

**Committee:** Environment and Transport  
**Date:** 10 June 2003  
**Agenda Item No:** 4(ii)  
**Title:** Review of Night Flight restrictions  
**Author:** Will Cockerell (01799) 510581

### **Summary**

- 1 This report advises Members that the Stansted Airport Advisory Panel considered a report on a consultation document from the Department for Transport on proposals to extend the existing night flight regime for an additional year.
- 2 The Panel accepted the attached report and made a number of additional comments.

### **Comments**

- 3 The Advisory Panel felt it important that a number of the obligations on Stansted Airport Limited in the recently signed Section 106 agreement should be brought to the Department's attention.
- 4 In particular the obligation of Stansted Airport Ltd. not to seek any relaxation of the night flight restrictions currently in force both for the night period and the night quota period; to use their best endeavours to secure a total voluntary ban on the take off and landing of QC4 aircraft in the night quota period; not to schedule QC8 or QC16 aircraft to take off or land during the night period, and to draw the attention of the Government to their obligations in any consultations regarding night flight restrictions.
- 5 The Advisory Panel felt that there should be a rapid reduction in movements and quota points to meet the Council's adopted policy of a total night flight ban. This needed to be the first critical point made to Government in the Council's submission.

RECOMMENDED that the comments in the attached report and the additional comments of the Advisory Panel be included in the Council's response to the Department for Transport's consultation.

Background Papers: Department for Transport Consultation April, 2003, *Night Flying Restrictions at Heathrow, Gatwick and Stansted*

Stansted Airport Advisory Panel 29 May, 2003 Agenda Item 4 *Review of Night Flight Restrictions*

**Committee:** STANSTED AIRPORT ADVISORY PANEL

**Date:** 29 MAY 2003

**Agenda Item No:** 4

**Title:** REVIEW OF NIGHT FLIGHT RESTRICTIONS

**Author:** Will Cockerell (01799) 510581  
Richard Secker (01799 510580)

### Summary

- 1 This report advises Members of a preliminary consultation on the next night flight restrictions regime to be introduced in October 2005 and the suggested arrangements proposed between October 2004 and October 2005. Some responses are suggested which must be returned to the Department for Transport by 11 July 2003.

### Background

- 2 Since October 1993, common arrangements were introduced at the three London Airports to restrict night flights and disturbance to local communities by limiting actual movements and restricting (or banning in some cases) the noisier aircraft. The night period adopted was 2300 hours to 0700 hours with a night quota period of 2330 hours to 0600 hours.
- 3 The Night Quota period had movement and noise quota limits set specifically for each individual airport. The limits were applied on seasonal periods of summer and winter which were defined by changes to the clocks. The noise quota is obtained by each type of aircraft having its noisiness rated in accordance with its ICAO certification. In this way, the quieter aircraft are rated as 0.5 QC and the noisiest 16 QC, and no aircraft above QC 4 is permitted to operate during the night period.
- 4 The limits at the three London Airports under the current regime are:-

Winter 2003/04	Movements	Noise Quota
Heathrow	2,550	4,140
Gatwick	5,250	6,640
Stansted	5,000	3,550

Summer 2004	Movements	Noise Quota
Heathrow	3,250	5,610
Gatwick	11,200	9,000
Stansted	7,000	4,950

- 5 As indicated above, the present regime should end on 31 October 2004 and normally a full consultation would be underway on some future arrangements through to 2009. However, the Government has given three reasons for a delay in putting forward any new proposals which are:-
- (i) the outcome of the consultation on the future development of air transport in the UK;
  - (ii) the decision of the European Court of Human Rights on an earlier night flight regime at Heathrow;
  - (iii) the new European Community legislation which has to be implemented later this year.
- 6 This unplanned delay therefore means that interim proposals must be put in place for the one-year period. Also the opportunity has been taken to seek views on various aspects of the current restriction regime, although the full consultation will be undertaken next year.

### **Comments on the consultation**

The consultation asks a number of questions and suggested answers to these questions are set out below.

- 7 (a) **Questions and answers about 2004/2005**
- Q1** Do you agree that it is sensible to extend the present night restriction regime for a further year to 30 October 2005?
- A1** In view of the outstanding issues and particularly the awaited decision of the ECHR, it seems reasonable to roll forward the existing regime for another year.
- Q2** Do you agree that the movements, limits and noise quotas at each airport for winter 2004-05 and summer 2005 should be the same as those for winter 2003-04 and summer 2004 respectively?
- A2** The movement and noise quota limits should remain at the 2003/04 levels. This means that the previous annual 3% increase will not apply. In fact it has become unnecessary considering the trends over the last few years, and this is in spite of passenger numbers having increased from under 3 million in 1993 to 16 million in 2003.
- (b) **Preliminary questions and answers about the night restrictions to apply from 30 October 2005**
- Q3** What are your preliminary views on whether we should continue the present policy of having common arrangements at all three

airports, and on the broad issues relating to possible extension of a night quota period?

- A3** The present system should be applied to all three London Airports in a fair and transparent way. Equally the night quota period should be extended to the full night period with QC4 and above aircraft banned.
- Q4** Do you accept the general principle that having the same rules at three airports is fair to all the people living around those airports and to the airlines?
- A4** In general it is fair for the same basic rules to apply at each airport whilst striking a better balance between night flights and the local community and environment. However, in the last consultation insufficient weight was given to Stansted as 'an airport in the country' with particularly low background noise levels.
- Q5** In the context of night restrictions, do you think efficient and economic administration and transparency are important considerations?
- A5** Efficient and economic administration and transparency should be important factors providing that this does not compromise the intentions and benefits required to protect the local community.
- Q6** What are your views on the possibility of retaining some aspects of common arrangements, but not necessarily having the same night quota period at each airport?
- A6** There is merit in general common arrangements. However, if the Government continues with night flights then the quota period must recognise the unique location of Stansted as an airport in the countryside.
- Q7** What are your preliminary views on:-
- (a) When should the night quota period start and finish?
  - (b) What is the appropriate size of the movements, limits and noise quotas that should apply during the night quota period?
  - (c) Which types of aircraft should be restricted in the night quota period?
  - (d) If the night quota period were extended, would any consequential adjustments be required to other elements of the night restrictions regime?

**A7** This Council considers that there should be a total night flight ban between 2300 hrs and 0700 hrs at Stansted and preferably at all three airports for all but emergency flights. This has been its adopted policy for several years and any new regime should at least progressively reduce movements and quotas to reach that goal. The Council will respond further on receipt of the formal consultation later in the year.

RECOMMENDED that the above comments be recommended to the Environment and Transport Committee as this Council's response to the Department for Transport.

Background Papers: Night Flying Restrictions at Heathrow, Gatwick and Stansted: Department for Transport, April 2003

**Committee:** Environment and Transport  
**Date:** 10 June 2003  
**Agenda Item No:** 5  
**Title:** PROPOSED PEDESTRIAN CROSSING IN EITHER  
PEASLANDS ROAD OR MOUNT PLEASANT ROAD  
**Author:** ESSEX COUNTY COUNCIL - AREA MANAGER  
(01371) 872888

### **Summary**

- 1 To consider the introduction of a pedestrian zebra crossing in either Peaslands Road or Mount Pleasant Road in light of objections received during the informal consultation period.

