

**SOUTH WEST AREA PANEL held at STANSTED FREE CHURCH HALL
STANSTED at 7.00 pm on 23 NOVEMBER 2006**

Present:- Councillor G Sell – Chairman.
Councillors E C Abrahams, J F Cheetham, A Dean, C Dean,
E J Godwin, R T Harris, R M Lemon, A Marchant, D J Morson
and A R Row.

Officers in attendance:- G Bradley, F Gardiner, V Harvey, S Hayden,
L Petrie, R Procter and J Mitchell.

Also present:- Davina Millership and Councillor Ray Gooding from
Essex County Council.

G Stewart
L A Hawker
J M Shalding
R M Warren – Rooks
R F Peachy
J E Hudson from Stansted Parish Council
Peter Brown
Queenie Brown
Frances Spalding
W Moss
Beth Parsons
Ray Woodcock
David Hibday
Christina Hope
Paul Welling
Tracy Welling
Janice McDonald
Ken Macdonald
Toby Allanson from the Herts & Essex Observer
Rosalind Peck
Roger Peck
Trevor Allen from Takeley Parish Council
O Griffiths from Henham Parish Council
Carole King
Andrew Jale
I L Knowles
C Bullock
L Mannering
B Reid
E Frozley
Carole Barbone from SSE
Liz Woods
A McPherson
Tony Turner from Ugley Parish Council
Mel Sullivan from Hatfield Heath Parish Council
Mr Ward - Booth.

SWAP23 PUBLIC QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION

Mr Ward-Booth, a partner of Sworders Auction house explained to the Panel that he was looking to move his sale room from the High Street in Stansted to the gravel pit area, north of Stansted. He had spent a lot of time in ensuring the building was as eco friendly as possible. He had encountered problems with the Highways Department and explained that he was being treated as an operator of heavy vehicles, which he was not. He only operated a few furniture lorries. He asked if Highways could reconsider the intended works as this would involve carbon being embedded in the road. The nearest competition to his business was in Yorkshire, where they had a better road system and the capacity for 600 cars to park. He said he was feeling penalised and the cost of road works were extremely high.

SWAP24 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors K R Artus, J I Loughlin and V Pedder.

Councillors made the following declarations of personal interests.

Councillor C Dean as a member of the Development Control Committee in relation to agenda item 6 and as a resident living on the edge of the Recreation Ground in Stansted and a member of Stansted Parish Council in relation to agenda item 6.

Councillor E J Godwin as a member of Development Control Committee and a member of Birchanger Parish Council.

Councillor A Dean as a partner of SY2000 and a resident living on the edge of the Recreation Ground in Stansted.

Councillor E C Abrahams as a member of Development Control Committee.

Councillor A Marchant as a member of Stansted Parish Council.

Councillor R T Harris as a member of Development Control Committee.

Councillor G Sell as a member of Stansted Parish Council.

SWAP25 MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 7 September 2006 were received and signed by the Chairman as a correct record, subject to the word *Government* being replaced in the final sentence of SWAP 19 to read *BAA*.

BUSINESS ARISING**(i) SWAP 13 – Apologies for Absence and Declarations of Interest**

Councillor R Chambers telephone number had been omitted from the previous minutes; if residents wished to call him at any time of day or night his number was 07889 286041.

(ii) SWAP 15 – Business Arising – SWAP 7 - Uttlesford Primary Care Trust

The PCT were still undergoing restructure and more time was needed to produce an answer. Councillor A Dean proposed the Panel write a further letter.

(iii) SWAP 15 – Business Arising – SWAP 9 – Recycling – Update on South West Issues

Councillor C Dean reported that the bio-degradable bags were only available at W Barker & Son Garage in Henham. However the Post Office had asked to be supplied with the bags. The Community Development Officer (Cultural Services) would follow up to ensure the Post Office received the bags.

