

Committee: Environment and Transport
Date: 14 January 2003
Agenda Item No: 4
Title: Proposed 40-mph speed limit order
B184 Walden Road, Little Chesterford
Author: Area Manager
(01371) 872888

Summary

- 1 To advise Members of the objection received in response to the informal publication of the proposed introduction of a 40 –Mph speed limit order for B184 Walden Road, Little Chesterford.

Background

- 2 The measures have been prepared in conjunction with the proposed roundabout scheme for the Chesterford Research Park development. Planning permission for the roundabout was granted by Uttlesford District Council (UTT/0091/01/FUL).
- 3 Following planning approval the provision of a 40 – mph speed restriction was specifically included in the legal agreement negotiated with the County Council.
- 4 The informal consultation process on the proposals was undertaken in October 2002. The proposals were formally advertised from 9 January to 31 January 2003.
- 5 The proposals are shown in Appendix A. One objection has been received from the Chief Constable and this is detailed in Appendix B of this report.
- 6 The estimated cost of implementing the signs and road markings for the speed limit is £5,000 and these will be funded from the Section 106 Agreement.

Conclusions

- 7 The Chief Constable has objected to the proposal due to the fact that there is very little development on the new section of road and they consider that it does not meet the requirements for a 40 – mph speed limit as laid down in the Essex County Council current Speed Reduction Policy.
- 8 Although the proposals do not meet the County Council's current Speed Reduction Policy in terms of residential development the Policy still allows for

restrictions to be implemented as long as physical speed reducing or driver awareness measures are implemented at the same time.

- 9 The alignment of the new approach roads and the roundabout on the B184 have been designed to restrict vehicle speeds to the proposed speed limit and the extent of the speed limit has been designed to co-inside with these areas. This means that the proposed 40 mph restriction will be self-enforcing and therefore the policy is met.

RECOMMENDED that

1. As the Policy is clearly met in this case that the Area Manager be requested to process for the introduction of the speed limit.
2. That the Chief Constable be informed of this decision.

Local County Member
Mr R P Chambers CC

Local District Member
Mrs E Tealby – Watson DC

Background Papers: Correspondence on this matter is held at the Area Office, Great Dunmow.

Committee: Environment and Transport
Date: 14 January 2003
Agenda Item No: 5
Title: Proposed 50-mph Speed Limit Order
B184 Walden Road, Great Chesterford
Author: Area Manager
(01371) 872888

Summary

- 1 To advise Members of the comments received in response to the informal consultation of the proposed introduction of a 50-mph speed limit order for B184 Walden Road, Great Chesterford.

Background

- 2 The proposal was selected for funding from the Locally Determined Budget 2002/03. Originally the request was for a speed limit to run from Stumps Cross through to Springwell, Little Chesterford. Following two separate site meetings between representatives of the Area Manager and Essex Police

Traffic Management Unit followed by a meeting with representatives from the Parish Council the proposals shown on attached drawing number TRW / 89 and as detailed in Appendix A were prepared, however, following a subsequent Parish Council meeting Great Chesterford requested the inclusion of the area up to the Park Road junction as detailed in drawing number TRW / 89A and detailed in Appendix B.

- 3 A letter received from Essex Police dated 5 July 2002 indicated that the Chief Constable would object to the proposal if the area up to and including the Park Road junction was included in the proposal. In November 2002 the Parish Council wrote directly to the Chief Constable to see whether he would be willing to amend his decision, a copy of the Parish Council's letter is attached and is featured in Appendix C of this report. A further letter was received from the Chief Constable on 23 December 2002 outlining his reasons for his original comments to the extent of the proposal but re-iterated his support for the introduction of a 50-mph speed limit for the developed area adjacent to B184 Walden Road and these are detailed in Appendix D.
- 4 The informal consultation process on the proposals was undertaken in December 2002. The proposals were formally advertised from 9 January to 31 January 2002.
- 5 The proposals are shown in Appendix B and are supported by the Parish Council. One objection has been received and this is detailed in Appendix D.
- 6 The estimated cost of implementing the signs and road markings for the B184 Walden Road speed limit are £4,000. The measures will be funded from the Locally Determined Budget.

Conclusions

- 7 The Chief Constable has reservations about the extent of the proposed 50-mph speed limit where, for approximately 250 metres north of the Jackson's Lane junction, it is in open countryside with no development on either side of the road. This section may be seen as unnecessarily restrictive by the majority of motorists and as such there may be poor level of compliance that could have the effect of demeaning the desired speed reduction throughout the whole length of the proposed limit.
- 8 A twenty four-hour speed survey was undertaken along B184 Walden Road, approximately two hundred metres south-east of the Jackson's Lane junction. The 85th percentile speeds recorded over a twenty four-hour period for north-westbound vehicles were 60-mph and 55-mph for south-eastbound vehicles.
- 9 Although there are some vehicles using the Park Road junction visiting the industrial units on Park Farm, a far higher number of vehicles will be using the High Street and Jackson's Lane junctions it is felt that if the proposed speed limit included the Park Road junction it could result in a low level of compliance for the areas in the vicinity of these two junctions.

RECOMMENDED that

1. the process be continued by the Area Manager to introduce the 50-mph speed limit as described in the schedule and featured in Appendix A in accordance with the County Council's Standard Order Making Procedure but excluding the area upto and including the Park Road junction.
2. the Parish Council and Chief Constable be informed of this decision.

Local County Member
Mr R P Chambers CC

Local District Members
Mrs E Tealby – Watson DC

Background Papers: Correspondence on this matter is held at the Area Office, Great Dunmow.

Committee: Environment & Transport
Date: 14 January 2003
Agenda Item No: 6
Title: Increasing Car Park Charges – the Options
Author: Sarah McLagan (01799) 510560

Summary

- 1 This report provides Members with details of various options for tariffs for Council car parks. It recommends that Members determine the level of charges to be levied for use of the Council's car parks as soon as possible.

