by Cllr T G Cutmore it was:-

Resolved

That a letter be sent to the County Council, with copies to the 2 local MPs and the County Portfolio Holder for Education, expressing this Authority's dissatisfaction with the arrangements for allocating school places that result in local children having to attend a school well outside the district, and requesting a detailed explanation of the processes and procedures that result in the situation occurring. (HPS)

374 AIR QUALITY – (SECOND) REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT FOLLOW-UP REPORT

The Committee considered the report of the Head of Housing, Health and Community Care updating Members on progress on the second review and assessment of air quality within Rochford District and determining what action needs to be taken.

Responding to a Member enquiry relating to the possible sources of PM₁₀ in the vicinity of Rawreth industrial estate, officers confirmed that although, typically, PM₁₀ is caused by vehicle exhaust emissions, in this case it was more likely to be attributed to fugitive emissions relating to a combination of the re-suspension of dust by heavy vehicles, industrial activities, including the waste transfer station and general vehicle exhaust emissions.

In response to a further query relating to PM₁₀ validation monitoring, officers advised that Unit 13 had been given a deadline of 30 November for construction of the partial enclosure, but a planning application for the structure had only just been lodged with the County Council. It was therefore unlikely that the deadline would be met and validation monitoring could only commence once the structure was in place.

Officers confirmed that the costs this year for monitoring PM₁₀ and NO₂ were approximately £8,000 higher than anticipated in January, totalling around £25,000, and were likely to be higher in the next financial year.

In response to a Member concern relating to any potential health risk to residents in the properties situated behind the industrial estate, officers advised that the PM₁₀ monitoring station had been placed in the garden of one of these properties and that the monitoring was very much health focused. Officers stressed that PM₁₀ was not necessarily carcinogenic, but was a pollutant due to its effects on the respiratory system, and as such, had to be properly monitored.

Resolved

- (1) That a further 3 months of PM₁₀ monitoring is carried out early in 2006 at the nearest relevant receptor to Rawreth Industrial Estate.
- (2) That a further report be made to this Committee in the second quarter of 2006 once the planned monitoring has taken place and the Updating and Screening Assessment has been submitted to Defra. (HHHCC)

375 STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT (SCI) FOR THE ROCHFORD DISTRICT

(Note: Cllr Mrs M J Webster declared a personal interest in this item by virtue of membership of the Rural Community Council of Essex.)

The Committee considered the report of the Head of Planning Services seeking Members' approval for the deposit version of the Statement of Community Involvement that would go out for public consultation.

During debate, Members expressed concern about potential costs associated with employing consultants to work on specific elements of community engagement. Officers advised that the planning delivery grant could be used in order to address such costs, although this was not a long-term grant.

Responding to a Member enquiry relating to the possibility of a public inquiry following public consultation, officers confirmed that this would be in relation to any objections which the Authority was not prepared to accept. Any subsequent report from the Inspector would be legally binding.

In response to a Member concern with respect to the translation of planning documents into languages other than English and associated costs, officers advised that this would be on demand and that, to date, no requests had been made to the Planning department.

Members were of the view that there would be merit in including within the document some detailed references to the relevant planning pages of the Council's website.

Responding to a Member concern relating to the list of other representative groups listed in table 5 on page 23 of the draft, officers advised that although it was possible that some of the organisations listed would not wish to

comment on the draft Statement, it was nevertheless beneficial for the Council to be able to demonstrate that it was consulting with as wide a range of organisations as possible.

The following further points were noted during discussion of the draft:-

- There was some repetitive language in box 3 on page 5, which would benefit from some amendments.
- The reference to Hockley Parish Council in Table 4 on page 11 should be replaced with 'Town and Parish Councils'.

Resolved

- (1) That the draft Statement of Community Involvement for the Rochford District be approved for community and stakeholder consultation.
- (2) That the outcome of the public consultation be reported back to the Committee.
- (3) That authority be delegated to the Head of Planning Services to carry out minor amendments to the LDS to ensure consistency and correctness following Regulation 25 consultation under the Planning and Compulsory Act 2004. (HPS)

EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

Resolved

That the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the remaining business on the grounds that exempt information as defined in paragraph 8 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 would be disclosed.

376 OPTIONS FOR ADDITIONAL CAR PARKING IN TOWN CENTRES

The Committee considered the exempt report of the Head of Planning Services asking Members to consider options for the provision of additional car parking in Rayleigh Town Centre.

During debate, Members concurred that it would be imprudent to consider either of the two options listed in the report without having more detailed costings.

It was, however, noted that an Electronic Variable Message Signing system (EVMS), which operated under similar technology as that for bus telemetry, could provide welcome assistance in relieving some of the car parking problems experienced in Rayleigh town centre. Motorists would be alerted, via sign boards at major entrance points to Rayleigh, of whether, for example,

Websters Way car park was full, thus giving them the opportunity of avoiding the town centre and making use of alternative car parks, such as the Market car park.

It was perceived that car parking in Rochford and Hockley was becoming increasingly difficult and that Rochford, in particular, would probably have an increased demand for car parking in the town centre as a result of new development within the town. Members were of the view that there would be merit in detailed costings for EVMS display boards in Rayleigh, Hockley and Rochford being prepared for consideration at the Members' budget away day on 26 November.

Members also expressed interest in visiting the County Hall Traffic Management Office.

In response to a Member enquiry relating to the Market car park, officers confirmed that funds had been set aside within the budget for the re-fencing, re-design, re-surfacing and re-lining of this car park and it was anticipated that this would result in additional car parking spaces.

Members also felt that it would be worthwhile exploring the possibility of whether the Fitzwimarc School and the Holy Trinity Church would consider opening their car parks during the daytime on Saturdays for use by the public.

On a Motion moved by Cllr K J Gordon and seconded by Cllr T G Cutmore, it was:-

Resolved

- (1) That letters be sent to the Fitzwimarc School and the Holy Trinity Church enquiring about the possibility of opening their car parking facilities during the daytime on Saturdays for use by the general public.
- (2) That costed proposals for the provision of EVMS display boards in Rayleigh, Hockley and Rochford be prepared for the budget away day on 26 November.
- (3) That a Member visit to the County Hall Traffic Management Office be arranged. (HRHM)

The meeting closed at 20.55 pm.

Chairman

Date