

To: Environment and Transport
Date: 4 November 2003
Agenda Item No: 6
Title: Policy Priorities and Budgets 2004/05
Author: John Dickson (01799) 510300
Philip O'Dell (01799) 510670
Sarah McLagan (01799) 510560
John Mitchell (01799) 510450
Dick Secker (01799) 510580
Rod Chamberlain (01799) 510508

Summary

- 1 This report outlines the Committee's initial draft General Fund revised estimates of direct costs and income for 2003/04 and estimates for next year, 2004/05, prepared on the basis of existing approved levels of service. Also included in the report and in Appendix 2 is information regarding the Budget Review Items identified at the previous meeting of this Committee. Information in this report, together with any issues raised by this Committee will be included in the overall General Fund budget strategy report which will be submitted to the Resources Committee on 20 November.

Background

- 2 At its previous meeting on 9 September, this Committee was informed of the Council's difficult financial position for 2004/05 and also the Council's decision in July 2003, to set an indicative budget target equating to a 7.5% Council Tax increase. Since that meeting, the Government have indicated a possible cap on Council Tax increases which makes close scrutiny of the Budget Review Items already identified even more important.
- 3 The Resources Committee on 18 September asked for Budget Review Items to be considered regarding their contribution to the Quality of Life Plan, legal or contractual necessity, delivery of increased efficiency or support from customers or the public generally, and to be accompanied by a rigorous risk analysis. The Resources Committee gave particular emphasis to a robust approach to increasing income from fees and charges.
- 4 The intention is that the Resources Committee on 20 November will recommend to Council Committee cash limits and Committees will then be required to finalise their budgets and Service Plans in the January Committee cycle.

Revised 2003/04 Budgets

- 5 The process of revising budgets undertaken in this cycle takes the place of more routine budgetary control reports, with the summarised position being:

	£	£	£
BASE ESTIMATE 2003/2004			2,767,970
<u>Less</u> Internal Charges			<u>938,220</u>
BASE DIRECT COSTS			1,829,750
Transferred to Community and Leisure Committee:- Bridge End Gardens Project Manager (part year)			-34,110
Transferred from Development Control and Licensing Committee:- Planning Services Staffing Restructure net (part year)			<u>13,940</u>
Adjusted Base Direct Costs			1,809,580
Changed Pattern in use of Earmarked Reserves:			
District Plan – carried forward to 2004/05		-24,190	
RPG 14 –carried forward to 2004/05		<u>-20,000</u>	-44,190
Use of Earmarked Reserves:			
Community Transport – Replacement Vehicle		12,000	
Dilapidations work at Industrial Estate (<i>note 1</i>)		<u>80,000</u>	92,000
Other Variations – Expenditure			
<u>Plus</u> Contingency sum (<i>note 2</i>)	100,000		
<u>Plus</u> Kitchen Waste Recycling trial (<i>note 3</i>) (net)	65,000		
<u>Plus</u> Contract Growth (<i>note 4</i>)	18,300		
<u>Plus</u> Disposal Charges (<i>note 5</i>)	12,800		
<u>Less</u> Other (net)	<u>4,400</u>	200,500	
Other Variations - Income			
<u>Plus</u> Industrial Estate Shortfall (net) (<i>note 6</i>)	68,610		
<u>Plus</u> Large Containers (<i>note 7</i>)	30,000		
<u>Plus</u> Septic Tanks (<i>note 8</i>)	8,200		
<u>Plus</u> Car Parking – overstated budget	4,000		
<u>Plus</u> Trade Refuse – overstated budget	4,000		
<u>Less</u> Recycling (<i>note 9</i>)	-21,000		
<u>Less</u> Building Control Fee Income (net) (<i>note 10</i>)	<u>-7,150</u>	<u>86,660</u>	287,160
Total Variation from Adjusted Base			<u>334,970</u>
			2,144,550
Revised Estimate 2003/04 – Direct Costs			

Notes on the key variations:

1. Dilapidations Work at Industrial Estate

This refers to the full use made of the Earmarked Reserve set aside to meet the additional cost of dilapidation work at Golds Nurseries in 2003/2004. (Minute RE5 refers). This work is now almost complete. The work covers the Council's legal liabilities and is not directly associated with marketing the units, although it may help.

2. Contingency Sum

This relates to a legal issue to be discussed as a Part Two item on this Agenda.

3. Kitchen Waste Recycling Trial

See report elsewhere on this agenda.

4. Contract Growth

The Recycling Kerbside Collection contract has been renegotiated with the DSO to meet the actual costs of the service. The recycling contract has also risen due to the collection of kitchen waste and the recycling banks being emptied more frequently.

5. Disposal Charges

This is mainly due to the Materials Recycling Facility (MRF) increasing the processing charges.

6. Industrial Estate Shortfall

This reflects a projected loss of income through vacant units, based on the current number of occupied units, adjusted for achieving only one further letting in 2003/2004, taking total occupancy to seven units out of eighteen this year.

7. Large Containers

Demand for this service is very unpredictable and recently some customers have moved out of the district. Also there is an increase in the amount of waste being recycled by some companies.

8. Septic Tanks

The revised estimate reflects a lower income. The demand for tanks to be emptied has reduced this year due to the exceptionally dry summer.

9. Recycling

This is due to an increase in the amount of household waste that is being recycled and the increased value of recycling credits from Essex County Council.

10. Building Control Fee Income

The revised estimate has been re-based in line with current trends and projections. The income is shown net of any additional costs incurred to achieve this increased level.

Draft Budgets 2004/05

- 6 The detailed budgets have been prepared at estimated outturn prices and therefore they include provision for agreed future pay awards and other price increases. Prior to any further growth or savings proposals being approved by the Council, the detailed figures have been prepared at the existing approved levels of service. The summarised position for this Committee is as follows:

	£	£	£
BASE ESTIMATE 2003/2004			2,767,970
<u>Less</u> Internal Charges			<u>938,220</u>
BASE DIRECT COSTS			1,829,750
Transferred to Community and Leisure Committee:-			
Bridge End Gardens Project Manager			-40,920
Community Transport Grant			-30,000
Transferred from Development Control and Licensing Committee:-			
Planning Services Staffing Restructure (net)			<u>20,660</u>
Adjusted Base Direct Costs			1,779,490
Previously Projected Items:			
<u>Less</u> One off use of Earmarked Reserve – District Plan			-80,870
Decriminalised Parking Enforcement; (note 1)			

<u>Plus</u>	Set Up Costs	45,000		
<u>Plus</u>	Running Costs (6 Months) net	68,300		
<u>Less</u>	Essex County Council	<u>-113,300</u>		0
	Inflation:			
<u>Plus</u>	2004 Pay Award	40,500		
<u>Plus</u>	Contract price increases -recycling, vehicle maintenance, street cleaning, septic tanks etc	44,500		
<u>Plus</u>	Other	<u>12,610</u>	97,610	
	Other Variations – Expenditure			
<u>Plus</u>	Staffing – Annual Increments	5,970		
<u>Less</u>	Leasing (<i>note 2</i>)	-27,820		
<u>Less</u>	District Plan (<i>note 3</i>)	-25,000		
<u>Plus</u>	Contract Growth – as per revised estimates	18,300		
<u>Plus</u>	Disposal Charges (<i>note 4</i>)	17,800		
<u>Plus</u>	Concessionary Fares (<i>note 5</i>)	6,980		
<u>Less</u>	Other (net)	<u>3,310</u>	-460	
	Other Variations – Income			
<u>Plus</u>	Industrial Estate- (net) (<i>note 6</i>)	37,850		
<u>Plus</u>	Large Containers –as per revised estimates	30,000		
<u>Plus</u>	Car Parking – overstated budget	4,000		
<u>Plus</u>	Trade Refuse – overstated budget	4,000		
<u>Less</u>	Recycling – as per revised estimates	-21,000		
<u>Less</u>	Building Control Fee Income net	<u>-8,210</u>	<u>46,640</u>	<u>143,790</u>
	Base Estimate 2004/05 – Direct Costs			1,842,410

Revised 2003/04 and draft 2004/05 budgets are contained at Appendix 1 to this report.

Notes on the key variations:

1. Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement (DPE)

Members resolved to proceed with the implementation of DPE subject to the deficit on the parking account being funded by Essex County Council (ECC), the budgets have been prepared on this assumption. Budgetary implications will be developed with ECC and form part of a business plan and Agency Agreement that holds ECC responsible for these costs.

2. Leasing

The estimate reflects the vehicle leasing savings identified following the Council's decision to purchase all new vehicles.

3. District Plan

The Plan will be adopted in 2004/05 and funded from reserves therefore the base budget for this is not required.

4. Disposal Charges

The increased cost for 2004/2005 is due to the increased charges passed on by the County Council for trade waste, and a continuation of the increased costs of the Materials Recycling Facility processing charges.

5. Concessionary Fares

Reflects the increase in take up of the statutory Bus Pass off set in part by a reduction in the use of Bus Tokens.

6. Industrial Estate

The ongoing position for the Industrial Estate shows a projected loss of income based on achieving three further lettings in 2004/2005, taking total occupancy to ten units out of eighteen. This is felt to be a prudent estimate in line with current levels of interest shown. Any additional lettings would impact upon the shortfall.

7 Apart from inflation, also included are amounts to cover other unavoidable variations such as those arising from contractual commitments, any projections for 2003-2004 identified last year, and variations in the planned property maintenance programme. Excluded are any items related to service changes, which would require specific Committee approval.

8 Officers have examined the very limited number of fees and charges for this Committee and have concluded that, following the review undertaken in the last budget cycle, no further changes are currently justified, other than those connected with the Budget Review Items outlined in paragraph 9 below.