Background

- 2 At the meeting of the Environment and Transport Committee on 12 November 2002, it was agreed that charges for parking on Council car parks should be increased. Officers were asked to provide the Committee with details of options and implications for tariffs to enable a decision about the level of increase to be made at the next meeting of the Committee. Members agreed that officers should seek to find an increase of about £50,000 in addition to the £25,000 declared at a previous meeting of the Committee. Such an increase would still ensure that parking charges in Uttlesford remained reasonable in comparison with similar towns in the surrounding area.

- 3 In developing options for increasing tariffs, officers have been mindful of the following: –
- (a) The need for the charges to reflect particular circumstances in each town.
 - (b) The desire to encourage people to stay in a town for more than an hour
 - (c) To achieve additional income of about £75k by increasing the charges
 - (d) The need to avoid using small denominations of coinage.
 - (e) The Rose & Crown car park should be restricted for short stay use.
- 4 Obviously, permutations for options are endless and so officers have developed five options for tariffs, as set out in Appendix 1. Current usage figures have been used to indicate potential income. In the past when charges have been increased income is affected initially, but usually recovers to previous usage levels.

Option A = Every Tariff is increased by 10p.

Option B = Tariffs are increased incrementally i.e. 5p, 10p 15p etc.

Option C = First tariff on each car park is increase by 10p, but all other tariffs remain the same. On Swan Meadow, a new tariff is introduced to encourage visitors to stay for up to 5 hours.

Option D = First tariff is increased by 20p and the other tariffs are increased by 10p. On Swan Meadow, a new tariff is introduced to encourage visitors to stay for up to 5 hours.

Option E = Introduce a charge for parking at the Council Offices on Saturdays in conjunction with either Options C or D where the Swan Meadow tariff is adjusted.

Consideration of Options

- 5 The table below sets out the predicted income for each option.

Predicted Income	Option A £	Option B £	Option C £	Option D £	Option E £
Charges	85,900	63,900	60,000	138,500	22,000

- 6 At the last meeting of the Committee, it considered Options A & B. It was considered that a flat increase of 10 p per tariff (Option A) would not achieve a number of objectives expressed by Members at the meeting. However, this Option would achieve the required income level. Option B falls short of the required income level and would introduce 5p denominations into the tariffs. Option E to introduce charges at the Council Offices car park could be applied to each of these options but there would be a necessary adjustment to the long stay charges for Swan Meadow.
- 7 In the past, the main criticism from local businesses and traders has been that the tariffs have not encouraged longer stays in the towns. In Option C, this issue is addressed by increasing the first/short stay tariff, but not the long staff tariffs. This option does not, however meet the required income level of

£75,000. This target would be reached if charges were introduced at the Council Offices.

- 8 It is predicted that there would be an income of approximately £22,000 for parking at the Council Offices and this is based on 250 spaces being utilised each Saturday for a charge of £2.00 per day. The introduction of a charge on this car park is counter-balanced with a reduction in the charge for all day parking on Swan Meadow. This would help to deter visitors from tracking across the town to find cheaper parking.
- 9 An alternative to the introduction of charges at the Council Offices is to close the area off for parking altogether. This would mean that those that currently use the facility would have to use the pay and display car parks instead. The likelihood is, however, that they would attempt to park on-street, creating more traffic and pollution in the process. This option would also affect the Wedding parties that would wish to park in the car park whilst attending Wedding ceremonies in the building.
- 10 Option D would exceed the required level of income and this would go some way towards meeting the savings that the authority has to make. This Option also achieves the objectives set out in paragraph 6 above. Members may consider that the increase to the first/short stay tariff is high i.e. 66%, however, parking charges in Uttlesford are generally lower than in neighbouring authorities.
- 11 Discussions with neighbouring authorities on the charges levied confirm that most will be increasing their charges from April 2003. When questioned, they also indicated that they would not be offering a 1 1/2-hour parking tariff due to the logistics in patrolling and the substantial loss of income that is likely to be incurred. A number of authorities that, in the past, have not made charges for car parking are to do so in the near future e.g. Kings Lynn.

RECOMMENDED that Members determine the level of charges to be levied for use of the Council's car parks

