

No	Rec/9 wd target to respond	Question by	Response from	Sent to Cllr	Published
1	<p>Received 17<sup>th</sup> October 2005</p>	<p><b>Cllr Abbott</b></p> <p>At the October Full Council meeting I made a statement about the high likelihood of a planning application for a major waste facility on Rivenhall Airfield and asked the Leader of the Council for assurances that the issue would be subject to wide opportunity for consideration by members in a similar way to the welcome approach that has been taken on issues such as consultations on Stansted and the A120, pre planning application stage.</p> <p>I listed a number of likely features of the development which were taken directly, or closely derived, from the recent pre EIA Consultation Scoping Document, produced by Agents for the landowners of Rivenhall Airfield and submitted to the County Council and local Parish Councils, as well as BDC, for comment.</p> <p>The quoted features I raised emphasised the very large nature of the potential development in the countryside of this District and implications such as for traffic and access to the existing and proposed A120.</p> <p>In response, the Leader stated that Council policy has not changed and that I was often wrong on these issues.</p> <p>I would be grateful if the Leader could indicate which policy he was referring to and in what respect my statement was wrong.</p>	<p><b>By Councillor Butland, Leader of the Council</b></p> <p>The policy I was referring to was the current Waste Plan, Section 8, pages 68-73.</p>	28/10/05	28/10/05

No	Rec/9 wd target to respond	Question by	Response from	Sent to Cllr	Published
2	Received 24 <sup>th</sup> October 2005	<p><b>Cllr Gyford</b></p> <p>On what date was the Warners Mill property put up for sale?</p> <p>On what date was the Warners Mill property withdrawn from sale?</p> <p>On what date did the Leader of the Council discover that a sale of the Warners Mill property without the prior consent of the Heritage Lottery Fund</p> <p>(a) would be contrary to the terms of the grant from the Fund in respect of the Warner Archive, and</p> <p>(b) would entitle the Fund to reclaim the £1.9 million grant money?</p> <p>On what date did discussions take place with the Braintree District Museum trustees to consider the</p>	<p><b>By Councillor Butland, Leader of the Council</b></p> <p>The property was market tested during the course of 2005 before it was decided to sell at auction on 11<sup>th</sup> October 2005. The decision to dispose of the Warners Mill site was taken at the Industrial and Commercial Property Review Group, 29<sup>th</sup> January 2003, endorsed by the Executive on 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2003. Discussion commenced with the Museum Trust regarding the sale of the site in early September between the Chief Executive and the Trustees. The Trustees were offered the freehold interest if they were willing to make an offer around the market value of the site. No formal offer has been received though in early discussions some outline figures were discussed.</p> <p>7<sup>th</sup> October 2005.</p> <p>I became aware of the issues concerning the sale of the Warners Mill property and the condition of the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) in early October. Since the decision to dispose of the freehold was in 2003, this was an implementation issue.</p> <p>HLF subsequently confirmed that the Council could dispose of the site provided that the Trust had a lease of the property which would be</p>	03/11/05	03/11/05

		future of the Warner Archive in the light of the discovery referred to in the question above?	had a lease of the property which would be acceptable to HFL. In giving this confirmation, the HLF has acknowledged that the main purpose of the grant was to acquire the archive rather than the property and in hindsight had this been made clearer at the time, then consent to dispose of the site would not have been required. HLF has now agreed the disposal subject to some minor alterations in the lease arrangements, these are currently being negotiated.		
	<b>Rec/9 wd target to respond</b>	<b>Question by</b>	<b>Response from</b>	<b>Sent to Cllr</b>	<b>Published</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Received 24<sup>th</sup> October 2005</b>	<p><b>Cllr Edwards</b></p> <p>I understand that those who are late renewing their resident's parking permits have been told that these can be back dated. Is this council policy?</p>	<p><b>By Councillor Gage, Cabinet Member for Environment</b></p> <p>An electronic residents-permit database is currently being prepared. Until it is ready, the current system does not facilitate the generation of automatic renewal reminders. As such, some residents may not realise that their permit has expired. Parking Attendants will issue reminders to vehicles seen with recently expired permits but in some cases the motorist is not aware until a penalty charge notice is issued. In such circumstances, permit renewals can be back-dated. Where long periods of time have elapsed (e.g. over a month) renewals will generally not be considered and a new application will have to be made.</p>	03/11/05	03/11/05

No	Rec/9 wd target to respond	Question by	By Councillor Gage, Cabinet Member for Environment	Sent to Cllr	Published
4	Received 24 <sup>th</sup> October 2005	<p><b>Cllr Edwards</b></p> <p>Is it council policy that resident's parking schemes are not enforced at weekends?</p>	<p><b>By Councillor Gage, Cabinet Member for Environment</b></p> <p>Different residents-only parking zones have different restriction periods, not all of which cover weekends. However, those that do are indeed patrolled at weekends, including Sundays.</p>	03/11/05	03/11/05
No	Rec/9 wd target to respond	Question by	Response from	Sent to Cllr	Published
5	<p>Received 24<sup>th</sup> October 2005</p> <p><b>Target Date to respond 04/11/05</b></p>	<p><b>Cllr Dr Evans</b></p> <p>It was a Council decision on the 25<sup>th</sup> July 2005 :-  <i>"that BT be requested to remove the telephone box in Shaw Road in the Templars Estate, Witham as a matter of urgency"</i></p> <p>It is the case that the telephone box is still in place and being misused in a totally unacceptable manner.</p> <p>Would the leader please give me for the people who live on the Templars Estate an up to date position as to when BT intend to remove this telephone box ?</p>	<p><b>By Councillor Mrs Scattergood, Cabinet Member for Planning and Rural Issues</b></p> <p>BT have been contacted twice by the Council since the 8 July Council Meeting with requests to remove the telephone box and no reply has been received. While we will continue to persue this matter, I would suggest that Witham Town Council themselves could also make representations to BT whose responsibility this clearly is.</p>	3/11/05	03/11/05

