

LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE 8 OCTOBER 2012

Present :- Councillor Bill Frame (Chairman)
Councillor Colin Sykes (Deputy Mayor)
Councillors Elizabeth Blundell, Andrew Ellis,
Martin Goss, John Jowers and Kim Naish

12. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 20 August 2012 were confirmed as a correct record.

13. Street Services Delivery Strategy // Supplementary Planning Document

Councillor Jowers (in respect of being a member of Essex County Council with a Cabinet responsibility for Communities and Planning) declared a non-pecuniary interest in this item pursuant to the provisions of Meetings General Procedure Rule 7(5).

The Head of Strategic Policy and Regeneration submitted a report on a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for the Street Services Delivery Strategy together with a draft SPD and a document giving further guidance to developers in respect of the cost of provision, maintenance and siting for various waste and recycling containers. Also provided was the Statement of Consultation. The Committee was invited to agree to adopt the Supplementary Planning Document document.

Karen Syrett, Spatial Policy Manager, Matthew Young, Head of Street Services, and Cheryl Pashley, Strategy and Performance Officer, attended to assist the Committee with its deliberations. The draft document had originally been published for consultation immediately prior to the National Planning Policy Framework being published. It had therefore been necessary to redraft the document to take account of advice in the NPPF in respect of not seeking standard charges in levels of detail down to waste sacks. As a consequence the appendices were now regarded as further guidance and would be identified as such on the website. The redrafted document should more appropriately address design issues such as waste vehicles not being able to reach properties.

Members of the Committee were supportive of the document but expressed a number of concerns such as:- the extent of CCTV provision; whether traffic regulation orders needed to be put in at an early stage; the provision of recycling sacks and containers; and how the cost of maintenance of recycling, litter and dog bins had been calculated. Members considered that an explanation should be provided where sums of money were referred to in the document. There were concerns about developers being required to provide CCTV and it was suggested that CCTV should only be installed where there was an identified need, for example in mixed developments, near shops and businesses. In respect of recycling sacks and containers there was a view that

developers should not be required to provide recycling containers which were normally provided by the borough council, but developers could provide the white garden waste sacks for which householders were required to pay. There was a view that estates should be self-sufficient in waste collection and removal; and that if too much was asked of developers there was a danger that affordable housing contributions could be negated. It was considered reasonable to ask the developer to pay for bins for litter and dog waste. Members queried what would happen if a development was moth-balled or in the event of the development not being adopted after five years.

The Spatial Policy Manager responded that there were three statutory tests, one of which was to make the development acceptable in planning terms. It was intended that the approach should be to look at the requirements of individual developments. The appendices were provided as a guide and did not form part of the Supplementary Planning Document.

The Head of Street Services explained that the intention was to avoid having to use non-standard refuse vehicles where estate roads had not been designed to accommodate standard refuse and road cleaning vehicles. He explained that a development comprising one thousand households would require a separate round with its own vehicles and staff. The provision of bins was only part of the cost; there were also ongoing maintenance/emptying costs. He supported the provision of a separate document to provide detailed guidance.

The Strategy and Performance Officer responded to members' queries. In particular she explained that the cost for a bin was based on an annual cost of £250 and multiplied for a 5-year period. CCTV would only be relevant where there was an identified need and would not normally be provided on residential developments. The section on Traffic Regulation Orders had been submitted to Essex County Council for consultation and their response was to request that the wording be amended to the effect that the need for Traffic Regulation Orders should be designed out as far as possible.

RESOLVED that –

- (a) The Street Services Delivery Strategy Supplementary Planning Document be approved and adopted.
- (b) The Spatial Policy Manager be authorised to make minor revisions to the document prior to publication in order to provide clarity where necessary. The final version to be sent electronically to the members of the Committee.

14. Better Town Centre Plan // Supplementary Planning Document

Councillor Jowers (in respect of being a member of Essex County Council with a Cabinet responsibility for Communities and Planning) declared a non-pecuniary interest in this item pursuant to the provisions of Meetings General Procedure Rule 7(5).

The Head of Strategic Policy and Regeneration submitted a report on a draft Supplementary Planning Document in respect of the Better Town Centre Plan together with a Statement of Consultation.

Laura Chase, Planning Policy Manager, attended to assist the Committee with its deliberations. She explained that this was an interim document which had, through its development, involved a significant degree of inter-departmental working through the Better Town Centre Steering Group. It also reflected stakeholder and public views. It was intended to publish a delivery plan alongside the SPD which would show progress on detailed proposals and which could be regularly reviewed by the Local Plan Committee. The Committee was requested to make comments on the document which would be taken into account in formulating the final draft document. It was intended to submit the final document to a future meeting of the Committee for approval and adoption.

Members of the Committee were in support of the document, and there was particular support for the Lanes-style project and for encouraging better residential use in the town centre. The Planning Policy Manager referred to the consultation having kick-started various conversations including the reasons why people were not using premises above the retail units. She also highlighted the need to identify landowners of properties located on the Roman walls because the tenant-occupiers were not in a position of influence. In response to members' queries regarding organisations which had been consulted as listed in Appendix 1, it was explained that the list of Statutory Consultees was set out in the Regulations; some consultees had changed. The list of Other Stakeholders had been compiled from previous consultations and was reviewed from time to time.

RESOLVED (UNANIMOUSLY) that the outcome of the public consultation exercise on the Better Town Centre Plan Supplementary Planning Document be noted and the Committee's comments be taken into account in finalising the document for approval at a future meeting.

15. Boxted Neighbourhood Plan Area

Councillors Jowers (in respect of being a member of Essex County Council with a Cabinet responsibility for Communities and Planning and a Rural Commissioner) and Naish (in respect of his association with the Environment Agency) each declared a non-pecuniary interest in this item pursuant to the provisions of Meetings General Procedure Rule 7(5).

The Head of Strategic Policy and Regeneration submitted a report inviting the Committee to approve the Boxted Neighbourhood Plan Area in order to progress the development of a Neighbourhood Plan. The Boxted Neighbourhood Plan Area had been advertised to enable those who lived, worked or carried on a business in the application area to make representations on the area.

Karen Syrett, Spatial Policy Manager, attended to assist the Committee with its

deliberations. She noted that the period of consultation ended on 2 October 2012 that no representations had been received to the consultation.

RESOLVED (UNANIMOUSLY) that the Boxted Neighbourhood Plan Area be approved for the purpose of developing a Neighbourhood Plan.