Background Papers:- Details of current Charges for Council car parks

Appendix 1 – Proposed Options for car park Tariffs

Saffron Walden	Current Tariffs	Option A	Option B	Option C	Option D
Fairycroft & Common	Up to 1 hr 30p	Up to 1hr 40p	Up to 1 hr 35p	Up to 1 hr 40p	Up to 1hr 50p
	Up to 2 hrs 70p	Up to 2hrs 80p	Up to 2 hrs 80p	Up to 2 hrs 70p	Up to 2hrs 80p
	Up to 3 hrs 1.50	Up to 3hrs 1.60	Up to 3 hrs 1.65	Up to 3 hrs 1.50	Up to 3hrs 1.60
Rose & Crown	Up to 1 hr 30p	Up to 1 hr 40p	Up to 1 hr 35p	Up to 1 hr 40p	Up to 1 hr 50p
	Up to 2 hrs 70p	Max.Stay 2 hrs 80p	Max.Stay 2 hrs 80p	Max.Stay 2 hrs 70p	Max.Stay 2 hrs 80p
	Up to 3 hrs 1.50				
Swan Meadow	Up to 1 hr 30p	Up to 1 hr 40p	Up to 1 hr 35p	Up to 1 hr 40p	Up to 1 hr 50p
	Up to 2 hrs 70p	Up to 2 hrs 80p	Up to 2 hrs 80p	Up to 2 hrs 70p	Up to 2 hrs 80p
	Up to 4 hrs 1.30	Up to 4 hrs 1.40	Up to 4 hrs 1.45	Up to 5 hrs 1.50	Up to 5 hrs 1.60
	Up to 6 hrs 1.90	Up to 6 hrs 2.00	Up to 6 hrs 2.10	Over 5 hrs 2.50	Over 5 hrs 2.60
	Up to 10 hrs 2.50	Up to 10 hrs 2.60	Up to 10 hrs 2.75		
Coaches	Up to 5 hrs 2.00	Up to 5 hrs 2.50	Up to 5 hrs 2.50	Up to 5 hrs 2.50	Up to 5 hrs 2.50
	Up to 10 hrs 4.00	Up to 10 hrs 5.00	Up to 10 hrs 5.00	Up to 10 hrs 5.00	Up to 10 hrs 5.00
Season Tickets	£232 per annum Inc. VAT	£232 per annum Inc. VAT	£250 per annum Inc. VAT	£250 per annum Inc. VAT	£250 per annum Inc. VAT
Great Dunmow	Current Tariffs	Option A	Option B	Option C	Option D
White Street, Angel Lane & Chequers Lane	Up to 1 hr 20p	Up to 1 hr 30p	Up to 1 hr 25p	Up to 1 hr 30p	Up to 1 hr 40p
	Up to 3 hrs 60p	Up to 3 hrs 70p	Up to 3 hrs 70p	Up to 3 hrs 60p	Up to 3 hrs 70p
	Up to 5 hrs 1.00	Up to 5 hrs 1.10	Up to 5 hrs 1.15	Up to 5 hrs 1.00	Up to 5 hrs 1.00
	Up to 10 hrs 2.00	Up to 10 hrs 2.10	Up to 10 hrs 2.20	Over 5 hrs 2.00	Over 5 hrs 2.00
Season Tickets	£172 per annum Inc. VAT	£200 per annum Inc. VAT	£200 per annum Inc. VAT	£200 per annum Inc. VAT	£200 per annum Inc. VAT
Stansted Mntfitchet	Current Tariffs	Option A	Option B	Option C	Option D
Lower Street & Crafton Green	Up to 1 hr 20p	Up to 1 hr 30p	Up to 1 hr 25p	Up to 1 hr 30p	Up to 1 hr 40p
	Up to 3 hrs 60p	Up to 3 hrs 70p	Up to 3 hrs 70p	Up to 3 hrs 60p	Up to 3 hrs 70p
	Up to 6 hrs 1.00	Up to 6 hrs 1.10	Up to 6 hrs 1.15	Up to 6 hrs 1.50	Up to 6 hrs 1.50
	Up to 10 hrs 2.00	Up to 10 hrs 2.10	Up to 10 hrs 2.20	Over 6 hrs 2.00	Over 6 hrs 2.00
Coaches	Per Visit 4.00	Per Visit 5.00	Per Visit 5.00	Per Visit 5.00	Per Visit 5.00
Season Tickets	£120 per annum Inc. VAT	£150 per annum Inc. VAT	£150 per annum Inc. VAT	£150 per annum Inc. VAT	£150 per annum Inc. VAT
	£350 per annum Inc. VAT for non Businesses/ Employees				

Committee: Environment and Transport
Date: 14 January 2003
Agenda Item No: 7
Title: Budgets and Service Plans 2003-04
Author: John Dickson (01799 510300)
Nick Harris (01799 510313)

Summary

- 1 This report presents the draft revenue estimates for final consideration by this Committee. The detailed figures attached now include savings and growth items approved at the previous meeting on 12 November 2002, internal charges and developments since 12 November unless otherwise stated. The figures are subject to final checks for consistency and accuracy and do not include the implications of any new capital programme items or the impact on internal charges of any growth or savings. The Committee is asked to reconsider these estimates including identifying further savings before their inclusion in the overall budget report to the Resources Committee on 23 January 2003. Also included are the key points of the Service Plan for 2003-04

Background

- 2 At its meeting on 12 November 2002 this Committee considered its draft 2003-04 revenue estimates for the first time. The detailed figures provided at that stage included direct costs only i.e. excluding internal charges. The Committee was requested to consider its budgets in the light of the projected direct cost total that it approved at its meeting on 3 September 2002 together with a further savings target of £70,000 approved by Council on 22 October 2002.
- 3 The figures presented to the Committee on 12 November exceeded the total projected in September by some £14,000 – a margin that increased to £84,000 when the £70,000 savings target was taken into account. Appendix BS09 included a list of possible savings/additional income for consideration totalling £149,900.
- 4 After considering the report and the possible savings it was resolved that:
 - The committee notes that its target had not yet been met

It was further RECOMMENDED that

The possible savings set out in Appendix BS09 and the matters highlighted in paragraph 17 of the report be approved with consideration of the following items being taken into account:

- Possible savings in relation to depot rationalisation and increased car parking charges.
- Savings in relation to increased building control income, residents parking and cessation of the village shop scheme were approved.
- Continuation of membership of the Greater Cambridge Partnership and a contingent sum for the public examination of the regional plan were approved
- The additional sponsorship sum of £80,000 was not accepted.

In the light of these decisions, service plans for 2003-04 and full budgets be prepared by officers for consideration at the next cycle of meetings.

5. These decisions left the Committee's 2003/04 direct cost budget at £1,754,000 – some £93,000 above the targeted £1,661,000 and can be illustrated as follows:

	£'000	£'000
Budgets as Presented on 12 November		1,820
Changes approved on 12 November		
Deletion of Sponsorship Income	80	
Grant to Greater Cambridge Partnership	5	
Use of Reserves – District Plan	(32)	
Public Examination of RPG14	20	
Less use of Reserves	<u>(20)</u>	
		53
Savings approved on 12 November		
Residential Parking Income	(16)	
Depot Rationalisation (use of Reserves)	(14)	
Car Park Fines-VAT Treatment	(6)	
Increase Parking Charges	(50)	
Increase Penalty Charges	(16)	
Increase Season Tickets	(3)	
Discontinue Village Shop Grant Scheme	(4)	
Additional Building Control Income	<u>(10)</u>	
		(119)
Accepted Budgets		1,754
Target		1,661
Shortfall		93

The £93,000 shortfall shown above is £6,000 less than that reported to Resources on 21 November following clarification of the decisions taken by this Committee on 12 November regarding parking charges.