(iv) SWAP19 – Highways and Transportation Street Lighting Policy

Many members felt there had been a lack of consultation with Parish Councils. The Panel would liaise more with the District Council and ensure consultation had been full and comments were being passed to County Hall. A letter would be passed from the Panel to the County Council.

(v) SWAP21 – Stansted Skate Park

As a result of a decision of the Community Committee, a further £16,000 had been raised.

ESSEX COUNTY COUNCIL HIGHWAYS DEPARTMENT

Davina Millership the Interim Highways Manager for Highways and Transportation gave a presentation to the Panel and members of the public on the areas of work covered by the department.

The department covered parking enforcement, promoting cycling and walking, lighting, pedestrian crossings, roads and streets, traffic control systems and junction improvements among many others. The Director of Highways and Transportation was Tony Ciaburro and Councillor Rodney Bass was the portfolio holder for highways and transportation. Four main groups operated from the department which were: Passenger Transport, Transport and Development, Highways Maintenance and Network Management.

Underneath this were the Local Programme Offices, of which Uttlesford fell into the West, with the office based in Harlow. The work areas include: day to

day maintenance, public rights of way, traffic management, road safety, development control (of 5 to 50 properties) and street lighting.

The Programme budget covered the Local Transport Plan, Locally Determined Budget which was set at £200,000 and went to the Environment Committee every March, basic/structural maintenance, which was £6 million, Public Rights Of Way budget and Section 106 which varied according to consultation. LTP2 objectives were to: tackle congestion, deliver accessibility, create safer roads and enhance maintenance.

Davina Millership asked for any questions.

Mr Mel Sullivan from Hatfield Heath Parish Council asked if the £200,000 for the Locally Determined Budget was ring fenced. Davina Millership replied that it was not formally ring fenced, but was divided equally. Mr Sullivan then went on to ask why it was not possible to see the project plan and was told that this would now be possible. This would be supplied to each Area Panel Champion on a quarterly basis.

Mrs Keane, a local resident asked about the current situation with works to the old A120 through Takeley with regard to the 30mph limit, traffic calming and street lighting. Davina Millership explained that there had been an error in the traffic order and this had elongated the processes of introducing the 30mph limit; she thought there was a good chance it would go through before the end of the year.

Councillor Lemon said that there had been two fatalities in Hatfield Heath earlier this year and after a meeting with Highways was informed that chevrons would be implemented quickly, which they had not. Davina Millership said she was unfamiliar with this case but would respond after she had made investigations.

Ray Woodcock asked why there were no speed limit on many country roads that were only wide enough for one and half cars to drive at speed. He was informed that the County Council had a speed management strategy, which was in line with Government legislation but this took a long time to implement. It was further added that speed limits relied heavily on drivers adhering to them, as many peoples perception of what should and should not be a limited area differed according to lighting and development.

Councillor C Dean said that the residents were not getting an efficient service. The district and parish had consulted on a Residents Parking Scheme for Stansted and it had now fallen at the last stages with the County as it did not meet their criteria to be self funding. Davina Millership explained that this was probably because the County had not been party to the decision and said she would forward the criteria to Councillor Dean.

Many residents wished to know about developments in specific areas which Davina Millership was unable to answer as she was new to the post. She also explained that the department was very short staffed and found it difficult to recruit the calibre of staff she needed.

SWAP28 THE GREEN STONEYFIELD DRIVE STANSTED

The Tenant Participation Officer had produced a report setting out the results of a consultation with members of the community that had been affected by issues relating to the Green, Stoneyfield Drive, Stansted, including a request for new equipment. She asked the Panel to consider, in principle, a full sized ball court and the use of smaller items of sports and recreation equipment.

Consultation had taken place with a youth group over the way the green was kept and one teenager had made the comment that a ball court might cause disputes between groups wanting to play different sports. However further consultation would be sought.

Members were aware of the need for recreation areas and that the Green was currently neglected. Councillors Cheetham and Harris explained that a ball court was used in Takeley and had had a positive impact. He invited the Tenant Participation Officer to observe the court being used.

