

TO: PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

ON: 22 MARCH 2001

Agenda Item No: 4

**Title: MATTER REFERRED FROM DEVELOPMENT CONTROL
SUB-COMMITTEE
PROPOSED EXTENSION TO EXISTING WAREHOUSE AT
OLD MEAD ROAD, HENHAM/ELSENHAM –
UTT/1775/00.FUL**

Author: John Grayson (01799) 510455

Introduction

- 1 This report refers to a planning application which Members of the Sub-Committee have referred to this Committee for decision. It relates to a departure from the District Plan which the Sub-Committee recommend be approved.

Background

- 2 A copy of the Officers' report to the Sub-Committee meeting on 26 February 2001 is attached.

RECOMMENDED that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions listed in the report.

Background Papers: planning application file no. UTT/1775/00/FUL

UTT/1775/00/FUL - HENHAM/ELSENHAM

Extension to existing warehouse.
Old Mead Road. GR: 535-271. Willis Gambier Ltd.
Case Officer: Beverly Smith on (01799) 510464
Expiry Date: 14 February

NOTATION: Outside Development Limits

DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND PROPOSAL: This site is located just to the north of Elsenham close to the level crossing and rail passengers' car park at the southern end of Old Mead Road.

The proposal is to erect a 1160 sqm extension on the southern side of the recently extended warehouse. The extension would measure 60m x 19m and be in line with the existing depot.

APPLICANT'S CASE: See letter dated 15 December 2001 attached at end of Schedule.

RELEVANT HISTORY: Warehouse granted in 1989 and 1990 (lapsed in 1995) and change of use of agricultural land to car park granted in 1989. Use of land (for storage of goods associated with the existing depot granted in 1989 and renewed in 1994 (lapsed in 1999). Warehouse (2300 sq.m.) (Class B8), hardstanding, associated car parking and access improvements approved in 1999 (now implemented).

CONSULTATIONS: Environment Agency: Advisory comments only.

ECC Transportation: No objections.

Railtrack: To be reported (due 15 February).

Environmental Services: To be reported (due 15 February).

PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS: Henham: Concerned at impact on already problematical drainage system. Screening required to the southern boundary.

Elsenham: To be reported (due 15 February).

REPRESENTATIONS: One representation received. Notification period expired 31 January.

Since the extension the flooding has increased, obviously due to the excess of surface water from the extension. The water can be seen gushing from a four inch pipe into an already overloaded ditch. If permission is granted for yet further growth the flooding situation will be exacerbated. Urge investigation to this problem before granting approval.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

The main issue is whether there are any material considerations which justify the granting of planning permission as an exception to Policy S2.

The site is outside developments limits and the proposal does not relate to agriculture or outdoor recreation and therefore is strictly contrary to Policy S2. Being an extension rather than a freestanding building, it would not be visible from the north, because it would be hidden by the recently constructed extension and from the south it would also have a similar appearance to the new extension. Although it would not be dominant from the street due to it being set well into the site, it would be visible from the British Rail car park which is used by the general public. The proposal would still enable a 5m strip to be retained at both the southern and eastern sides to enable the previously approved planting scheme to be implemented.

The applicant's anticipate that 2 extra people would be employed and one additional 7.5 ton lorry would visit the site per day. It is considered that the previously approved hardstanding and car parking area would be sufficient to meet the company's needs. In light of the applicant's case and the extension being siting on land which is presently viewed as an infill gap, it would be difficult to demonstrate the harm to the surrounding countryside.

The views of the Parish Council are appreciated, but the Environment Agency consider that correction to the recently constructed drainage system would be satisfactory.

CONCLUSIONS: The development can be justified as a departure from Development Plan policy in view of the special circumstances of the applicant's case and the location of the extension.

RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS TO P & D COMMITTEE

1. C.2.1. Time limit for commencement of development and reason.
2. C.3.1. To be implemented in accordance with approved plans and reason.
3. Use of the extension to be ancillary to the existing building.
4. Use for Class B8 purposes only.
5. C.4.1. Scheme of landscaping to be submitted and agreed.
6. C.4.2. Implementation of landscaping.
7. Drainage requirements.

Agenda Item No: 5

**Title: Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan Review
Consultation on Key Issues**

Author: Roger Harborough (01799) 510457

Summary

- 1 This report recommends that the Council respond to the consultation by emphasising that the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan should make adequate provision for housing within Cambridgeshire to meet the needs of the sub region. The Structure Plan should strongly adhere to the sequential approach to housing that RPG advises and provide for a Cambridge Centred option. It should not assume any contribution to the sub region's needs from Saffron Walden.