Budget Review Items

9 This Committee's meeting on 9 September recommended sixteen Budget Review Items for further investigation. Two further items have been brought forward to this Committee, one covering energy efficiency measures previously referred to the Resources Committee, and the other a new proposal for a planning monitoring service. These items have been numbered as 17 and 18 and added to the list below. All the other Items had previously been identified during the joint Chairman / officer Budget Review meetings

held in August. Details of these items are summarised as follows with further information in Appendix 2 if relevant:

Item		Estimated cost/income pa	Proposed action
1	Planning grants – review effectiveness	Current budget £28,500	Continue with grants
2	Car parking – review of charges	Various options to increase income, ranging from £27,000 to £168,000	Members to decide on appropriate option
3 & 5	Decriminalisation of parking	Net effect should be nil, via funding from County Council	Continue with implementation
4	Resident parking – continue reduction on deficit	Current deficit is £13,000 pa and covers management costs and capital charges	Leave unchanged pending merger with Decriminalisation budget to be funded by County Council.
6	Assisted travel – consideration of extra support	£15,000 re statutory costs of Bus Passes, plus options costing £1,500-£17,200 re National Transport Tokens	Bus Passes are statutory. Members to choose an option re Transport Tokens
7	Road Safety Agency – review agreement	N/A	No negotiation possible until December 2006.
8	Client services – examine rationale	Current budget £210,000 including direct costs of £120,000	Defer decision pending further examination.
9	Dunmow Office and Depot option appraisal	Not known	Report going to Resources Committee on 20 November
10	Vehicle management - review servicing frequency	No budgetary effect pending outcome of pilot changes to frequency of servicing	Await outcome of pilot
11	Recycling – more partnership working plus split bodied vehicle	-	Partnership work ongoing and to be reported on in the future. Vehicle in Capital Programme.
12	Refuse collection – increase income from green sacks	£2,500 extra income	Implement. Further consideration required regarding green waste disposal cost reduction for the elderly and those with disabilities

13	Refuse collection – Best Value review options to be considered	Not finalised	Report to Scrutiny Committee shortly.
14 & 15	Local amenities and cemetery – Grounds maintenance costs on retendering	Included in separate report on this Agenda	Report on this agenda
16	Industrial Estate	Base budget adjusted	Report on this agenda
17	Energy Efficiency Post	£30,000 less offset via reduced costs of energy in Council offices	Implement
18	Planning Monitoring Service	£3,000	Implement

Other Issues

- 10 The work being undertaken on the Quality of Life Plan and the Budget Prioritisation exercise continues, and any financial implications or direct service effects will be submitted to this Committee in the budget and Service Plan report presented at your next meeting.
- 11 The corporate review regarding the First Point of Contact (previously described as the Access to Services Review) also continues, including the review of administrative functions within the Council. Any impact on the work or budget of this Committee will again be reported at your next meeting.

RECOMMENDED that this Committee

- 1 Approves and comments as appropriate on the revised 2003/04 budget and draft 2004/05 budget.
- 2 Submits the revised 2003/04 budget and draft 2004/05 budget to the Resources Committee for comments.
- 3 Gives officers further guidance on the Budget Review Items.
- 4 Instructs officer to prepare, in the light of guidance issued by the Resources Committee on 20 November, Service Plans and draft budget proposals for consideration at the next meeting of this Committee on 6 January.

Background Papers: Base Budget Working Papers and Budget Review Item working papers.

Uttlesford District Council – Budget Review Item Report – Item 1

	Details Required	Officer Responses
1.	Committee	Environment & Transport
2.	Review Item Description, background and origins	<p>Planning Grants – Consider effectiveness of grants given.</p> <p>Budget Total = £28,500</p> <p>Promotion of Local Centres (£20,000) – This grant is available to the Town/Parish Council's of the four main towns in the district. Grants are applied for, often on behalf of or in conjunction with various representative groups, such as the Dunmow Town Strategy Group or Chamber of Trade/Saffron Walden Initiative for projects which help to promote the town/village. Each can apply for up to £4,000 but this figure must be match funded by the town/parish council. Examples of projects include finger posts and information/map boards, Christmas trees/lights, conservation area lighting enhancement, feasibility study for a young persons facility etc.</p> <p>The remaining £4,000 is used on a project(s), which helps to promote the whole district, but with specific emphasis on the four main towns. Examples include a poster showing an informative map of the district, posters advertising the district at the mainline stations to/from London.</p> <p>The grant is well received as it allows for specific partnership working to promote the district between the Council and the four main towns.</p>

		<p>Essex Economic Partnership (£3,500) – The Essex Economic Partnership is a public/private Countywide partnership which has set out a five year Economic Strategy for Essex. It also has a ten year vision for the County, with targets and actions needed to ensure that Essex can identify real and measurable improvement in its competitive position regionally, nationally and at a European level.</p> <p>Uttlesford Enterprise (£5,000) – The Braintree District Enterprise Agency Ltd incorporating Uttlesford Enterprise is located at the Council Offices in Saffron Walden It provides:</p> <p>BUSINESS TRAINING People Management & Development Financial Management and Control Budgeting Pricing Marketing Selling Company Law Management Information Systems</p> <p>BUSINESS COUNSELLING People Management & Development Financial Management and Control Budgeting Pricing Marketing Exporting Company Law</p> <p>FINANCE AND FINANCIAL ADVICE Sources of Finance Grants</p> <p>OTHER Special needs groups available</p> <p>Members could consider reducing or deleting all or part of this budget in order to make financial savings.</p>
--	--	---

3.	Potential net budget effect 2004/2005. Please also specify budget items affected e.g. Salaries, Premises costs etc	No change Net Effect (£) grant of £28,500 split as in 2 above
4.	Does this item provide potential ongoing effects? If so please state the yearly net effect and budget items as in 3 above.	Net Effect (£) as 3 above
5.	Details of any legal or contractual necessity to implement this item.	Promotion of Local Centres Grant - N/A Essex Economic Partnership –N/A Uttlesford Enterprise – N/A
6.	Relevance of item to Quality of Life Plan	All three grants are relevant to leisure, environment, meeting peoples needs and the economy
7.	Effects on efficiency e.g. better interdepartmental working	Promotion of Local Centres Grant - Enhances relations with the four main organisations in each town. Essex Economic Partnership – encourages partnership working with other Essex authorities and businesses Uttlesford Enterprise –encourages partnership working with other Essex authorities and businesses
8.	Implementation timescale if approved	All April 2004
9.	Major benefits, including effects on the quantity and quality of service	Promotion of Local Centres Grant – The grant is match funded and it assists each town with promotion of local business and tourism Essex Economic Partnership – encourages better links and positive involvement with the business community Uttlesford Enterprise – encourages better links and positive involvement with the business community
10.	Major risks that may prevent the achievement of the Review Item.	All may have an impact on local businesses and tourism. Could reduce opportunities for partnership working
11.	Likelihood of achievement e.g. certain, possible	All certain

12.	Views of Stakeholders (users/customers/Members/staff/others)	Promotion of Local Centres Grant – very well received and has enable projects to take place where they might not have happened Essex Economic Partnership – N/A Uttlesford Enterprise – N/A
13.	Staffing/workload effects	Promotion of Local Centres Grant – some savings in staff time if no available Essex Economic Partnership –not quantifiable but it would not be compatible with emphasis on QOLP on economic development to stop paying the grant Uttlesford Enterprise – not quantifiable but it would not be compatible with emphasis on QOLP on economic development to stop paying the grant
14.	Partnership possibilities identified	Promotion of Local Centres Grant – not only do partners match fund it enables them to apply for funding from other sources Essex Economic Partnership – is a partnership arrangement Uttlesford Enterprise – is a partnership arrangement
15.	Details of any further work/consultation required.	Promotion of Local Centres Grant – the four centres would have to be advised of withdrawal/reduction of grant Essex Economic Partnership – all partners would need to be advised if grant is to be withheld Uttlesford Enterprise – all partners would need to be advised if grant is to be withheld
16.	Links to other Budget Review items, as part of a re-packaging of services (if any).	None
17.	Other Comments	None
18.	Officer Recommendation e.g. implement/do not implement	All three grants: continue

Uttlesford District Council – Budget Review Item Report – Item 2

	Details Required	Officer Responses
1.	Committee	<i>Environment & Transport</i>
2.	Review Item Description, background and origins	<p><u>Car Parking –</u> <i>Look at complete charging structure for Car Parks, including the Council Office site.</i></p> <p><i>Each car park tariff was increased by 10p in April 2003.</i></p> <p><i>The attached sheet provides the Committee with a number of options for tariff increases, including the introduction of charges at the Council Offices.</i></p>
3.	Potential net budget effect 2004/2005. Please also specify budget items affected e.g. Salaries, Premises costs etc	<p>Growth/Reduction (Delete as appropriate)</p> <p>Net Effect (£) Comprising: -</p> <p><i>See attached sheet</i></p>
4.	Does this item provide potential ongoing effects? If so please state the yearly net effect and budget items as in 3 above.	<p>Net Effect (£) Comprising: -</p> <p><i>See attached sheet</i></p>
5.	Details of any legal or contractual necessity to implement this item.	<i>On & Off Street Parking Orders, Agency Agreement with ECC for provision of RPS and imminent statutory Agency Agreement with ECC for provision of Decriminalised Parking Enforcement (October 2004)</i>
6.	Relevance of item to Quality of Life Plan	<i>C, E</i>
7.	Effects on efficiency e.g. better interdepartmental working	<i>Decriminalisation will streamline the parking systems and provide the public with one enforcing body to</i>

		<i>deal with</i>
8.	Implementation timescale if approved	<i>As close to 1 April 2004 as process allows</i>
9.	Major benefits, including effects on the quantity and quality of service	<i>N/A</i>
10.	Major risks that may prevent the achievement of the Review Item.	<i>Disquiet that charges have increased – may receive protests from Chambers of Trade etc. and customers may choose to go elsewhere.</i>
11.	Likelihood of achievement e.g. certain, possible	<i>Quite Certain</i>
12.	Views of Stakeholders (users/customers/Members/staff/others)	<i>Opinion from visitors/outsideers that current charges are low. Opinion of residents and businesses that increases to charges will be detrimental to vitality of towns. However, there is no evidence to support this.</i>
13.	Staffing/workload effects	<i>Work will need to be done to change the On-street Parking Order and charge boards</i>
14.	Partnership possibilities identified	<i>Potential for further development of existing refund scheme (currently with the Co-oP and Waitrose) if local business were to consider it beneficial to trade</i>
15.	Details of any further work/consultation required.	<i>Any increases would require careful liaison with the Co-oP and Waitrose to ensure awareness of the increases</i>
16.	Links to other Budget Review items, as part of a re-packaging of services (if any).	<i>Item 3/5</i>
17.	Other Comments	<i>None</i>
18.	Officer Recommendation e.g. implement/do not implement	<i>Select Option for increase to charges</i>

Uttlesford District Council – Budget Review Item Report – Item 2 - Appendix

Uttlesford District Council – Budget Review Item Report – Item 2

Options for increasing Car Park Tariffs from 1 April 2004

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.

