

**Agenda Item No:** 9.9 **Report No:** 123/15  
**Report Title:** Ward Issues Raised by Councillors at Council  
**Report To:** Cabinet **Date:** 24 September 2015  
**Cabinet Members:** Councillors Blackman, Franklin, Jones and Maskell  
**Ward(s) Affected:** Ouse Valley and Ringmer, Lewes Priory, Lewes Castle, Seaford South and Newhaven Valley  
**Report By:** Assistant Director of Corporate Services  
Catherine Knight  
**Contact Officer(s)-**

**Name(s):** Trevor Hayward  
**Post Title(s):** Committee Officer  
**E-mail(s):** [trevor.hayward@lewes.gov.uk](mailto:trevor.hayward@lewes.gov.uk)  
**Tel No(s):** 01273 471600

---

**Purpose of Report:**

To respond to ward issues raised by councillors at Meetings of the Council.

**Officers Recommendation(s):**

To note and agree the officer action detailed in the Report.

---

**Reasons for Recommendations**

To ensure that appropriate follow up action is taken.

**Information**

- 1 The following Ward issue was raised at the Council meeting on 16 July 2015:

<u>Councillor/Ward</u>	<u>Ward Issue Concerning</u>	
<b>Councillor Gander – Ouse Valley and Ringmer Ward</b>	There had been some concern over the closure of Barclays Bank in Ringmer, which offered facilities to those in more rural areas. Councillor Gander informed the Council that thousands of people had a Barclays account because of the locality of the branch.	

<u>Councillor/Ward</u>	<u>Ward Issue Concerning</u>	
	<p><u>Suggested Action to be taken by the Council</u> That the Council wrote a strongly worded letter to Barclays Bank imploring it not to close the branch.</p>	DBSD
<p><u>Comment by Chief Officer (Director of Business Strategy and Development):</u> Letter sent to Barclays PLC from Head of Regeneration &amp; Investment, as per suggested action.</p>		
<p><b>Councillor Rowell - Lewes Priory Ward</b></p>	<p>At the Annual Meeting of the Council on 20 May 2015, concerns were raised over the future of Saxonbury in Juggs Road, to which the Director of Service Delivery had responded at the Cabinet meeting on 6 July 2015 stating "It is too early to say what plans might be for Saxonbury, but Councillors and residents will have the opportunity to be involved once we reach that part of the consultation process".</p> <p>Prior to that on 26 June 2015, a spokesperson for the Council had informed the Sussex Express that "Our intention is also to refurbish the existing run down building into high quality, innovatively designed flats".</p> <p><u>Suggested Action to be taken by the Council</u> That official clarification be provided as to which of the above statements was correct, and that the plans for Saxonbury be provided.</p>	DSD
<p><u>Comment by Chief Officer (Director of Service Delivery):</u> A planning application for this site is not anticipated until August next year so the Council and the developer have not developed any initial drawings or architectural plans or have fixed views as it is still very early in the process. However, there is a preference to retain the house and restore it and it is anticipated that this will be preferred by residents too, however, further consultations may or may not confirm this.</p>		
<p><b>Councillor Chartier - Lewes Castle Ward</b></p>	<p>At Offham Road between the Avenue and Prince Edwards Road, there was vegetation which had overgrown, forcing traffic into the middle of the road.</p> <p>There were also brambles growing on the footpath opposite Prince Edwards Road which was used regularly to gain access to Pells School and Lewes Youth Centre.</p>	

<u>Councillor/Ward</u>	<u>Ward Issue Concerning</u>	
	<p><u>Suggested Action to be taken by the Council</u> That the Officers be requested to determine who was responsible for clearing the roads, and then request the relevant organisation/person to arrange for the vegetation to be cut back and cleared.</p>	DSD
<p><u>Comment by Chief Officer (Director of Service Delivery):</u> The roadway at Offham Road and the pathway opposite Prince Edwards Road have been inspected and they do not belong to Lewes District Council. The areas are maintained by East Sussex County Council, and the request has been forwarded on to them.</p>		
<p><b>Councillor Murray – Lewes Castle Ward</b></p>	<p>St Mary's Social Centre was within Lewes Castle Ward, and the Trustees and users of the Social Centre were concerned about the future of the facilities, following the announcement of the 49 sites proposed for redevelopment.</p> <p><u>Suggested Action to be taken by the Council</u> That assurance is given and that proper consultation be undertaken when deciding the future of St Mary's Social Centre.</p>	DSD
<p><u>Comment by Chief Officer (Director of Service Delivery):</u> The assurance is given. Further, the council met with St Mary's Social Centre Trustees and supporters on the 20 July 2015 and the agreed notes of that meeting state <u>'We will not move forward without the trustees support.'</u></p>		
<p><b>Councillor Adeniji - Seaford South Ward</b></p>	<p>A few years ago, the Council had earmarked some areas as proposed sites for Traveller settlements. Councillor Adeniji believed that one of these sites was in Alfriston Road, Seaford, which had also been named as a proposed site for housing redevelopment in May 2015.</p> <p>There was confusion amongst some residents that the proposed site for the Council's new homes would, instead, be used for a Traveller settlement.</p> <p><u>Suggested Action to be taken by the Council</u> That clarification be provided in respect of the confusion which existed in respect of the proposed development of the land at Alfriston Road, Seaford.</p>	DSD

<u>Councillor/Ward</u>	<u>Ward Issue Concerning</u>	
<u>Comment by Chief Officer (Director of Service Delivery):</u> Alfriston Road is not being considered for a travellers site but for homes.		
<b>Councillor Saunders Newhaven Valley Ward</b>	<p>It was a well known issue that the air quality in Newhaven was a concern. After consulting East Sussex County Council (ESCC) Highways via the Strengthening Local Relationships meeting about the possibility of installing signage informing drivers to turn their engines off when they were stationary, ESCC Highways had said it would not be feasible to implement that idea.</p> <p><u>Suggested Action to be taken by the Council</u> That the Council write to ESCC Highways in order to find out if the above was a feasible suggestion and that, in the event that it was not considered to be feasible, that ESCC Highways be requested to provide the reason therefore.</p>	DSD
<u>Comment by Chief Officer (Director of Service Delivery):</u> A letter has been sent to ESCC and when a response is received it will be forwarded to Councillor Saunders.		

### **Financial Appraisal**

2 None arising from this Report.

### **Legal Implications**

3 None arising from this Report.

### **Risk Management Implications**

4 I have not completed the Risk Management Checklist as there is no need to undertake a risk assessment.

### **Equality Screening**

5 I have not completed the Equality Analysis checklist as this Report is free from the requirement to do so.

### **Background Papers**

6 None

### **Appendices**

7 None