



# MEETING OF THE HEALTHY ENVIRONMENT DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY PANEL

**TUESDAY, 6 JUNE 2006 2.30 PM**

---

## **PANEL MEMBERS PRESENT**

Councillor David Brailsford  
Councillor Elizabeth Channell  
Councillor Nick Craft (Vice-Chairman)  
Councillor Donald Fisher

Councillor Fereshteh Hurst  
Councillor Stanley Pease  
Councillor Mrs Margery Radley  
Councillor Jeffrey Thompson (Chairman)

## **OFFICERS**

Scrutiny Officer  
Scrutiny Support Officer  
Head of Environmental Health and Licensing  
Assets and Facilities Manager  
Community Safety Manager  
Energy Manager  
Sports Manager

1 member of the local press

## **OTHER MEMBERS PRESENT**

Councillor Peter Martin-Mayhew  
Councillor Gerald Taylor

Mrs. Jackie Bainbridge (Hon. Secretary,  
Grantham Athletics Club)  
Mr. Tim Bridle (Leisure Connection)  
Mr. Mike Bundy (President/Chairman,  
Grantham Athletics Club)

---

## **1. APOLOGIES**

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Helyar.

## **2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

No declarations were made.

## **3. ACTION NOTES**

Noted.

## **4. FEEDBACK FROM THE EXECUTIVE**

The response from the Healthy Environment Portfolio Holder on recommendations relating to Strategic Health Authority reconfiguration consultation was noted.

## **5. MERES LEISURE CENTRE & GRANTHAM ATHLETICS CLUB**

The Chairman welcomed Tim Bridle (Manager of the Meres Stadium), Jackie Bainbridge (Hon. Secretary of Grantham Athletics Club) and Mike Bundy (President and Chairman of Grantham Athletics Club) to the meeting. They had been invited to the meeting to discuss problems regarding a stadium booking and to try and prevent any such problems in the future.

The Sports Manager briefly summarised the situation based on his findings:

- **September 2005:** Telephone booking/discussion occurred between Grantham Athletic Club's previous secretary and a member of Leisure Connection staff regarding an athletics meeting on 30<sup>th</sup> April. No correspondence from either party was exchanged.
- **6<sup>th</sup> April:** Discussion with officers from Grantham Town Football Club, Leisure Connection and SKDC representatives for grounds maintenance; it was agreed that the grounds maintenance programme would commence on 24<sup>th</sup> April. At the meeting Leisure Connection confirmed that there were no bookings, which had been taken for almost 3 weeks from this date.
- **19<sup>th</sup> April:** SKDC received a letter from Mrs. Bainbridge stating that the Club were under the impression that they had booked a date of 30<sup>th</sup> April 2006 for a Young Athletes League match, which would be unavailable because of grounds maintenance work. Leisure Connection had advised them of the grounds maintenance period.
- Mrs. Bainbridge stated the inconvenience and additional cost to the club. She asked if SKDC could change the dates for grounds maintenance works.
- If the date were changed, it would mean the County Athletics Championships (13/14 May 2006) would be affected.
- Leisure Connection are aware of no application form or written correspondence relating to the booking.

Mr. Bridle stated his case, as noted below:

- **June 2005:** The centre was contacted by the former secretary, asking whether the stadium would be available on that date. At the time she was advised that it would be.
- **September 2005:** Change in Secretary at Grantham Athletics Club.
- Nothing was confirmed. He had found out about the enquiry, which had been logged, when he asked the booking team to look at the events due to be held.
- Any telephone conversation is immediately followed up with a letter and booking form, which made sure that hirers were aware that they would need to see confirmation through.

Mrs. Bainbridge reported the situation from the time she took over as Hon. Secretary for Grantham Athletics Club:

- **End September/October:** The venue was requested. Assurances were made that as she was taking over, all correspondence regarding the booking would be sent to Mrs. Bainbridge.
- The former secretary was still receiving some correspondence; this was passed on.
- **6<sup>th</sup> April 2006:** Mrs. Bainbridge asked for confirmation that the stadium was available. She was advised that the track could be used but not the field.
- Mrs. Bainbridge was advised that the original booking had not been confirmed.