Table 1, below, sets out the additional predicted income for each option:-

Predicted Income	Option A £	Option B £	Option C £	Option D £	Option E £
Charges	88,500	65,000	64,000	146,000	22,000 Less one-off costs of £6,000

Table 2, below, sets out the predicted additional income for Season Tickets

Car Park	Suggest Increase £	New Cost £	Predicted Additional Income £
Swan Meadow, Saffron Walden	25	275	3,000
White Street/ Chequers Lane, Dunmow	20	220	

Lower Street/Crafton Green, Stansted Mountfitchet	15	165	(Based on the no. of permits sold 2003/04)
---	----	-----	--

Table 3, below, sets out the new tariffs under each option:-

Saffron Walden	Current Tariffs	Option A	Option B	Option C	Option D
Fairycroft & Common	Up to 1 hr 40p	Up to 1hr 50p	Up to 1 hr 45p	Up to 1 hr 50p	Up to 1hr 60p
	Up to 2 hrs 80p	Up to 2hrs 90p	Up to 2 hrs 90p	Up to 2 hrs 80p	Up to 2hrs 90p
	Up to 3 hrs 1.60	Up to 3hrs 1.70	Up to 3 hrs 1.75	Up to 3 hrs 1.60	Up to 3hrs 1.70
Rose & Crown	Up to 1 hr 40p	Up to 1 hr 50p	Up to 1 hr 45p	Up to 1 hr 50p	Up to 1 hr 60p
	Up to 2 hrs 80p	Max.Stay 2 hrs 90p	Max.Stay 2 hrs 90p	Max.Stay 2 hrs 80p	Max.Stay 2 hrs 90p
Swan Meadow	Up to 1 hr 40p	Up to 1 hr 50p	Up to 1 hr 45p	Up to 1 hr 50p	Up to 1 hr 60p
	Up to 2 hrs 80p	Up to 2 hrs 90p	Up to 2 hrs 90p	Up to 2 hrs 80p	Up to 2 hrs 90p
	Up to 4 hrs 1.40	Up to 4 hrs 1.50	Up to 4 hrs 1.55	Up to 4 hrs 1.40	Up to 4 hrs 1.50
	Up to 6 hrs 2.00	Up to 6 hrs 2.10	Up to 6 hrs 2.20	Up to 6 hrs 2.00	Up to 6 hrs 2.10
	Up to 10 hrs 2.60	Up to 10 hrs 2.70	Up to 10 hrs 2.85	Up to 10 hrs 2.60	Up to 10 hrs 2.70
Coaches	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 5 hrs 2.50
	Up to 10 hrs 5.00	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	£250 per annum Inc. VAT	£275 per annum Inc. VAT	£275 per annum Inc. VAT	£275 per annum Inc. VAT	£275 per annum Inc. VAT

Great Dunmow	Current Tariffs	Option A	Option B	Option C	Option D
White Street, Angel Lane &	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 3 hrs 70p	Up to 3 hrs 80p	Up to 3 hrs 80p	Up to 3 hrs 70p	Up to 3 hrs 80p

Chequers Lane	Up to 5 hrs 1.10	Up to 5 hrs 1.20	Up to 5 hrs 1.25	Up to 5 hrs 1.10	Up to 5 hrs 1.20
	Up to 10 hrs 2.10	Up to 10 hrs 2.20	Up to 10 hrs 2.30	Over 5 hrs 2.10	Over 5 hrs 2.20
Season Tickets	£200 per annum Inc. VAT	£220 per annum Inc. VAT	£220 per annum Inc. VAT	£220 per annum Inc. VAT	£220 per annum Inc. VAT
Stansted Mntficht	Current Tariffs	Option A	Option B	Option C	Option D
Lower Street & Crafton Green	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 3 hrs 70p	Up to 3 hrs 80p	Up to 3 hrs 80p	Up to 3 hrs 70p	Up to 3 hrs 80p
	Up to 6 hrs 1.60	Up to 6 hrs 1.70	Up to 6 hrs 1.75	Up to 6 hrs 1.60	Up to 6 hrs 1.70
	Up to 10 hrs 2.10	Up to 10 hrs 2.20	Up to 10 hrs 2.30	Over 6 hrs 2.10	Over 6 hrs 2.20
Coaches	Per Visit 5.00	Per Visit 5.00	Per Visit 5.00	Per Visit 5.00	Per Visit 5.00
Season Tickets	£150 per annum Inc. VAT	£165 per annum Inc. VAT	£165 per annum Inc. VAT	£165 per annum Inc. VAT	£165 per annum Inc. VAT
	£350 per annum Inc. VAT for non Businesses / Employees (TBC)				

Notes associated with the Options

- 1 Option A would provide a consistent increase in car park charges.
- 2 Option B introduces 5p denominations into the tariffs - these, in the past, have been a cause for public dissatisfaction and inconvenience

- 3 Option C addresses the main criticism from local businesses and traders that the tariffs have not encouraged longer stays in the towns.
- 4 Option D – as Option C above, but higher charges would apply. 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 neighbouring authorities (not including East Herts).
- 5 Option E – this Option could be introduced with any of the above options. It is predicted that there could be an income of up to approximately £22,000, not including VAT, from parking at the Council Offices on Saturdays. This estimated figure is based on an “average” charge of £2.00 per day 250 spaces at full occupancy. There would be a capital cost to be met of £6k for the provision of two car park ticket machines.

This car park could have the same tariff as that of Swan Meadow but, to encourage people to stay longer, Members could amend the existing longer-stay tariff to “Up to 5 hours = £1.60” and “Over 5 hours = £2.70”. The introduction of a Pay & Display car park at the Council Offices could discourage visitors from tracking across the town to use a free car park.

- 6 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.
- 7 Members may wish to consider introducing charges at the Dunmow Council Offices Car Park, which would raise additional income. This could be on the basis of a Season Ticket car park, for which there is currently a waiting list in Great Dunmow.

Uttlesford District Council – Budget Review Item Report – Items 3 & 5

	Details Required	Officer Responses
1.	Committee	Environment & Transport
2.	Review Item Description, background and origins	Decriminalisation – Report this cycle re. Effects <i>Details of budgetary implications will be developed with ECC and subject to a robust Business Plan, which is approved by DETR and an Agency Agreement with ECC which holds ECC liable for the deficit on the on-street parking account.</i>

3.	Potential net budget effect 2004/2005. Please also specify budget items affected e.g. Salaries, Premises costs etc	<p>Growth/Reduction (Delete as appropriate)</p> <p>Net Effect (£) 0</p> <p>Comprising: -</p> <p>One Off Costs 45,000</p> <p>Staffing 70,000</p> <p>Supplies/Admin 31,700</p> <p>Charges <u>-33,400</u></p> <p>Met by ECC 113,300 subject to Agency</p> <p>Agreement</p> <p>Capital set up costs £80,000 initially met by ECC</p>
4.	Does this item provide potential ongoing effects? If so please state the yearly net effect and budget items as in 3 above.	<p>Net Effect (£) 0</p> <p>Comprising: -</p> <p>Staffing 140,000</p> <p>Supplies/Admin 82,900</p> <p>Charges <u>-128,200</u></p> <p>Met by ECC 94,700 subject to Agency</p> <p>Agreement</p>
5.	Details of any legal or contractual necessity to implement this item.	<i>Becomes a legal, contractual agreement once the Agency Agreement is signed.</i>
6.	Relevance of item to Quality of Life Plan	A, F, G
7.	Effects on efficiency e.g. better interdepartmental working	<i>Decriminalisation will streamline the parking systems and provide the public with one enforcing body to deal with</i>
8.	Implementation timescale if approved	October 2004
9.	Major benefits, including effects on the quantity and quality of service	<i>Decriminalisation will streamline the parking systems and provide the public with one enforcing body to deal with</i>
10	Major risks that may prevent the achievement of the Review Item.	<i>The DETR do not accept ECCs application for implementation of Decriminalisation in Uttlesford</i>
11	Likelihood of achievement e.g. certain, possible	Quite Certain

12	Views of Stakeholders (users/customers/Members/staff/others)	<i>All Parish & Town Council's that have responded to consultation have indicated agreement to the introduction of DPE</i>
13	Staffing/workload effects	<i>Staffing levels will have to be increased. The cost of this will be incorporated in the Business Plan</i>
14	Partnership possibilities identified	<i>Investigations are underway to consider partnership opportunities</i>
15	Details of any further work/consultation required.	On going with Town & Parish Councils
16	Links to other Budget Review items, as part of a re-packaging of services (if any).	Item 4
17	Other Comments	None
18	Officer Recommendation e.g. implement/do not implement	Implement subject to confirmation that Essex County Council pay the deficit on the parking account – as per resolution by full Council 14 Oct 2003

Uttlesford District Council – Budget Review Item Report - Item 4

	Details Required	Officer Responses
1.	Committee	Environment & Transport
2.	Review Item Description, background and origins	Resident's Parking Scheme – Continue trend of reducing deficit <i>Members had been concerned that the Scheme was not self-financing and agreed to introduce an increase to the cost of a Resident's Permit from 1 April 2003 from £54 to £70 p.a. It was considered that a further</i>

