

Agenda Item No: 9.8 **Report No:** 155/15
Report Title: Ward Issues Raised by Councillors at Council
Report To: Cabinet **Date:** 23 November 2015
Cabinet Members: Councillors Merry and Smith
Ward(s) Affected: Chailey and Wivelsfield; Plumpton, Streat, East Chiltington and St John Without; Peacehaven East; and Newhaven Valley
Report By: Catherine Knight, Assistant Director of Corporate Services
Contact Officer(s)-
Name(s): Trevor Hayward
Post Title(s): Committee Officer
E-mail(s): 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

- The following Ward issues were raised at the Council meeting on 14 October 2015:

| <u>Councillor/Ward</u> | <u>Ward Issue Concerning</u> | |
|--|---|--|
| Councillor Davy – Chailey and Wivelsfield Ward | Councillor Davy reported that the Bluebell Railway’s application to the Heritage Lottery Fund in support of its Accessible Steam Heritage Project, had passed the first round for agreed support in the sum of £30,000. The Project would revitalise the way that the Railway displayed its locomotives by way of substantial repairs to the Running Shed which would be converted into an exhibition hall. | |

| <u>Councillor/Ward</u> | <u>Ward Issue Concerning</u> | |
|---|--|------|
| | <p>Councillor Davy thanked the Chair and the Council for their support of the Railway.</p> <p><u>Suggested action to be taken by the Council:</u> That the Council be requested to continue its support of the Bluebell Railway.</p> | DBSD |
| <p><u>Comment by Chief Officer (Director of Business Strategy and Development):</u> Lewes District Council welcomes the funding from the Heritage Lottery Fund. We continue to be supportive of the work of the Bluebell Railway, and are happy to publicise or promote its work.</p> | | |

| | | |
|--|--|------|
| <p>Councillor Osborne – Plumpton, Streat, East Chiltington and St John Without Ward</p> | <p>East Chiltington Parish Council had repeatedly written to the Council with Freedom of Information requests in respect of the Council’s strategy regarding the ‘49 Sites’ (ie the New Homes Project), with particular regard to the potential building of homes on land at Hollycroft. No replies had yet been received and they were currently outside the timescale for such responses.</p> <p><u>Suggested action to be taken by the Council:</u> That the Officers be requested to reply immediately to East Chiltington Parish Council’s Freedom of Information requests.</p> | ADCS |
| <p><u>Comment by Chief Officer (Assistant Director of Corporate Services):</u> East Chiltington’s request for information was set out under five different headings.</p> <p>The Council’s response in respect of the matters under heading (v) was provided in early August. Responses to the remaining matters under headings (i) to (iv) was provided on 28 October.</p> | | |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| <p>Councillor Enever – Peacehaven East Ward</p> | <p>The Steyning Avenue car park in Peacehaven was included for development in the Council’s New Homes Project. The parking assessment that had been prepared for the Council had indicated that, in the event of the car park being closed, there would be insufficient on-street spaces available. The car park also offered an informal park-and-ride facility which supported wider sustainable travel initiatives. The proposed development of the site, and that of the Piddinghoe Avenue car park in Peacehaven, would also involve the loss of recycling facilities.</p> | |
|---|---|--|

| | | |
|--|--|------|
| | <p>Councillor Enever felt that the closure of the car park facility would result in the loss of local businesses and employment.</p> <p>The Council had indicated that, in the event that the car park was to close, it would look to provide alternative car parking facilities. East Sussex County Council was also looking to improve bus and cycling travel along the A259 road which might also result in the loss of further parking places.</p> <p><u>Suggested action to be taken by the Council:</u> In light of the impact on the local economy and the environment, that the proposal to develop Steyning Avenue car park be reconsidered at a future meeting of the Cabinet.</p> | DSD |
| <p><u>Comment by Chief Officer (Director of Service Delivery):</u> The Council has received the finalised report conducted by independent experts into the impact of removing car parks at Steyning Avenue, Piddinghoe Avenue and Roderick Avenue South. The report is available on our website and identifies a significant minority of users at the Steyning Avenue car park are using the site as an informal park-and-ride. The report also indicates that surrounding on-street and off-street parking would be sufficient to mitigate the loss of all previously identified car parks except Steyning Avenue. The Council believes that the existing recycling site can be either relocated, and due to proposed changes in the waste and recycling service, some of bins decommissioned without impact to residents.</p> <p>Officers have met with Peacehaven Chamber of Commerce and a business owner adjacent to the Steyning Avenue Car Park to discuss what mitigating work could be undertaken to ensure the impact on surrounding businesses is minimal. The Council is committed to working with local businesses to find a solution, and are meeting with the Chamber, alongside representatives from East Sussex Highways, to explore available and preferable options. One of the options available to the Council would be to designate and signpost the Fairlight Avenue car park (which is no longer a viable site for development due to ground conditions) as a park-and-ride therefore reducing long-stay users in the car parks closer to the commercial businesses.</p> | | |
| Councillor Saunders – Newhaven Valley Ward | <p>In some previous years, Councillors Saunders and Robertson had successfully requested the provision of free parking concessions in Newhaven on the approach to Christmas.</p> <p><u>Suggested action to be taken by the Council:</u> That consideration be given to again supporting such concession and that parking charges be waived in the town of Newhaven for the two weeks prior to Christmas 2015 in order to support the businesses therein.</p> | DBSD |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p><u>Comment by Chief Officer (Director of Business Strategy and Development):</u> The last time that two weeks' free parking was granted in Newhaven was in December 2012. At the time, the Facilities team took a number of calls from traders in both Newhaven and Seaford who were concerned that the car parks were being used as commuter parking because they were free (and therefore unenforceable). As a result, parking spaces were not turning over as quickly, and it was suggested anecdotally that it actually had a negative impact on trade. The exercise has not been repeated in subsequent years, although there have been occasions where free parking has been agreed for 24 hours at a time.</p> <p>Councillor Giles has recently taken a Lead Member decision to allow up to three free parking days per year in the off-street car parks of the towns affected. The cost of this is to be met by the District Council and used on days nominated by the Town Councils. The Town Councils will be in a position to determine how best to use the free parking days to support events and traders within Seaford, Newhaven and Lewes.</p> | |
|---|--|

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