

**Colchester's Local Development Framework
Street Services Delivery Strategy
Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)
Statement of Consultation**

Spatial Policy
Strategic Policy and Regeneration
Colchester Borough Council
PO Box 885
Town Hall
Colchester
Essex CO1 1ZE
01206 282787
planning.policy@colchester.gov.uk

Introduction

The Street Services Delivery Strategy Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) is one of the planning documents that make up Colchester's Local Development Framework. The overarching Core Strategy DPD was the first document to be produced, in line with Government guidance on priorities for the LDF. The Core Strategy sets out the spatial vision, strategic objectives and policies for the Borough up to 2021. The Core Strategy was declared 'sound' by a Government-appointed Planning Inspector and was adopted by the Council on 11 December 2008. The policy direction set in the Core Strategy has been used as the cornerstone for the production of subsequent planning policy documents including this SPD.

In preparing the Street Services Delivery Strategy SPD for adoption, we are required to comply with the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 and 2008 amendments. Regulations 18 and 19 of the 2008 amendments provide that the Council should not adopt a SPD until they have prepared and published a statement setting out:

- Who was invited to be involved in the plan preparation
- How they were invited to be involved in the plan preparation
- A summary of the main issues raised and how they have been addressed

The following statement addresses these points and also is in accordance with Colchester's Adopted Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). The SCI stipulates the level of consultation to be undertaken, which includes a wide range of media and publicity to engage the general public, hard-to-reach groups, community groups, councillors, businesses and governmental bodies.

Consultation Process

In line with Government regulations, the Council consulted on the Street Services Delivery Strategy between 12th February and 13th March 2012. The consultation provided the public and stakeholders with the opportunity to comment on the Council's preferred approach to securing planning contributions for street service facilities, and design requirements to ensure sustainable development.

Letters and/or emails were sent to individuals recorded on the Local Development Framework List of Consultees compiled by Colchester Borough Council. The list was drawn up in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) Regulations 2004 and therefore included "specific consultation bodies" such as Government agencies like Natural England and the Highways Agency. In addition, in line with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement, a large number of "general consultation bodies" were consulted representing voluntary groups, ethnic minorities, religious groups, disabled persons and business community representatives. The list of stakeholders is attached as Appendix 1 and the letter sent to stakeholders is attached as Appendix 2. In accordance with regulations, a statutory advert was posted in the Borough's weekly newspaper (*The Essex County Standard*) notifying people of the consultation details. A copy is attached as Appendix 3.

The consultation was also hosted on the website, and copies were located at Angel Court and the Town Centre Library to encourage public access and responses.

Although a survey form was created to encourage feedback on specific areas of the draft SPD, all responses received were 'free text' and either in the form of email or letters.

In all, there were seven external responses to the document and feedback from internal departments to be taken into consideration.

Further to the statutory consultation, and based on some of the feedback received, further work and communication with internal and external stakeholders took place in order to address specific concerns identified in the consultation. The results and input from this are also set out in this document.

Table

Summary of Detailed Comments Received and Colchester Borough Council's Response

Respondent	Summary of Comments	CBC Response	Action Required
Wivenhoe Town Council	On behalf of Wivenhoe Town Council I would like to say that we agree with the aims set out in the above document and welcome the initiatives it contains.	Noted and appreciated	N/A
Riverside Residents Association	<p>1. The levying of the capital cost of Dog waste/Litter bins & recycling boxes, garden waste sacks, compost/waste(Flats)/recycling(Flats) bins and recycling(Flats) sacks in the shape of a compulsory 'starter kit' is considered appropriate and sensible. While applauding 'creativity' it is felt that the association of running costs clearly encompassed by the Community Charge such as bin emptying along with the provision of black refuse & clear recycling sacks is inappropriate, serving only to deplete Section 106 and CIL funding.</p> <p>Needs to focus on the identification of the 'exacerbation' of existing infrastructure problems by way of new developments, for example :-</p> <p>(i) Every additional residence in the Colchester area produces additional demand for access to the Town Centre and increased demand on parking in residential streets, close to the Town Centre, without parking restrictions.</p> <p>(ii) Every reduction in Town Centre parking increases demand for parking on residential streets, close to the Town Centre, without parking restriction.</p> <p>(iii) Many residential streets cannot accommodate the passage of collection vehicles in the event of vehicles being parked on both sides of the road. Increased residential development in the Colchester area increases the likelihood of parking on such roads.</p>	<p>Town centre parking is outside the remit of the Supplementary Planning Document. Changes to Essex design standards in the vehicle parking and design standards document (2009) should address some of these concerns in future development. The SPD can't address existing issues within the borough, but sets out to ensure good future design that will enable ease of vehicle collection passage.</p>	<p>Section 6.1f of the document now amended to highlight the overlap with and significance of the adopted Parking Standards SPD in ensuring requirements are met that will promote access for collection vehicles.</p>
Natural England	Our only comment on this draft SPD is to recommend that section 6.6 Environment and Climate Change is re-worded to state that 'Where developments are judged to have a detrimental impact on the environment.....developments must work to mitigate and offset these.'	Noted	Text changed at 6.6a
Mersea Homes	1. Any increase in financial and physical resource for street services will be paid for by the new residents via council tax	Council tax is just one source of funding for Colchester Borough Council to provide services for residents. Rather than being allocated to specific services and functions, the funding can be used for anything as the council	

