

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
HEALTH AND WELLBEING POLICY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
MONDAY 8 AUGUST, 2011 AT 4.00 P.M.
IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK

PART 1

PRESENT: Councillors

Todd, R. (Chairman)
Gilbert, P. (Vice-Chairman)

Allt, Mrs. A.	Grice, Mrs. D.
Bernard, Mrs. A.F.	Jones, R.
Davis, Mrs. M.A.	Molineux, G.N.

1. Apologies

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Mrs. D.J. Bennett.

2. Declarations of Interests of Members in Contracts and Other Matters and Restriction on Voting by Members

<u>Member</u>	<u>Nature of Interest</u>	<u>Type</u>
Grice, Mrs. D.	Member of Watchdog	Personal

3. Minutes

AGREED:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 24 March, 2011 be approved as a correct record.

4. Health and Wellbeing Priority Delivery Plan – Annual Performance Report

Consideration was given to the Health and Wellbeing Priority Delivery Plan – Annual Performance Report for 2010/11.

Mr. S. Shilvock, Head of Environmental Health reported that 3 indicators had not been delivered on time. He referred to indicator NI 182 'Satisfaction of business with local authority regulation services' and explained that this indicator no longer existed although the Council would continue to monitor it for improvement and performance purposes.

He referred to Priority Outcome 1 'Hold mass participation event' and explained that although it was late this had now been delivered. With regard to the indicator 'Commence implementation' the Head of Environmental Health explained that this would be delivered in the next few weeks as there were problems previously trying to engage partners.

A Member referred to Indicator NI 182 and sought further clarification of what the indicator was. The Head of Environmental Health explained that the Council was required to undertake a customer satisfaction survey based on how satisfied a member of the public was with a particular Environmental Health regulatory inspection that had been undertaken.

Members discussed the reliability factor of the surveys in terms of how accurate the information was that was supplied. The Head of Environmental Health reported that positive responses had been received which included those establishments that had not received very good inspections. He reported that a few hundred responses had been received although he would forward more accurate information to Members.

The Head of Environmental Health explained that the Priority Delivery Plan previously discussed was the annual report for 2010/11, and then circulated the Priority Delivery Plan for this year to Members. He reported that the Plan for this year only included the actions that the Council and Officers directly controlled, and not those reliant on the involvement of other partners.

He pointed out a number of actions that fell both within the Health and Wellbeing and the Culture and Sport areas although those actions would be reported directly to the Culture and Sport Policy Development Committee.

A Member referred to the action 'Facilitate the adaptation of the homes of people with disabilities' and asked if there was any funding the Council received from the NHS.

The Head of Environmental Health referred to the resources the Council currently had and reported that with regard to disabled facilities grants (DFGs) £300k was received through funding from central government and £200k was found from within the Council. DFGs are means tested, however, adaptations for children were not means tested and could cost anything up to £50k. Eligible works for DFGs had been broadened in their scope and now include, for example, works to provide access to gardens. A similar sum (£500,000) is spent each year on providing disabled adaptations to the Council's own housing stock.

The Head of Environmental Health reported that some Local Authorities had a backlog of work that was increasing year on year. However this Council currently had a backlog of work which was not growing, although it would take a considerable amount of funding to remove the backlog altogether.

A Member referred to the disabled facilities grants and the cost of making adaptations for shower rooms which was fairly high. The Head of Environmental Health indicated that this was one area that was being reviewed, although it should be appreciated that the provision of a level access shower room could involve considerable work.

AGREED:

- (A) That with regard to Indicator NI 182 'Satisfaction of business with local authority regulation services', the Head of Environmental Health provides the Committee with more detailed information in respect of the questionnaires.
- (B) That with regard to disabled adaptations, the Head of Environmental Health provides the Committee with more detailed information e.g., waiting times/reasons for waiting.

5. Update on the A5 Air Quality Management Area

The Head of Environmental Health gave a presentation to Members on the A5 Air Quality Management Area (AQMA).

He reported that under the Environment Act 1995 the Council had a duty to review and assess air quality across the District against 7 key pollutants and levels set by health based objectives. There were concerns at Bridgtown with traffic emissions and a AQMA was declared in June 2006 and effective from July 2006.

He reported that the AQMA included the A5 between Churchbridge and the District boundary just beyond Longford island. The stretch of the A460 between Longford island and the boundary at Wedges Mills was also included. The main area of concern was the residential properties on the A5 between Churchbridge and Walkmill Lane.

A number of ideas were discussed and initially a joint steering group with South Staffs District Council was set up as there were issues with the proposals to de-trunk the A5 and also with traffic data for the M6 Toll.

He reported that the Council were continuing to work with the Highways Agency, Staffordshire County Council Highways, the Council's Planning Control Department and Consultants for the Highways Agency.

He advised that an action plan had been drafted which involved further reviews and assessment one of which was due in December 2011. The draft action plan which is currently awaiting final agreement by the Highways Agency will undergo full public consultation and be adopted by Council.

The Head of Environmental Health advised that monitoring of the pollutants would continue and there was a duty to produce an action plan. Discussions were continuing with the Highways Agency and Staffs County Council regarding road improvement schemes to include in action plan.

He advised that there was the potential for further AQMA on the Churchbridge to Turf Island stretch of the A5.

The Chairman referred to the problems and particularly pollutants around the A5 where HGV's and other vehicles used that particular stretch of road. The Head of Environmental Health reported that there were a number of complications and referred to recent planning

permission for 2 incinerators which would be located at Four Ashes and Kingswood Lakeside. He advised that the biggest impact related to traffic movement and commented that when the permission was agreed for the incinerator at Four Ashes, one downside was of how vehicles would access the site.

Some discussion took place between Members in respect of the type of waste and the vehicles used. The Head of Environmental Health commented that vehicles currently used Poplars Landfill for refuse collections but would use Four Ashes in the future. He also noted the concern with vehicle movement around the A5 corridor.

A Member raised concern with traffic movement and asked why Environmental Health had agreed longer operating hours at the Poplars Landfill for its anaerobic digesting facility which had been discussed at the last meeting of the Poplars Liaison Committee. The Head of Environmental Health stated that the decision would have been made through Staffordshire County Council and consultation with the Planning Department, he would however check to see if any questions were asked.

In response to a question raised by a Member, the Head of Environmental Health would liaise with the Poplars Landfill site in respect of loads being escorted onto site by the Police after hours.

A Member referred to the further testing in December and sought further clarification of what this involved. The Head of Environmental Health advised that there was a fully automated station located in Bridgtown and diffusion tubes were scattered around the District. The information would then be analysed to measure the pollution across the District. He also explained that Rugeley Power Station carried out their own pollution monitoring and data from their monitoring station was also used..

A Member was keen to know if any other areas within the District were coming close to meeting the pollution target. The Head of Environmental Health discussed the improvement in air quality following the introduction of smoke control areas a number of years ago. He also suggested that a solution was needed in Bridgtown to try and combat the congestion with traffic at the traffic lights.

AGREED

That the Head of Environmental Health check to see if any questions have been asked of the department in respect of longer operating hours at the Poplars Landfill site.

6. Supplies and Internal Trading Costs

Members were provided with the budget breakdown requested at the following meeting in respect of supplies and internal trading costs, and the Head of Environmental Health provided information in respect of internal recharges.

CHAIRMAN

The meeting closed at 5.10 p.m.