

KENT COUNTY COUNCIL LOCAL BOARDS

NOTES OF MEETING

FAVERSHAM LOCAL ENGAGEMENT FORUM

Date Tuesday, 10 February 2009

Venue:

Present:

Local Board Members:

Apologies for absence:

KCC Officers:

		Action
A1.	Minutes of the Faversham Local Engagement Forum 10 Feb 2009	
	<p>FAVERSHAM LOCAL ENGAGEMENT FORUM</p> <p>MINUTES of the Meeting held at The Abbey School, London Road, Faversham on Tuesday 10th February 2009 from 7:00 pm to 9:12 pm.</p> <p>PRESENT: Councillor Anita Walker (Chairman), Councillors Mark Baldock, Barnicott, Bobbin, Mike Cosgrove, Cindy Davis, Trevor Fentiman, Bryan Mulhern, Prescott and David Simmons. Kent Association of Local Councils Representative: Councillor Duncan (Selling Parish Council). Kent County Councillors: Bowles and Tom Gates (Vice-Chairman).</p> <p>OFFICERS PRESENT: Philippa Davies, Louise Matthews, Mark Radford, Bill Ronan and Jean Wood.</p> <p>ALSO IN ATTENDANCE: Chief Inspector Tony Henley, Cabinet Member for Health (KCC) Alan Marsh, Dennis McCaughan (Faversham Fire Station), David Meikle (Director of Finance and Interim Director of Commissions, Swale Eastern and Coastal PCT), John Mills (Kent Association of Local Councils (KALC)) and Inspector Kevin Swinney.</p> <p>APOLOGIES:</p>	

654 ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIRMAN

RESOLVED:

(1) That Mr Gates (Kent County Councillor) be elected Vice-Chairman for the remainder of the Municipal Year.

655 MINUTES

The Minutes of the Faversham and Swale East Area Forum Meeting held on 7th October 2008 (Minute Nos. 350 - 355) were taken as read, approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record subject to the amendment of Minute No. 354 (Public Session) page 264, final paragraph. The minute to be amended to read 'increased fly posting' not 'increased fly tipping'.

656 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Mark Baldock declared a personal interest in item 8 on the agenda (The Alexander Centre) as he was a trustee of the Faversham Community Café.

657 LOCAL ENGAGEMENT FORUM (LEF)

The Head of Policy explained that the newly formed Local Engagement Forum was a pilot scheme which brought together Swale Borough Council's (SBC) Area Fora and Kent County Council's (KCC) Local Boards. The scheme would be reviewed in December 2009.

658 PUBLIC SESSION

The Chairman read a response to a letter received from Mr Oswald-Jones regarding the junction at Salters Lane/Canterbury Road, Faversham. Mr Oswald-Jones had raised concern with the dangerous access turning right into Salters Lane due to cars parked on the corner which forced westbound A2 traffic to use the right-turn slip road as a contra-flow lane.

The response from the Head of Environment and Amenities was as follows:

The issues raised in the letter have been discussed with Kent Highways and while we are aware that vehicle collisions have occurred at this location there is no record of personal injury

crashes for the last 3 year period up to 30/9/08. It would not seem appropriate to restrict parking to the complete frontage of the cottages in Canterbury Road as there appears to be no alternative parking for these residents and parked cars act as a pinch point and in effect slow down vehicles in an area that is now covered by a 30mph speed restriction. However, corner protection at the junction of Salters Lane in the form of double yellow lines on the radius of the junction should be considered to try and keep the junction clear and this will be recommended to the next meeting of the Joint Transportation Board on 16th March 2009.â€œ

The Landlord of the Windmill Public House acknowledged that there had been no personal injury, but reported that there had been several instances of cars being written-off in that area; both travelling vehicles and parked ones. He considered that further restrictions in the area should be made but suggested that double yellow lines on the corner would raise displacement issues where vehicles would be forced to find somewhere else to park. He suggested that more public car parking was needed and considered the Police felt that the parked vehicles restricted the speed of vehicles along that part of the A2.

A Ward Member explained that she had received numerous letters regarding the junction over the years. She considered there was no easy answer to the problem.

Mr Oswald-Jones explained that he considered the problem at the junction to be caused by obstruction and that Police Community Support Officers (PCSO) would initially notify any offenders with a polite notice which stated that if they parked there again they would be issued with a Fixed Penalty Notice. He suggested that the simple answer would be to install double yellow lines and he acknowledged that parking in the area was a problem generally.