### **Background**

- 2 The measures have been proposed for St Thomas More Primary School as part of the Safer Journeys to School Initiative. Following the completion of a travel survey undertaken by the school and analysis of the survey results, it was agreed with the school to introduce a zebra crossing.
- 3 An informal consultation process together with a letter drop to residents living in the relevant road was undertaken on 13 February 2003 for the Peaslands Road location (Appendix A1). After receiving objections the alternative location (Appendix A2) was sent out for consultation on 9 April 2003 for the Mount Pleasant Road.
- 4 The proposals for location 1 Peaslands Road are shown in Appendix A1 and are supported by the School, a District Councillor and the Parish Council. The proposals for location 2, Mount Pleasant Road is shown in Appendix A2, the School and the Chief Constable support this.
- 5 The estimated cost of implementing an average zebra crossing is £16,000. The scheme will be funded from the County Council's Safer Journeys to School Initiative.
- 6 The objections received are shown in Appendix B together with the comments of the Area Manager.

### **Conclusions**

- 7 The children from the south of the town have to cross either Peaslands Road or Mount Pleasant Road to get to South Road where St Thomas More School and R.A. Butler School are situated. The introduction of a zebra crossing will enable the students, parents and teachers of the school walk to school safely at the start and end of the day and on a Friday when the school visits the

leisure centre for swimming practice. Following a previous request from the Town Council for the introduction of a zebra crossing a crossing survey was undertaken so that the request could be prioritised and included on the reserve list. The survey results in the area indicated that on average 361 people cross this road with 6.93% being prams/pushchairs and 15 unaccompanied children. The person to vehicle ratio was 0.12.

- 8 The school have shown their support for both proposals, however they do have a preference for location 1 on Peaslands Road.

RECOMMENDED that notwithstanding the objections received, it is recommended that arrangements be made to introduce the Zebra Crossing as published and described in Appendix A2, further to a safety audit approval.

**Local County Member**

Cllr Chambers CC

**Local District Members**

Cllr C A Bayley DC

Cllr MA Hibbs DC

Cllr V J T Lelliot

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











**Committee:** ENVIRONMENT & TRANSPORT

**Date:** 10 June 2003

**Agenda Item No:** 6

**Title:** SPLIT OF HIGHWAY NETWORK INTO ROUTES OF STRATEGIC AND LOCAL SIGNIFICANCE

**Author:** Essex County Council – Highway and Transportation Area Manager – Paul Hardy (01371 872888)

### **Summary**

- 1 This report is to inform Members of the possible changes to the way in which decisions on Highway and Transportation issues could be made in the future as part of the discussions relating to Local Service Agreements.

### **Background**

- 2 Uttlesford District Council has received a letter from Cllr. Bass as the Cabinet member at Essex County Council with responsibility for matters relating to Highways and Transportation. The letter is attached. It refers to the meeting of 13 March 2003 where he had outlined his proposals for the provision of Highway Services in Essex in the future.
- 3 A key part of these proposals is establishing a split between routes of strategic and local significance that in turn will form the basis of the Local Service Agreements (LSA's). The aim under the LSA will be to give district councils greater discretion on priorities and enhanced decision making powers on routes of local significance with the County Council focussing on the strategic routes.
- 4 A draft map is available showing the probable split and the District Council has been asked to comment on the proposals. There are some detailed aspects to the plans and other issues such as speed management, freight distribution, congestion relief and transport strategies that also need to be taken into consideration.
- 5 In the coming months Cllr Bass will arrange a meeting with members of Uttlesford District Council to keep this process moving.  
Conclusions
- 6 Currently the highway service in Uttlesford is delivered through the Area Office at Great Dunmow by the County Council direct. The proposal for the LSA's will continue with this although the officers will be asking for more decisions on the proposals on the local route network from district members.

RECOMMENDED that the District Council welcomes the opportunity to discuss matters with Cllr Bass and takes the opportunity to raise any preliminary matters at this stage.

Background papers: Letter dated 20 May, 2003 from Essex County Council.





**Committee:** Environment and Transport  
**Date:** 10 June 2003  
**Agenda Item No:** 7  
**Title:** Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement  
**Author:** Sarah McLagan/Alex Stewart (01799) 510560/510555

### **Summary**

- 1 This report recommends that a Member/Officer Task Group be established to make recommendations to this Committee about the implementation of Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement in Uttlesford.

### **Background**

- 2 Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement (DPE) is a power available to Highways Authorities on application to the Secretary of State at the Department of Transport (DfT). Simply, it allows a Highways Authority (i.e., Essex County Council) to take over responsibility for non-endorseable parking contraventions from the Police, putting, for the first time, full responsibility on local authorities both to make traffic regulations and enforce them.
- 3 Although the power rests with Essex County Council (ECC) as the Highways Authority, it is normally the district authorities which are delegated responsibility for the operational aspects of implementing the powers. ECC Members have agreed to adopt DPE for the whole of Essex and are in the process of applying to the DfT for the associated powers. A project plan has been drawn up and Uttlesford is in the last tranche of authorities to be 'decriminalised' in October 2004. This is over 12 months earlier than originally anticipated by ECC.
- 4 In May 2001, Members of the Parking Strategy Working Party (PSWP) considered whether to apply to ECC for powers to adopt Decriminalisation and recommended to Community Services Committee that the District make no commitment to doing so until Maldon DC had been operational for one year. Officers were requested to keep abreast with developments but not to commit the Council to anything.

### **The Need for a Task Group**

- 5 ECC is in the process of introducing DPE across the County. There are both advantages and disadvantages to the Council if it agrees to take on the powers. The advantages include the Council being in a position to manage the implementation and scheme. The disadvantages are that the Council



would be responsible for the costs of the scheme should it fail to breakeven within the predicted timescales. Officers are concerned that because the Council has adopted a “wait and see” stance that issues are being discussed and decisions are being made and that the Council does not have the ability to influence these. Consequently, these decisions could affect the way in which DPE is implemented in Uttlesford. Experience with the implementation in other authorities has suggested, for example, that the financial model should be thoroughly reviewed before making any decisions to proceed. It is not possible to do this without being engaged in the process.

- 6 When the Council made its initial decision to “wait and see” how Maldon DC had managed after a year of operation, it was envisaged that this appraisal would take place in the summer of 2003. However, Maldon DC’s implementation timescale slipped and it did not go “live” until April 2003. Since then, however, time has been made up and through experience of introducing the scheme elsewhere the last tranche of authorities can be ‘decriminalised’ by October, 2004
- 7 Bearing in mind that Uttlesford is now due to go “live” in October 2004 the Council would need to reach a decision about whether or not to adopt DPE powers by September 2003. Given that the suggested lead-in time is 18 months there would be insufficient time to prepare for the implementation of decriminalisation should the Council wait to appraise the Maldon operation after one year in Summer 2004.
- 8 To enable Members to be sufficiently informed to make such an important decision it is suggested that the establishment of a Task Group would considerably assist this process. The Group would have to meet during the summer to understand and consider the implications of decriminalisation and report back to this Committee in September.
- 9 Should the Council decide not to adopt the powers to implement DPE, ECC will select an agent (which could be another district or a contractor) to carry out DPE in Uttlesford on its behalf. The Council would maintain responsibility for off-street parking e.g. car parks. There will be no opportunity to reverse the situation once in place and the agent would be responsible for all DPE administration and decisions on where parking restrictions are implemented and also the level of enforcement they would receive.