Background

- 2 Regional Planning Guidance for East Anglia (RPG6) published in November 2000 sets out a planning framework for the Cambridge Sub Region. Its vision for the sub region includes allowing it to develop further as a world leader in research and technology based industries and the fields of higher education and research; fostering the dynamism, prosperity and further expansion of the research and technology based economy; protecting and enhancing the historic character and setting of Cambridge and the important environmental qualities of the surrounding area; providing a more sustainable balance between rates of growth in jobs and housing; allowing the sub region to accommodate a higher proportion of the region's housing development; and promoting a more sustainable and spatially concentrated pattern of locations for development and more sustainable transport patterns. It sets out annual housing targets for Cambridgeshire and Suffolk and requires that 2,800 of Cambridgeshire's 4,000 dwelling annual county target should be within the Cambridge Sub Region. It also provides an order of preference for the location of new housing:

- within the built up area of Cambridge
- on the periphery of the city
- in a new settlement close to Cambridge
- within the built up area of market towns, larger villages and previously established new settlements
- by extensions to market towns, larger villages and previously established new settlements.

- 3 RPG6 required a series of linked sub regional studies to inform the review of development plans. The report has now been published. It concludes that, to meet a target of 63,500 dwellings within the sub region between 1996 and 2016, the scale of development for which strategic options need to be identified is 22,000 dwellings. The report identifies four options:

Option 1 – the “Cambridge centred strong RPG sequence option,” which places the largest amount of residual growth in Cambridge and the inner Green Belt;

Option 2 – The “Mixed Strategy (criteria based)” option, which places growth in all the RPG settlement categories according to the outcome of capacity criteria tests; and

Options 3 and 3A – the “Urban/Corridor/High Quality Passenger Transport Infrastructure Investment option”, which places a much larger proportion of the residual growth in market towns and in the transport corridors that lead to them. Option 3 involves the Huntingdon, St Neots, Newmarket and Royston corridors. Option 3A uses the Haverhill corridor instead of the Huntingdon corridor.

The report suggests that both Options 1 and 2 could involve sites in Saffron Walden making some contribution.

Key Issues for Uttlesford

- 4 The Structure Plan Review consultation asks five questions about the Cambridge Sub Region. These are:
- Should there be more housing development and higher building densities in Cambridge?;
 - A question about where development should be concentrated within the Cambridge Green Belt: on the edge of the city or in its villages;
 - Which location should be identified for a new settlement? Four options are identified, three of which are to the east/north of Cambridge and one to the south east of Cambridge. This is Great Abington.
 - Which market towns and transport routes should receive the most homes? Saffron Walden and the “A603” (A1303?) is one of the nine options listed;
 - In combining the options which of the following themes is preferred: Cambridge focus, Mixed Strategy or Corridor and Market Towns (a new settlement will be included in each theme)?

Comment

- 5 The Council’s response should emphasise that the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan should make adequate provision for housing within Cambridgeshire to meet the needs of the sub region. It should not plan on the basis that some of the sub region’s needs will be met in Essex and Hertfordshire. Strategic decisions on the locations of housing development by county have already been taken in the regional planning guidance. Any

capacity within Saffron Walden needs to be retained to meet Uttlesford's contribution to the Essex and Southend Structure Plan requirement.

- 6 The few hundred dwellings that the Sub Region study has suggested in Saffron Walden, although a substantial amount of development in the local context of the town, represents about 1% of the 22,000 dwellings the study sets as its target. There is sufficient flexibility within the Cambridge Centred Strong RPG Sequence option and the Mixed Strategy option to make alternative provision without compromising the overall consistency of the approaches. Saffron Walden was, in any event, identified in the study as being a low priority for further development relative to other market towns in the sub region.
- 7 In principle, however, the RPG's vision for the sub region would best be achieved by strongly adhering to the sequential approach to housing it advises. The Cambridge and Peterborough Structure Plan should accordingly be based on the Cambridge Centred option. The new settlement choice should be from the two options that have long term capacity and could continue to grow to meet the sub region's needs beyond 2016. These are Oakington and Waterbeach to the north of Cambridge.

RECOMMENDED that

The Council should respond to Cambridgeshire County Council as set out in the comments above.

