

**MEETING held at 7.30pm at COUNCIL OFFICES LONDON ROAD  
SAFFRON WALDEN on 12 FEBRUARY 2002**

Present:- Councillor D W Gregory – Chairman  
Councillors Mrs C A Bayley, W F Bowker, Mrs C A Cant,  
Mrs M A Caton, R P Chambers, Mrs J F Cheetham,  
R J Copping, Mrs D Cornell, A Dean, Mrs C M Dean, R C Dean,  
Mrs C D Down, Mrs S Flack, M L Foley, M A Gayler, R D Green,  
M A Hibbs, D M Jones, A J Ketteridge, P G F Lewis,  
Mrs C M Little, Mrs J I Loughlin, Mrs J E Menell, R A Merrion,  
D M Miller, D J Morson, R J O'Neill, G W Powers, A R Row,  
Mrs S V Schneider, G Sell, R C Smith, R W L Stone,  
A C Streeter, Mrs E Tealby-Watson, A R Thawley, R B Tyler and  
P A Wilcock.

Officers in attendance:- Mrs E Forbes, Mrs M Cox, M R Dellow, J B Dickson,  
A Forrow, B D Perkins and M Perry.

**C24 HRH PRINCESS MARGARET**

Before the start of the meeting, Members stood for a minute's silence in  
tribute to HRH The Princess Margaret who had died at the weekend.

**C25 APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors E C Abrahams,  
R A E Clifford and Mrs E J Godwin.

**C26 MINUTES**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 11 December 2001 were received,  
confirmed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record subject to the  
addition of the following words at the end of recommendation 3 to Minute C22:

"The substantive motion was then put to the vote and carried, with 33 votes  
for and no votes against."

**C27 BUSINESS ARISING**

**(i) Minute C15(vi) - Stansted Airport Referendum Group**

In answer to a question, Councillor Chambers confirmed that he had  
recently received a reply from BAA and this would be circulated to all  
Members.

**(ii) Minute C15(viii) - Uttlesford Police and Community Consultative Group**

It was reported that no reply had yet been received from the Police Authority. Councillor Smith asked that when a letter was sent on behalf of the Council, a copy of the letter be circulated automatically to all Councillors.

**(iii) Minute C17 – Leader’s Communications**

Councillor A Dean said that the last meeting of the Constitution Task Group had prepared a draft job description for Members and for the Leader.

C28

**CHAIRMAN’S COMMUNICATIONS**

The Chairman reported that, unfortunately, it had been necessary to cancel the planned gala concert. The quiz sheet was being prepared and a quiz night would be held at the Foakes Hall, Great Dunmow on March 22. The Chairman had been invited to attend a ceremony as the guest of the Lord Mayor of Stoke-on-Trent. It was hoped that there could be a reciprocal visit to this district in the summer.

It was planned to hold four open forums in March for local businessmen throughout the District. At these meetings they would have the opportunity to ask questions of leading Council Members.

The presentation of long service awards to staff would be taking place in the Council chamber on 19 February. All Members were invited to attend.

The Chairman drew attention to a booklet on volunteers, entitled “How to Volunteer”.

C29

**MATTERS ARISING FROM COMMITTEES**

It was agreed that the page numbers of the relevant minutes referred to under this item should be included on the agenda in future.

**(i) Standards Committee 23 January 2002 – Minute S4 – New Ethical Framework – Roles and Responsibilities.**

The Assistant Chief Executive confirmed that if this recommendation were approved he would be writing to parish councils including the offer to arrange a workshop on the new ethical framework and its implications.

RESOLVED that the recommendations contained in this Minute be approved.

**(ii) Special Health and Housing Committee 23 January 2002 – Minute H25 – Housing Revenue Estimates and Rent Setting 2002/03**

Councillor Miller drew attention to the indicative budget of £70,000 that had been included in the budget to upgrade the computer system to bring about the integration of the formula rents. He was concerned at this additional spending for a Government-required calculation that was used only once a year. Other Members were disappointed that the rents had to be increased because of a Government desire for Council rents to be more in line with those in the private sector. Councillor Gayler added that rent increases affected those in the District that were least able to pay.

Councillor Stone, the Chairman of the Health and Housing Committee drew attention to his comments about poor attendance at this meeting and Members failing to send in their apologies. This had been an important meeting to set the Council's housing rents and all the tenant representatives had attended.

RESOLVED that the five recommendations in Minute HH25 be approved.

**(iii) Resources Committee 24 January 2002 – Minute RE37 – Report on the Best Value Review of Corporate Services – Office Accommodation**

Councillor Chambers proposed the recommendations in Minute RE37. He was Chairman of the Corporate Services Best Value Review Reference Group and therefore actively involved in the discussions on this issue. He emphasised that it was not the intention to sell the Council building at Great Dunmow. As a result of the changes, the community information services at Great Dunmow would be enhanced. In seconding the proposal, Councillor Tyler added that savings had been identified and it was time to agree the principle of the administrative centralisation of the Saffron Walden offices. He believed the proposal would lead to better services in the south of the District.

Councillor Gayler then made an amendment that was duly seconded.