Developments Since 12 November

6. At its meeting on 21 November the Resources Committee recommended that further savings and additional income be sought from the Environment and Transport and Community and Leisure Committees in order to meet their cash savings targets agreed at the meeting of the Council on 22 October 2002, to help to achieve the Council's agreed priority of keeping the increase of Council Tax at a sustainable level. The Resources Committee recommended that before the next Environment and Transport Committee meeting officers review the financial implications of recycling promotion and development and Planning Department restructuring. The recycling issues will be pursued within the commitments contained in the Service Plan the key features of which are shown in paragraph 14 below and the planning department restructuring is the subject of a report elsewhere on this agenda. The decisions of the Resources Committee were endorsed by the Council meeting on 17 December following consideration of the Director of Resources report.
7. The Council's overall 2003-04 budget position reported to the Resources Committee on 21 November identified just £29,000 as room for manoeuvre in the Council Tax setting process subject to the Local Government grant settlement. On 5 December the provisional settlement was announced and increased the sum available for manoeuvre to £74,000. This is however, still a shortfall of £144,000 compared with the overall total target to achieve a Council Tax increase of 2.5% approved by Council on 22 October
8. Provision of £1,470 in 2002-03 and £8,730 in 2003-04 is now included in respect of the additional travel costs and disturbance payments payable to staff relocating from Great Dunmow to Saffron Walden. These payments will be met from reserves and are not included in the comparison with the target.
9. A report elsewhere on this agenda makes proposals in respect of Golds Nurseries Business Park. If approved the proposals will add £4,250 to the 2003-04 Estimates attached.
10. A report elsewhere on this agenda addresses restructuring the Planning Department. The consequent budgetary implications are not reflected in this report.
11. The figures included in this report reflect the previous decisions taken by this committee at its meetings on 10 September and 12 November regarding car parking when income of £25,000 and £50,000 respectively was added to the base budget. Also on this agenda there is a report examining a number of options in respect of car parking charges. The Committee's view on the options may produce a different level of additional income to the £75,000

already built into the figures attached and hence the comparison with the target.

12. Since this Committee's 2003-04 Estimated direct costs remain above the target, Members may wish to reconsider their decisions not to discontinue the Bus Tokens facility and not to cease the Local Centres Grant Scheme. Approving these savings would reduce the budget by £31,000 and £20,000 respectively. For information Appendix BS09 from the 12 November report is attached to this report. If the Committee reverses its previous decision regarding these two items the Direct Cost total will fall to £1,707,000 or £46,000 short of the target but Members will still need to examine further means of achieving the savings target since these two items alone will not enable the target to be met. If the Committee confirms its decision not to make these savings the Direct Cost total will be £1,758,000 or £97,000 short of the target.

Summary of the Current 2003-04 Budget Position

13. No additional savings items have been identified by officers and the Committee's direct cost budget after reserve funding stands at £1,758,000 (after taking account of the growth item in respect of Golds Nurseries) or £97,000 above the Council approved target of £1,661,000.

Service Plan

14. Key features Include:
 - Undertake the En-Trust funded trial to separate kitchen and green waste for in-vessel composting.
 - Establish a partnership for joint use of a local MRF involving Stansted Airport funding.
 - Participate with Essex partners in the Public Service Agreement and other funding opportunities to extend recycling activities.
 - Undertake a Best Value Review of Recycling and Refuse Collection Services.
 - Develop a new waste management strategy and disposal contracts with Essex County Council and the other Essex districts.
 - Introduce new charges on car parks in the district.
 - Introduce Pay and Display visitor parking on RPS streets in Saffron Walden.
 - Consider the implications of implementation of Decriminalisation in Uttlesford.
 - Monitor the take-up and budgetary implications of Concessionary Fares in the light of the requirement to provide free Bus Passes.
 - Introduce Document Imaging in Planning.
 - Develop the planning website
 - Restart Planning Best Value Review
 - Settling in after the move to Saffron Walden and maintaining a service from Great Dunmow.

- Respond to further issues arising from SERAS.
- The Local Plan Inquiry and subsequent adoption.
- Respond to issues arising from the Government's recent consultation exercise on the regional spatial strategy, RPG14.
- React to issues arising from the Planning Bill.
- Continue to provide input into the Community Strategy.
- Continue to provide excellence in Building Surveying, Building Control, Access, Energy Efficiency etc

The Next Step

15. The budgets approved by this Committee will be summarised with the budgets of the other Committees in a report to the Resources Committee on 23 January. This report will include "below the line items" such as investment income and pension backdating costs. It will also make recommendations to the Council regarding the Council Tax.

Conclusion

16. This is the final opportunity for this Committee to consider its draft revenue estimates that now include everything identified to date. It is

RECOMMENDED that the Committee reconsider the draft revenue estimates including identifying further savings required by the Council before recommending them for inclusion in the overall budget to the Resources Committee on 23 January 2003.

Background Papers: none

Committee: Environment & Transport
Date: 14 January 2003
Agenda Item No: 8
Title: Street Cleansing – Best Value Review
Author: Richard Secker (01799) 510580
Members: Russell Green, David Gregory, Jim Ketteridge

Summary

- 1 Street Cleansing has been subject to a Best Value review this year and Scrutiny 2 Committee has approved an Improvement Plan for submission to this Committee.
- 2 The purpose of this report is to approve the proposed Improvement Plan, or recommend any appropriate changes.

Background

- 3 The terms of reference for the review were agreed and are attached as Appendix 1.
- 4 Officers involved in the review were Diane Burrige (Contract Services Manager), Rosemary Danton (Unison Representative), Pete Dickson (Services Officer) and Mike Felgate (Highways Area Manager – Critical Friend).

Challenge

- 5 Three challenge events were held at different times of day to facilitate maximum attendance. Invitations went to all members and staff, Parish and Town Councils, Uttlesford's head teachers and PTAs, and the various Chambers of Trade and Commerce within the district.
- 6 These events, while poorly attended, provided a good platform of information and opinions to progress the review.