	<p>2. The SPD is in breach of emerging national policy NPPF</p> <p>3. The report infers that something has changed in the current system of street service that justifies developers paying for a service covered by council tax</p> <p>4. A viability evidence base that should have been carried out has not been made public.....there is no indication of the total financial cost involved</p> <p>5. There is no mechanism set out on how the additional tax is to be collected....</p>	<p>sees fit. It does not specifically match to services.</p> <p>The one off cost of recycling and waste containers is a cost which is directly attributed to new development, and therefore should be met by developers, as per National Planning Policy Guidance.</p> <p>Other councils, such as Welwyn Hatfield have employed the same approach and also have an SPD in place which requires the provision of recycling and waste containers by new dwellings.</p> <p>Changes in the financial climate mean that although we have borne the burden of the cost associated with new development, we can no longer afford to do so, and are passing back such costs which are directly attributed to the cost of new development.</p> <p>The table in appendix A gives indicative costs for required containers. It currently costs the council around £30 a unit to supply the recycling and waste containers and this cost is just being directly transferred to the developer. This is also at the lower end of the SPD contribution scale.</p> <p>Noted. Response to point 7 (below) addresses this</p>	<p>N/A. The principles of the SPD are believed fair and correct in terms of the cost to developers.</p> <p>CBC working with partners to create a simple delivery process for the SPD.</p>
--	--	---	---

	<p>10. How will the requirement to supply compost bins, recycle bins and waste sacks be policed?</p> <p>11. Proper policy for the justification of CCTV is not given</p> <p>12. Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO's) are now said to be necessary this must mean that CBC should be applying it in all situations throughout the borough in both new and existing circumstances</p> <p>13. Infrastructure mapping shows what the borough is currently happy with, but this is in contrast with the requirement set out in the SPD that dog bins are required for over 35 dwellings (Abberton and Langenhoe has its own primary school but only needs 3 bins and no dog bins at all)</p> <p>14. The sums involved are not insignificant as bins....includes the cost of emptying for 5 years. Why is this not part of council tax and why has a 5 year lifetime been used?</p>	<p>This forms part of the SPD delivery strategy newly added at Appendix D.</p> <p>Requirement for CCTV cleared up in section 6.5.</p> <p>Justification is based on individual circumstances and design requirements rendering such actions necessary. The SPD cannot address existing issues, but with future developments, will ensure that if design standards cannot be met without TRO's, the borough may introduce where necessary</p> <p>The map does not demonstrate what we are happy with. It is shown as a reference point, so that for some developments, we don't ask for infrastructure to be provided that is already there. Unfortunately, the SPD can't address existing issues, but the requirements for litter and dog bins will ensure that future development is sustainable and has adequate infrastructure.</p> <p>The adopted public space SPD charges a maintenance cost for a 25 year period, so it was felt that 5 years would be reasonable in the current climate, again, council tax is just one source of funding for Colchester</p>	<p>Waste and Recycling collection will be a conditional.</p> <p>Changed and added text at 6.5</p> <p>Text added at section 6.7 to clear this up</p> <p>Text added in section 8 to introduce the infrastructure mapping principle, map removed so that an up to date picture can be provided for each development.</p> <p>N/A. Justification has been given for the question addressed.</p>
--	--	--	--