Councillor A Dean supported the project in principle and thought that funding should be sought. He added that research into a shelter at another location within the village should be included in any further reports.

The Chairman summarised by saying the Panel was in favour of the principle of a ball court and recognised a need to provide more leisure facilities for the young people.

RESOLVED that the Area Panel:

- 1 Note the report
- 2 agrees that the proposal for installing a full sized ball court should be approved in principle, thus authorising officers to investigate funding options and to apply for planning permission and other consents as necessary.
- 3 agrees that proposals for installing smaller items of sports/recreation equipment should be approved in principle.

SWAP29 PLANNING ENFORCEMENT

The Executive Manager (Development Services) gave a presentation on planning enforcement. This was one of the most controversial areas of planning work, and also gave rise to the biggest areas of misunderstanding.

If someone did breach planning control it would not be mandatory to take action – the legislation refers to expedience. Development without planning permission is not a criminal offence, whereas the unauthorised display of advertisements and works to a listed building would be an offence.

The hierarchy of methods to deal with breaches of planning control were: Injunction, Stop Notice, Enforcement Notice, Breach of Condition Notice and a

Planning Contravention Notice. There were around 350 – 400 cases each year, most of which were resolved through negotiation.

Planning Enforcement used a lot of staff resources and currently Uttlesford had two Planning Enforcement Officers and one trainee; strong legal support and cross service working was also essential. Priorities for action were if a development threatened the safety of people, had a severe effect on amenities, such as noise or smell or a severe effect on policy.

There was a set procedure, which always started with negotiation, as often people were unaware that they had committed a breach. The Council could not use enforcement to regularise development that would have otherwise been approved. A lot of painstaking evidence was needed in case court action was sought. A Planning Contravention Notice would be issued and if that was not returned in the specified time then court action would be taken. If it was clear that a breach had occurred then an enforcement notice would be issued. This had to detail the nature of the breach, the means to resolve it and the time allowed. There was a right of appeal against an enforcement notice. The main issues in Uttlesford were: airport parking, conversion of rural buildings, annexes used as separate houses, breaches of precedent conditions, neighbour disputes, people proceeding regardless and road side signs. The Council took a robust approach and would not hesitate to seek injunctions where necessary.

The Executive Manager (Development Services) invited questions from the Panel.

Councillor A Dean asked what action the Council would take if Stansted Airport exceeded the limit of 25million passengers per annum. The Executive Manager said that the Council could serve an enforcement notice.

SWAP30 **UPDATE ON STANSTED AIRPORT**

The Executive Manager (Development Services) updated the Panel on the current situation at Stansted Airport. The Council was now at the latter stages of reaching a decision upon the removal of the cap of passenger movements. The final report had been published with a recommendation of refusal. This was based on nine grounds. It was at a delicate stage to be considered by the Development Control Committee on Wednesday 29 November. He explained that if the recommendation was accepted he would imagine an appeal would be lodged and a public inquiry would take place in the spring.

The public inquiry would be similar to a court of law. There would be a team of inspectors appointed by the Secretary of State. On one side would be the Council and on the other the applicant. Any third parties would also be able to make their representations. Each side would bring expert witnesses and would be open to cross examination. This could be a confrontational process and would take many weeks. The council would incur many logistical problems, such as finding a venue.

There would be no announcement on the Runway 2 proposal until the new year.

Carole Barbone said that SSE had welcomed the report and thanked the Council for taking into account technical implications and views of the community.

SWAP31

ALCOHOL INTERVENTION IN SOUTH WEST AREA – PROPOSED ALCOHOL FREE ZONE AT RECREATION GROUND, STANSTED

The Anti Social Behaviour Co-Ordinator had prepared a report advising the panel of a Designated Public Places Order (DPPO). There had been incidents of alcohol related anti social behaviour reported in Stansted Mountfitchet to the police. These incidents were causing concern and were intimidating to local residents and commuters. The litter that was generated in these areas was also becoming more of a problem.