Mr. Bundy, the President/Chairman of Grantham Athletics Club (GAC) defended the Club:

- In previous years, a meeting had been held between the football club, the leisure centre, SKDC grounds maintenance and the athletic club. This did not happen in 2005/2006.
- In 2005, GAC were promoted to a higher league. They did not find this out until September, so the provisional booking could not have been made in June, as

reported by Mr. Bridle.

- No booking form arrived. Booking procedures were considered inconsistent because sometimes telephone bookings had been accepted.
- **7<sup>th</sup> April 2006:** GAC were told that they would be able to use the track only. He questioned whether the grounds maintenance work could have been delayed by one week.
- GAC had to organise the transfer of the event to Boston, resulting in increased expenditure for the club.
- Previously, booking forms had attached, a carbon copy. This would be returned by the Meres as confirmation of booking.

The Panel asked questions, highlighting important issues.

- When no booking form had been received, the secretary of GAC should have followed this up for confirmation.
- There was no consistent policy for the acceptance of telephone bookings.
- There had been no liaison meetings for interested parties, which could have helped prevent the problem.
- Further consultation with the grounds maintenance team would be necessary to establish whether the work was movable, or whether it was necessary for the field to be dormant for so long following these works.
- The grounds maintenance schedule was based around the schedule for Grantham Town Football Club. Until it was known at what date the pitch would cease to be used, final approval for grounds maintenance work would not be given.

Interested parties responded positively to the suggestion that liaison meetings should be recommenced. It was suggested that the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Panel should be invited to facilitate. It was agreed that the meetings should be organised by the Meres on a bi-monthly basis.

## **6. ENERGY EFFICIENCY**

The Assets and Facilities Manager and the Energy Manager attended the meeting to discuss some measures of energy efficiency. Since the Panel last discussed the issue, a Corporate Energy Efficiency Policy and a Private and Public Housing Energy Efficiency Policy had been drafted.

The Council had placed a contract with a contractor who would carry out an energy audit, which would allow the Council to plan for the future. Within the past year, there had been increased take up of advice by private homeowners.

### Wind power

Meetings were due to take place to discuss the feasibility of using wind power. It had been suggested that a wind turbine would be able to power the Meres Leisure Centre. A way in which the Council could begin to use wind power would be on a partnership basis. The Council would be able to use a percentage of the power generated, the rest would be siphoned by the partner organisation.

### Carbon output

The Council would participate in a one hundred day survey of carbon usage to identify areas where savings could be made. There would be a pilot for this in Grantham; if successful, it would be replicated in the remaining Council buildings within the District.

Figures would need to be compared to the same period in an earlier year, to ensure a like-for-like comparison.

### Solar Panels

It was suggested that investigation into the use of solar panels to power Council buildings should take place. Some work had been done; solar powers would not generate enough energy to power the whole building.

As part of the Corporate Energy Efficiency Policy, staff would need to be educated on ways in which energy could be saved. Ten presentations per year had been suggested. A further suggestion was that an all staff and councillor e-mail could be sent to increase awareness of the issue. It was hoped that this would decrease the number of lights and computers that are left on. The introduction of the improved CCTV cameras had meant that the installation of stronger lighting. Movement sensors would be fitted so that the lights would only be in use when necessary.

As part of planning guidance, it is encouraged that new-build properties should be as energy efficient as possible. The Council's housing stock had an energy efficiency figure of 65. Energy efficiency programmes relating to the housing stock would continue as normal until the result of the stock transfer ballot was known.

Some panel members felt that, while some staff did have a positive attitude towards energy efficiency, there could be benefit in recording energy usage by department and introducing a "naming and shaming" scheme.

### **CONCLUSION:**

***There should be an update on energy efficiency at the next meeting of the Panel (5<sup>th</sup> September 2006).***

## **7. POWERS TO RESTRICT THE CONSUMPTION OF ALCOHOL IN DESIGNATED PUBLIC PLACES**

The Community Safety Manager and the Head of Environmental Health and Licensing introduced the Panel to powers to restrict the consumption of alcohol in designated areas. The Community Safety Manager gave a presentation, showing the relationship between anti-social behaviour, criminal activity and alcohol.