		<p><i>increase would be appropriate from 1 April 2004 and thereafter until the deficit is significantly reduced.</i></p> <p>However, Members should be aware that although income from the Scheme covers direct costs, the deficit of approximately £13k relates to Internal Management and Capital Charges. To off set this deficit it would necessitate increasing a Resident's Permit to £165 p.a.</p> <p><i>Officers believe that this increase would be untenable. The decision, therefore, given that Members wish to continue the trend of reducing the deficit, is by how much the Resident's Permit should be increased for 2004/05, if at all.</i></p> <p><i>Members need to be aware that upon the implementation of Decriminalisation in October 2004 a substantial proportion of this deficit will become part of the on-street parking account which, in turn, will be the "acceptable deficit" to be met by ECC.</i></p>
3.	Potential net budget effect 2004/2005. Please also specify budget items affected e.g. Salaries, Premises costs etc	<p>Growth/Reduction (Delete as appropriate)</p> <p>Net Effect (£) Comprising: -</p> <p><i>Depends on the level of increase</i></p>
4.	Does this item provide potential ongoing effects? If so please state the yearly net effect and budget items as in 3 above.	<p>Net Effect (£) Comprising: -</p> <p><i>Depends on the level of increase</i></p>
5.	Details of any legal or contractual necessity to implement this item.	<p>This Scheme will be transferred into the On-street parking account form October 2004 under Decriminalisation</p>
6.	Relevance of item to Quality of Life Plan	G

7.	Effects on efficiency e.g. better interdepartmental working	N/A
8.	Implementation timescale if approved	1 April 2004 and annually thereafter
9.	Major benefits, including effects on the quantity and quality of service	<i>Moving towards a breakeven situation for the Scheme</i>
10.	Major risks that may prevent the achievement of the Review Item.	<i>Resident's seek to park elsewhere to avoid purchasing a Permit and bad publicity for the Council</i>
11.	Likelihood of achievement e.g. certain, possible	Certain
12.	Views of Stakeholders (users/customers/Members/staff/others)	<i>Received complaints from residents about the last increase, as it was not perceived as value for money</i>
13.	Staffing/workload effects	None
14.	Partnership possibilities identified	N/A
15.	Details of any further work/consultation required.	<i>Have to go through the process of advertising the On-street Parking Order and the amendments to the Scheme.</i>
16.	Links to other Budget Review items, as part of a re-packaging of services (if any).	Items 3/5
17.	Other Comments	None
18.	Officer Recommendation e.g. implement/do not implement	Do not implement

Uttlesford District Council – Budget Review Item Report - Item 6

	Details Required	Officer Responses
1.	Committee	Environment & Transport

2.	Review Item Description, background and origins	<p>Assisted Travel – <i>Assisted Travel, including National Transport Tokens, is a possible area for extra spending</i></p> <p><i>The Council has a statutory requirement to make ½ Fare Bus Passes available Free of Charge to any resident over 60 years of age and the Registered Disabled. Take up for 2001/02, when the pass had to be paid for, take up was 1,455. Take up for 2002/03 was 1,862. This upward trend is likely continue as this year men over 60 years of age became eligible for the Bus Pass .</i></p> <p>Officers have been advised by MCL, the Contractors that administer the ½ Fare Bus Passes on behalf of Essex, that it will require an additional £15k to fund the increases in the cost and usage of the Bus Pass.</p> <p><i>As an alternative to the Bus Pass, residents of a pensionable age and the Registered Disabled can choose to purchase for £12 one bag of National Transport Tokens (NTT) per annum to the value of £35. These can be used against the cost of journeys by Taxi, Bus or UCT. Take up for 2001/02 was 953 and for 2002/03 was 749 and this downward trend is likely to continue.</i></p> <p>The Council could consider</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ increasing the number of NTTs per bag e.g. £40 worth. Based on last years take up this would required an additional budget of £3,745 ➤ allow residents to purchase more than one bag per year. Based on last years take up this would required a net additional budget of £17,200, or
----	---	---

		<p>➤ reduce the cost of each bag e.g. £10. Based on last years take up this would required an additional budget of £1,500.</p> <p>However, the above figures do not account for any additional take up due to the scheme being more attractive. Officers are concerned that there is increasing evidence of abuse of the NTT scheme. This could be overcome by the scheme only being available to residents meeting certain criteria, e.g. Means testing etc.</p> <p><i>This year the Council allocated £600 to the EDPA as a matched funding element towards its lottery application. The application was unsuccessful and the EDPA is currently redefining its role.</i></p>
3.	Potential net budget effect 2004/2005. Please also specify budget items affected e.g. Salaries, Premises costs etc	<p>Growth/Reduction (Delete as appropriate)</p> <p>Net Effect (£) - £15k + <i>selected item from above list</i></p> <p>Comprising: -</p>
4.	Does this item provide potential ongoing effects? If so please state the yearly net effect and budget items as in 3 above.	<p>Net Effect (£)£15k + <i>selected item from above list</i></p> <p>Comprising: -</p>
5.	Details of any legal or contractual necessity to implement this item.	<i>There a statutory requirement to supply the Half Fare Bus Pass free of charge and, therefore, necessary to increase the budget by £15k to meet costs of provision – see 2. above.</i>
6.	Relevance of item to Quality of Life Plan	A, F, G
7.	Effects on efficiency e.g. better interdepartmental working	N/A
8.	Implementation timescale if approved	1 April 2004

9.	Major benefits, including effects on the quantity and quality of service	Residents can travel for less
10.	Major risks that may prevent the achievement of the Review Item.	<i>Residents can not use the NTTs as transport services are inadequate</i>
11.	Likelihood of achievement e.g. certain, possible	Possible
12.	Views of Stakeholders (users/customers/Members/staff/others)	<i>All concessionary fares offered by the Council are well received as they offer choice</i>
13.	Staffing/workload effects	N/A
14.	Partnership possibilities identified	Already working with ECC
15.	Details of any further work/consultation required.	N/A
16.	Links to other Budget Review items, as part of a re-packaging of services (if any).	None
17.	Other Comments	None
18.	Officer Recommendation e.g. implement/do not implement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase budget by £15k to meet cost and use of Bus Passes • Select Option for National Transport Tokens

Uttlesford District Council – Budget Review Item Report - Item 7

	Details Required	Officer Responses
1.	Committee	Environment & Transport
2.	Review Item Description, background and origins	Road Safety Agency – <i>Agreement to be reviewed</i> <i>The Council currently has a 5 year</i>

		<p><i>Agency Agreement with ECC for the employment of a F/T Road Safety Officer and a P/T Road Safety Assistant to deliver the Road Safety work to meet ECCs Road Safety Strategy.</i></p> <p><i>The costs for the employment of these staff are entirely met by ECC.</i></p> <p><i>Opportunities for negotiation on the detail of the agreement will not be possible until December 2006 (prior to expiry March 2007)</i></p>
3.	Potential net budget effect 2004/2005. Please also specify budget items affected e.g. Salaries, Premises costs etc	<p>Growth/Reduction (Delete as appropriate)</p> <p>Net Effect (£) Comprising: -</p> <p>N/A</p>
4.	Does this item provide potential ongoing effects? If so please state the yearly net effect and budget items as in 3 above.	<p>Net Effect (£) Comprising: -</p> <p style="text-align: right;">N/A</p>
5.	Details of any legal or contractual necessity to implement this item.	<p><i>The Council has an Agency Agreement with ECC for the delivery of the Road Safety Service Required to attain various relevant objectives under the Crime & Disorder Act 1998 and the Uttlesford Community Safety Strategy</i></p>
6.	Relevance of item to Quality of Life Plan	G, H
7.	Effects on efficiency e.g. better interdepartmental working	N/A
8.	Implementation timescale if approved	<p><i>To consider position at end of existing Agency Agreement – December 2006</i></p>
9.	Major benefits, including effects on the quantity and quality of service	N/A
10.	Major risks that may prevent the	N/A

	achievement of the Review Item.	
11.	Likelihood of achievement e.g. certain, possible	N/A
12.	Views of Stakeholders (users/customers/Members/staff/others)	<i>Road Safety Service is of high quality and well received across the district</i>
13.	Staffing/workload effects	N/A
14.	Partnership possibilities identified	<i>Service achieves sponsorship and partner resource allocation for various activities e.g. Motorwise, Crucial Crew</i>
15.	Details of any further work/consultation required.	N/A
16.	Links to other Budget Review items, as part of a re-packaging of services (if any).	N/A
17.	Other Comments	None
18.	Officer Recommendation e.g. implement/do not implement	<i>Do not implement</i>

Uttlesford District Council – Budget Review Item Report – Item 12

	Details Required	Officer Responses
1.	Committee	Environment and Transport
2.	Review Item Description, background and origins	Increase income from green waste sacks/availability.
3.	Potential net budget effect 2004/2005. Please also specify budget items affected e.g. Salaries, Premises costs etc	Growth/Reduction (Delete as appropriate) Net Effect (£) 2,500 extra income by increasing cost from £0.80 to £1.00 per sack.

4.	Does this item provide potential ongoing effects? If so please state the yearly net effect and budget items as in 3 above.	Net Effect (£) As above
5.	Details of any legal or contractual necessity to implement this item.	None
6.	Relevance of item to Quality of Life Plan	Improving access to services and protecting the environment.
7.	Effects on efficiency e.g. better interdepartmental working	N/A
8.	Implementation timescale if approved	April 2004
9.	Major benefits, including effects on the quantity and quality of service	Increased income and availability of sacks.
10.	Major risks that may prevent the achievement of the Review Item.	Public resistance to increased charges.
11.	Likelihood of achievement e.g. certain, possible	Probable
12.	Views of Stakeholders (users/customers/Members/staff/others)	As 10 above.
13.	Staffing/workload effects	None
14.	Partnership possibilities identified	Possibility of more Parish Councils being agents for sale of sacks.
15.	Details of any further work/consultation required.	Letter to all Parish Councils as 14 above.
16.	Links to other Budget Review items, as	None

	part of a re-packaging of services (if any).	
17.	Other Comments	Popular service for those who don't compost or use C.A services.
18.	Officer Recommendation e.g. implement/do not implement	Implement wider availability only.