Compete

- 7 The street cleansing service has twice been subjected to competitive tender under CCT and the group felt, along with opinions emanating from the Challenge events that financially the service is competitive. Financial comparisons from the Compare section of the review also confirm this.

Compare

- 8 Comparison questionnaires were sent out to 8 nearby local authorities and five responses were received.
- 9 These provided vital information that not only showed that Uttlesford's contract is as comprehensive as any surveyed, but provided useful information for both client and contractor that could lead to an improved service. These are all covered in the Draft Improvement Plan.

Consult

- 10 Once the draft improvement plan had been presented to Scrutiny 2, it was sent out to all Parish and Town Councils as stakeholders, for their comments.
- 11 These comments along with recommended amendments were considered before a revised Draft Improvement Plan was submitted to Scrutiny 2 Committee on 4 December. This was approved with the additional recommendation that Cleansing Schedules be made available to all members, in addition to all Town and Parish Councils.

Draft Improvement Plan

- 12 This is attached as Appendix 2

RECOMMENDED that this Committee adopts the attached Draft Improvement Plan as the final Best Value Improvement Plan for Street Cleansing Services.

APPENDIX 1

BEST VALUE REVIEW – TERMS OF REFERENCE STREET CLEANSING SERVICES – 2002/03

Scope

The review will consider whether the following services, namely street cleansing, abandoned vehicles, fly tipping, litter bins and dog fouling

- meet national and local standards, and remain a community priority
- meet customer expectations
- could be more effectively and efficiently provided

The aim is to show what is currently being achieved and how any improvements can be made in future.

The Services

- The services and costs will be briefly described.
- The reasons why the current services are being provided will be explained and the links to strategic objectives, Council policies and priorities.

Some Fundamental General Questions

- Does the Council have a statutory duty to provide the services?
- Are the services meeting current required standards?
- What contractual arrangements are appropriate to meet future requirements?

Some specific questions

- What standards are appropriate?
- How should any improvement in standards be addressed?
- How can services be better controlled/documented/audited?
- Is the client/contractor split necessary or desirable?
- Can the service react to seven day trading conditions or other requirements?
- Can the procedures and response to abandoned cars and fly tipping be improved?
- Can parts of the service be better delivered by others?

How we will carry out the review

The answers to the **challenging** questions above will be assisted by

The answers to the **challenging** questions above will be assisted by

- **Comparing** where practical with service providers in similar areas recognised as market leaders – probing questions rather than attempted statistical comparisons.
- **Consulting** with users, partners to supplement where necessary existing evidence.
- **Competing** where appropriate with other providers.

The Process

- The Member Reference Group will meet regularly with officers
- There will be a challenge event in April/May

- There will be notes on the review progress to members and staff
- There will be reports to Scrutiny Committee
- An improvement plan will go to Scrutiny Committee in December and the Policy Committee in January 2003.

Membership of Review Team

- Members Councillor D Gregory
 Councillor R Green
 Councillor J Ketteridge
- Officers Core team of Richard Secker, Peter Dickson, Diane Burrige and Rosemary Danton
 Others will be contributing
- Critical Friend Mike Felgate – Essex County Council (part of core team)

Background Papers: BVPP 2002/2003

APPENDIX 2

OBJECTIVE	PROPOSED ACTION	TARGET DATES	PREDICTED OUTCOMES	BUDGET IMPLICATIONS
Review effectiveness of cleansing frequencies on streets adjoining Zone 1 areas.	Increase monitoring of those areas, particularly after weekends.	June 2003	Reduction in litter around town centres.	Possible increase in resources required by contractor.
Enforce Contract as per schedules to improve performance.	Issue financial defaults for poor or non-performance.	Introduced August 2002.	Improvement in service.	Dependent on contractor's performance. No overall financial implication to council's budgets.
Co-ordinate litter collection with cutting of grass verges on district's main routes.	Liaise with ECC Highways or their agents to gain information on cutting schedules.	March 2003 (in advance of first cut of year)	Reduction of windblown litter on major routes, created by verge cutting.	None
Ensure competitively priced service upon expiry of current contract.	Invite tenders for service provision prior to end of current contract.	Dependent on use of extension clause in current contract.	Value for money.	Not known. Dependent on bids and future contract specification.
Encourage Town/Parish Council participation in National Spring Clean events.	Write to all councils, introducing the campaign and offering assistance.	January/February 2003 and annually thereafter.	Increased participation by Parish/Town Councils and increased awareness on a local scale.	Minimal – provision of refuse sacks and loan of litter picking equipment.
Develop educational material for schools,	Obtain samples of literature etc. from	Annually, during school summer holidays, i.e. in	Increased awareness and reduced litter	Minimal – cost of postage and possible

with regard to reducing litter generation.	Encams, then introduce to schools and encourage participation.	advance of the start of each academic year.	creation.	officer time for school visits.
Assess adequacy of current weekend working arrangements.	Limited weekend monitoring of town centres.	April 2003.	Town centres clean on Monday mornings.	Resource issue for contractor if current arrangements are shown to be insufficient.
Investigate possible benefits of issuing fixed penalty notices for litter.	Assess performance of and cost to authorities already issuing such notices.	June 2003	Reduction in litter a greater public awareness – if successful.	None. This will only be introduced if is shown to be cost effective elsewhere.
Investigate practicalities and perceived benefits of making contributions to Town/Parish Councils with respect to provision of street cleansing services.	Liaise with other authorities already doing this. Consult with Town/Parish Councils.	December 2003	Unknown	Unknown
Assess suitability of introducing vacuum-filled backpacks for litter picking.	Obtain information from Colchester BC's trial of this equipment.	February 2003	Increased productivity	One-off purchase – will only be introduced if increase in productivity outweighs cost.
Enhance communication with residents to provide satisfaction data for the Public Service Agreement with Essex County Council.	Increase number of survey cards delivered. Analyse trends in public perception of performance.	January 2003	Evidence of improved service provision. Funding from Essex PSA.	None.