Background Papers:

Regional Planning Guidance for East Anglia, DETR, November 2000
Cambridge Sub Region Study, SCEALA, February 2001
Letter from Cambridgeshire County Council dated 2 February 2001 and enclosures

Agenda Item No: 6

Title: Planning Policy Guidance, Revised Consultation Paper – Development and Flood Risk February 2001

Author: Melanie Jones (01799) 510461

Introduction

- 1 This report advises Members of revised draft Government guidance. The guidance explains how flood risk should be considered at all stages of the planning and development process in order to reduce future damage to property and loss of life. In order to achieve this new development should be

safe and authorities should ensure that flood plains continue to function effectively and are protected from inappropriate development.

Background

- 2 The Government first published draft Planning Guidance on Development and Flood Risk last year. In the light of flooding problems since then it has revised its draft proposals.

The Draft Guidance

- 3 The draft guidance published in April 2000 stated that the susceptibility of land to flooding is a material consideration. The new draft strengthens the approach in the earlier version. This includes the introduction of a risk based sequential test to assess sites depending on the probability of flooding occurring. Building in flood plains where excess water flows and is held at times of flood should be wholly exceptional and limited to essential infrastructure. There should be stronger emphasis on planning in relation to river catchments. Local planning authorities should make flood risk information available to developers and people doing planning searches. Land allocations should be reviewed in the light of the latest information on flood risk from the Environment Agency where possible in combination with reviews of land suitable for housing recommended in PPG3. Applicants should properly assess the flood risk to their proposed developments and where other funding is not available should fund the provision and maintenance of any flood mitigation or defence works required by the development. All new development should include drainage measures to avoid adding risks elsewhere. Authorities should encourage developers to promote building designs that are better able to resist and cope with flooding and recover faster if flooded.

Comments

- 4 The weather conditions and the extent of flooding experienced in the District in recent years and the disruption caused has highlighted the need for flood risk to be considered carefully in reviewing the local plan and determining applications for new development. Generally the advice in the Draft PPG is welcomed.
- 5 The sequential risk assessment approach being suggested could have implications for the development of brownfield sites, although not to any significant extent in Uttlesford. However PPG3 already advises local planning authorities to take account of physical and environmental constraints such as flood risk and the principles of this guidance complement that advice.
- 6 The revised draft guidance suggests that Local Plans should show areas of flood risk, or that Councils adopt maps as supplementary planning guidance. The Environment Agency has supplied floodplain maps to all local authorities which will be updated. The Council does not currently make information on floodplains available to members of the public. There may be resource

implications in doing so. The information is available on the Environment Agency's website.

RECOMMENDED that the Council advise the DETR that the provisions in the Draft PPG are supported.

Background Papers:
Planning Policy Guidance – Development and Flood Risk Revised
Consultation Paper February 2001

Agenda Item No: 7

Title: **SPEAKING BY TOWN AND PARISH COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVES AT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL SUB-COMMITTEE MEETINGS**

Author: **John Grayson (01799) 510455**

Introduction

- 1 This report considers the results of the recent consultation exercise with Town and Parish Councils and it recommends a change to the current procedure.

Background

- 2 At its meeting on 15 January 2001 (Min P128), the Development Control Sub-Committee agreed in principle that representatives of Town and Parish (Local) Councils should be allowed to speak on any application regardless of the officers' recommendation. Members agreed to consult the Councils and also to ask them to indicate whether, in the case of site visits, they would prefer to speak on site or at the meeting.

Consultation

- 3 Fourteen Councils responded to the consultation and 13 were in favour of widening the opportunity to speak. One felt that it could be repetitious when the local Council agreed with the officer recommendation. Seven of the 13 supportive Councils agreed that they should only speak on site or at the meeting, but five felt that they should be allowed to do both. One argued that as not all Sub-Committee Members attended site visits, some would not hear their comments. Two Councils considered that they should be allowed to continue to attend the site visits even if they could not speak.

Analysis

- 4 It is concluded that the proposal is supported in principle by the majority of local Councils. The reason given by the one Council opposing the suggestion is not considered to be fundamental. The issue of repetition should not unduly delay

matters at the meetings and the fear of criticism from unsuccessful applicants if their applications are refused contrary to that Council's views is not considered sufficiently strong to outweigh the benefits of a revised procedure.