Uttlesford District Council – Budget Review Item Report – Item 17

	Details Required	Officer Responses
1.	Committee	Environment and Transport
2.	Review Item Description, background and origins	<p>Reinforcement of Energy Efficiency role of the Council.</p> <p><u>The Energy White Paper and the Energy Efficiency Implementation Plan</u></p> <p>Maintaining a forward looking coherent energy policy is a major task for Government. To this end, the Government published on 24 February 2003 the White Paper 'Our Energy Future - Creating A Low Carbon Economy', setting out a long-term strategy for UK Energy Policy</p> <p>The White Paper has four overarching goals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to put ourselves on a path to cut the UK's carbon dioxide emissions - the main contributor to global warming - by some 60% by about 2050, with real progress by 2020; • to maintain the reliability of energy supplies; • to promote competitive markets in the UK and beyond, helping to raise the rate of sustainable economic

		<p>growth and to improve our productivity; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to ensure that every home is adequately and affordably heated. <p>Within the White Paper are over 130 commitments that must be delivered. These have been broken down into 10 overall work streams, which are: Climate Change; Reducing UK Emissions; Energy Efficiency and CHP; Renewables; Social; International Energy Relations; Innovation; Education; Skills and Research; Transport; Security of Supply; and Delivery Partnerships. A lead department with responsibility for delivery has been assigned to each of these workstreams, with Defra leading on the workstreams for Climate Change, Reducing UK Emissions, Energy Efficiency and CHP, and Social including Fuel Poverty.</p> <p>To ensure joined-up Government and efficient delivery of the commitments, a virtual network has been established between departmental policy units, the devolved administrations, regulators and key delivery partners</p> <p><u>Energy Efficiency Implementation Plan</u></p> <p>A major underlying theme of the White Paper is the need for the UK to move towards a low carbon economy. To this end, the Government has accepted the RCEP's recommendation that the UK should put itself on a path to a reduction in carbon dioxide emissions of 60% from current levels by about 2050, with real progress by 2020. The White Paper makes clear that energy efficiency is highly cost-effective and can deliver big carbon savings across the economy. We expect to achieve about half of the extra carbon savings we need by</p>
--	--	---

		<p>2020 through energy efficiency; The strands of policy set out in the White Paper add up to an ambitious strategy for energy efficiency. Within a year of the White Paper's publication, the Government will publish an implementation plan that sets out in further detail how this strategy will be delivered. From then on the Government will report annually, as part of the follow-up to the White Paper, on progress towards achieving the savings set out.</p> <p>In addition to the implementation plan for energy efficiency, the Government will publish a strategy to meet its commitment to achieve 10,000MW of Combined Heat and Power by 2010 - a commitment that is restated in the White Paper. The Government takes the difficulties currently faced by the industry very seriously and will continue to work with them to identify further ways to overcome the problems</p> <p>The Council actively promotes energy efficiency both in its own buildings and those of the community but also in its day to day use of energy, and in educating the public in the efficient use of scarce energy resources. The function is currently lodged in the Building Surveying Service and is carried out by a Senior Building Surveyor in addition to his normal Building Surveying duties ensuring the Building Regulations are met in the District. The role is increasing because of the requirements of the White Paper and assistance is now required in the form of a new post. While the Building Control service is required to be self financing the costs of energy efficiency need to be met from central funds and not from surpluses on the</p>
--	--	--

		Building Control trading account.
3.	Potential net budget effect 2004/2005. Please also specify budget items affected e.g. Salaries, Premises costs etc	Growth. There will be an addition in salary costs Net Effect (£)30,000 Comprising: - salary costs of one post up to PO1-4 including on costs
4.	Does this item provide potential ongoing effects? If so please state the yearly net effect and budget items as in 3 above.	Net Effect (£)30,000 Comprising: - salary costs of one post up to PO1-4 including on-costs
5.	Details of any legal or contractual necessity to implement this item.	Requirements of White Paper. Also Sustainable Energy Bill is expected to receive Royal assent in the next few days. This will place a statutory obligation on LA's to achieve HECA (Home Energy Conservation Act) targets.
6.	Relevance of item to Quality of Life Plan	There is no direct reference to the need to save energy or use renewable sources. However the Council is committed to recycling and it is considered that renewable energy is related to that.
7.	Effects on efficiency e.g. better interdepartmental working	Reduced energy costs for Council premises and for the public at large.
8.	Implementation timescale if approved	From 1 st April 2004
9.	Major benefits, including effects on the quantity and quality of service	The additional post will enable a material improvement in the service offered by the Council as follows: A proactive approach to energy efficiency issues will be possible.
10.	Major risks that may prevent the achievement of the Review Item.	Insufficient resources. Need to ensure Building Control business is efficient and effective will mean that emphasis on energy efficiency will be reduced if there continues to be an upturn in business
11.	Likelihood of achievement e.g. certain,	If funding is available then the

	possible	likelihood of achievement is certain
12.	Views of Stakeholders (users/customers/Members/staff/others)	Energy Efficiency is a strong theme at DC meetings and via Planning Best Value Workshops. It is a requirement for new developments in the emerging Local Plan
13.	Staffing/workload effects	Failure to resource energy efficiency will mean that the service remains at its current level. There is no scope to increase the level of service without compromising the Building Control service, which is a highly efficient and effective fee earning service for the Council
14.	Partnership possibilities identified	Fuel/power companies (funding opportunities). Essex Energy Efficiency Advice Centre.
15.	Details of any further work/consultation required.	None
16.	Links to other Budget Review items, as part of a re-packaging of services (if any).	None
17.	Other Comments	
18.	Officer Recommendation e.g. implement/do not implement	Implement

Uttlesford District Council – Budget Review Item Report – Item 18

	Details Required	Officer Responses
1.	Committee	Environment and Transport
2.	Review Item Description, background and origins	Contribution of £3,000 pa to Essex County Council to continue to providing a planning monitoring service. The County Planning

		<p>department has provided a monitoring service for all the District Councils in Essex for many years. Monitoring is vital to ensure that the policies of the Development Plan are on course, in particular the rate of development of housing, commercial and employment land. The service has been provided gratis up to now but the County Council will shortly lose its statutory planning function and as a consequence is looking at the costs and viability of all its planning services. The County will continue to provide monitoring information for £3,000 per annum. This Council does not have the human or financial resources to carry out this function. It is estimated that as a minimum approximately 0.25fte would be necessary, or approximately £7,500 pa. In the circumstances the offer is reasonable</p>
3.	<p>Potential net budget effect 2004/2005. Please also specify budget items affected e.g. Salaries, Premises costs etc</p>	<p>Growth</p> <p>Net Effect (£) 3,000 Comprising: - contribution to Essex County Council for monitoring planning policy</p>
4.	<p>Does this item provide potential ongoing effects? If so please state the yearly net effect and budget items as in 3 above.</p>	<p>Net Effect (£) 3,000 Comprising: - as above</p>
5.	<p>Details of any legal or contractual necessity to implement this item.</p>	<p>Failure to provide adequate monitoring will mean that the Council will have no idea of the degree of achievement of its planning policies. There is a Government Requirement that the development plan should specify how policies are to be monitored, and performance is checked annually by the District Auditor and the Audit Commission. There are also Best Value performance indicators for the</p>

		percentage of development on brownfield sites
6.	Relevance of item to Quality of Life Plan	The Environment, Peoples Needs and the Economy are all areas where monitoring information will be very relevant
7.	Effects on efficiency e.g. better interdepartmental working	A good partnership arrangement with the County Council.
8.	Implementation timescale if approved	From 1 st April 2004
9.	Major benefits, including effects on the quantity and quality of service	See 1 above
10.	Major risks that may prevent the achievement of the Review Item.	The County Council may abandon all its non-statutory planning functions.
11.	Likelihood of achievement e.g. certain, possible	If all the districts contribute then achievement is certain.
12.	Views of Stakeholders (users/customers/Members/staff/others)	Na
13.	Staffing/workload effects	Implications of not contributing would be that the work would still have to be done and that greater resources would have to be allocated to do it.
14.	Partnership possibilities identified	It is a partnership arrangements. Economies of scale mean that the work can be done at a lower cost than in-house
15.	Details of any further work/consultation required.	None
16.	Links to other Budget Review items, as part of a re-packaging of services (if any).	None
17.	Other Comments	The County Council will be taking a similar approach its landscaping and conservation service, but details are not yet available.
18.	Officer Recommendation e.g. implement/do not implement	Implement

Committee: Environment and Transport
Date: 4 November 2003
Agenda Item No: 7
Title: Stansted M11 Corridor Development Options Study
Author: Roger Harborough (01799) 510457

Summary

- 1 This report recommends a response from the Council to the Draft Final Report of the Study.
- 2 Its key messages are:
 - That the Regional Assembly should stick to its existing commitment and only plan on the basis of the existing runway capacity at Stansted;
 - The report is confusing and largely hypothetical in its comments on development post 2021 and acceptance of new runways;
 - The scale of housing growth in the consultant's preferred strategy to 2021 is unrelated to the local economic driver in the London Stansted Cambridge corridor, namely Stansted Airport, exacerbating unsustainable commuting patterns;
 - It is strongly refuted that there is environmental capacity in Uttlesford for the scale of growth the consultant recommends;
 - The proposals would damage the quality of life in Uttlesford: they fail to achieve all the objectives of the Sustainability Framework for the East of England at the same time;
 - Strategies that seek to locate significant development in a rural area have important implications for infrastructure requirements;
 - The proposed high quality high frequency busways are impractical: the whole strategy of locating development in a corridor through a rural area is therefore underpinned by an unrealistic transport proposal.
 - Decisions as to where housing and employment land should be proposed are for the Local Development Document.