RECOMMENDED that a Member/Officer Task Group be established to make recommendations to this Committee about the implementation of Decriminalisation in Uttlesford, with its first report in September.

Background Papers: Minutes of Parking Strategy Working Party; The Implementation of DPE – Essex County Council; guidance on Decriminalised Parking Enforcement Outside London (DETR)

**Committee:** Environment and Transport  
**Date:** 10 June 2003  
**Agenda Item No:** 8  
**Title:** Use of Lower Street Car Park – Stansted Mountfitchet to provide Skateboard Facility  
**Author:** Alex Stewart (01799) 510555

### **Summary**

- 1 This report asks Members to determine the sale or lease of land at Lower Street Car Park in Stansted Mountfitchet to Stansted Mountfitchet Parish Council for the provision of a skateboard facility.

### **Background**

- 2 Members of the Development Control and Licensing Committee considered a planning application submitted by Stansted Mountfitchet Parish Council at its meeting on 7 April 2003.
- 3 The applicant was granted permission to site a skateboard park on the existing coach park area of the Lower Street car park – see appended plan of existing site. The approval is subject to a number of conditions and these are detailed in the appendix.
- 4 A number of alternative sites for the skateboard facility were considered and after extensive consultation with local residents (including young people) by the Parish Council, Lower Street car park was considered to be the most appropriate area. The District Council has committed £19,000 from its Capital Programme towards the skateboard project.
- 5 The Parish Council was aware of concerns expressed as to the safety of the site and requested that ROSPA provide a report detailing any requirements to ensure both the safety of car park users and skateboarders. In addition, WAGN have been consulted and both are satisfied with the ROSPA report which suggests safety measures akin to those required by the planning permission.
- 6 In order for the project to progress, the Committee needs to decide, as land owner, whether to allow the provision of the skateboard facility on the Lower Street car park coach park site. If it is prepared to allow such provision it needs to determine the basis for the arrangement with the Parish Council – lease, sell etc. and what, if any, further conditions should apply.

## **Arrangements with the Parish Council**

- 7 The permission allows for the Skateboard Facility to be provided on the coach park of the car park site – see second appended site plan. Beyond the coach park is a tapering piece of land that is currently fenced off. It has always been considered that this land would provide an extension to the car park should it be necessary in the future. The site could be leased to the Parish Council at a value to be determined by an independent valuer. However, in recognition of the principle behind the project, Members may prefer to offer a lease at a peppercorn rent. The lease would need to allow the Council to claim back the land for development with adequate notice.
- 8 There is sufficient land within the taper to accommodate the coaches. However, some costs would be incurred to do so. Currently, the coach park site is unmade, as is the tapered land, although it is intended that the coach park will be surfaced as it is muddy in the winter and dusty in the summer. The costs that would have to be met are to relocate the Pay & Display machine adjacent to the new coach park, redo/replace signage and resite the existing fence beyond the new coach park area.
- 9 It would be reasonable to consider requiring the Parish Council to meet these costs as they are incurred as a result of the project on this site. The Planning Conditions do not require the Parish Council to provide any fencing around the skateboard facility area itself. Members may consider this an essential, further safety measure that should also be provided by the Parish Council. It is understood that the Parish Council accepts these commitments.

### **RECOMMENDED that**

- 1 Members determine whether they wish to release the coach park at Lower Street Car Park for the provision of a skateboard facility by Stansted Mountfitchet Parish Council and, if they do,
- 2 Determine the arrangements for the release and any associated conditions to be met by Stansted Mountfitchet Parish Council.

Background Papers: Planning Application UTT0123/03/FUL, Minutes of Development Control and Licensing Committee (07/04/03 & 28/04/03)







**Committee:** Environment and Transport, Development Control and Licensing, Resources Committees

**Date:** 10<sup>th</sup> June, 16<sup>th</sup> June and 26 June 2003

**Agenda Item No:** 9

**Title:** The Planning Delivery Grant and performance of the Planning Service

**Author:** John Mitchell (01799) 510450

### Summary

1 At their meeting of 13<sup>th</sup> March 2003 Members were informed of the Planning Delivery Grant, which amounts to £246,261 for Uttlesford – the 34<sup>th</sup> highest allocation in the country. The report concluded: *Officers consider that the priorities that present themselves are:*

- *The appointment of independent consultants to carry out the Best Value Review of Planning Services*
- *Bringing forward the appointment of new staff following the approved restructuring of Planning Services*
- *Funding the appointment of temporary staff to reduce “pressure points” in workload*
- *Improvements in IT*
- *Staff and Member training*
- *Outsourcing handling of planning appeals and consideration of outsourcing certain categories of planning applications*
- *Technical and administrative support for the Enforcement Service.*

The Committee resolved: *that officers prepare a costed improvement and delivery plan for implementing the priorities in paragraph 17 of the report to take maximum advantage of the grant resources available.*

2 This report sets out the current position in planning services and how officers consider the Grant should be spent so as to bring about short and long term improvements for the service. It also makes reference to the need for service improvements and recommends the creation of new posts which would have revenue implications.

### Background

#### Current Performance

3 The close of year figures on performance are as follows

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>Govt. Target</b>	<b>UDC Performance</b>
% Major applications determined in 13 weeks	60%	32%
% Minor applications determined in 8 weeks	65%	39%
% All other applications determined in 8 weeks	80%	66%

4 It is apparent that during the last financial year some 1460 hours of paid overtime were worked in development control. This does not include Time Off In Lieu (TOIL) which is approximately half as much again. Although the effect of this is broadly neutral it does indicate that the equivalent of one full time post is being worked as overtime.

#### Best Value

5 Tentative and informal approaches have been made to a range of consultants and a range of between £50,000 and £75,000 have been put forward. It is emphasised that no formal tendering process has been commenced and these figures are indicative.

6 A comprehensive survey of all the customers of the service will need to be carried out as part of the Best Value review.

#### Bringing forward posts

7 The recent restructuring of the planning service as it affects Development Control involved the deletion of the posts of Development Control Manager, Principal Planning Officer and Chief Administrative Officer, and the creation of two Team Leaders with an additional 1.5 new planning officer posts in Development Control. These are about to be advertised. The Principal Planning Officer and the Chief Administrative Officer have already left the service and the Development Control Manager retires at the end of October. The 1.5 new planning officer posts are about to be advertised. One of these is currently occupied by an agency member of staff. The workload in the section amounts to some 1800 planning applications per annum. There are approximately 16 staff permanently working on development control matters (including administrative support) each with an average of 112 applications per head. This is high in relation to the national average of 91. It is considered that the 0.5fte post should be increased to be a full time post, at a cost of approximately £15,000 including on costs. The scope for taking on additional planning officers also needs to be further investigated.