- 5 The supplementary issue of speaking at site visits is less clear. It is being suggested that Councils would be able to choose whether to speak on site or at the meeting. In terms of natural justice, it is not desirable to allow Councils to have two opportunities to speak. In site visit cases this would normally amount to three, since they are also likely to have spoken at the first meeting. The argument put forward by one of the Councils about not all Members being on site is not well founded, because decisions are not made on site, but at the meetings.
- 6 Two Councils argued that it is more effective if issues are brought to Members' attention on site, rather than trying to explain them later at the meeting. In these cases, the Council could bring such matters to Officers' attention in written representations beforehand, so that they can be pointed out on site in their presence.

Conclusion

- 7 It is agreed that the opportunity for Town and Parish Councils to address the Sub-Committee be widened to include applications where they support the Officers' recommendation. In site visit cases, they should be allowed to choose whether to speak on site or at the meeting. If they chose to speak on site, they could still attend the meeting as observers, and vice versa. This revision would also have the benefit of allowing Councils to speak in those rare cases where Members disagree with Officers' recommendations.
- 8 There will be certain additional administrative effects of this change in procedure which can be absorbed. The wider issue of allowing others to speak at Development Control Sub-Committee meetings still needs to be addressed.

RECOMMENDED that the procedure be amended as indicated in para 7.

Background papers: Report to Planning & Development Committee 27 March 1997
Replies from Local Councils January/February 2001

Agenda Item No: 8
Title: Vehicle Parking Standards
Author: Melanie Jones (01799) 510461

Summary

- 1 The Essex Planning Officers Association (EPOA) has undertaken a review of car parking standards in Essex. In line with Government advice it has produced draft standards for use in Essex with a view to promoting more sustainable travel patterns. This report recommends that the Council supports in principle the Association's proposed standards. It will need to consider adopting standards as supplementary planning guidance in conjunction with its review of the Local Plan.

Background

- 2 The current car parking standards for Uttlesford are set out in Appendix 1 of the District Plan. Developers are required to provide a minimum number of car parking spaces for each new and/or extended development. There is no limit on the maximum number of spaces that can be provided.
- 3 The context for the new standards is set out in PPG3 Housing and draft PPG13 Transport and in Regional Planning Guidance – Parking Standards in the South East. The introduction of maximum standards is seen as a key tool to reduce levels of traffic and reduce the amount of land required for new housing. Policy T12 in the Essex and Southend on Sea Replacement Structure Plan also provides for the introduction of maximum standards in accordance with Government guidance. The use of maximum standards means there will be an upper limit on the level of provision which can be made.

The Standards

- 4 The document published by the EPOA contains standards for car parking for various land uses. These are set out in the attached table together with the current standards as set out in the District Plan. Also contained in the document are standards for cycle and motorcycle parking that reflect the more sustainable nature of these modes of travel. Minimum standards for cycle parking are set out according to the land use. For motorcycles one space is required for every ten car parking spaces being provided plus an additional space. In addition to the provision of secure parking developers will be required to demonstrate that they have considered additional needs for cyclists such as locker, changing and shower facilities.
- 5 A new approach to developer contributions is proposed as a result of abolishing minimum standards for car parking. Contributions should be used to support alternative modes of travel where the level of activity at a site would be in excess of the maximum car parking provision. Transport assessments will be

required for large scale development. Developments creating significant levels of additional employment will be expected to adopt travel plans.

- 6 The document also contains advice about design and layout of parking areas, size of garages and provision for disabled parking.

Comment

- 7 The proposed introduction of maximum standards for car parking and the requirement for cycle parking in association with new development represents a major shift in approach. A realistic approach is needed to try and discourage unlimited car parking provision and usage, in terms of general issues relating to sustainability, for new developments and the risk of creating and/or transferring problems elsewhere within a community.
- 8 The Government sees parking requirements as a significant determinant of the amount of new land required for housing and suggests that developments with more than 1.5 off street car parking spaces per dwelling are unlikely to reflect the Government's aim of providing sustainable residential environments. Policies that would result in higher levels of off street parking especially in urban areas should not be adopted.
- 9 In recognition of the diverse and rural nature of the county, the EPOA is suggesting a range of standards for the maximum number of car parking spaces that may be provided. These range from 1 space per dwelling in urban areas and locations well served by public transport to 2 spaces per three bed property and 3 spaces per four bed property in rural or suburban locations where services are poor. The District falls into the latter category and in this case the maximum level of parking would be the same as the minimum standard currently applied to residential development.
- 10 In relation to the other types of land uses, regional planning guidance published in 1998 suggests that parking requirements should be determined by reference to a site's location by zone rather than the type of land use. The standards in the consultation document are categorised by land use and it is considered that this is a more appropriate approach in a rural area like Uttlesford. The table attached to this report shows that the suggested maximum parking standards for non-domestic parking are broadly similar to the current minimum provision standards.
- 11 In practice, it is expected that developers would normally provide the maximum car parking. As in Uttlesford this would be broadly similar to the minimum level required, there would not be much difference on the ground. Where the site is sufficiently well located in relation to public transport and local facilities, an applicant may propose less than the maximum parking. It is difficult to justify why the local planning authority should not accept this, in principle, in the context of a national integrated transport strategy that aims to encourage alternatives to using the private car.

