

# CHELMSFORD CITY LOCAL HIGHWAYS PANEL MINUTES

## 12 SEPTEMBER 2019

### at 13:00 at the Civic Centre, Chelmsford

<b>Chairman:</b>	County Councillor Bob Massey
<b>Panel Members:</b>	<p>Chelmsford City Council – Councillors Jeremy Lager, Jenny Lardge, Andrew Sosin and Mike Steel</p> <p>Essex County Council – County Councillors John Aldridge, Ian Grundy, Mike Mackrory, Dick Madden and Stephen Robinson</p> <p>Representing Parish Council – Councillor Wendy Daden</p>
<b>Officers:</b>	Michael Adewole and Stuart Graham - Chelmsford City Council, Jon Simmons and Sonia Church - Essex Highways, and Joy Thomas, Essex County Council
<b>Secretariat:</b>	Brian Mayfield - Chelmsford City Council

Item		Owner
1.	<p><b>Welcome and Introductions</b></p> <p>The Chairman welcomed those present.</p>	
2.	<p><b>Apologies for Absence</b></p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from County Councillors Jenny Chandler, Jude Deakin and John Spence, City Councillor Chris Shaw, and CCC Officer David Green. Councillor Shaw had appointed Councillor Sosin as her substitute.</p>	
3.	<p><b>Minutes of Previous Meeting</b></p> <p>Subject to the correction of the spelling of Councillor Lardge's surname, the minutes of the meeting on 13 June 2019 were agreed as a correct record.</p>	
4.	<p><b>Matters Arising from Minutes of the Previous Meeting</b></p> <p><i>LCHE152057 – Old Moulsham, Chelmsford</i> – The Panel was informed that after the introduction of 20mph speed limit schemes, it was the usual practice to allow six to 12 months for drivers to adjust</p>	



	<p>The basis of Section 106 Agreements and how they contributed to the provision of infrastructure to mitigate the impact of development was explained, as were the tests that needed to be passed before such Agreements could be considered. Another mechanism, the use of agreements under Section 278 of the Highways Act, was increasingly being used in place of Section 106 for the provision of highways infrastructure directly by a developer as part of the planning approval for development.</p> <p>The County Council currently held £3,589,000 in Section 106 highways payments and the City Council £548,000. The City Council also transferred highways-related sums to the County Council. The high cost of large highway schemes meant that funds needed to be accumulated from a number of developments to enable meaningful projects to be carried out. It was possible to use Section 106 funds for LHP schemes but only if the Section 106 purposes permitted it.</p> <p>Funding from Section 106 Agreements was reducing as greater use was made of CIL. This was a charge on new residential and retail development to help fund infrastructure and was currently set at £165/sq m for residential, £115/sq m for non-food retail and £200/sq m for food retail. The City Council had collected £17 million in CIL payments and another £10 million was due from current developments. Eighty per cent of that was used for strategic infrastructure – roads, schools, medical facilities, sports and recreation and open space – 5% on administering the CIL system and 15% was earmarked for Neighbourhood Allocations to address the demands a development placed on a particular area.</p> <p>During the discussion that followed the presentation, the Panel was informed that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Essex Highways met quarterly with a number of services to see whether Section 106 funds could be matched to LHP schemes. Members asked that those meetings also look at whether unspent funds could be allocated to LHP schemes and how the conclusions of those meetings could be fed back to the Panel.</li> <li>• Determining the infrastructure requirements of a large development took a sequential approach, from the general identification of need in the Local Plan to more specific and refined schemes at the master planning and planning application stages. Section 106 Agreements were reached as part of the planning permission for a scheme, or their requirements could be met through Section 278 Agreements.</li> <li>• A Parish Council with a Neighbourhood Plan could receive a 25% allocation of CIL monies, but only 15% if it did not have such a Plan. A Parish with no Plan could not claim the 10% by making a bid to the strategic allocation, but it may be</li> </ul>	<p><b>JS</b></p>
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------

