

CHELMSFORD CITY LOCAL HIGHWAYS PANEL MINUTES

18 MARCH 2021

at 13:00 via Remote Meeting

Chairman:	County Councillor Bob Massey
Panel Members:	Chelmsford City Council – Councillors Jeremy Lager, Jennie Lardge, Chris Shaw and Mike Steel Essex County Council – County Councillors John Aldridge, Jude Deakin, Ian Grundy, Mike Mackrory, Dick Madden, Stephen Robinson and John Spence
Officers:	Michael Adewole - Chelmsford City Council, Jon Simmons and Sonia Church - Essex Highways
Secretariat:	Brian Mayfield - Chelmsford City Council

Item		Owner
1.	Welcome and Introductions The Chairman welcomed those present.	
2.	Apologies for Absence Apologies for absence were received from County Councillor Jenny Chandler and David Green, Chelmsford City Council.	
3.	Minutes of Previous Meeting The minutes of the meeting on 17 December 2020 were agreed as a correct record.	
4.	Matters Arising from Minutes of the Previous Meeting <i>LCHE162143 – Copperfield Road nr Dickens Place – Zebra crossing improvements</i> – The funding options were being explored, with the use of CIL funding a possibility.	

	<p><i>LCHE192028, Ford End Average Speed Cameras</i> – The Cabinet Member was sympathetic to the idea of reducing the cost of this scheme and means of doing so were being looked at. Councillor Aldridge observed that with consideration being given to the use of Average Speed Cameras to calm traffic from Writtle to the A414 as a result of the Warren Farm development, the use of such cameras could become the norm.</p> <p><i>Patching Hall Lane Cycle Route</i> – An update on funding this scheme from the Growth Package had been provided to Councillors Aldridge and Robinson.</p> <p><i>LCHE172027, Chatham Green, Little Waltham</i> – Councillor Aldridge had been updated.</p> <p><i>LCHE163005, Penny Royal Road/Mayes Lane to Woodhill Road, Danbury</i> – It had been confirmed that Section 106 monies could be used to part fund for this scheme.</p> <p><i>LCHE203003, O/s Writtle Infants School, Lodge Road, Writtle</i> – The views of the school on this scheme were still awaited, Cllr Aldridge would ask the School for a plan showing the proposed location of the new gate.</p> <p><i>Public Rights of Way Schemes</i> – The information requested at the last meeting had been provided to Cllr Aldridge.</p>	
5.	<p>Strategic Development Team</p> <p>Emma Featherstone of Essex Highways' Strategic Development Team attended to give a presentation on the purpose and work of the Team.</p> <p>Essex Highways was a statutory consultee for planning applications and the main function of the team was to consider any highways and traffic implications associated with the approximately 5,000 planning applications submitted in Essex each year. The Team also provided pre-application advice to applicants and worked with local planning authorities on the production of their Local Plans.</p> <p>Strategic developments of over 50 properties needed to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment and those under that number by a Transport Statement. Once those and the associated drawings were received, the Team examined the highway and traffic implications, consulting other County Council services where necessary. In carrying out its functions, the Strategic Development Team sought to protect the safety of the highway network; promote sustainable and active travel; and mitigate the effect of development on the highway network. Objections could only be made if it could</p>	

be demonstrated that a proposed development would have a severe effect on the highway and traffic that could not be mitigated. Acting within paragraph 56 of the NPPF, planning contributions were sought to mitigate the effect of development and to provide the necessary transport infrastructure. This was mostly achieved by way of Section 278 agreements, where the developer carried out the required work, but Section 106 and CIL agreements were used in appropriate cases.

In response to questions from members, Emma Featherstone and Jon Simmons said that:

- Although the development north of South Woodham Ferrers was being promoted by two developers, the Strategic Development Team was seeking a single Transport Assessment for the whole development area.
- The enforcement of Section 278 agreements and ensuring that developers met their commitments in a timely manner was a concern often raised. The starting point was ensuring that highway mitigation was included in any planning obligations, giving a legal footing for subsequent enforcement. It was acknowledged that some developers were more difficult to deal with than others but the Team had learned to insist on things like a single Transport Assessment for developments being promoted by more than one company; to be clear on trigger points for the provision of infrastructure; and to be ready to enforce requirements when necessary.
- The change to the priority of traffic as part of the Hollow Lane scheme had been proposed by the developer to help improve safety and the flow of traffic.
- The guarantee period for statutory undertakers work on the highway depended on the depth of the work and the utility concerned was required to remedy any defects.
- Where a developer obtained planning permission and subsequently sold on the site or parts of it to another party, the planning obligations associated with the development could be still be enforced.
- It was difficult to prove that any damage to the existing highway was caused by the construction traffic of a particular company or developer.
- It would be necessary to check whether a Section 38 agreement existed between the Highway Authority and the developer which covered the adoption of Shardlow Avenue.
- Essex Highways worked and liaised with other highway authorities to press the relevant bodies to ensure that there were adequate powers to enforce developers' highways obligations.