- 12 It is anticipated that maximum car parking standards will be adopted by the County Council as supplementary planning guidance to the Structure Plan. The District Council should also considering adopting them in due course. It is emphasised that in determining particular planning applications, Members should always weigh any other material considerations against parking standards which may have been adopted as supplementary planning guidance to the statutory development plan.
- 13 Standards for cycle and motorcycle parking are not included in the Adopted District Plan and this will need to be addressed in the Local Plan Review.

RECOMMENDED that the vehicle parking standards proposed by the Essex Planning Officers Association be supported in principle.

Background Papers:

Vehicle Parking Standards, Consultation Draft, Essex Planning Officers Association, January 2001
Parking Standards in the South East, DETR, October 1998

Vehicle Parking Standards

Car parking standards as set out in Uttlesford District Plan Adopted 1995		Vehicle Parking Standards suggested in Consultation Draft January 2001
Residential		
Housing 3 bed or less	2 spaces or 1 space + garage	Max 1 space per dwelling for main urban areas and locations where access to public transport is good.
Housing 4 bed or more	3 spaces or garage plus at least 2 spaces	Where an urban location has poor off-peak public transport services a maximum of 1.5 spaces per dwelling is appropriate Max 2 spaces for 3 bed properties and 3 spaces for 4 bed properties in rural/suburban locations where services are poor.
Sheltered Housing with warden	1 space for each unit 1 space for warden 1 space for visitors to warden	No comparable standard given
Community Homes	1 space per 3 units + 2 spaces per staff unit	1 space per resident staff + 1 space per 3 bed spaces/dwelling units.

Business Premises		
Industrial development where Office Accommodation exceeds 200m ² or 20% of floor space	2 spaces per unit + 1 space for 30m ² gross floor space used as offices and 1 space per 60m ² in other uses	1 space per 50m ² . A transport assessment will be required for developments of 5,000m ² or above
Industrial accommodation with limited office accommodation	2 spaces per unit plus 1 space for every 50m ² gross floor space	As above
Research and Development Labs	1 space per 35m ² gross floor space	1 space per 35m ² . A transport assessment, including a travel plan is likely to be required for new or extended development of 5,000m ² or above

Offices		
General	1 space per 30m ² gross floor space	1 space per 35m ² . A transport assessment including a travel plan is likely to be required for new or extended development of 5,000m ² or above.
Financial and Professional Services	1 space per 25m ² gross floor space	1 space per 20m ²

Warehousing		
Gross floor space less than 5,500m ²	3 spaces plus 1 space for every 280m ² gross floor space	1 space per 150m ² A transport assessment will be required for developments of 10,000m ² or above
Gross floor space more than 5,500m ²	No specific ratio but not less than 25 spaces	As above

Retail Premises – Shops		
Up to 499m ² retail Floor space	1 space per unit + 1 space per 25m ² gross floor space	1 space per 20m ²
500-1999m ² gross floor space	1 space per unit + 1 space per 20m ² gross floor space	As above
Over 2000m ² gross floor space	1 space per unit + 1 space per 10m ² gross floor space	As above

Retail Premises – Cash and Carry Wholesale Warehouses		
Gross Floor space less than 5500m ²	Minimum of 3 spaces + 1 space per 280m ² gross floor space for staff and a minimum of 5 spaces + 1 space for every 100m ² gross floor space for customers	1 space per 20m ² A travel assessment will be required for developments of 5,000m ² and above

Gross Floor space greater than 5550m ²	No specific ratio but not less than 83 spaces. Provision to be based on comparable operators experience with similar sites	As above
---	--	----------