		Borough Council to provide services for residents. Rather than being allocated to specific services and functions, the funding can be used for anything as the council sees fit. It does not specifically match to services, including bin maintenance.	
Essex County Council- Sustainable Environment and Enterprise	<p>1) Under 6.1 Design Requirements Fourth point: should note that these collection points should be outside the boundaries of the highway Fifth point: this is covered by the parking standards – again a note to this effect would help</p> <p>2) Under title 'Domestic Recycling and Waste Requirements: Flats' First paragraph, at the beginning of the 4th sentence add 'If the location is accessed directly from the highway, where regulations permit...'. Parking restrictions may not be allowable/desirable in these locations</p> <p>3) Under 6.7 Parking and Traffic Regulation Orders For want of a better phrase, this passage implies that if there is an issue, a TRO is the answer/the way forward. This is not the case. As stated above, a TRO may not be allowable/desirable. A note should be included to this effect</p>	<p>Noted and addressed.</p> <p>Noted and addressed.</p> <p>Noted and addressed.</p>	<p>Amended accordingly within section 6.1</p> <p>Amended accordingly in section 6.3e</p> <p>Amended accordingly in section 6.7</p>
Essex Highways Authority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The document is clear and well presented in terms of what is expected in terms of Street Services and Developments. However I am not clear how this will be delivered down on the ground. As you know, my team looks after road adoption and traffic regulation orders on new estates and there are a number of aspects where it does not identify a process of how this SPD will be delivered. Design requirements – when it is stated that 2500mm width vehicles need to be accommodated, is this within the running lane or the road? Although we ourselves are uncomfortable with 4800mm width roads, they are commonplace and still being approved through the planning process. However, I am not sure residents, you or us will want every 4800mm road covered by TROs Dog waste bins – it would be useful if it is specified that these will not be 	<p>Several comments about language</p> <p>Many comments made are around delivery of the SPD. We will endeavour to work jointly</p>	<p>Wording changes suggested have been made.</p> <p>Meetings will be held with Highways and Colchester Borough Council about the delivery of the SPD.</p>

	<p>permitted on footways/cycletracks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Litter bins – I think if I was a developer, I would struggle on how many bins I had to provide. Need to consider where they are placed – that they do not obstruct visibility splays or obstruct narrow footways • Domestic recycling and waste requirements - flats – It states that a dropped kerb should be installed to enable the retrieval and return of containers – this will need to be implemented by our teams. Often bin storage areas are not shown on highway design drawings so this probably needs some more thought • TROs - We still process the TROs for new estates so we probably need to discuss this section in more detail. I am not comfortable with installing TROs at every junction. In an ideal world, no TROs should be installed as this generally suggests the design of the road is incorrect. At present, we tend to install TROs on spine roads/bus routes and where there will be particular problems with commuter/shopping parking. 		<p>An appendix about the practical application and delivery of the SPD will be produced as an outcome of this.</p>
<p>Myland Community Council</p>	<p>Myland Community Council is in broad agreement with the Strategy outlined in the SPD and therefore welcomes it. We make a number of constructive suggestions, raise a number of queries and hope they will assist CBC in the preparation of the final document.</p> <p>Many grammatical and wording changes/ additions have been suggested, but we don't consider these to change the content or direction of the supplementary planning document.</p> <p>Point 'page 11, 6.4, para 1- why no references to plastics or green waste'</p>	<p>Noted and each suggestion and query will be individually addressed.</p> <p>We do not currently operate a plastics or green waste collection service in flats, this is only available for household collection.</p>	<p>Suggested amendments have been made where appropriate and applicable.</p> <p>Document does not address this, as felt unfair to require containers and provision for something we do not currently operate. The monitoring and reviewing of this document will also include updating</p>

