

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL
NOTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
HEATH HAYES, NORTON CANES AND RAWNSLEY COMMUNITY
FORUM

MONDAY, 2 DECEMBER, 2013 AT 7.00PM

AT BOURNE METHODIST CHURCH

PRESENT: Cannock Chase Councillors:

Sutherland, M. (Chair)
Bernard, Mrs. A.F. (Vice Chair)

Spicer, A Todd, D
Rowley, J Holder, M

Other District Councillor(s):

Bottomer, B. Toth, J

Cannock Chase Council Officers:

T. McGovern Corporate Director
D. Cook Senior Committee Officer

Representatives from the following organisations:

Staffordshire County Council Mark Keeling, Community
 Infrastructure Liaison Manager
Staffordshire Police Sgt S Lavendar

Heath Hayes P.C.
Norton Canes P.C. J. Beddows

Approximately 4 local residents

1. Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillors Bernard, J.D. and Todd, R.

2. Declarations of Interest

None.

3. Notes

An update was given by the Corporate Director relating to the incident of a gun being fired in the vicinity of Bleak House Colliery Site. The owners had been contacted and permission to use a fire arm had not been given to anyone.

The member of the public who reported it originally explained that shooting had occurred on the 4 and 6 October 2013 but that there had not been any since.

The Police reminded everyone that in cases like this a note of the day and time should be made and it should be reported to the police immediately.

The notes of the meeting held on 12 September, 2013 were agreed as a correct record.

4. Matters Arising (Not Otherwise Covered on the Agenda)

None.

5. Questions for Staffordshire Police

The new Sergeant for the area was introduced, Sgt Lavender. Sgt Lavender gave an update on the incidents in the surrounding area. Leaflet dropping regarding frosty mornings was on going.

A brief update on Speedwatch and the need for community involvement was discussed. The Police agreed to come to the next meeting and give a talk about what Speedwatch entailed.

A discussion ensued regarding the growing of drugs and the need to engage with people in the community about the dangers.

Work had been ongoing regarding Environmental Health operations in the local area eg car boot sales and bootleg material.

A request was made by the Police that events and information between Cannock Chase District Council and themselves are pulled together and the information can be tweeted from their twitter account.

Members commented that there had been a good relationship with the last Police Officer and hoped that this would continue with the new one. The Police Officer assured the Member that she would work closely with the community.

6. Mid-Staffordshire NHS Foundation Trust

A response had been received and put on the agenda as consultation was still taking place and therefore, no one was in attendance.

7. Staffordshire Fire and Rescue Services

No questions had been submitted in advance of the meeting for the Fire and Rescue Services, consequently no representative had been sent to the meeting.

No other matters were raised for referral back to the Fire and Rescue Service.

8. Questions for Staffordshire County Council (Highways)

No questions had been submitted. Responses to questions raised at the last forum were dealt with.

With regard as to why chicanes had not been used as a traffic calming measure in Wimblebury Road the response was that they would have needed a substantial amount of build outs, which may have reduced facilities for parking; chicanes are used to allow one direction of traffic to have precedence over the other however this does not always happen and can reduce their effectiveness. Therefore, on this occasion speed humps and tables were used as the effective means of traffic calming.

A member of the public voiced concern that the chicanes may have been better either side of the school. The Officer acknowledged that a mixture had been used to keep the speed down by the school.

A member of the public queried the cost of the traffic calming measures totally several hundreds of thousand of pounds and how 36 people could be seen as a majority to initiate this kind of spend. The Officer assured the Forum that spend for the two phases (one in Wimblebury Road and an adjacent road) cost approximately £230,000 for the two.

He explained that there is a consultation process that has to be followed for any traffic calming measure. Information regarding the areas are inputted into the Integrated Transport Budget at which point Wimblebury Road moved up the list of areas for suggested traffic calming measures. The Statutory consultation includes the Parish, County and District Councillors, haulage companies, the Police, Fire and Ambulance Service. The people whose houses fronts the road with the proposed scheme are consulted as they may have specialist requirements ie disabilities. The consultation is then advertised on street and within local papers. With regard to Wimblebury Road the elected Members and Parish Councillors, the Police and Fire Departments all supported the scheme.

The Officer acknowledged that not everyone would like the traffic calming measures but the scheme would not have gone ahead if it did not have the backing of Parish Councillors. A statutory process had to be followed.

A Member queried the traffic calming measures that had taken place on Hednesford Town which had resulted in businesses losing trade and the parking restrictions. This was in comparison to Chase Town High Street which had alternate parking with build outs which had meant that shops were thriving. When the Parish Councillors had raised their concerns an Officer from County had told them that due to the Fire Department only really approving speed humps this was all that would be installed. The Parish Councillors were not listened to.

The Officer agreed to go back and check the facts and figures for Hednesford Road and what the response back from the Parish Council was.

There had originally been 4 proposals for Hednesford Road and all 4 had been rejected by the majority of the people consulted.

The Officer explained that they do listen to what the Parish Councillors and elected Members say and sited Wimblebury Road as an example. Originally there were to be 3 phases but after a County Councillor had explained the parishioners concerns only 2 phases were implemented. He also explained that there are different budgets and the monies can be moved between preventative and reactive maintenance at the behest of the County Members.

Concerns were raised by the public relating to the state of the road and poor repair work that was being undertaken on potholes. As soon as a pothole had been filled in it was displacing within hours. The Officer commented that potholes referred to would probably have had temporary repairs and would be waiting for the full repair when the machinery and teams were available. The officer acknowledged that the temporary repair to the pothole used a cold tarmac repair which was not as durable as providing a cut out and hot tarmac patch but agreed that the temporary fix should last a couple of months not a couple of hours. Within Cannock Villages at the moment there are over 250 potholes/defects shown on the system which are categorised to ensure that the most urgent are dealt with first.

The contract for this type of work with Enterprise was due for renewal and as such had been put out to tender with a view to start a new contract in April 2014.

Members questioned whether utilities were monitored when they needed to access wires under the ground. The officer replied that there was a Network Team who monitored and inspected any of the work on the highways that the utility companies undertook. If there is a problem it is within the County's power to fine the utility companies if their work is not up to standard and this does happen.

The Chair proposed that all Councillors and Parish Councillors go back

to their respective meetings and raise the issue of potholes with a view to redirect the money in the budget to where it is needed by exerting their influence.

A Member asked for comparative data relating to Cannock and surrounding areas regarding how much money was being spent in Cannock compared to other areas.

9. Any Other Business

None.

10. Next Meeting

24 March 2014.
Venue: TBC

11. Forward Agenda for Future Meetings

None.

The meeting closed at 8.10pm.

CHAIRMAN