Background

- 3 The initial report of the Study to Council on 14 October outlined the background. The Study, together with the earlier London Stansted Cambridge Sub Region Study and the Harlow Options Study, is one of the inputs to the preparation of new Regional Planning Guidance for the East of England (RPG14), which will include a district by district housing distribution for the region to 2021 and a statement of sub regional spatial strategy.

RPG14 and the sub regional strategy within it are being prepared on the basis of full use of the existing runway at Stansted in 2021.

- 4 The consultants were also asked by the commissioning organisations to identify the increase in jobs and housing associated with further growth in passenger throughput at Stansted if that were to occur by 2021, and beyond 2021 to 2036. The brief required a recommended spatial strategy to accommodate all growth, that which would occur anyway by 2036 without airport development and that arising as a consequence of airport expansion. Finally it required a comprehensive assessment of the impacts.
- 5 The Draft Final Report comments:

“The regional planning process needs to be guided by an understanding, informed by stakeholder views, of the possible consequences of various scales and distribution patterns of new development.”
- 6 The new draft Regional Planning Guidance is being prepared in parallel with stakeholder consultation on the Study because of the programme required by the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister. The Final Report of the Study including the report of stakeholder views will be considered along with the draft sub regional strategy at the meeting of the Regional Planning Panel on 21 November. There will be a limited opportunity for further stakeholder input in November/ December prior to the Regional Planning Panel considering Draft Regional Planning Guidance in January and the Regional Assembly approving it for deposit in February. The Government Office for the East of England will then arrange for formal public consultation in Spring 2004 and a Public Examination in Autumn 2004.

Study Terms of Reference

- 7 The study terms of reference are:
 - i. To identify the increase in jobs and housing, and where possible other land uses, associated with growth in passenger throughput at Stansted;
 - ii. To recommend a spatial development strategy to accommodate all growth, i.e. that arising as a consequence of the growth of Stansted plus growth that is anticipated to occur anyway; and,
 - iii. To assess the impacts of the development strategy on land use and development, population and social infrastructure, the urban and rural environment and transport in the areas around the airport.
- 8 The terms of reference are problematic. They evidently assumed that the baseline scenario for the growth anticipated to occur anyway without any airport development would not require any radical shift in policy approach and could be accommodated through urban capacity and incremental growth, and the more significant challenge would be posed by the implications of Stansted growth. However, the economic modelling work suggested that the economic

buoyancy of the area without airport growth would imply significant in migration into the area with housing demand consequences. The consultant's assessment is that 49,750 dwellings would be required in the study core area by 2021 without further runway development, of which over 28,000 have already been allocated in development plans or are assumed in urban capacity studies, leaving 21,500 to be distributed in a new spatial development strategy. This scale of development would be needed by 2021, on the basis of the economic modelling, whether the airport throughput is 25 mppa or 40 mppa.

- 9 The consultant's recommended spatial strategy for this scale of development by 2021 will be considered in preparing the sub regional strategy within RPG14. This was one of the reasons for commissioning the Study.
- 10 The Study has then gone on to look at the implications of a number of "what if" scenarios for Stansted Airport. The purpose of this aspect of the Study is not clear. It runs the significant risk of at least appearing to be planning for new runways. The Study may be used by the Government in this way. It is absolutely imperative that in preparing RPG14 and the sub regional strategy, EERA only plans on the basis of the existing runway capacity at Stansted, as it has previously agreed with Minister of State in the ODPM, Lord Rooker.
- 11 It has emerged since the publication of the draft final report that the consultant has been asked to do more "sensitivity testing" by the steering group. This testing involves changes to the assumptions in the economic modelling. These changes are: adopting the Regional Economic Strategy enhanced activity forecasts (in other words there will be more jobs in the area because these will be needed in addition to higher productivity to achieve a more prosperous region in terms of the EU regional hierarchy), revisiting the assumed split of some airport related jobs between the core and outer study areas (50:50 instead of 30:70), a lower level of displacement of existing jobs (competition for labour results in some existing jobs disappearing) and a continuing high level of net out commuting flow from the core area rather than some commuter drawback. This work has not yet been completed but it is expected to show substantial in-migration and additional housing requirements. **The request is understood to stem from GO East's concerns that the scale of housing in the baseline scenario does not reflect the Communities Plan aspirations for a step change in the rate of housing supply in the Growth Areas. It is becoming increasingly obvious that this is becoming a housing numbers exercise unrelated to the capacity of the area.**
- 12 The work explores, however, the scale of employment changes that would need to take place if delivering that step change in new housing supply were not to result in a worsening of commuting flows and acute strain, particularly on the West Anglia line and strategic road network. The risks are becoming clearer.

The consultant's Preferred Strategy for 2021 with no new runways

- 13 The consultant's recommended strategy for the period to 2021 without any new runway, on the basis of its preferred economic assumptions, is that development is mainly concentrated around Harlow (11,800 homes), Bishop's Stortford (2,000 homes) and Stansted Mountfitchet (4,000 homes) with 800 dwellings in the Dunmow area and 500 each at Loughton, Waltham Abbey and Braintree. The strategy also features significant employment land releases at Harlow in particular and at the latter three locations. New development would need high quality bus corridors from Epping to Stansted and Braintree to Bishop's Stortford and substantial investment in public transport infrastructure and a new south west bypass for the Harlow area.
- 14 If the assumptions in the sensitivity testing as set out in paragraph 11 above were to be accepted as the basis for the sub regional strategy, a very significant number of additional dwellings would need to be accommodated in the six core districts of the study area. The assessment seems to show that Harlow is unlikely to be able to accommodate additional growth over and above that proposed in the consultant's preferred strategy. Consequently, any additional growth would involve either further expansion of other settlements in the north-south/ east-west corridors or development of a new settlement plus expansion of existing settlements.

Comment on the Consultant's recommended spatial strategy

- 15 It is strongly refuted that there is environmental capacity for the scale of development the consultant recommends in Uttlesford by 2021.
- 16 Its baseline preferred strategy puts 3,000 homes between Stansted and Birchanger. The consultant's methodology fails to attach due weight the importance of retaining the separate identity of existing settlements. It would seriously undermine the objective of maintaining Stansted as an airport in the countryside and would result in visual coalescence of Bishop's Stortford and the airport. Substantial new landscape planting would be required to accommodate such development, the consultant acknowledges.
- 17 The consultant's baseline strategy also puts 1,200 dwellings on the north east of Stansted. This is extremely attractive valued countryside with woodlands and mature hedgerows.
- 18 In the Dunmow area, the consultant's preferred baseline strategy seems to put 800 homes at Barnston "adjoining the non vegetated urban edge". This is a curious proposal. It is remote from the town centre facilities and off the line of the Braintree Stansted rapid transit quality bus link the consultant recommends. A strengthened landscape framework is required.
- 19 The existing Great Dunmow town centre Conservation Area does not have capacity to serve development on any substantial scale.
- 20 It is notable that the consultant recommends that all of the schemes would involve actually creating a new or reinforced landscape structure to contain

the new development. In other words, the capacity needs to be created. It does not exist.

- 21 Whilst the consultant describes the sustainability scores for these locations as “good”, many of the elements are scored negative or neutral and the overall totals hardly reach the positive spectrum. They are well below the optimum sustainability score.
- 22 The consultant has assumed that an overall housing density of 40 dwellings per hectare would be achievable.
- 23 An essential element of the consultant’s spatial strategy is that the transport strategy to serve new residential and employment development would need to be integrated with that required to handle the movement of passengers to and from Stansted. Clearly there is an inter relationship. On the West Anglia line there are severe capacity limitations and the use of the existing resource needs to be maximised and existing capacity enhanced if air passenger rail mode share is to be maintained and the level of service to other rail users is not to be compromised. However, there are tensions that are inherently difficult to resolve. Most air passengers want fast limited stop services to London. This results in a relatively poor service between Harlow, Bishops Stratford and Stansted Airport and, coupled with poor accessibility of the stations, low levels of rail use for journeys from Bishops Stortford and Harlow to work at the airport. The high quality rapid transit bus corridors from Epping to Stansted and Braintree to Bishop’s Stortford are accordingly an important element in the consultant’s schemes. Without such provision the spatial strategy would give rise to an unacceptably high proportion of development-generated trips by car. The consultant envisages a high frequency bus based system with few intermediate stops and bus priority measures so that an express service can be offered. However, the routes indicated are not the most direct. The Epping – Stansted Airport route loops through Stansted Mountfitchet. It is understood that the proposals to use the old A120 as a bus priority route is regarded as impractical by Essex CC highways and transportation officers. The old railway track identified by the consultant as a possible bus route beyond 2021 is now a valued recreation asset. It has been turned into a linear park. The proposal that the bus links could serve two markets: i) development generated trips and ii) air passengers from remote park and ride sites, seems particularly problematic. It is unlikely that air passengers would find remote parking at M11 J7 attractive if they then had to take a bus route through Harlow, Sawbridgeworth, round the Bishop’s Stortford bypass through Stansted Mountfitchet to reach the airport terminal. Without the air passengers, would a high frequency service be viable? The whole strategy of locating development in a corridor through a rural area is therefore underpinned by a potentially unrealistic transport proposal.
- 24 When RPG9 first identified the London Stansted Cambridge sub region as a potential growth area, it was on the basis of the major economic regeneration potential of the London Boroughs in the East London/ Lower Lea Valley PAER, the local economic dynamism of Cambridge, the Harlow PAER and London Stansted Airport. Job growth at Stansted to 2021 with no new

runways, even assuming low job displacement and 50:50 dispersal of indirect and attracted jobs between the core and outer areas, is extremely modest. The scale of housing in Uttlesford is totally disproportionate to job growth at the airport. It does not relate to any of the other factors identified underpinning the Growth Area concept.