	Emma Featherstone was thanked for her presentation.	
6.	<p>Funded Schemes 2020/21</p> <p>The Panel received an update on the schemes in the Funded Schemes Programme for 2020/21. The total cost of the current year's programme, including Safer Roads and Commissioned Schemes, was £652,500.</p> <p>Comments were made and updates given on the following schemes:</p> <p><i>LCHE175014 – Nr 35 Plantation Road, Boreham</i> – The design for the new scheme had been shared with the parish council.</p> <p><i>LCHE201001 – A414 Main Road j/w Halls Lane, Sandon</i> – This scheme had now changed to a VAS in 2021/22 but the rest of the works would be picked up as part of a capital maintenance scheme.</p> <p><i>LCHE182043 – Westway nr service road to bus station</i> – Two dropped kerbs had been completed. The possibility of linking the footway was being looked at separately.</p> <p><i>LCHE162060 – Springfield Green, Springfield</i> – The civils works for this scheme had started on site and this was noted by Cllr Mackrory.</p> <p>AGREED that the update on Funded Schemes 2020/21 be noted.</p>	JS
7.	<p>Schemes Awaiting Funding</p> <p>The Panel received details of the latest version of the list of Schemes Awaiting Funding, which contained schemes with a total estimated cost of £1,346,000. Priority Schemes totalling £318,500 had been identified. The County Council had agreed that as well as providing a capital budget of £500,000 for 2021/22 to fund schemes recommended by the Panel, each district would be allocated an additional £200,000, although it was not yet clear whether there would be any conditions or limitations on the spending of those additional budgets.</p> <p>In addition, since the publication of the report, the Safer Roads budget had increased to £121,500 and the scheme for Stump Lane in the Traffic Management budget had been removed as it could now be funded through Section 106 monies, giving a new total for priority schemes of £272,000.</p> <p>The Panel agreed that it would consider at its next meeting how the additional £200,000 should be allocated, bearing in mind the staffing resources available to design and implement them. Councillors Daden, Lardge and Robinson suggested that consideration should</p>	

<p>be given at that time to prioritising schemes that promoted walking, cycling and the use of public transport.</p> <p>Turning to schemes that could be funded from the £500,000 budget, Jon Simmons suggested that those shown as amber schemes which had been commissioned for a feasibility study/design in 2020/21 should be added to the priority list.</p> <p>Councillor Shaw suggested that scheme <i>LCHE182011 – Footpaths off Dorset Avenue, Galleywood</i> should be expedited and Councillor Spence proposed the same for <i>LCHE192040 – A414 Danbury Route Based Strategy</i>, the latter arguing that this was necessary to assess whether any schemes could alleviate the pressure of traffic on that road. The Panel AGREED to add both to the priority list.</p> <p>With regard to the other amber schemes:</p> <p><i>LCHE152057 – Old Moulsham, Chelmsford - 20mph</i> – It was agreed that now remedial works should be considered until the works planned under the Active Travel Fund in the area had been completed.</p> <p><i>LCHE162148 – Hatchfields, Great Waltham</i> – No feasible scheme had been identified owing to the site constraints.</p> <p><i>LCHE182053 – Milburn Crescent</i> – layby - the estimated cost was £19,500</p> <p><i>LCHE182064 – Andrews Place</i> – one-way - the estimated cost was £19,500</p> <p><i>LCHE182065 – Chequers Road, Lodge Road, Writtle</i> – layby -the estimated cost was £39,000</p> <p><i>LCHE142040 – Highwood Road to Edney Common</i> – Walkable verge - the estimated cost was £220,500</p> <p><i>LCHE182032 – Thames Avenue</i> – Grasscrete parking - the estimated cost was £97,500</p> <p><i>LCHE182031 – Cherwell Drive</i> – Grasscrete parking - the estimated cost was £26,000</p> <p><i>LCHE152095 – 29-59 North Avenue</i> – Parking -the estimated cost of land acquisition and processing the TRO was £5,500 and it was proposed to undertake this in 2021/22 and then look to implement the scheme in 2022/23.</p> <p>The Panel AGREED that the following Amber schemes were funded in 2021/22:</p>	<p>JS</p>
--	------------------

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>LCHE182053 – Milburn Crescent – layby</i> • <i>Scheme LCHE182064 – Andrews Place</i> • <i>LCHE182065 – Chequers Road, Lodge Road, Writtle – layby</i> • <i>LCHE182032 – Thames Avenue – Grasscrete parking</i> • <i>LCHE182031 – Cherwell Drive – Grasscrete parking</i> • <i>LCHE152095 – 29-59 North Avenue – Parking</i> <p>The Panel AGREED that the following Amber schemes would not at this stage be funded in 2021/22:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Scheme LCHE142040 – Highwood Road to Edney Common - Footway</i> But that consideration should be given to lowering the specification for the design of the footpath. <p>The Panel AGREED that the following scheme would be funded in 2021/22:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Scheme LCHE193002 – Nr Garden Centre, White Elms Road, Bicknacre</i> be added to the list at a cost of £4,000. • The remaining amber schemes totalling £206,500 be added to the priority list 	
8.	<p>Any Other Business</p> <p><i>LCHE152156 - Stump Lane Railway Bridge</i> – This scheme would be reinstated on the list of schemes awaiting funding to investigate alternative sources of funding.</p> <p><i>LCHE202042 – Highwood Road, Loves Green</i> - This would be removed from the list as the Parish Council had advised Cllr Aldridge they did not want the original scheme changed.</p>	
9.	<p>Dates of Meetings 2021/22</p> <p>AGREED as 17 June 2021, 16 September 2021, 16 December 2021 and 17 March 2022.</p>	

The meeting closed at 14:40

Chairman