8 It is becoming apparent that the amount of work required of the team leaders in the new structure has been underestimated. This now includes fee checking and validation of applications which is proving time consuming, combined with the checking of draft decision notices, both vital and time



consuming tasks. There is also a need for a person to carry out day-to-day filing and sundry other issues, including assisting the Head of Service. Overtime worked by administrative staff over the last year alone justifies a new post. Customer expectations and future business activity across the whole of Planning Services confirm the need for this ongoing support.

## IT

- 9 Document Imaging was introduced in the Development Control Service on 1<sup>st</sup> April. This enables all planning applications and associated correspondence to be held electronically, and will enhance the planning website by enabling planning applications to be viewed on the internet. It will be a significant improvement to the service and its accessibility for the public, as well as benefiting officers. Document Imaging requires all documents, whether plans or related correspondence, to be “scanned in”. It was initially considered that economies of scale after the move to Saffron Walden would obviate the need for duplicate functions to be carried out (such as the handling of incoming and outgoing mail), thus freeing up staff to scan in documents. This has not proved to be the case. The correspondence generated by the planning service is very high and the capacity was not available at Saffron Walden to handle the volumes of mail generated. Planning staff are required to assist in the Mail Room every day and effectively carry out all the functions previously carried out in Great Dunmow. Consequently only the very rudimentary functions of document imaging are carried out, which amounts to the scanning in of new applications but no additional correspondence. Although permanent staff have been trained in, and carry out, document imaging, temporary agency staff have had to be employed to cover for their normal duties at a cost equivalent to approximately £25,000 pa, and to cover for maternity leave. Moreover planning staff seldom have cause to refer to the document imaging system because it is not comprehensive. This is not a satisfactory situation. It is essential that the Council maximises its investment in service enhancements for the benefit of its many thousand customers.
- 10 Officers are working with Remploy to employ a person initially on a contract basis using PDG to carry out full time scanning duties so as to enable document imaging to be comprehensive and usable. This is likely to cost in the region of £20,000 with on-costs.
- 11 With document imaging comes a need to improve the monitors used by Officers to give better definition of plans etc, and to provide terminals for visiting members of the public. Flat screens will need to be purchased at a cost of approximately £269 per terminal, or approximately £10,100.

## Staff and Member Training

- 12 The opportunity should be taken to use some of the PDG for training, for both officers and Members. No programme has yet been finalised as appraisals are still occurring but approximately £10,000 could be set aside for this. Members’ views on their training would be welcomed.

## Enforcement

- 13 The enforcement service is provided by two staff, with administrative support coming from the administrative support within the area development control teams. The administrative support does not have as high a priority as in relation to planning applications, where the need to try and process applications within the statutory 8 week period is paramount. It is considered that PDG should be used to employ a new post of trainee enforcement officer who also has responsibility for the administrative functions of the service. The cost would be approximately £20,000 with on-costs.

## **Outsourcing and use of agency staff**

- 14 The Service has outsourced planning appeals and inquiries to consultants for some years now. Part of the savings package to meet the £50,000 target last year was the abandonment of the budget for external consultants. PDG gives the opportunity to remedy this situation. In view of extra work pressures it is not possible for staff to do all this work. The possibility of outsourcing householder planning applications has also been investigated. A budget for this has been estimated at about £20,000 for a full year. It compares with the cost of a planning officer, which at a maximum is about £30,000 with on costs, for an equivalent number of applications. It is stressed, however, that this is not a direct comparison because a case officer's workload includes many more complex items than householder applications. The advantage would be that workload would be taken away from existing staff, enabling more time to be spent on more complex applications. It would enable trained professional staff to spend more time on quality of proposed developments.
- 15 As well as outsourcing officers will continue to use temporary staff, whether from agencies or on short contracts, where it is of benefit to the service. Agency and contract staff will continue to be employed while the document imaging situation is resolved.

## 16 **Proposals for a) Use of Planning Delivery Grant**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Approx. Expenditure</b>	<b>Improvement</b>
Consultants for BV Review	£50-75,000	Better service for all customers arising from whole-service review and improvement plan, including planning policy and conservation. It would enable an 'outsider' to examine critically the service and relieve pressure on existing staff who have to continue with service delivery.

Staff for document imaging @ s1-3	£20,000	Improved access to the planning system for all
New screens	£10,000	Better use of document imaging by staff
New Enforcement staff @ s1-3	£20,000	Better service in response to complaints about slow action on enforcement matters. Improved speed of planning decisions with dedicated enforcement administrative function. Aim to increase % cases resolved in three months from 80% to 85%.
Member and staff training	£10,000	Improved understanding of the planning system and better working practices and customer care
Investigation of outsourcing and use of agency/contract staff. Use of consultants for planning appeals and inquiries and for specialised assistance where no alternative budget is available. Possible interim use of grant to assist with funding the two posts below.	£80-110,000	Aim to achieve current targets 2003/04 by turn of year
Total	£190,000-245,000	

**b) Items with on-going Revenue implications**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Approx. Expenditure</b>	<b>Improvement</b>
New administrative assistant at scale 1-3	£17,140	Removal of administrative functions from professional officers. Justified by amount of overtime worked by DC staff. Better overall service to

		customers.
Enhancement of one 0.5fte planning officer to 1 full time equivalent planning officer	£15,700	Better service to customers. Improved speed of determination of planning applications

### Conclusion

- 17 The proposed apportionment of PDG, together with improvements which have revenue implications, would be of considerable long term benefit while at the same time attacking the present problems which affect the service. The Best Value Review and Improvement Plan would lay down a firm basis for future improvement and consolidation of the service, which additional members of staff, and research of alternative means of provision, would help with the problems of the service as they are today.

RECOMMENDED that the Resources Committee (i) be recommended to agree the use of the Planning Delivery Grant as set out above and (ii) to approve a supplementary estimate for the increase in revenue expenditure also as set out above.

Background Papers: Report to E&T, DC&L and Resources Committees, March 2003,

**Committee:** Environment and Transport  
**Date:** 10 June 2003  
**Agenda Item No:** 10  
**Title:** Chesterford Research Station Master Plan – outcome of consultation exercise  
**Author:** John Mitchell (01799) 510450

### **Summary**

- 1 At their meeting of 13<sup>th</sup> March 2003 the Committee resolved to approve the Master Plan for public consultation. This report summarises the outcome of the consultation exercise. A copy of the report previously considered by the Committee is attached.
- 2 The following were notified of the proposed Master Plan: Anglian Water, Essex County Council, the Environment Agency, The Essex Wildlife Trust, CPR Essex, the Little Chesterford Action Committee, Little and Great Chesterford and Littlebury Parish Councils. In addition an exhibition was held in Little Chesterford on Saturday 26<sup>th</sup> April 2003. Between 40 and 50 people attended during the course of the day. Most of the comments relate to the

external implications of the development, such as the potential for traffic generation and its impact on nearby roads.