- 25 The preferred strategies for multi runway scenarios by 2021 and all strategies beyond 2021 to 2036 are regarded as highly hypothetical and it is not appropriate to attach too much weight to them. However, the scale of impact on the countryside reinforces the Council's case for opposition to new runways at Stansted. The sites involved in the consultant's preferred strategy to 2036, or a 2021 scenario for additional levels of housing, are, the consultant acknowledges, fundamentally unsuitable for large scale development without landscape change.
- 27 Strategies that seek to locate significant development in a rural area have important implications for infrastructure requirements: the social infrastructure does not exist, the area will remain remote from hospital services, water and sewerage issues would be complex, costly and take time to resolve, and electrical supply networks would need strengthening.
- 28 It will be apparent that there is considerable uncertainty about the scale of development in Uttlesford that may be specified and what spatial strategy would be most appropriate to accommodate a particular level. Members will need to form a judgement about how best to address this issue. Planning Policy Guidance Note 11 on Regional Planning gives guidance about the preparation of RPG. It recognises that in some regions or parts of regions it will be appropriate for RPG to contain sub regional strategies. It makes it clear, however, that "their purpose is not to move local decisions to the regional tier". "RPG should avoid identifying specific sites as suitable for development." It will need to establish "the locational criteria appropriate to regionally or sub regionally significant housing, business and other uses". The broad location of such sites may be identified. This may be defined as an area of search. Supplementary guidance on Regional Spatial Strategies says that "sub regional planning will be critical to the delivery of the strategy set out in Sustainable Communities: building for the future in respect of planning for the growth areas." It repeats the guidance that sub regional strategies should specify the broad locations for development of regional or sub regional significance, and in any event establish sub regional locational criteria. It is of considerable concern that the Stansted/M11 study goes well beyond assessment of broad locations. The Government's emphasis on early delivery may lead it to try and shape the spatial strategy on the basis of the material available to it: EERA's draft, the consultant's reports, and responses to consultation. If the sub regional strategy were too specific, it would constrain the options available to the Council in preparing its Local Development Document. Decisions on where development should take place within an area of search must be for the Local Development Document. Ideas about the right strategy for Uttlesford are less well advanced than ideas for the Harlow area. There will be further opportunities to engage in the process in November/ December, and in response to the deposit draft regional strategy.

RECOMMENDED that

The consultant and the East of England Regional Assembly be advised that:

- The consultation period on the study report was too short and the amount of information available was too limited. The District Council has involved the local community in preparing this response.
- It is absolutely imperative that in preparing RPG14 and the sub regional strategy for the period to 2021, EERA only plans on the basis of the existing runway capacity at Stansted, as it has previously agreed with Minister of State in the ODPM, Lord Rooker.
- No significance should be attached to the consultant's ideas for the new runway scenarios and the longer term to 2036. The report is confusing and largely hypothetical in its comments on development post 2021 and acceptance of new runways;
- The scale of housing growth in Uttlesford is unrelated to the local economic driver in the London Stansted Cambridge corridor, namely the airport.
- The scale of housing growth in Uttlesford ought to be on a scale that is compatible with achieving a reduction in the net flow of out commuting from the Stansted/M11 corridor sub region core area.
- It is strongly refuted that there is environmental capacity for the scale of development the consultant recommends in Uttlesford by 2021. Such development would be in the wrong location in terms of the rural White Paper and its commitments to protect what makes rural England special. If implemented, the strategy would result in significant urbanisation of valued countryside.
- Insufficient weight has been attached to the importance of retaining the separate identity of existing settlements.
- The recommended spatial strategy would seriously undermine the objective of maintaining Stansted as an airport in the countryside and would result in visual coalescence of Bishop's Stortford and the airport.
- All of the schemes would involve actually creating a new or reinforced landscape structure to contain the new development. In other words, the capacity needs to be created. It does not exist.
- The assumed density of development at 40 dwellings per hectare is high for the rural locations in the consultant's strategy.
- Concentrating development in Uttlesford in locations with good access to West Anglia rail stations will tend to increase rail commuting to London. Whilst this will also occur with development at Harlow, regeneration is the priority. Adding additional rail commuting from Uttlesford stations must be avoided. It would exacerbate passenger loadings in excess of capacity down the line to London.
- The high frequency bus rapid transit proposals look impractical to the extent that i) they seek to address both the needs of air passengers from remote park and ride sites and trips generated by new homes and jobs; and ii) they require dedicated road space on the old A120 and elsewhere.

The whole strategy of locating development in a corridor through a rural area is therefore underpinned by an unrealistic transport proposal.

- There is not the supporting infrastructure in a rural area for development on this scale. It would need new primary and secondary school capacity and primary health care facilities. The socio economic demography of Uttlesford would be changed by large scale housing with implications for health needs. Electrical supply networks would need strengthening.
- The scale of growth in the six core districts in one of driest parts of the UK where there is no additional water supply available is a major issue. Importing water would have significant energy use implications. Sites in Uttlesford are at the heads of river catchment areas, requiring outflow from sewage treatment works into rivers to be high quality. This would be expensive.
- The proposals would damage the quality of life in Uttlesford: they fail to achieve all the objectives of the Sustainability Framework for the East of England at the same time;
- Decisions as to where housing and employment land should be proposed are for the Local Development Document. The Sub Regional Strategy should not be more specific than indicating the level of development in the district, locational criteria and a broad area of search for sub regionally significant development.

Background Papers:

- i) Stansted/ M11 Corridor Development Options Draft Final Report, Colin Buchanan and Partners together with Bone Wells Associates and Wardell Armstrong.
- ii) Key Issues Report.

Committee: Environment and Transport
Date: 4 November 2003
Agenda Item No: 8
Title: Kitchen Waste Recycling Trial
Author: Richard Secker (01799) 510580
Ron Pridham (01799) 510597

Summary

- 1 This report gives a progress report on the kitchen waste recycling scheme and recommends a further review in January 2004.

Background

- 2 Members will be aware that this Council was successful in 2002/03 with a bid to the Essex EnTrust for funding to undertake a trial to separate and recycle kitchen waste for composting. In that year £45,000 was received to run the trial from April 2003 for a minimum of one year. Uttlesford's contribution was the availability of a new split bodied refuse vehicle and some extra labour costs.
- 3 The trial started on time initially covering three collection areas and later extended to a fourth. Householders received small lidded plastic bins and biodegradable liners which are placed out on collection day. Other than some early problems with the greater liquid content, the scheme was generally accepted by the public and produced three to four tonnes of kitchen waste each week.

Financial

- 4 The scheme was introduced using the Materials Recycling Facility at Haverhill and with final treatment at Cambridge using in-vessel composting technology. It was always anticipated that an in-vessel system would be provided in Essex by the waste disposal authority (ECC) for direct vehicle discharge and greatly reduced costs to Uttlesford.
- 5 This summer the authorisation for the Cambridge plant and all other in-vessel systems handling food wastes was withdrawn by the Environment Agency following the DEFRA foot and mouth inquiries until new standards are met by the processors. Works are in progress at Cambridge and they now anticipate relicensing by January 2004.
- 6 To bridge what had initially been expected to be a small interval, arrangements were made for a waste food processor to treat the trial

collection material. This was at a cost of some £250 tonne instead of the £50 tonne previously paid.

- 7 The budget for 2003/04 revised and 2004/05 have now been prepared on the basis of the Cambridge site being available in early 2004. However, this does mean a revised disposal cost for 2003/04 of approximately £60,000, reducing to £20,000 for 2004/05.
- 8 The trial was for a period of at least one year to avoid the repayment of the EnTrust money. However, costs above £20,000 a year for disposal are clearly not sustainable and a decision on ending the trial scheme at the end of March 2004 may be required.

RECOMMENDED that the continuation of the kitchen waste composting scheme be reviewed at the next Environment and Transport Committee in January 2004.

Committee: Environment & Transport
Date: 4 November 2003
Agenda Item No: 9
Title: GM-Free Uttlesford
Author: Sarah Nicholas (01799) 510454

Summary

- 1 Saffron Walden and District Friends of the Earth (FoE) are asking Uttlesford Council to give full consideration to the proposal to declare Uttlesford GM-free and specifically to adopt the following policies
 - To ensure that no GM crops are grown on land over which it has control;
 - To adopt a GM-free policy for all goods and services for which the Council is responsible;
 - To urge Essex County Council to adopt a similar policy for goods and services for which it is responsible, particularly school meals and social services catering.
 - To request the Secretary of State for Agriculture and the European Commission to provide legal protection for this district from specific GM crops in line with article 19 of the Deliberate Release Directive (Directive 2001/18/EC).
- 2 This report considers the implications of each of these requests and recommends that the Council recognise the public's concerns and makes itself aware of applications to market GM crops which could be grown in Uttlesford.

Background

- 3 In July 2003 the Council hosted a public debate on GM foods. There was an overall concern over the lack of any investigation into possible effects on human health and the fact that once GM crops are introduced into the UK GM contamination will eventually prejudice non GM farming, especially organic farms, and this change would be irreversible.
- 4 At the same time there was recognition that there could be a place for future GM speciality crops that really did offer a special advantage, and which could possibly be grown in contained conditions on our small island.

Comment

- 5 Ensure that no GM crops are grown on land over which it has control
The Council owns only a small parcel of farmland at Ashdon, which is part of a larger land holding owned by the farmer.
- 6 Adopt a GM-free policy for all goods and services for which the council is responsible
The Council does not operate many services that this would affect, mainly the Day Centres. Otherwise it would relate to catering supplied internally and by external caterers to the Council's offices.
- 7 Urge Essex County Council to adopt a similar policy for goods and services for which it is responsible, particularly school meals and social services catering.
For the County Council to adopt this policy would have a greater impact than Uttlesford.

Request the Secretary of State for Agriculture and the European Commission to provide legal protection for this District from specific GM crops in line with article 19 of the Deliberate Release Directive (Directive 2001/18/EC).