Committee: Environment and Transport
Date: 14th January 2003
Agenda Item No: 9
Title: The Introduction of Noise Related Operating Restrictions at Airports
Author: Will Cockerell (01799) 510581

Summary

1. This report seeks the views of the Committee on a Department for Transport (DfT) Consultation Document on the Implementation of the European Directive 2002/30/EC which amongst other matters, enables the banning of marginally compliant sub sonic jets as part of a balanced approach to aircraft noise management. Officer level comments have already been forwarded to the DfT to meet the consultation deadline.

Background

2. The Directive repeals the EU Hushkit Regulations and replaces them with a balanced approach to limiting or reducing the number of people significantly affected by the harmful effects of noise around major airports. The Directive requires a number of matters to be taken into account by a competent authority as part of the decision making process. These include a reduction of aircraft noise at source, land use planning and management, and noise abatement operational procedures and operating restrictions.
3. The Directive requires the provision of extensive information about the effects of noise on the local population and the effects of existing and proposed developments on the noise climate around the airport including the production of noise contour maps. In addition a comprehensive package of technical information on existing noise abatement procedures and operating restrictions is required along with an assessment of the costs and benefits of specific measures on all interested parties.
4. If the assessment of all available measures demonstrates that the objectives of the Directive cannot be met, then the withdrawal of marginally compliant Chapter 3 aircraft can be required, and it lays down rules under which this can be achieved over time.
5. The Government sees the Directive as an opportunity to build on existing practice and expertise rather than creating a new body, or designating an alternative existing body, to act as the "competent authority" for implementing the process.

6. The types of aircraft that currently use Stansted Airport and could be affected by the action include B737-200 and B747-200.
7. The Government suggests that the Secretary of State for Transport should be the competent authority for the three designated London Airports and in the case of other airports to which the Directive applies it should be the airport operator. These are the existing arrangements.
8. The Consultation also seeks views on which body should grant temporary exemptions for developing countries, the setting up of an appeals procedure and enforcement of the requirements. The Government suggest that the Civil Aviation Authority would be the most appropriate body for this role.
9. Officers have commented as follows:-
 - a. the Secretary of State for Transport be the competent authority for the designated London airports including Stansted.
 - b. the Civil Aviation Authority should deal with exemptions, appeals and enforcement matters
 - c. that a strict timetable for the assessment process be included in the proposals

RECOMMENDED that Members endorse or amend officer comments to the DfT

Background Papers: Consultation Document, 31 July 2002

Committee: Environment and Transport

Date: 14 January 2003

Agenda Item No: 10

Title: Supplementary Planning Guidance for existing small areas of development within Prior's Green, Takeley/Little Canfield

Author: John Bosworth (01799) 510453

Summary

- 1 There are a number of small 'islands' of existing development within the Takeley/Little Canfield Local Policy 3 – Prior's Green site. It is proposed that Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) should be issued to provide general advice for their proper development, designed to be consistent with the relevant policy considerations and to ensure comprehensive development of the whole policy area and in association with the larger sites within it. Application of this SPG will result in consistent and equitable decision-making.

This report identifies the areas to which the SPG applies, sets out the background and recommends the SPG for public consultation.

The sites

- 2 The sites will be shown on a plan to be tabled at the meeting and are at Jack's Lane, Broadfield Road, Clarendon Road, Warwick Road, Hamilton Road, Thornton Road and fronting Dunmow Road.

General description

- 3 The areas are generally residential where bungalows predominate. The main exception is the Stansted Motel site. The densities at Jack's Lane, on land at the eastern side of Broadfield Road and at land fronting the Dunmow Road to the east of Broadfield Road are relatively high with few opportunities for infill. Elsewhere densities are generally low with buildings often in large plots. Access is generally from narrow unmade tracks. Some properties access directly onto the Dunmow Road. Boundary trees and hedgerows are important amenity features in a number of locations.

Background

- 4 The sites are included in Takeley Local Policy 1 of the Adopted District Plan. They also fall within the Takeley/Little Canfield Local Policy 3 area of the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan that is proposed for comprehensive residential and associated development of 725 dwellings. Importantly, the policy relates to all land, including the 'island' sites. The policy requires community benefits to be delivered by legal agreement.
- 5 Paragraph 19.4 of the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan says 'A master plan has been approved for part of this site, taking into account the character of the site(s) and its setting. The remaining area includes pockets of existing housing. There may be potential for some infill development in these locations that would make a contribution to the total number of dwellings. Development of these locations will need to respect the provision of the approved Master Plan'.
- 6 The Master Plan referred to above was approved in June and November 2000. Very importantly, Members required that all future development in the policy area should have vehicular access from the approved internal road network.
- 7 In May 2002, Members resolved to grant planning permission for UTT/0816/00/OP (the Countryside application) subject to conditions and legal agreements. The conditions include one that restricts the number of dwellings to 650 whilst another requires the provision of 25% affordable housing. The agreements require a school site, contributions to transport infrastructure, provision of open space, landscaping, a community hall, a local centre and a financial contribution to local sports or community facilities.

- 8 Within the Hamilton Road 'island', a small outline application for residential development, UTT/1149/00, was dismissed on appeal in July 2001. The appeal Inspector considered that the proposal would be premature until planning permission had been granted for development on nearby land because 'until then there is a risk that the proposal would be an inappropriate piecemeal form of development that would not be in keeping with the comprehensive development of the area'.

Proposed principles relating to new development within the 'island' sites

General

New development within the 'island sites' is acceptable in principle.

Reason. The sites fall within an area of comprehensive residential and associated development where the principle of development has already been established in the local plan. Therefore, subject to normal development control considerations and the retention of trees and hedges of amenity value, the general principle of development is acceptable subject to the provisos set out below.