- The three crimes that would most commonly be associated with alcohol were criminal damage, wounding and theft from a vehicle (in other areas, the latter is more prevalent for those needing money to buy drugs).
- **Criminal Damage:** Criminal damage figures for Grantham, Stamford and Bourne were over twice the District average. Hotspots were identified round the Earlesfield area and in the town centre. The town centre hotspot also correlated with an anti-social behaviour hotspot. In Stamford, the criminal damage hotspot was in the centre in the area near the licensed premises.
- **Theft from a vehicle:** Most common in car park areas, hotspots were identified in Grantham, Stamford and Billingborough. Other areas where there were high rates of theft from vehicles were along travel routes on the way into and out of towns.
- **Wounding:** In Grantham the hotspot for wounding was identified as the Market Place, Westgate and the town centre, in the vicinity of the licensed premises.

Members had several concerns, which they discussed with the officers present:

- Plans to pedestrianise the Market Place in Grantham could promote the culture of outdoor alcohol consumption. The Panel were advised that the predominant problem with the consumption of alcohol in public places were those people who had been refused service in pubs and clubs and who had instead purchased alcohol at an off-licence.
- Young people who were not old enough to be served in pubs/clubs could acquire alcohol, which they would consume in a public place. The majority of complaints about drunken and alcohol-induced nuisance behaviour, were made against people who aged over 18.
- Designating areas where the consumption of alcohol was restricted could displace any drunken anti-social or criminal behaviour, instead of stopping it.
- Legislation was not deemed clear on the provision of the act; alcohol would not be entirely banned in these places, it would be at the discretion of the police to restrict its consumption if people were creating a public nuisance. One member showed concern that the Act would make little difference; it would only permit the *status quo*. If the District Council were to pursue the proposed restriction, the police would be authorised to act.

Areas suggested for designation to restrict the consumption of Alcohol.

**Grantham:** The town centre, the Market Square, areas of Harrowby and the parks. Other areas suggested included Dudley Road and the area to the back of the Sainsburys store.

**Stamford:** Red Lion Street, Red Lion Square, Broad Street, the Meadows.

**Bourne:** The Well Head, Abbey Lawns.

**The Deepings:** Nothing had been received from the Deepings area in response to consultation.

Villages supported the scheme, however, the majority felt that they did not have a problem, which would necessitate the instatement of such a zone.

The DSP discussed whether they thought it would be more appropriate to introduce schemes that covered the entire town centre areas, or to target smaller pockets. Given the restrictions of the Act, they felt it would be more appropriate to target smaller areas and then extend as necessary.

### **CONCLUSION:**

***To recommend to the Healthy Environment Portfolio Holder, that powers to restrict the consumption of alcohol should be targeted at particular problem areas, which could then be expanded if necessary.***

## **8. REPORTS FROM WORKING GROUPS**

The Chairman of the Waste Management Working Group provided a verbal report on a meeting with the Head of Waste and Contract Services on Friday 21<sup>st</sup> April 2006. Tenders for the twin-bin project had been sent out, retuned and awarded.

### Publicity

A booklet relating to each of the two bins would be sent to each household, detailing

what could be deposited in each bin and waste minimisation suggestions. Stickers would be attached to each bin lid, identifying what could be placed in them. There would be a calendar of collection times. A book to encourage children to recycle had been prepared. A plastic disc would also be circulated, with specific items listed around the edge, identifying which bin they could be placed in.

Each bin would be fitted with a microchip, so that the weight could be recorded and monitored by each property. Information gained from tagging would be for the use of SKDC only.

It was anticipated that 10% of properties would retain black bags. Work was being done on reusable bags with the same capacity as a wheeled bin. If this idea progressed, it would be trialled in a pilot area and if successful, rolled out across the whole District.

The rollout of the twin bins was still on schedule for September.

**9. BEST VALUE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS**

Noted.

**10. WORK PROGRAMME**

Noted.