Retail Warehouses		
DIY goods warehouses	1 space per 15m ² gross floor space	1 space per 20m ² A travel assessment will be required for developments of 5,000m ² and above
Other retail warehouses e.g. furniture, carpets and electrical goods	1 space per 30m ² gross floor space	As above
Retail warehouse parks	Provision to be based on anticipated split of DIY/other goods retailers. If known 1 space per 22.5m ² gross floor space	As above
Garden Centres less than 1000m ² trading and display area	1 space per 35m ² covered area plus 1 space per 50m ² open trading and display area.	1 space per 20m ² A travel assessment will be required for developments of 5,000m ² and above
Garden Centres greater than 1000m ² trading and display area	1 space per 15m ² trading and display area	As above
Motor vehicle workshops	4 spaces plus 1 space per 35m ² gross floor space	1 space per staff and 1 space per 35m ²
Car showrooms	2 spaces plus 1 space per 45m ² of display/storage area of reserved parking for staff/customers	1 space per 45m ² display area

Hotels, Eating and Drinking Places		
Hotels	1 space per guest bedrooms or staff bedrooms	1 space per bedroom (guest or staff). Provision is expected to be less in town centre locations
Public House, Licensed Clubs	1 space per 35m ² covered public area	1 space per 5m ²
Restaurants	1 space per 5m ² dining area	1 space per 5m ²
Transport Cafes	1 lorry space (15x3m) per 2m ² dining area plus 1 space per non residential staff	1 lorry space per 2m ²

Community Facilities		
Places of Worship	1 space per 10 seats or 1 space per 10m ² whichever is the greater	1 space per 10m ²
Hospitals	1 space per doctor plus 2 spaces for every 3 beds/rooms (whichever is greater)	1 space per 4 staff and 1 space per 3 daily visitors
Health centres, surgeries, clinics, operating on appointment system	1 space per practitioner, 1 space for every 2 members of staff present at peak times plus 2 visitor spaces per consulting room	1 space per full time staff + 2 spaces per consulting room

Day Care Centres		
For the physically handicapped	1 space for every 2 members of staff plus 1 space for every 4 members of the public attending	1 space per full time staff and 1 space per 4 persons attending and an area reserved for the collection and delivery of clients
For the elderly	1 space for every 2 members of staff plus 1 space for every 8 persons attending the centre	As above

Other counselling/care centres	Provision should be related to staffing	No standard given
Place of assembly (Church Halls, Village Halls, Community Centres)	1 space for every 3 members of staff normally present plus 1 space per 4m ² public areas (net floor space)	1 space per 15m ²
Craft Centres, museums or similar uses	2 spaces plus 1 space per 30m ² public areas	1 space per 25m ²
Places of public entertainment	1 space for every 4m ² of public accommodation (net floor space)	1 space per 15m ²
Sports Grounds	1 space for every 2 people who could use the playing areas at any one time plus spectator parking	Stadia – 1 space per 15 seats
Sports Centres	1 car parking space per 10m ² plus space for 2 coaches	1 space per 15m ²
Sports and Badminton Clubs	3 spaces per court	1 space per 15 m ²
Day Nurseries	1 space per full time member of staff or equivalent	1 space per full time staff and waiting facilities where appropriate.

Agenda Item No: 10

Title: Business Development Services (North West Essex)

Author: Roger Harborough (01799) 510457

Summary

- 1 This report advises Members of the work undertaken by Business Development Services (NW Essex). It is for information.

Uttlesford Enterprise

- 2 The latest statistics available are for the period 1 April 2000 to 30 September 2000. Comparative information for the same period in 1999 is shown

NUMBER OF COUNSELLING SESSIONS

	Apr-Sept 1999	Apr-Sept 2000
Great Dunmow		
Pre Start	15	6
Established	6	2
Follow up/ aftercare	24	3
Total	45	11
Known start ups	1	4
Saffron Walden		
Pre Start	28	21
Established	10	6
Follow up/ aftercare	38	5
Total	76	32
Known start ups	7	5

- 3 The reduction in counselling activity was also reflected in the Braintree and Huntingdon area.
- 4 Enterprise Agency clients are monitored one year after commencement and this is used as an opportunity to offer further services including Business Reviews and Mentoring.

Other BDS provision

- 5 Uttlesford firms had the opportunity to take up E-Commerce training events, of which 8 successfully took place in the Autumn programme. Additional planned events in the programme did not take place because places could not be filled. These difficulties were apparently reflected across Essex.
- 6 Four planned management development seminars also did not take place due to insufficient demand.

- 7 BDS has a Learning Network club with about 50 members, which Uttlesford firms can join.

FOR INFORMATION

Background Papers: None