No	Rec/9 wd target to respond	Question by	Response from	Sent to Cllr	Published
6	<p>Received 24<sup>th</sup> October 2005</p> <p>Target Date to respond 04/11/05</p>	<p><b>Cllr Dr Evans</b></p> <p>It is the case that agreement was reached following proper consultation between The Post Office, Witham Town Council and Braintree District Council that 30 names of fallen heroes commemorated on Witham War Memorial from both World Wars would be used for naming streets/roads on the Maltings Lane development.</p> <p>Would the leader please provide me with the names which have been used to date from this list and would he also please confirm that Barratts the developers “were unhappy” to use the name Sneezum as a road or street name.</p> <p>The brothers George and Charles Sneezum were volunteers in the Great War and may I add the only sons in the family. George at 22 years of age was killed in action at Ypres in 1916 and is buried there in the Essex Cemetery. His elder brother Charles died of terrible wounds in 1915 and is buried in All Saints Churchyard.</p> <p>By any standards these men were heroes and worthy of being commemorated as a street or road name in their home town.</p>	<p><b>By Councillor Mrs Scattergood, Cabinet Member for Planning and Rural Issues</b></p> <p>A list of 30 names of fallen heroes have been supplied by the Witham Town Council and approved for use at the Maltings Lane Development.</p> <p>Names are taken from this list, at random, and allocated to new streets and phases as the development proceeds, the layout is finalised and a street address is needed.</p> <p>To date the following names from the list have been allocated;-</p> <p>HAWKES BAKER DAWSON MORRISON GREENWELL RUSSELL RANDALL MORTIMER</p> <p>The rate of development has slowed over recent months and a need for street name allocation has also slowed in relation to the speed of development. No policy change to has been made to the intention to use names from the list for the new streets.</p> <p>Barratt Homes indicated an objection to the use of the name Sneezum together with seven other</p>	03/11/05	03/11/05

			<p>proposed names from the list. A Developer or any other person if so minded, has the right to object to a proposed street name by lodging their objection to a Magistrates Court within 21 days of the advertisement of the intention to assign a particular name. We have no budget for defending a Magistrates Court hearing and usually seek to agree an acceptable alternative with the objector and Developer, where a party is unhappy with an intended name assignment.</p> <p>In the case of the name Sneezum, we have since been provided with the background history to the fallen brothers and will be better placed to use this information persuasively with a developer on a future occasion before completion of the Maltings Lane development. It may be helpful if the background information surrounding the loss of the soldiers whose names have not as yet been used for street names could be made available, the better to advise on the significance of the commemoration.</p>		
No	Rec/9 wd target to respond	Question by	Response from	Sent to Cllr	Published
7	<p>Received 2<sup>nd</sup> Nov 2005</p> <p>Target Date to respond 15/11/05</p>	<p><b>Councillor B Gaught</b></p> <p>With the Government inspired Licensing review completed, could the appropriate Cabinet member provide the following details:-</p> <p>(a) The number of appeal hearings and their estimated cost.</p> <p>(b) The total number of applications</p>	<p><b>By Councillor Mrs Schmitt, Cabinet Member for Public Protection and Healthy Living.</b></p> <p>(a) No appeal hearings and none anticipated to date – consequently no cost.</p> <p>(b) 983 of which:-</p> <p>504 Personal licences</p>	11/11/05	11/11/05

		<p>(c) The estimated cost of this whole exercise</p> <p>(d) How much of this imposed cost will have to met by the local Council Tax payer</p> <p>(e) What benefits have been gained by the District.</p>	<p>58 Club premises</p> <p>403 Premises licences (including variations to granted licences)</p> <p>9 Designated premises supervisors (have to be applied for if DPS changes after premises licence has already been granted.</p> <p>9 Interested parties</p> <p>(c) Across the last 2 years, the total cost of the new Licensing Act is estimated at £277,000, offset by income from fees of £116,000. This leaves a net cost of £161,000 although the total amount includes first year 'one-off' set-up costs which are not recoverable through fees.</p> <p>Fee income also varies depending on whether it relates to new applications or renewals and the different applications require varying input from the staff who also administer a wide range of other licensing activities.</p> <p>Overall, the Council's ongoing Licensing function costs £12,170 including income from such activities as taxi and entertainment licensing, but excludes incidental costs that have arisen in other service areas such as Environmental Protection and Health Protection.</p> <p>Separating out the ongoing cost of just the new Licensing Act is complex and would</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p>require a significant amount of detailed work.</p> <p>(d) See above.</p> <p>(e) The introduction of the Licensing regime was a statutory responsibility imposed on the Council by the Government. It is for individual Members to determine the benefits to their constituents. However, in introducing the proposals, the Government highlighted the following anticipated benefits:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Local business will have increased flexibility in opening hours and provision of regulated entertainment that should increase revenue.</li> <li>▪ Alcohol will be more widely available to purchase and consume by those who wish to do so.</li> <li>▪ All licences will be issued subject to conditions including those relating to noise/nuisance which, if adhered to, should prevent nuisance.</li> <li>▪ There will be benefits in regulating events which were previously unregulated.</li> </ul>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

Last updated 14<sup>th</sup> November 2005