	<p>possible for a project in a Parish to be funded through the strategic allocation, if it was required for a project considered to be of strategic importance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The CIL funding arrangements were currently being reviewed and the Panel would receive an update when that had been completed.</li> <li>• Essex Highways would consider whether the Section 106 funding accumulated for cycle schemes could be used for schemes of that type in the LHP programme.</li> <li>• Parishes in receipt of CIL allocated funding could use it to meet the cost of highway schemes in their areas if the LHP was unable to do so.</li> <li>• There was scope for the South Essex Parking Partnership to meet the cost of some parking-related highway schemes.</li> </ul> <p>Stuart and Joy were thanked for their presentation.</p>	JS
6.	<p><b>Funded Schemes 2019/20</b></p> <p>The Panel received an update on the schemes in the Funded Schemes Programme for 2019/20.</p> <p>The meeting was informed that £100,000 of the budget had yet to be allocated. It was proposed that a sub-group be established to consider which schemes awaiting funding should be funded from that sum. Jon Simmons advised the Panel that the funding needed to be allocated at the Panel meeting to ensure delivery of the chosen schemes.</p> <p>Jon Simmons advised the Panel that the Design team had reviewed all the 2019/20 design schemes in their programme and that the following two schemes could be implemented in the current financial year –</p> <p>LCHE152093 – Chignal Hall Lane j/w Mashbury Road, Chignal Smealy – Removal of bennett junction – Implementation - £24,000</p> <p>LCHE172043 – Church Street, Great Baddow – Zebra crossing – Implementation £78,000</p> <p>The Panel <b>AGREED</b> that LCHE152093 and LCHE172043 should both be funded and implemented in 2019/20</p> <p>With regard to scheme <i>LCHE165022, Metsons Lane, Highwood</i>, officers were asked to review the number of passengers using the bus stop before it was decided whether to retain the scheme in the list.</p>	

	<p>Confirmation was awaited from the Secretary of State on whether the land required for scheme <i>LCHE162060, Springfield Green, Springfield</i> could be acquired for highway purposes.</p> <p><b>AGREED</b> that a sub-group comprising the Chair, Vice Chair, Councillor Daden and Councillor Steel meets to prioritise which of the schemes awaiting funded could be brought into the funded schemes list and carried out in 2019/20, and that their recommendations be put to the next meeting.</p>	<b>JS</b>
7.	<p><b>Schemes Awaiting Funding</b></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 £1,747,000.</p> <p>It was suggested that the sub-group established at minute 6 above should prioritise schemes in this programme for inclusion in the approved schemes list for 2020/21. The Panel also expressed the view that schemes should be identified that could be funded from the CIL strategic allocation, such as bundles of cycling schemes.</p> <p>With regard to scheme <i>LCHE182006 Savernake Road</i>, it was suggested that the sub-group consider whether this should remain on the list.</p> <p>On scheme <i>LCHE175010 Gowers Avenue, Great Baddow</i>, the Parish Council would be asked whether it would be able to fund it.</p>	<b>JS</b>
8 & 9	<p><b>Revenue Spend/Section 106 Update</b></p> <p>The Panel had been sent information on the work of the Highways Rangers, Traffic Surveys, VAS Maintenance and S106 schemes.</p> <p><b>AGREED</b> that the electronic reports on Revenue Spend and Section 106 Update be noted.</p>	
10.	<p><b>Other Business</b></p> <p><i>Recording of requests for schemes</i></p> <p>Councillor Robinson referred to a scheme that he had suggested some time ago which, on checking, appeared not to have been recorded. He enquired whether the system for logging and tracking schemes was working. The Panel was informed that the system was functioning and Jon Simmons would speak with Councillor Robinson about the scheme in question.</p>	

	<p><i>Format of information for Panels</i></p> <p>The Panel was informed that all the LHPs received information on Funded Schemes and Schemes Awaiting Funding in the same, paper-based format, with some other information being sent electronically; they appeared to be content with that arrangement. However, work was being carried out on putting the information in the Funded Schemes and Schemes Awaiting Funding schedules in an electronic, searchable format. Works was also been carried out to produce an additional layer on Map Essex to show those schemes due to be carried, though this was not yet finalised.</p> <p><i>Cycleway in Victoria Road</i></p> <p>The Panel was told that anomalies existed with the cycleway between Waterloo Lane and Victoria Road, and that all the relevant parties would be involved in finding a way to deal with them.</p>	
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

The meeting closed at 14:45

Chairman