Mrs Martin, a local resident, described a recent accident that had occurred near the junction and advised that she was compiling a petition. She suggested that there were not enough speed restriction signs.

Mr Martin considered that not all the accidents along that stretch of road were caused by obstruction.

Mr Redbath, a local resident, raised concern with the amount of HGVs that were travelling along this part of the A2 and that islands in the centre of the road restricted its width and there was a lack of lighting. He believed that the parked cars protected the houses.

A Member suggested that the issue be referred to the Swale Joint

Transportation Board.

A Member advised that consultation on the junction would commence shortly.

Mr Vesey-Wells, a local resident, considered that the parked cars were a hazard, but that they did slow vehicles down. He stated that residents needed alternative places to park.

The landlord of the Windmill Public House suggested that flashing speed restriction signs be installed in the area.

Inspector Swinney reported that any enforcement of parking restrictions would displace the problem elsewhere. He suggested that an engineered solution was needed and that Salters Lane became a one-way street. He advised that the Police would continue to try to move vehicles away from the junction. He stated that some speed enforcement could be carried out in the area, although he reported that a pattern of continued speeding was generally rare.

A Ward Member agreed that the solution to the problem should be an engineered one but raised concern with Salters Lane becoming a one-way street. He suggested the A2 was made wider and the junction improved.

A Member suggested that containers going to and from the municipal dump in Salters Lane used the Corporation Yard instead for access onto the A2.

Mrs Lloyd, a local resident, stated that the junction of Westwood Place onto the A2 was also hazardous because of parked cars blocking lines of vision to the main road.

Local residents raised concern that the area around the junction was hazardous to pedestrians and especially young children.

Mr MacDonald raised an issue with regard to a pram that had been stolen from the Alexander Centre and a request that had been made to view CCTV images. He had been told that under the Data Protection Act, it was not possible for individuals to view the images. He considered that the owners of the pram had not been given the opportunity to view the facts of the circumstances of the pram theft.

Chief Inspector Henley further advised that there had been no footage to look at and that the cameras would not necessarily be looking at the place in question at the right time.

The Chairman advised that a response to Mr MacDonald's

question had been received from the Community Safety Officer and would be forwarded to Mr MacDonald.

Democratic Services Officer

RESOLVED:

(1) That the issue of the junction at Salters Lane/Canterbury Road, Faversham be considered at the next Swale Joint Transportation Board meeting on Monday 16th March 2009 at 5.30 pm.

PART B MINUTES FOR INFORMATION

659 FAVERSHAM COTTAGE HOSPITAL

The Chairman welcomed the Cabinet Member for Health to the meeting.

Mr Meikle addressed the Forum and explained what was happening with regard to the future of the Faversham Cottage Hospital. He explained that it was the Primary Care Trust's (PCT) intention to expand the services at the hospital to enable more people in Faversham to use the service, rather than travel to other hospitals. He highlighted the short term problem and explained that only 1,000 people used the Minor Injuries Unit per year and it had become a challenge to retain staff in the unit. The PCT had talked with the local GPs and they would staff the Minor Injuries Unit in the short term.

Mr Meikle apologised to the Forum for the misleading message that had been received by Faversham residents that the Minor Injuries Unit would be closed. He acknowledged that, rather than trying to solve the problem, the PCT should have worked with the people in Faversham. He advised that there would be no change in the service provided until consultation had taken place. There would be an open day on 13th March 2009 at the Alexander Centre where there would be briefings on the issues at the hospital. A street survey would also be carried out. He explained that one issue was to get Faversham residents to use the Minor Injuries Unit rather than travelling elsewhere. This could be done by investing in more equipment at the hospital. He advised that the PCT was keen to work with Faversham residents to tackle the problems. From April 2009 there would be plans to move forward positively. He assured the Forum that the Minor Injury Unit would remain there and it was the intention to improve it. He explained that the model that would be followed would mean that

there was a continuity of service with planned care and an aim of giving better patient satisfaction and quality of care. Mr Meikle advised that the PCT were committed to the hospital and investment and consultation to find a sustainable solution.

A Member acknowledged and accepted Mr Meikle's apology. He was pleased to hear that the PCT were committed to improving services at the hospital. He considered that visits to the Minor Injuries Unit were more than Mr Meikle had reported; as 60-70 people revisited the hospital for re-dressing. He reported that 5,000 residents with a Faversham postcode went to Canterbury A & E and challenged whether the cottage hospital could cope with this amount of patients. He explained that other hospitals which had adopted the proposed model had been community hospitals, not cottage hospitals. He emphasised the need for local people to be seen by their own GP. He considered that Faversham residents wanted the hospital to remain as Faversham Cottage Hospital.