### Background

<b>Objector</b>	<b>Representations</b>	<b>Officer Comment</b>	<b>Proposed change</b>
Anglian Water	No objections in principle but point out there are no public foul or surface water facilities in the vicinity of the proposed development	This will be an issue to be covered in determining planning applications for development within the various phases	None
Essex County Council Highways	No comment – the Plan includes all the items in the legal agreement with Norwich Union	Noted	None
Great Chesterford Parish Council	The plan lacks sufficient detail. The assumption that the ratio of employees/sq m will be 1:35/40 is questionable. Similar developments have occupancy ratios of 1:10. Effect on traffic movements. The possibility of traffic restraint measures in Great Chesterford needs to be examined. There is concern in Great Chesterford over flooding by water displaced from the park.	The plan is considered adequate as a background to assess future planning applications. The development of the Park will be market led and it is not possible to be too prescriptive because of the differing needs of tenants. The occupancy ratios are low because the nature of research uses is that much of the floor area comprises laboratories and plant. Each planning application for further development will be accompanied by a traffic impact assessment, enabling any changes in occupancy ratios to be taken into account as the development proceeds, as well as mitigating the effects on Great Chesterford. It is not possible to restrict employees by	Amend the master plan to explain how the development will be subject to traffic assessments with each planning application.

		planning condition. The matter of flooding will be referred to the Environment Agency	
Little Chesterford Parish Council	A full traffic impact assessment for the full development potential of the site needs to be undertaken, taking into account the extra traffic generated by development at Hinxton hall to see if the surrounding road network can accommodate the proposed expansion. The minibus service should not use minor roads. The footpath link should be restored as soon as possible	The traffic impact assessment is considered adequate by the Highway Authority. Each planning application for further development will be accompanied by a traffic impact assessment, enabling any changes in occupancy ratios to be taken into account as the development proceeds, as well as mitigating the effects on the surrounding road network.	See above
Littlebury Parish Council	Special attention needs to be paid to light spillage and pollution attributable to roads, parking areas and security lighting, as well as buildings. More screened woodland is needed so that local residents do not see the additional buildings and car parking	Lighting and landscaping will be dealt with in the determination of planning applications. The master plan shows the overall landscaping vision.	Amend the master plan to include a requirement for a strategy for external illumination, which would be the subject of additional and separate consultation. The strategy should be completed by the end of 2003.
CPREssex	The master plan does not meet the criteria of Chesterford Park Local Policy 1, as the information on development potential and phasing is so vague that any application	The plan is considered adequate as a background to assess future planning applications. The development of the Park will be market led and it is not possible to be too prescriptive because of the differing	Amend the master plan to explain how each new application will be the subject of a TIA as the development proceeds.  Amend the master plan to include a

	<p>would be in accordance. Much more detail should be provided including internal road layout, height and scale of buildings, overall and phased employee numbers, floorspace added and lost in each phase and location/scale of parking.</p> <p>The total floorspace could be up to 56,500sq m, sufficient for 2825 employees at a ratio of 1:20 sq m. Traffic impact studies should be updated and the master plan should include details of the green travel plan.</p>	<p>needs of tenants. The occupancy ratios are low because the nature of research uses is that much of the floor area comprises laboratories and plant. Each planning application for further development will be accompanied by a traffic impact assessment, enabling any changes in occupancy ratios to be taken into account as the development proceeds, as well as mitigating the effects. There is a travel plan already, and its broad requirements are set out in the master plan. It is considered that the master plan would be improved by the addition of further information on scale and heights of buildings and by a strategy for illumination at night.</p>	<p>requirement for a strategy for external illumination, which would be the subject of additional and separate consultation. He strategy should be completed by the end of 2003.</p> <p>Amend the master plan to include the scale and height of proposed buildings</p>
M Fagan	<p>The major issue is traffic generation in the Little Chesterford. The needs to be a commitment from the owners and tenants that all measures are taken to stop through traffic</p>	<p>This is covered in the Travel Plan and the master plan and will be taken into account in determining planning applications</p>	<p>None</p>
RH Tennens	<p>Main concern is traffic, signage and effect on flooding</p>	<p>As above</p>	<p>None</p>
S Horan	<p>Public access/footpath Timings of the phases</p>	<p>The route of the footpath is being finalised by the developers. The phases will proceed in</p>	<p>None</p>

		order but the timing cannot be guaranteed because the speed at which development will proceed will depend on the market.	
D and K Bagley	Expansion is disproportionate and inappropriate to the rural setting. Adverse effects of traffic on the rural road network The roundabout now under construction was approved on the basis that it was not needed to justify expansion and was based on a TIA using the existing floorspace. Inadequate detail in the master plan. More work needs to be done on assessing the impact on the local community.	Expansion of the site is implicit in the Local Plan. Each planning application for further development will be accompanied by a traffic impact assessment, enabling any changes in occupancy ratios to be taken into account as the development proceeds, as well as mitigating the effects. It is considered that the master plan would be improved by the addition of further information on scale and heights of buildings.	See comments on CPREssex above
JH Butcher	Possibility of the adverse effects of street and other lighting. The footpath link should go through the park Care needs to be taken over the presence of unexploded wartime munitions.	It is considered that the master plan would be improved by the addition of a strategy for illumination at night. Security implications prevent the footpath passing through the park. The presence of munitions is not an issue for the master plan.	See comments on CPREssex above
G Atterbury	More detail is required including internal road layout, height and scale of buildings, overall and phased employee numbers, floorspace added and lost in each	It is considered that the master plan would be improved by the addition of further information on scale and heights of buildings and by a strategy for illumination at night.	See comments on CPREssex above



	<p>phase and location/scale of parking and external lighting.</p> <p>The total floorspace could be up to 56,500sq m, sufficient for 3,000 employees.</p> <p>The developers should fund traffic calming measures in Little Chesterford</p>	<p>Each planning application for further development will be accompanied by a traffic impact assessment, enabling any changes in occupancy ratios to be taken into account as the development proceeds, as well as mitigating the effects. The developers would be prepared to fund traffic calming measures subject to the agreement of the Highway Authority. The travel plan also includes measures to restrict traffic passing through Little Chesterford.</p>	
--	---	--	--

**Comment**

3. The major issue emerging from the consultation exercise is the external effect of the development rather than the layout and design within the Park. The Master Plan is considered to be sufficiently robust as a basis on which to make judgements about future planning applications, and many concerns about the possibility of higher densities of occupation and the effect on traffic generation can be addressed through the development control process, as planning applications come forward for further phases of development. Each application would be linked to the existing s106 agreement.
4. Proposed changes to the Master Plan are set out above. Subject to inclusion of these matters it is recommended that the Master Plan be approved.

**RECOMMENDED** that the Master Plan for Chesterford Research Station be approved, subject to the detailed changes set out in the report.