- 8 The background to this request is that if a biotech company wants to market a GM crop in the EU, it needs to obtain a Part C (marketing) consent under the Deliberate Release Directive. Once consent is granted, that GM crop can then be marketed across the EU without further restriction or local consultation. Conditions must be attached to the granting of a Part C consent. One condition that can be imposed relates to the geographical area where the GM crop can be grown. This is specifically provided for in Article 19 of the Directive. Any Part C consent for a GM crop must specify conditions for the protection of a particular ecosystem/environments and/or geographical areas. FoE have interpreted this as meaning, for example, a part C consent could be granted allowing a GM crop to be grown throughout the EU except, for example, for a specified geographical area.

- 9 When a part C consent is applied for there is a specific consultation period provided by the Directive. Therefore for each prospective Part C consent which is relevant to our area (ie likely to be grown here) the Council would need to write to Secretary of State for Agriculture asking her to seek a geographical area exemption from the EC; respond to the Commission via the Joint Research Council Website and write directly to the Commission.
- 10 The case for seeking a geographical area exemption for a crop is likely to be strongest where the reasons for seeking the exemption are scientifically based, environment/human health related and especially where they reflect the specific character or concerns of an area.
- 11 Some examples of the types of specifically local concerns identified by FoE include
- The amount of land under organic management
 - The number and size of designated wildlife habitats
 - The number of bee keepers
 - The presence of wild relatives of GM crops
 - The number of food businesses engaged in local and added value food production
 - The terms of any local sustainability or community plans and the objectives of any local biodiversity action plan
 - The numbers of farmers who produce their own farm-saved seeds
 - Any Sites of Special Scientific Interest or other specially protected areas
 - The value of the area's natural environment and organic agriculture to the local tourist industry
 - Presence of rare species in any habitat
 - Number and length of quality water courses
 - Extent of use of ground water

Conclusion

- 12 Friends of the Earth are asking local authorities across the country to make a resolution that, as far as is possible, their administrative area be kept free of GM crops and GM food and feed.
- 13 Prevention of GM crops on Council land and adopting a GM free policy for its goods and services would have minimal impact but would need to be undertaken should the Council decide to whole heartedly embrace a GM-Free Uttlesford. Successful lobbying of Essex County Council would have greater impact in these areas.
- 14 In February 2003, the Department of the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) published a briefing on Article 19. It states that to be consistent with the Directive any such request (to include a condition excluding a geographical area) could only be considered if **sound scientific evidence** (their emphasis) was put forward to demonstrate that the GM produce in

question posed a particular risk to the area in question. In practice, the close environmental/ecological proximity of different parts of the UK and Northern Europe makes it likely that a risk posed in one territory would be a risk posed to the other areas too – and this would make it very unlikely that EU members would agree to a Part C consent being granted.

- 15 In other words the case for a 'geographical area' exemption would only be strong enough in instances where the crop would be banned anyway.
- 16 A few local authorities have already voted to go GM-Free but no relevant Part C consents have been applied for to see how the EC are considering the environmental cases. However there are 23 applications in the pipeline for Part C consent, 19 of which are for crops which could be grown in the District. All are awaiting the lifting of the present EU moratorium on the commercial growing of GM crops in the EU.
- 17 If Members decided to undertake the resolution there will be significant implications on the Council's resources. For the Council to respond to Part C (marketing) applications it would need to be continually aware of each application and be aware if it were relevant to Uttlesford. The Council would need to be ready to make its environmental case within the 30 day comment period. The environmental case would need to be scientifically robust and would require significant research and scientific knowledge not currently held by Council officers. Friends of the Earth are however intending to assist local authorities and are in the process of producing guidance and information. Copy of the publication is awaited.
- 18 Government policy in relation to the commercial growing of GM crops is awaited.

RECOMMENDED

1. That the Council recognise the continuing public and scientific debate and disquiet about the desirability of and safety of GM food.
2. That the Council determines its policy in relation to GM food and crops within the district.

Background Papers:

Letters to Cllr Thawley, Chairman of Environment & Transport Committee, from Saffron Walden and District Friends of the Earth dated 5 August and 5 September 2003.

Letter from Friends of the Earth's Legal Team. Article 19 Legal Advice. February 2003.

DEFRA briefing note. Control of GM products in the EU, and the possibility of "GM-free" zones under Article 19 of Directive 2001/18/EC. 21 February 2003.

Committee: Environment & Transport
Date: 4 November 2003
Agenda Item No: 10
Title: Saffron Walden Town Centre Management Scheme
Author: Sarah Nicholas (01799) 510454

Summary

- 1 The purpose of this report is review the parking regulations for Market Place Saffron Walden and its approach roads and in particular to consider the results of a questionnaire sent to residents and businesses.

Background

- 2 In June 1999 new parking regulations were introduced in Saffron Walden Town Centre. They covered the one-way system in Market Place; a restricted parking zone for Market Hill, Market Place, Market Street, Market Row, Market Walk, Butchers Row, Cross Street and King Street; Tuesday Market Day closure and modifications of the existing Saturday Market Day Order.
- 3 Members were concerned about impact of the regulations on those visiting and working within the town centre. Members therefore agreed that the regulations be monitored.
- 4 In reviewing the regulations and, before deciding if any changes are necessary, Members decided to consult members of the public and businesses who live and work in and around Saffron Walden.
- 5 In November 2002 a questionnaire was sent to all residents in Saffron Walden and immediate parishes and to business in the Town Centre asking a series of questions about when, why and how they visited the town centre and their views on aspects of the traffic management.

Questionnaire Replies

- 6 The questionnaire was primarily concerned with the area covered by the restricted parking zone described in paragraph 2 above. The replies to key questions are set out in the following table.

Question	Residents	Businesses
	<i>3524 replies</i>	<i>60 replies</i>
Should more parking spaces be provided in the area? If Yes - where?	24% Yes 76% No Of those who made suggestions 21% suggested King Street 29% Suggested Market Place/Street/Hill 7% suggested elsewhere within area	50% yes 47% no Of those who made suggestions 40% suggested King Street, Market Place and Market Street.
Closure of Market Square	66% Stay the same 24% more days 5% fewer days or never	78% stay the same 7% more days 15% fewer days or never
One Way System round Market Place	89% agreed to a one way system 57% remain anti-clockwise 26% clockwise	88% agreed to a one way system 63% remain anti-clockwise 22% clockwise
Blue/Orange badge holders		
Difficulty Parking on Non Market Days	70% often/sometimes 15% always 15% never	
Difficulty Parking on Market days	90% Often/sometimes 10% never	
Are disabled bays in the best location	75% yes 25% no	
Use of loading bays		72% used the loading bays
How often do you receive deliveries?		55% Daily 30% Weekly 15% less frequently
Should more loading bays be provided?		70% no 23% yes
Should fewer loading bays be provided?		75% no 12% yes
Should delivery times be restricted?		80% no 17% yes

7 The areas of concern raised by Members after the regulations were introduced were on street parking, traffic circulation, pedestrianisation and loading/unloading. The findings of the survey for each of these areas are discussed below.

On Street Parking

8 Within the restricted zone short stay parking areas are identified in the Market Place. Parking is limited to 30 mins between 8am and 6pm Monday to Saturday. Elsewhere there is no parking at any time Monday – Saturday

between 10am and 5pm. Parking can occur outside these hours even in the loading bays.

- 9 Three quarters of the residents did not consider that more parking should be provided in the area. Businesses were evenly split on this issue.
- 10 However the questionnaire results have identified a parking problem for blue badge holders. Reserved parking bays for badge holders are only available in King Street, which is not accessible after the road is closed on market days

Traffic Circulation

- 11 The regulations introduced a one-way system, anticlockwise around the Market Place, with the aim of helping lorries turn from the Market Place into Market Street without having to drive all around the square.
- 12 The results have shown that the majority of people are happy with the one-way system.

Pedestrianisation

- 13 The results have shown that the majority of people are happy with the existing closure of the market place on market days.

Loading and Unloading.

- 14 The current regulations identify loading bays for heavy and light goods vehicles in King Street, Market Hill, Market Place, and Market Row for use on Monday to Saturday between 10am to 5pm. Outside these hours other vehicles can use the loading bays and the remaining areas are available for loading and unloading
- 15 The questionnaire results have shown that the loading bays are well used and that there is the right number of bays. However there was a high level of feeling that delivery times should not be restricted

Comment

- 16 The questionnaire has highlighted two problem areas – parking for blue badge holders and loading/unloading times.
- 17 There is potential to reserve one or two bays in the market square in front of the library for blue badge holders. This would not however overcome the problem of access on market days. Reserving Disabled Bays in Market Street, which is not affected by the closure, would displace the taxi rank.
- 18 With regards to loading and unloading times, it is considered that the current regulations maximize the limited space available by reserving space for lorries at peak times, and allowing other vehicles to use the bays outside the core times. If the restriction was lifted so the bays could only be used for loading/unloading throughout the whole day this would be an inefficient use of limited space. A concern that has been raised in the past is that many businesses make deliveries in private vehicles which cannot use the loading bays between 10.00 and 5.00.

- 19 It is therefore proposed to discuss the issues raised with representatives of District, Town and Parish Councils, Uttlesford Access Group and ECC officers. The purpose of the meeting would be to consider means to enable greater and easier parking in the town centre by disabled drivers and to discuss the potential for more flexible use of the loading/unloading bays.
- 20 Essex County Council is currently in the process of consolidating its traffic regulations prior to decriminalization. Any changes to the traffic order could not therefore take place until after decriminalization in late 2004.

RECOMMENDED

- (i) That a meeting of District, Town and Parish Council Members, ECC Highways and Access Group be convened to consider the issues of parking for the disabled and loading/unloading within the town centre to identify the best way forward.
- (ii) That a further report be made to the next meeting of this Committee.

Background Papers: Saffron Walden Town Centre Management Scheme questionnaire results.