Note. Residential development or redevelopment will normally be appropriate except in relation of any proposals to redevelop the site of the Stansted motel. Here an hotel, motel or appropriate business use, compatible with nearby residential properties, will be appropriate.

Access

New development will gain access from the approved internal road network. It will not have access directly to the unmade roads joining the Dunmow Road or from the Dunmow Road.

Reason. In approving the Master Plan, Members resolved that all access should be from the approved internal road network only. Additional development would result in more vehicle movements on to substandard accesses and junctions that would be unacceptable in terms of general highway and highway safety considerations and would lead to a greater use and proliferation of access points directly onto the Dunmow Road.

Note. This will not apply to the continued use of existing access tracks by existing dwellings or by individual replacement dwellings.

Financial contributions.

New development, other than replacement dwellings, will contribute towards wider and longer term planning benefits through legal agreement, as required by policies contained in the development plan. Such financial contributions will be required in respect of educational, transport, sports, community and

landscaping facilities. The basic contribution per dwelling has been assessed at approximately £6,000, (at 2002 prices) the calculation for which is explained below.

Reason. There is a local plan policy requirement that applies to the whole policy area and to all new development within it. Additionally the requirement to contribute to educational facilities is set out in the County Structure Plan. It would be inappropriate to apply this requirement in respect of single replacement dwellings because they would not result in additional population and therefore would not bring additional pressures on existing facilities and infrastructure.

The level of contribution will be based on an assessment of

- (a) The costs of primary and secondary education.
- (b) A contribution to transport enhancement and a contribution to the enhancement of local sports and/or community facilities.
- (c) A contribution to fitting out, equipping and furnishing the on-site community centre.
- (d) A financial contribution to structural landscaping and a 15-year landscape sum for its proper maintenance.

Note: it is considered that Countryside Properties who have submitted a further outline application (UTT/1042/02/OP, shown on plan) for about 35 dwellings on land between the Dunmow Road and Takeley Nurseries, should not make additional contributions to (a), (b) and (c) above in relation to this new application because the contributions agreed in respect of UTT/0816/00/OP were based on a total of 700 dwellings. In resolving to grant planning permission for the latter, Members reduced the total dwellings to 650 whilst the financial contributions remained the same.

With regard to (a) above the cost of providing primary education at Prior's Green has been assessed by Essex County Council Learning Services as £9,047 per place. This excludes the value of the site that is being provided at no cost by Countryside Properties. The County Council calculate there will be 0.25 places per house (which equates to a sum of £2,262) for primary education. In relation to affordable housing this sum will increase because there will be 0.5 places per social dwelling. The cost of secondary education will be £7,514 per place, which converts to £1,503 per dwelling using the County's recommended multiplier of 0.2. Therefore the total basic cost per dwelling for educational purposes will be £3,765 (again at 2002 prices).

With regard to (b) above, the calculations have been made on a pro rata basis to the contributions negotiated with Countryside. Thus transport enhancement is calculated at £300 (£195,000 divided by 650), and contribution to local sports and/or community facilities, £154 (£100,000 divided by 650).

With regard to (c) above, the building and basic facilities are being provided by Countryside Properties. The Council's architect has assessed the price for

final fitting out and the provision of furnishings, fittings and equipment to be £70,000-£90,000. The bottom of this range has been selected for the purpose of this calculation. These costs will be shared between the 'island' sites and the larger of the two sites fronting the Dunmow Road, known as 'The Laurels' but excluding the recently submitted application by Countryside Properties, (UTT/1042/02/OP). It is not easy to calculate the final number of houses that will eventually be provided in these locations. However, subtracting 650 (the number of dwellings in respect of the Countryside application, UTT/0816/00/OP) and a further 35 in respect of the subsequent Countryside application (UTT/1042/02/OP) from the policy area total of 725 as defined in the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan, provides a figure of 40 dwellings. By dividing this total of 40 into the lower cost estimate of £70,000, a contribution of £1750 per dwelling is calculated.

With regard to (d) above, sites may be required to provide structural landscaping. Consequentially they will be required to contribute a sum to cover proper maintenance of the landscaping for a 15-year period. This cannot be calculated until the landscaping details have been assessed in detail for each 'island' site.

Thus the total basic financial contribution for wider and longer-term benefits (excluding affordable housing and any associated additional educational payments and landscape contributions), totals £5,969 (£3,765, education; £1,750, furnishing, equipping and fitting out the on-site community hall; £300, transport; £154, contribution to local sports and/or community facilities).

Comprehensive development.

New proposals will be compatible with an approved comprehensive development proposal for each 'island' site and will, themselves, be compatible with the development of the whole Prior's Green site. It is recommended that such comprehensive proposals should be produced and agreed with the Council before planning applications are considered.

Reason. Comprehensive development will avoid sporadic piecemeal development and ensure that development of 'island' sites will be properly integrated into the wider policy area.

Note. Officers will assist in preparing a comprehensive proposal in relation to each site if requested.

Affordable housing.

An appropriate proportion of affordable housing will be provided in accordance with the requirements of the adopted Plan operative at the time of the submission of planning applications.

Reason This is a policy requirement that is justified by the findings of the Council's Housing Needs Survey.

Note. The exact proportion will be in accordance with the adopted local plan, operative at the time when planning applications are considered. The current local plan seeks up to 25% and the Council has recently been successful in achieving this amount elsewhere in the policy area and at other sites in the District. However the Revised Deposit Draft Plan seeks higher proportions that will be sought, should they form part of this plan once it has been adopted.

Timing of development.

No planning applications, including outline planning applications, will be approved until planning application UTT/0816/00/OP has outline planning permission. No detailed planning permissions in the 'island' sites will be granted until detailed planning applications relating to adjacent land pursuant to UTT/0816/00/OP, have been approved.