A Member raised concern with patients not being able to see their own GP. He queried why changes needed to be made if matters seemed to be running well as they were. He asked what the benefits of the changes would be to the patient and welcomed the consultation.

A member of Faversham Town Council emphasised the importance of patients receiving personal care from their GP.

In response to a question, Mr Meikle explained that it was not change for changes sake.

A local resident suggested that Mr Meikle issued a summary to the Press to inform and update Faversham residents on issues related to the proposed changes.

Mr Meikle acknowledged the support that the hospital had received. He explained that there was never an issue of the Minor Injury Unit closing at the hospital, but that the PCT were committed to improving services and that this was the driver for change. He suggested that this drive and personal service of the GP be brought together. It was important to achieve the best possible service and the best personal service from the GP.

A Member thanked Mr Meikle for attending the meeting and welcomed the commitment of the PCT.

A local resident queried as to whether the services within Faversham Cottage Hospital were advertised enough.

In response to a question, Mr Meikle confirmed that the GPs had

not indicated that they could not cope with the Minor Injuries Unit. He advised that the single GP model provided a better quality of care and better continuity. He reiterated that there would be no changes at the moment and that consultation and the PCT working with the GPs would get the balance right. He confirmed that a brief would be published following the meeting.

The Chairman thanked Mr Meikle for attending the meeting.

660 THE ALEXANDER CENTRE

The Chairman explained that there was no one present at the meeting to provide an update on information on the Alexander Centre's future.

661 POLICE IN SWALE

Inspector Swinney outlined the work that the Police did in Faversham, including Partners and Communities Together (PACT) meetings. He explained that there were eleven PACTs in Faversham, eight within the town and three in the rural areas. PACTs were an opportunity for people to come together and contribute and talk with other partners and to highlight any issues that they were concerned about. He reported that attendance at the meetings varied. Other ways of increasing engagement were being looked into, including contacting hard to reach groups. He explained that anti-social behaviour had decreased by 25 per cent.

A Member congratulated Inspector Swinney on the work that he had done and raised issues with regard to lack of venues and the cost of hiring venues.

Inspector Swinney advised that as the PACT meetings were not Police, but partnership meetings, it was necessary for contributions to hire costs to be made.

Mr McCaughan offered the Fire Station in Faversham free of charge for a future PACT meeting.

Chief Inspector Henley explained that PACT meetings were trying to find out the local issues within Faversham and they were committed to local engagement.

Inspector Swinney advised that PACT meetings were designed to be held one in each Ward; if there were too many it could become unmanageable.

Parish Councillor Duncan raised concern with regard to

	<p>unauthorised cycling in Perry Wood. Inspector Swinney advised that he would look into the matter.</p> <p>In response to a question, Inspector Swinney advised that the combination of Police Officers and PCSOs were larger than ever before. Each Ward in town had at least one PCSO; these extra resources had allowed engagement and the ability to intervene more quickly.</p> <p>In response to a question regarding traffic movement and management in Faversham, a Member advised that this would be considered at the next meeting of the Forum.</p> <p>Inspector Swinney advised the Forum that four PCSOs had been trained to ride bicycles to carry out some of their work.</p> <p>In response to a question, Inspector Swinney advised that litter in Faversham Recreation Ground was under the jurisdiction of SBC and the street wardens.</p> <p>Members of the Forum recognised the need to engage young people in PACT meetings. Inspector Swinney advised that Junior PACTs were being looked into.</p> <p>The Chairman thanked Inspector Swinney for attending the meeting.</p> <p>662 DATES, TIMES AND VENUES FOR FUTURE MEETINGS</p> <p>RESOLVED:</p> <p>(1) That the Alexander Centre be added to the next agenda.</p> <p>(2) That traffic issues in Faversham Town Centre be added to the next agenda.</p>	
A2.	Election of Vice-Chairman	
A3.	Apologies for absence	
A4.	Minutes	
A5.	Declarations of Interest	

Tuesday, 10 February 2009

A6.	Local Engagement Forum	
A7.	Public Session	
A8.	Faversham Cottage Hospital	
A9.	The Alexander Centre	
A10.	Police in Swale	
A11.	Dates, Times and Venues for Future Meetings	