Background Papers: Chesterford Research Station Master Plan and related correspondence

**Committee:** Environment and Transport  
**Date:** 13 March 2003  
**Agenda Item No:** 12  
**Title:** Chesterford Park Research Station Master Plan  
**Author:** John Mitchell (01799) 510450

**Summary**

- 1 The Chesterford Park Research Station is a 100 hectare site 2.5 miles north of Saffron Walden. Formerly an agricultural research station it is now being developed for science-based enterprises. The Chesterford Park Local Policy in the deposit draft Local Plan requires the preparation of a master plan for the site to indicate how development on a phased basis relates to an overall design concept. The local plan requires the master plan to be subject to public consultation. This report seeks authority to commence consultation.
- 2 A planning application (ref UTT/) is currently on hold pending public consultation over the master plan. An overall plan of the Research Park is attached.

**Background**

- 3 The Master Plan for Chesterford Research Park is set out as follows: introduction, evolution of the research park, the vision for the research park, planning policy, existing and proposed landscaping, architecture and design, traffic and access, and finally phasing of changes. Each of these sections is summarised below.

Introduction

- 4 The Research Park is a well established site offering a high quality environment for a range of research companies. It has been acquired by Norwich Union Life and Pensions Ltd who are undertaking a programme of improvement works including upgrading of buildings and services and additional landscaping. Whereas it used to be operated by a single occupier it is now being developed for a range of research companies. The Master Plan has been prepared to guide the progress of change at Chesterford Research Park, and it is intended to maintain and enhance the site as a high quality location attractive to research companies, benefiting from its proximity to Cambridge with its concentration of research facilities.

Evolution of the research Park

- 5 The park is based around a Victorian Country House standing in grounds of some 250 acres (100ha). It was built in around 1850, and, following various

occupiers, was used as a hospital during the Second World War. It was brought back into use as a research site in 1952, when it became Fison's agricultural research centre, going through a series of ownerships as companies merged. Norwich Union acquired the site in 2000.

- 6 Buildings were added to over the years to meet operational requirements and there is a range of styles. There are some 70 buildings of all types on the site with a total floor area of 32,500 sq m. The mansion is the centrepiece of the site with its adjacent inner park and arboretum. It is not listed but is an attractive and imposing building that will be retained and enhanced. New occupiers have moved onto the site since its acquisition by Norwich Union and the focus is on maintaining and improving the Park as a site for leading research companies and fostering new science based enterprises.

### The Vision

- 7 Norwich Union's vision for the site is to preserve the best elements of the site, to improve the environment, provide additional facilities for occupiers and to construct new buildings to meet modern research requirements. Its strengths lie in the landscaped environment and historic elements of the site. A weakness is the quality of some of the buildings. This overall vision will be achieved by the following means:
- Provision to be made for business start ups requiring smaller laboratory space and flexible terms, as well as providing for more established companies. There are advantages for high technology companies forming part of a cluster of research activities.
  - Improved central facilities to produce a better café/restaurant for staff on site and a gym. This will encourage contact between occupiers and meet needs to reduce journeys elsewhere.
  - Older and unsightly buildings will be removed over time and the distribution of buildings across the site changed to enhance the parkland setting. New floorspace will be initial located on the southern part of the site with some buildings in the northern part being removed.
  - The amount of space will depend on a number of factors including market demand but it is anticipated that approximately 24,000 sq m of additional floorspace will be provided. A phasing plan shows how this will be achieved, as new buildings are constructed and older ones removed.
  - This is a long term strategy and one that can respond to changes in market demand. Details have to respond to needs as they arise but the master plan sets out the overall context.

### Planning Policy

- 8 The Council's planning policy for the site is set out.

## Landscape

- 9 The master plan evaluates the existing landscape and divides it into three distinct character zones. These are:
- Zone 1: the historic inner park and arboretum  
Zone 2: the arboretum parkland extension zone  
Zone 3: outer parkland, farmland and woodland belts
- 10 Zone 1 will be retained and enhanced. Zone 2 is the area beyond the arboretum where there is scope to extend or complement the character of the inner zone - it also includes existing buildings and the potential sites of new buildings. The proposals for this zone include:
- Open swathes of meadow and grassland punctuated by specimen trees and tree groups
  - Informal pedestrian and cycle routes
  - Enclosure by estate rail fencing where necessary
  - Controlled views of buildings through the informal parkland setting
  - Formal clipped hedges and pleached trees to provide enclosure, separation and screening
  - Paved sitting out spaces with water or other features
  - Ornamental planting with year round interest.
- 11 Zone 3 contains elements that will be enhanced, thus providing ecological and visual benefits as well as woodland paths.
- 12 Comprehensive illustrative plans form part of the document.

## Architecture and Design

- 13 There is a wide range of buildings on the site, many being utilitarian and unsightly, which gives a fragmented appearance to the Park. The aim is to adopt consistent design principles so that over time a more attractive and coherent appearance is achieved.
- 14 The requirements of research and development buildings are set out - these are generally two and three storey buildings with laboratory space - the laboratory areas require a controlled environment and this results in substantial areas devoted to mechanical and electrical plant.
- 15 Contemporary designs are envisaged but each will have regard to the brick and stone detailing of the Mansion at the core of the Park. There will be a limited range of materials to ensure consistency across the site and to complement the landscaped setting. Emphasis is placed on energy efficiency, longevity and minimal maintenance.

### Traffic and Access

- 16 Planning permission for a new access has been granted. There is a travel plan for the site in place, which has been drawn up with the County and District Councils as part of the planning permission for the new access. It includes the appointment of a site travel co-ordinator to provide information and to set up a car-sharing scheme. The travel plan will evolve to meet changing needs and in response to development on the site. Norwich Union has introduced signs to discourage through traffic in Little Chesterford and is keen to ensure that the Park is a good neighbour. There will be a new section of public footpath to link the existing footpaths to the east and west of the site.

### Phasing of Changes

- 17 The master plan contains drawings showing how development will be phased over the coming years. The number of phases and the precise form that each phase would take will depend on a number of factors including the size and type of building required by individual occupiers and the features of each part of the site. Five main phases are shown which illustrate a gradual reduction in the emphasis of buildings to the north of the site and a general low-density occupation of the development zone around the inner park and arboretum.

### Officer Comment

- 18 The master plan is considered to meet the requirements of the Chesterford Research Park policy and as such is recommended for public consultation. It is considered that such consultation should include the relevant Parish Councils and local residents, as well as the usual statutory consultees. The site owners are willing to hold a public exhibition at which staff will be available to answer questions. They also extend an invitation to the Committee to visit the Research Park should Members consider it appropriate.

RECOMMENDED that the master plan for the Chesterford Research Park be approved for public consultation as set out above, and the results be brought back to a future meeting of this Committee.

Background Papers: Chesterford Research Park Master Plan

**Committee:** Environment & Transport  
**Date:** 10 June 2003  
**Agenda Item No:** 11  
**Title:** Uttlesford Transport Forum  
**Author:** Jeremy Pine (01799) 510460

### **Summary**

- 1 This report reviews the operation of the Uttlesford Transport Forum and recommends that the Forum should continue.