Reason. Planning permission for these 'island' sites would not be appropriate if development of the policy area as a whole did not proceed. Outline consent granted in advance of UTT/0816/00/OP could establish the principle of development in locations that would normally be wholly inappropriate. Detailed planning permissions granted in relation to 'island sites' in advance of approved detailed applications associated with the larger sites, could lead to piecemeal development, poorly related in terms of location scale and design to adjacent housing, open space or road layout.

Note. In relation to any outline permissions granted in respect of the 'island' sites, a condition will be imposed stating that reserved matters will not be approved until a start has been made on adjoining development permitted under UTT/0816/00/OP.

RECOMMENDED it is recommended that the above Supplementary Planning Guidance be approved for public consultation for a period of six weeks, following which a further report will be presented to this Committee.

Background Papers: The Adopted District Plan, The Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan, the approved Master plan and associated Committee papers and resolutions, UTT/0816/00/OP, UTT/1042/02/OP and Inspector's decision in relation to UTT/1149/00.

Committee: Environment and Transport
Date: 14 January 2003
Agenda Item No: 11
Title: London Ipswich Multi Modal Study (LOIS)
Author: Roger Harborough (01799) 510457

Summary

- 1 The consultants who have completed this study for GO East have now submitted their final report. The East of England Local Government Conference (EELGC) is seeking views on the final report before deciding what recommendations it will make to the Secretary of State for Transport.
- 2 Members are recommended to advise the EELGC that the Council notes the preferred strategy identified by the consultants and to make representations to the EELGC that it should take into account the LOIS study in opposing additional runways at Stansted Airport.

Background

- 3 Members will be aware from earlier stages of the study that it was intended to identify recommendations for a long term strategy to address passenger and freight transport needs and, where appropriate, a plan of prioritised, specific actions to address existing and predicted strategic transport problems in the area comprising the A12 corridor from the M25 (J28) to Ipswich and the A120 Stansted to Harwich corridor.
- 4 The objectives of this strategy are to create opportunities for a shift away from using the car; to improve the management of freight; to protect and enhance the built and natural environment; and to facilitate economic growth and regeneration.

Preferred Strategy – the consultants' recommendations

- 5 The key findings from the study include the assessment that if no major transport investment occurs there will be serious congestion problems on both the road and rail network by 2016, with further potential deterioration in the level of service to 2031 and beyond. Schemes currently in preparation that, in the view of the Study Steering Group, have a very strong likelihood of going ahead by 2016 such as WARM(E), Thameslink 2000 and Crossrail 1 and 2 and the Felixstowe – Nuneaton rail freight route upgrade, will not by themselves solve the problems of increased demand for travel in the area. The Study suggests that serious consideration needs to be given to road user

charging and tolling on trunk roads like the A12 in addition to the preferred strategy schemes to assist in the management of demand beyond 2016, as part of wider regional charging regime. The full report is posted on the study web site www.lois-mms.co.uk.

- 6 The “conceptual” schemes of particular relevance to Uttlesford are as follows. Each would be subject to more detailed studies by the relevant delivery agencies, which would look at variations.

Public Transport Schemes

- New rail link between Chelmsford and Epping via Ongar with links to Stratford and Stansted Airport
- High quality bus and coach corridor between Colchester and Stansted Airport

Highway Schemes

- A12 upgrade to dual 3 lane standard between M25 Brook Street junction (J28) and A120 Ardleigh junction north of Colchester.
- A120 to dual 2 lane standard Braintree to A12 Marks Tey
- New Chelmsford NE bypass and dualling of the A131 from Chelmsford to A120 Braintree together with implementation of traffic management measures on the existing A130 Chelmsford to Dunmow.

Other measures

- Integrated land use planning to reduce demand for movements, increased teleworking and more extensive travel plans, park and ride and other improved interchange facilities.

- 7 The new rail services included in the preferred strategy have been considered in conceptual form only. The services are based on new rail lines between Chelmsford and Epping and Epping and Harlow Mill and the use of existing lines elsewhere. Service frequencies of 4 trains per hour between Chelmsford and Liverpool Street via Stratford stopping at Ongar, North Weald Basset, Epping, Loughton, Woodford, Leyton and Stratford and four trains per hour between Chelmsford and Stansted Airport stopping at Ongar, North Weald Basset, Epping, Harlow Mill, and Bishop’s Stortford have been modelled. Twelve car train sets are envisaged for the former service and four car sets for the latter. The transport modelling has included employees working at or around Stansted, but has not included airline passengers travelling by rail.

Comment

- 8 Most of the elements of the preferred strategy are not particularly surprising, nor is the conclusion that current projects in preparation do not represent a coherent package that will solve the area’s transport demand problem. The new rail links between Chelmsford and Stratford or Stansted via Epping and

Ongar were not anticipated. The consultants expect they would however “improve journey ambience significantly by reducing over crowding on (existing commuter rail routes into Central London) and provide an alternative route from London to Stansted”. A rail link from Stansted to Colchester has been excluded from the preferred strategy because of poor demand and lack of viability of economic grounds.

- 9 It is noted that, as a sensitivity test, the study has looked at the effects of further development at Stansted not involving additional runways, in combination with residential and commercial development within the London Stansted Cambridge sub region. Such assumptions indicated significant potential increase in demand in east west movements. In this test employment within the study area has been redistributed with more jobs in West Essex. It has not involved any increase in the total number of jobs in the study area. The Study has not considered the effects of further runways at Stansted as featured in the DfT’s SERAS consultation.
- 10 The LOIS study can be seen as supporting the Council’s view that exceptional investment would be necessary to provide Stansted with the links that would make it a national node in the strategic route network and adequate capacity to and from London. The LOIS preferred strategy is a very substantial package and there must be questions as to the realism of its implementation, certainly by 2016. It is emphasised that even this very substantial package does not support the development of Stansted beyond the existing runway capacity.

RECOMMENDED that the Council

- 1 Notes the preferred strategy identified by the consultants; and
- 2 Makes representations to the EELGC that it should take into account the LOIS study in opposing additional runways at Stansted Airport.

Background Papers: London to Ipswich Multi Modal Study Final Report