	Point 'Page 7, 6.2, Requirements. New developments should also be required to contribute towards public education about recycling and litter.'	A previous SPD consultation received responses about requirements for developers to contribute towards public education and it was found to be an unfair requirement for developers.	as the waste and recycling provision and service changes.
Following a meeting and engagement between internal stakeholders (including development control, planning policy, legal services and street services) and other agencies including Essex County Council Highways representatives in order to address some of the comments received from the policy consultation, further feedback was received for the Street Services Delivery Strategy SPD, which is set out and addressed below, and has contributed to the revised Supplementary planning document.			
Colchester Borough Council (internal stakeholder) feedback	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The sections on dog and litter bins still need refinement – I am concerned we are asking for things that cannot be delivered because the developer will have no ownership/control over the land. I'm also concerned that we will end up with bins every 3 – 14m which is not desirable from a public realm point of view. 2. Where will bins go if they cant go in lay-bys, housing estates or land owned by others (other than CBC or other than developer?) I understand bins have been removed from open spaces because of abuse/nuisance too 3. 6.3 – the details of the various things are fine but I think we can only refer to these in an informative attached to the planning decision – it would be unreasonable and unenforceable to require them by condition. 4. The document still doesn't make it clear how many units trigger a need for a dog/litter bin – there are conflicting paragraphs. Do 35 units necessitate one dog bin and £1250 for maintenance? Do every 5 properties require a litter bin? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Only those developments that meet the criteria set out in 6.2a and b and that have available highway land and suitable location options as identified will require the installation of dog and/or litter bins, more text has been added t to these paragraphs to highlight/ draw this out further. 2. an adopted highway, or land owned or controlled either by the developer or the local planning authority are deemed as appropriate sites 3. Advice from the legal team has been that the requirements set out in the SPD are related to the development and in line with strategic priorities, giving ground to make requirements though obligation or conditional. 4. appendix C addresses this, by identifying the trigger points and circumstances for each SPD 	<p>Text added to section 6.2a and 6.2b to clarify this point</p> <p>Text added to section 6.2a and 6.2b to clarify this point</p> <p>The process as identified in Appendix D identifies this</p> <p>Appendix C added to show requirement trigger</p>

	<p>5. Delivery process – I’m assuming zone staff do not have authority under planning legislation to enter property and check bin bags have been provided? What happens if they haven’t or if the they are the wrong size? It would not be appropriate to take planning action. I have suggested an alternative on the hard copy. I think most things will only be covered by an informative.</p>	<p>requirement 5. As per bullet 3, this has been advised as best achieved through either condition or obligation. An informative will hold little weight, and is not something we can enforce to ensure that it happens with continuity across all new developments</p>	<p>To be confirmed</p>
<p>Essex County Council Highways (further comments)</p>	<p>6.1f I don't think the Vehicle Parking Standards has information about parking restrictions in it</p> <p>6.1j I am not sure this reads right - I think it is saying that where a bin store is not adjacent to the highway, restrictions may be required and I am not sure this is your intended outcome</p> <p>6.2a Do you want to state (as applicable) after local Highways Authority, otherwise we will need to approve all dog bins and we are only interested in those on the public highway</p> <p>Are you able to specify a certain supplier which you do for the bins? I would not be able to do this in our own documents - we would just provide a specification and they could contact us for more information.</p> <p>6.2b Appendix A is quoted, I think it should be Appendix B. We would not want to see these on our standard footway widths on the highway in our estates unless additional land is given over to the highway to accommodate these units. In the last section, you mention that it is not general practice to locate litter bins in housing</p>	<p>6.1f- the following extracts of the parking standard discuss parking restrictions Essex Parking standards extracts for parking restriction 3.4.27 Exceptions to the above standard could be made in appropriate locations, with suitable design and/or parking restrictions. Good practise includes the use of parking restrictions to prevent obstruction</p> <p>Noted and amended accordingly</p>	<p>6.2a Text has been changed to reflect comment</p> <p>Supplier details removed, and will be supplied at time of enquiry</p> <p>6.2b Text has been changed to reflect comment</p>

	<p>estates but most developments nowadays are an estate so you are giving developers a way out of providing them.</p> <p>6.2d Benches not beaches. Do you mean to state 3 - 14 metres between bins? Or do you mean 3 - 14 metres between the littering point and the bin?</p> <p>Appendix C - Under TRO , it states where road width is less than 2500mm with rows of parked cars - do you mean where the available road width is less than 2500mm due to the presence of parked cars - how is this going to work in planning terms, will there be a condition that a developer has to pay for the TRO and lines/signs once the development is up and running? All the estates are designed to take refuse vehicles but inconsiderate parking is unpredictable.</p> <p>I am still not entirely sure how this is going to work as most of the planning drawings do not go into enough detail to ascertain whether the provision has been met - I can see the problem of a recycling unit being required under planning but is not designed for and therefore ends up on a 2 metre footway. The flow diagram does not appear to deal with this scernario. As we discussed at the meeting, our engineering team receive the detailed design drawings after planning permission is received and our drawings are unlikely to show where bin stores are. Therefore the current process needs to be altered if this SPD is going to deliver down on the ground.</p>	<p>Appendix C- If the development is designed in a way where parking provision is an issue, or the location will put pressure on the development roads in such a way to reduce the ease of passage for collection vehicles, we would require the developer to pay the cost of TRO's that would be designed and implemented in conjunction with Essex highways.</p> <p>The idea is that bin stores will be indicated, as many currently are, at the design stage of development, and that a conditional is attached to the planning application that prior to occupation, the waste and recycling collection and containers are approved and arranged with Colchester Borough Council.</p>	<p>6.2d Text has been changed to address comment</p> <p>N/A –explanation given</p> <p>N/A- explanation given</p>
--	---	---	--