### **Background**

- 2 At the meeting of the Planning & Development Committee on 30 November 2000, Members resolved that the Uttlesford Transport Forum be set up for an experimental period of one year. The main purpose of the Forum, as established, was to consider how better public transport could be provided in Uttlesford and whether existing transport links could be more appropriately integrated, looking also at walking and cycling. Additionally, the Forum would discuss and feed into the annual capital expenditure programme drawn up by the County Council and, as appropriate, involve selected groups in developing projects set out in the capital programme.
- 3 Membership of the Forum consisted of 2 District Council Members (one currently acting as Chair) and representatives from Essex County Council, Stansted Airport Limited, Strategic Rail Authority, Network Rail, local groups and the bus and coach operators who provide services in the District. The first meeting of the Forum was in September 2001, and quarterly after that.
- 4 At the meeting of the Forum on 9 October 2002, it was agreed that a number of worthwhile outcomes had been achieved and that the Forum should continue. A review of the work of the Forum was given at a subsequent meeting of the Environment & Transport Committee, but it was not formally minuted that the Forum should continue.

**RECOMMENDED** That the Uttlesford Transport Forum should continue and District Council representation be confirmed.

Background Papers: Uttlesford Transport Forum file and minutes.

**Committee:** Environment and Transport

**Date:** 10 June 2003

**Agenda Item No:**

**Title:** Flood Relief

**Author:** Phil Hunt (01799) 510521

### **Summary**

- 1 This report discusses the criteria for the use of the flood relief budget and seeks further guidance on how it is to be expended.
- 2 Appended is an update on progress with the 'Ongoing Initiatives' listed in the report to this Committee on 10 September 2002

### **Background**

- 3 At its meeting on 5 February 2003 the Resources Committee resolved to set aside a sum of £50,000 to be used in the current financial year for flood relief schemes in the district. It has subsequently been indicated that this sum is intended to be used to 'pump prime' schemes in association with parish or town councils where they agree to match the district council's contribution. It has further been suggested that where appropriate private individuals or other agencies, such as the Environment Agency, should fund most of the cost.

### **The Flood Relief Fund**

- 4 The fund should be directed in the first instance towards those areas where the Council has a direct responsibility. In these cases the full cost will fall on the Council. The next priority should, in principle, be locations where the largest number of properties have been flooded. However, it must be understood that worthwhile works at such locations are not cheap. Many parish and town councils are unable or unwilling to expend money on flood relief schemes which they feel are the responsibility of others. Private individuals are in the most part unable to afford the scale of works necessary and have an expectation that the Council will fund the work. The Environment Agency will only get involved with schemes relating to main rivers and your officers will continue to work closely with them. Essex County Council has commissioned the design of a number of surface water alleviation schemes which would benefit private property as well as the highways but has obtained funding for only one in this district for the current financial year. These schemes are outside the scope of the Council's budget. The offer of a small contribution from the district and local council is unlikely to tip the balance on any particular scheme going ahead. Clearly the criteria for funding must be

applied flexibly. This includes the third category of very localised schemes benefiting only a few properties, but where minimal expenditure could resolve/minimise future flood risk.

- 5 One option for future funding would be to target a prioritised list of larger schemes over a period of years. As an example, one of the County's surface water alleviation schemes is for Monks Corner, Great Sampford, where as well as the highway, eight properties, including Council owned elderly person's bungalows, were affected by flooding in October 2001. The estimated cost of the scheme is £87,500 and a bid was made for funding in the current financial year. The bid was unsuccessful and will be resubmitted for next year's programme. If this Council were to guarantee a contribution of, say, £25,000 towards that scheme, its chances of inclusion could be improved. Members will note the request from County for assistance in meeting the shortfall in the budget for a scheme at Manuden (Appendix I).
- 6 Smaller projects such as those at Anso Road, Hempstead and Jacks Lane, Takeley are possibly more within the scope of the proposed fund insofar as joint working and limited financial contributions from partners can realistically achieve benefits within a short timescale.
- 7 Since the October 2001 flooding, officers have investigated large numbers of individual flooding incidents across the district. Many of these are caused by poor maintenance of ditches, in particular roadside ditches that also give rise to flooding on the highway. These ditches are in general the responsibility of the neighbouring landowner but the County Council often experiences difficulty in getting necessary maintenance carried out. County are now considering carrying out this work themselves in default in trouble spots. This is an area in which this Council and local councils could contribute to the costs where property is also affected.
- 8 The Council is already committed to the construction of the Lower Channel Link at Swan Meadow. Officers have approached Saffron Walden Town Council and Essex County Council seeking contributions towards the works. Both have indicated that they have carried out other works that will benefit the Bridge End area and feel unable to assist further. Therefore the full cost of the Link project is likely to be borne by the Council. The estimated cost of these works is £25,000 to be taken from this year's budget.

### **Ongoing Initiatives**

- 9 The appendix to this report gives Members an up date on progress at the particular locations that were highlighted in the report to this Committee on 9 September 2003.
- 10 The total land drainage/flood defence budget for the current financial year is £57,000. The Council has a duty to continue necessary maintenance on those ordinary watercourses and structures of which it is the riparian owner. This includes the programmed inspection of identified high-risk locations. £7,000 is set aside for these activities. There is also the commitment to the construction



of the Lower Channel Link at Swan Meadow, Saffron Walden at an estimated cost of £25,000. If agreement can be reached between the various parties there is the prospect of progressing the schemes at Jacks Lane, Takeley and Anso Road, Hempstead and a contribution towards the County Council project at Manuden has been requested.

### **Conclusions**

- 11 The flood relief budget should be targeted at the locations where the most serious flooding has occurred. However, it is important that officers continue to work with other authorities and agencies to secure sustainable high impact flood relief schemes. To do so the available funding must be utilised flexibly with larger contributions being awarded to appropriate schemes.

RECOMMENDED That Members determine the principles by which funds for flood prevention should be allocated and to advise on any specific priorities for the current financial year

Background papers: Correspondence with ECC

## APPENDIX I

### ONGOING INITIATIVES - PROGRESS

#### **Ashdon.**

The critical ordinary watercourse inspection took place during September 2002 and identified no serious maintenance problems. The Parish Council is taking a proactive stance regarding watercourses in the parish and is prepared to monitor the situation. The situation of the most seriously flooded properties is such that the only solution would seem to be to create upstream storage. This is unlikely to be viable.

#### **Great Chesterford - Walden Road.**

Housing Services have a budget for the implementation of the off-street parking scheme which will include improvements to the ditch along the frontage. The design is proceeding with a view to completion during the summer. Officers will continue to assist and push this project. If necessary some of the flood relief budget could be used to ensure that the flood defence aspect is fully covered.

#### **Great Chesterford - River Cam.**

The modelling for the Environment Agency Standards of Protection Study is complete. As a result certain areas will now be looked at in more detail and these include Great Chesterford, Littlebury and Newport. The next stage is the identification of economic and technically viable options and it is hoped that this will have been achieved by Christmas this year. The results will be prioritised and the schemes developed but nothing is likely to be seen on the ground within three years.