Within Stansted along Station Road and at the railway station, 31 incidents had been reported. The ASB Co-ordinator was to meet with Inspector Boland next week to discuss this Order and confirm that the police had enough evidence to implement.

Councillor A Dean asked if the DPPO would actually achieve anything other than being a status symbol. He said he knew of reports where alcohol has been confiscated and this had not always had a positive impact. Research into the negative impacts would be needed as it would be likely that the offenders would move onto other areas.

The ASB Co-Ordinator said that there were other possibilities to look into other than DPPOs. This however would need to be in line with the amount of police support.

Local residents were in support of this DPPO and thought there should be a ban on alcohol being consumed in all recreational areas. One resident explained how this summer had been the worst yet for mess left on the recreation ground and it was often very dangerous if broken glass was left.

A resident of Spencer Close was very keen to see a DPPO placed on the alleyway between the Recreation Ground and Spencer Close. He said that in the summer he had not allowed his 5 year old daughter out in the garden as the language from youths on the ground had been obscene.

The Chairman urged this matter to move forward and thanked the ASB Co-Coordinator for her report.

SWAP32

MULTI-DISCIPLINARY AGENCY MEETING

The Anti Social Behaviour Co-Ordinator presented a report on the multi-agency anti social behaviour meeting. Those present at the meeting were representatives from the District Council, Essex Police, One Railway, British Transport Police, Extended Schools Co-Ordinator, The Mountfitchet Mathematics and Computing College, Essex Youth Service and District and Parish Councillors.

The areas of discussion were: alcohol, railway danger and skate parks.

With reference to the previous agenda item not all 31 incidents at or the near the railway station in Stansted were alcohol related. A team would need to be set up to decide upon the best action to see how it could be prevented. She further added that a DPPO could be placed on any area.

A local resident, Wendy Moss said that the police had recommended that she cut trees along the garage roofs as youths were using the tree branches as a storing area for their alcohol.

SWAP33 UTTLESFORD PLAY STRATEGY

The Leisure Manager gave a presentation on Play Partnerships. £250,000 had been allocated per district for play initiatives for ages 0 to 19. There was a requirement for a play strategy to be developed and submitted to the Big Lottery in order to access the funding. Funding would not be allocated if the strategy was not deemed robust enough.

Projects to be funded should ideally be in the region of £50,000 and refurbishment of existing equipment did not qualify unless it achieved additional equipment for children with disabilities.

The Children's Fund Essex was co-ordinating the development of an Essex wide strategy and had contracted a consultancy company named Mapalim to assist with construction of that part of the strategy. Twelve District Councils in Essex had agreed to submit strategies as part of a county wide approach.

Children's Fund Essex had also engaged consultants to deliver a consultation process in primary and secondary schools across the district. Schools were invited to request involvement in this project and results would be fed into the district strategies.

The next stage would be the development of Play Partnership with Town and Parish Councils and a Participation Questionnaire would be sent out with a return date of 31 December 2006.

Councilor A Dean commented that this was a short return period, he was informed that consultation was sent about two months ago.

SWAP34 COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT REPORT

The Community Development Officer (Cultural Services) advised the Panel of related community development activities and schemes with which officers had been involved since the previous panel meeting.

Together with the Chairman of the Panel she had been holding drop in clinics across the area which had been successful. They were hoping to hold further dates in April.

The Leisure and Culture grants were open to arts groups or specialist individuals. Three grants had been awarded within the South West Area.

The closing date for the Community Achievement Awards had now passed, and the ceremony was to take place on Thursday 22 February 2007 at the Council Offices in Saffron Walden. The event would hand out 35 awards.

The Bodycare programme was running in partnership with primary schools, 17 had applied, of which three were from the south west area.

SWAP35 **NEXT MEETING**

The Panel's next meeting would be held in Elsenham on 11 January 2007.

The meeting ended at 9.55pm