Appendix 1 List of Consultees

Statutory Consultees	
Alresford Parish Council	Lancaster University Network Services Ltd
Anglian Water Services Ltd	Maldon District Council
Anglian Water Services Ltd.	Natural England
Ardleigh Parish Council	Nayland with Wissington Parish Council
Babergh District Council	Neos Networks Ltd
Bradford Cable Communications Ltd	Network Rail
Braintree District Council	North Essex PCT
Brightlingsea Town Council	NTL Group Ltd
British Gas Connections Ltd	NWP Spectrum Ltd
British Telecom	Omne Telecommunications Ltd
Bures St Mary Parish Council	Opal Telecom Ltd
Colchester Association of Local Councils (CALC)	Orange Personal Communications Ltd
Colchester STW	Regional Communications Team O2 Airwave
Colt Telecommunications	Sheffield Canal Company Ltd
Doncaster Cable Communications Ltd	South East Water Plc
East of England Development Agency (EEDA)	Sport England (East Region)
Easynet Telecommunications Ltd	SSE Telecommunications Ltd
EDF Energy	Stoke By Nayland Parish Council
Eircom UK Ltd	Stratford St Mary Parish Council
Energis Communications	Suffolk Constabulary
English Heritage	Suffolk County Council
Environment Agency	Telia Sonera International Carrier Ltd
Essex & Suffolk Water	Tendring District Council
Essex County Council	Tendring Hundred Water Services Ltd
Essex Police	Thames Water Utilities Ltd
Essex University	The Coal Authority
Essex Wildlife Trust	The Highways Agency
Feering Parish Council	The Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England
Fibernet Ltd	The National Trust
Friends, Family & Traveller and Travellers Reform	The Planning Inspectorate
Gamma Telecom Holding Ltd	The Secretary of State for Transport
Gemini Submarine Cable System Ltd	T-Mobile (UK) Ltd
Global Crossing	Tollesbury Parish Council
Great Braxted Parish Council	Tolleshunt D'Arcy Parish Council
Haven Gateway Partnership	Tolleshunt Major Parish Council
Hutchison Network Services UK Ltd	Tolleshunt Nights Parish Council
Kelvedon Parish Council	Vitesse Networks Ltd
Kingston Communications (Hull) Plc	Wireless World Forum Headquarters

Dear Sir or Madam

Colchester Borough Council
PO Box 885, Town Hall, Colchester, CO1 1ZE
Telephone (01206) 282222 DX 729040 Colchester 15

Street Services – Draft

Address here

Strategic Policy & Regeneration

Date 13th February 2012

Supplementary Planning Document

I am writing to inform you that the Council has published the Draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), referred to above. The SPD is subject to a four week period of public consultation running from **Monday 13th February to Monday 12th March 2012**.

The purpose of this SPD is to ensure adequate provision for Street Services in terms of facilities and infrastructure. This will support sustainable growth and enable a strategic approach to service provision.

This strategy is provided to ensure that councillors, officers and developers understand the impact new development can have on the Council's ability to undertake duties people take for granted. These include recycling and waste management, litter and dog bins and ground maintenance.

How to Respond

There is a standard representation form or you can simply email or write to us. The representation form is available on the Council's website, or in the Council's Customer Service Centre, Angel Court, High Street, Colchester or Colchester Central Library.

Copies of all documents and an on-line representation form can be downloaded from our website at www.colchester.gov.uk/planningconsult or are available for inspection at the following locations.

- Colchester Borough Council Customer Service Centre, High Street, Colchester, between 8.30am and 5.30pm (Monday to Friday);
- Colchester Central Library

Representations on the document should be made on the appropriate representation form and returned by email to planning.policy@colchester.gov.uk or posted to the following address:

Spatial Policy Team
FREEPOST RL5L-ZTSR-SGYA
Strategic Policy & Regeneration

**Colchester
CO1 1ZE**

The deadline for responding is **5.00pm on Monday 12th March.**

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Matt Young', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Matthew Young
Head of Street Services