#### **Clavering - River Stort.**

The Environment Agency Flood Management Strategy has not identified a viable solution. The local area office is now setting up an improved maintenance regime.

#### **Dunmow - Church End.**

The Environment Agency Catchment Study is in its early stages. The topographical survey is imminent but no modelling has yet taken place. It is likely to be two years before any viable solutions are identified.

#### **Dunmow - Riverside.**

Construction of the earth bund by the Environment Agency has reached a stalemate. Unavailability of land is the main cause. Residents are carrying out their own defence works. Contact is being maintained via Dunmow Town Council who is pressing for a wall to replace the bund where space is restricted.

### **Hempstead – Anso Corner**

ECC have started investigation of the problems at Anso Corner. Discussions with the Parish Council indicate that the main causes of flooding to property are an undersized culverted roadside ditch, almost certainly constructed by County, causing water to flood onto the road and then a lack of drainage off the road back into the open watercourse down stream. Officers are hopeful that County will undertake the work to the culvert, if found necessary, but not that it will be carried out in this financial year. The work to provide drainage off the road should be carried out as soon as possible and the council will assist if appropriate.

### **Littlebury - River Cam.**

See Great Chesterford above. UDC and ECC prepared a scheme which would have reduced localised flooding in Mill Lane but this did not receive the support of the Parish Council. No further action has taken place.

### **Manuden - River Stort.**

The Environment Agency Flood Management Strategy has not identified a viable solution. The local area office is now looking at an improved maintenance regime.

### **Manuden - The Street (North).**

The County Council scheme for this location is the only one to have been awarded funding in the district in this financial year. The proposal is to lay a large diameter pipe from the silt trap to the River Stort via the playing field. It will take water away from properties on the eastern side of The Street which were flooded to a depth of 900mm in October 2001. The original estimate for this work was £145,000 but has now risen to £195,000. ECC have requested assistance from UDC in meeting this shortfall. This is a scheme into which the council could contribute.

### **Newport - River Cam and Wicken Water.**

See Great Chesterford above. UDC is assisting the parish council in preparing an application to the Environment Agency for localised works around Bridge End.

### **Saffron Walden - Bridge End.**

The critical ordinary watercourse inspection took place in September 2002. Following computer modelling of the catchment UDC has commissioned a scheme to divert floodwater from the King's Slade to the lower channel through Audley End Estate is being implemented. Design of the works is virtually complete and the contract documents are being prepared. There are some legal issues to be resolved but the project is on programme for completion before the autumn at an estimated cost of £25,000. ECC has installed two new gullies on Windmill Hill, connected to the New Pond Lane drains which discharge into the Slade at the STW. There is a proposal to

provide gullies down the entire length of the hill and construct a new larger drain to the STW but this work will not be done in the current financial year. The ECC Structures section at Chelmsford is investigating options with the Bridge Street culvert.

#### **Great Sampford - Monks Corner.**

ECC has prepared a scheme estimated at £87,500 but has not been successful in obtaining funding this year. This is an area where a number of Council properties are at risk as well as private. Some drains owned by UDC would have required upgrading as part of this scheme but this would not give any benefit in isolation. Should the scheme proceed at some time in the future the council could be expected, at least, to fund the works to its own drains.

#### **Stansted - Lower Street (Ugley Brook).**

The Environment Agency Flood Management Strategy has identified a solution by the provision of upstream storage on the brook and a commitment has been made on the capital programme. Necessary approvals and land issues as well as funding mean that work is unlikely to start on the ground for two years at least.

#### **Takeley - Jacks Lane.**

ECC have had a design completed for a new pipe across the green and Jacks Lane, discharging into the roadside ditch which would be regraded and improved. This scheme is not yet costed, thought to be around £10,000, and will not be carried out this financial year. Once more details are known officers will investigate whether this can be progressed locally by residents in association with the district and parish councils.

**Committee:** Environment & Transport  
**Date:** 10 June  
**Agenda Item No:** 13  
**Title:** Golds Nurseries – Confirmation of Budget Adjustments  
**Author:** Rod Chamberlain (01799) 510508

### **Summary**

- 1 This report seeks Member approval to carry over £30,000 in the Gold Nurseries Budget from the year 2002/03 to 2003/04, and to confirm urgent action to increase the budget provision for repairs by £50,000.

### **Background**

- 2 An allowance was included within the Golds Nurseries Business Park revised 2002/03 estimates for the cost of work needed to be undertaken by the Council on outstanding dilapidations. Work commenced on renovating the units in February 2003. The budget is £30,000 under-spent overall at the year end because a late payment was received and less refurbishment work was completed by year end than originally expected.
- 3 Since the original estimate for work in 2003/04 the situation has changed significantly. The estimated cost of the first units to be refurbished was greater than expected and compounded by a number of units needing extensive work when vacated by the previous tenant. Vandalism has added to the costs.
- 4 Most importantly, notification was received in March that the Head Landlord now requires all dilapidation work to be completed within six months or legal action will be taken against the Council in accordance with the legal agreement. This means that the work required cannot now be phased over a number of years as originally planned. On receipt of the notification, urgent action was taken, in consultation with the Chairman of this Committee, to seek the approval of the Chairman of Resources Committee to increase the budget for repairs at Gold's Nurseries for 2003/04 by a further £50,000, to be funded from the Council's reserves.
- 5 Five units have been renovated to date. Work on the dilapidations of the remaining 13 units is ongoing and must be completed by October 2003.

RECOMMENDED that Members request Resources Committee:

- a) that £30,000 be carried forward as an earmarked reserve for use for dilapidation work in 2003/2004.
- b) that confirmation be given to the urgent action taken in consultation with the Chairmen for increasing the total budget by £50,000, to be funded from the Council's Financial Management Reserve.

Background Papers: none

**Committee:** Environment and Transport  
**Date:** 10 June 2003  
**Agenda Item No:** 14  
**Title:** Essex Waste Management  
**Author:** Richard Secker (01799) 510580

### Summary

- 1 The Essex Waste Management Advisory Board has arranged a conference on 30 June 2003 and districts are each invited to nominate up to 10 Member representatives to attend.

### Background

- 2 The Essex Waste Management Advisory Board (EWMAB) is the group formed by the Association of Essex Local Authorities to agree and progress future waste management and recycling arrangements across Essex. The County, Districts, Boroughs and unitary authorities all have representatives reflecting their collection and or disposal responsibilities. Councillor Thawley is currently this Council's representative and the deputy position is held by Councillor Ollier.
- 3 A one-day conference is to be held at the Five Lakes Hotel near Maldon on 30 June 2003 with the costs shared by the EWMAB authorities.
- 4 The intention of the event is to update both previous and new Committee/Council Members with the current position and progress which has to be made by 2008/9. There are a number of demanding statutory targets which have been set by UK and EU legislation and the achievement of these will be difficult and expensive for all local authorities.

RECOMMENDED that up to 10 Members be nominated to attend the EWMAB conference on 30 June 2003.

Background Papers: None.