

**North Dudley Area Committee – 29<sup>th</sup> March 2010**

**Responses to Questions Raised at the Previous Meeting**

**Report of the Area Liaison Officer**

**Purpose of Report**

1. To inform the Committee on the current status of responses to questions posed at the previous meeting of the Committee.

**Background**

2. At the meetings of this Committee held on 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2009 and 3<sup>rd</sup> February 2010, it was indicated that written responses would be sent to the questioners concerned. The responses are attached as appendix 1.

**Finance**

3. There are no direct financial implications at this stage.

**Law**


4. Section 111 Local Government Act 1972 enables the Council to do anything which is calculated to facilitate or is conducive or incidental to the discharge of its statutory functions.

**Equality Impact**

5. The proposals take into account the Council's policies on equality and diversity.

## **Recommendation**

6. That the Committee note the report and the appendix to the report.



.....  
**Phil Tart**  
**Area Liaison Officer**

Contact Officer: Joan Rees – Democratic Services Officer  
Telephone 01384 815242

E Mail: [joan.rees@dudley.gov.uk](mailto:joan.rees@dudley.gov.uk)

List of Background Papers:

Question slips submitted at the meeting  
Correspondence sent in response by Council Officers

### Responses To Issues Raised at the Previous Meeting held on 2<sup>nd</sup> December 2009 and 3<sup>rd</sup> February 2010

#### Petitions

a) A petition was submitted by Councillor Mottram to the meeting of the Committee held on 2<sup>nd</sup> December 2009, on behalf of local residents requesting consideration of the installation of CCTV security cameras for 639-668 Birmingham New Road, Coseley. The Petition was referred to the Director of the Urban Environment for consideration.

The Group Engineer Traffic and Road Safety has written to the first named person on the petition to advise that a site meeting has been arranged between concerned business owners, Police officers and Council officers, to discuss the problems associated with anti-social behaviour and vandalism in front of 639 – 668 Birmingham New Road, Coseley. The problems may take some time to resolve by the official partners involved and funding and other resources will also have to be considered.

b) A petition was submitted to the meeting of the Committee on 3<sup>rd</sup> February 2010, on behalf of local residents objecting to the temporary relocation of the Mast from Coseley Baths to the West Midlands Factory Site in Old Meeting Road. The Petition was referred to the Director of the Urban Environment for consideration.

The Head of Planning has written to the first named person on the petition to advise that in this instance O<sub>2</sub> have invoked their rights under the provisions of Town and Country (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 Article 3 Schedule 2 Part 24 Class A Part b. which allows the use of land in an emergency for a period not exceeding 6 months to station and operate moveable telecoms apparatus required for the replacement of unserviceable telecom apparatus including the provision of moveable structures on land for the purposes of that use. The mast has been erected under this provision and as such does not require the grant of any specific planning consent. The only control is that the mast must not exceed 15m in height. Antennas on the mast may take this over 15m but as long as the mast complies there are no planning controls we may invoke for this period of time.

c) A petition was submitted on behalf of local residents, to the meeting of the Committee on 3<sup>rd</sup> February 2010 requesting that a gulley in Barnesmeadow Place be closed due to acts of anti social behaviour and nuisance to local residents. The petition was referred to the Director of the Urban Environment and the Community Safety Team for consideration.

A verbal update will be given at the next meeting.

### Public Forum

1. A member of the public complained that previously reported remedial work required to repair pot holes in Central Drive, had not been carried out, but smaller pot holes which had not been reported, had been repaired. She requested that the reported holes be repaired as a matter of urgency.

The Group Engineer Traffic and Road Safety has written to the questioner and also referred this matter to colleagues in Street Care. We have been informed that Central Drive, Coseley is on the highway maintenance programme for resurfacing, however, because of the concrete construction discussions on technical solutions are taking place with the contractor and it is hoped that it will be scheduled for resurfacing for June of this year.

2. A member of the public questioned whether the Halesowen Baths, which had a flat roof, had ever been repaired and if so what the cost had been.

The Assistant Director Culture and Leisure has sent a written response to the questioner informing her that there is a fundamental difference between the roof construction at the Coseley and Halesowen facilities. As had been reported previously the roof at Coseley was constructed using a foam mortar concrete mix in the roof panels which cannot be protected by any maintenance regime and required the full replacement of the roof if it were to be put into a safe condition. Halesowen, on the other hand, utilizes a three layer glass fibre based felt system laid onto a continuous profiled aluminium structural decking sheet which spans onto a steel support system across the full width of the pool hall. Whilst the top layer can be expected to have been replaced a number of times during its life, a recent inspection of the internal roof space found that the aluminium structural deck and principal support steelwork is in good condition. He also informed the questioner that he was not in a position to give a figure of spending specifically on the roof at Halesowen but was able to give details of amounts which had been spent on Repair and Maintenance items at both sites by the Council's Corporate Property Division.

3. In response to a query as to the ownership of Cavendish House and whether a compulsory purchase order could be placed on the building, the Area Liaison Officer has written a response to the questioner and advised that Cavendish House is privately owned and therefore the Council does not have any control over the building's future use or demolition of the building. It is understood that the owner is currently reviewing options for the building.

4. Some members of the Committee and members of the public expressed concerns regarding the temporary mast which had been erected on the West Midlands Factory Clearance site in Old Meting Road Coseley. The Area Liaison Officer has written to the Operator expressing the concerns and requesting that the Operator consider an alternative site for the mobile mast. The Operator has responded explaining the reasons for the temporary siting of the mast. They also state that they are currently investigating options for an alternative solution. They also state that they have no scientific evidence to support the concerns expressed regarding health issues. They try to avoid sensitive locations wherever possible, but do have a duty to meet the needs of those wishing to use their mobile phones, which require mobile phone masts.

#### Ward Issues

1. Councillor Mottram raised the recent speed visor introduced at Yew Tree Lane needed to be revised as it was directing in the wrong direction.

A site meeting has been held with Councillor Mottram.