- “1 Following further consultation on the proposal to relocate planning staff at Saffron Walden a detailed action plan be prepared to cover such issues as car parking and relocation arrangements within Saffron Walden offices,
- 2 the market for leasing/selling potentially surplus accommodation be explored,
- 3 improved service delivery through website development, the provision of hot desk sites and the Community Information Centre be progressed,
- 4 the principle of relocating planning staff at Saffron Walden be reconsidered following further consultation and the outcome of the Best Value Review of planning.”

This amendment was similar to the original proposal but omitted the recommendation to approve the office move in principle. Councillor Gayler considered such an agreement to be premature as there were still unresolved concerns from the staff, insufficient financial information and further options that needed to be considered. He also pointed out that the Best Value Review of planning was to be undertaken this year and any decision on the office move should wait until the outcome of that review in order to maximise benefits.

Councillor Copping was concerned at the way consultation with staff had been handled. Members had been assured that staff had been consulted but there had been no details given at the Resources Committee. At the meeting of the Scrutiny 2 Committee wide ranging concerns had been expressed by the Unison representative. He asked that a balanced report be prepared before a decision on the principle of this matter was made. Councillor R C Dean added that the IdeA report had referred to staff disquiet and this might not be the right time for further disruption.

Councillor Foley asked about the options for the use of the Great Dunmow building. Councillor Chambers outlined the various alternatives that had been discussed at the Best Value Review meetings and said that the favoured solution would be to retain the building for an enhanced CIC and to lease the remaining parts of the building.

A number of Members emphasised that there would still be a service in Great Dunmow, including Planning Information. The Council had gone through a best value review, recommendations had been made and these should now be implemented. There was a view that staff needed certainty and once the decision to relocate had been made in principle, further detailed discussions could take place with staff. Councillor Jones declared an interest as a member of a Trade Union and said that although it was essential to consult and inform staff, this should not prevent the best decision for the Council being made.

Other Members said this was a major decision and the Council should be sure that it was the right one. Some Members were unclear as to the practical way in which the CIC in Dunmow would operate. Councillor Thawley was concerned at the delivery of services and the length of time a move might take given the amount of paper records held at the Great Dunmow offices. He also referred to the economic impact on the shops and services in Great Dunmow.

Councillor Tyler commented that two centres of administration were inappropriate for a sparsely populated district like Uttlesford. He said District Audit had drawn attention to the amount the Council spent on office accommodation.

Councillor A Dean said that the amendment would not slow the progress of this project, and would allow officers to carry out the further investigations and consultations. In his opinion, financial savings would not be seen immediately and there was no rush for a final decision on this matter. It was more important for the exercise to be carried out thoroughly and openly.

Councillor Chambers replied that it had been made clear that the centralisation of the administration to Saffron Walden would be “possible” and it was now time to move this matter forward. The amendment was then put to the vote. Councillor Gayler asked, that a recorded vote be taken.

#### **FOR THE AMENDMENT**

Mrs C A Bayley  
W F Bowker  
Mrs C A Cant  
R J Copping  
A Dean  
Mrs C M Dean  
M L Foley  
M A Gayler  
D W Gregory  
M A Hibbs  
Mrs C M Little  
Mrs J I Loughlin  
D J Morson  
G W Powers  
G Sell  
R C Smith  
Mrs E Tealby-Watson  
A R Thawley  
P A Wilcock

#### **AGAINST THE AMENDMENT**

Mrs M A Caton  
R P Chambers  
Mrs J F Cheetham  
Mrs D Cornell  
R C Dean  
Mrs C D Down  
Mrs S Flack  
R D Green  
D M Jones  
A J Ketteridge  
P G F Lewis  
Mrs J E Menell  
R A Merrion  
D M Miller  
R J O'Neill  
A R Row  
Mrs S V Schneider  
R W L Stone  
A C Streeter  
R B Tyler

The amendment was lost by 19 votes to 20.

Councillor A Dean asked the Leader of the Council how voting for the proposal set out in Minute RE37 would remove uncertainty for staff. Further investigation was required and the project still might not go ahead.

The recommendation in Minute RE37, originally proposed by Councillor R P Chambers, was then put to the vote and carried by 20 votes to 19.

RESOLVED that the recommendation in Minute RE37 be approved and adopted.

#### **(iv) Leisure (PFI) Board 12 December 2001 and 30 January 2002**

Members were asked to approve the recommendations in Minutes PFI146 and PFI153 in relation to tax advice costs. In answer to a question from Councillor Mrs Flack it was explained that this advice was needed for the very technical and complex aspects of the scheme. This advice had not been required until this stage of the project.

RESOLVED that the recommendations in Minutes PFI146 and PFI153 be approved.

C30

## **CAPITAL PROGRAMME AND GENERAL FUND REVENUE ESTIMATES AND COUNCIL TAX 2002/03**

### **(i) Capital Programme**

Councillor M A Gayler, moved and it was duly seconded by Councillor A Dean, that the recommendation set out in Minute RE35 of the meeting of the Resources Committee held on 4 February 2002 be approved.

Councillor Chambers moved an amendment which was duly seconded that

“the sum of £30,000 per annum in the years 2002/03 and 2003/04 for environmental works relating to flooding be deleted from the programme. Any necessary expenditure should be taken from reserves as and when necessary.”

Councillor Chambers argued that expenditure should not be committed until there had been a report on the extent of the works required. There should be flexibility for the Council to assist from the appropriate sources and this might not be through capital expenditure. He added that the Council would endeavour to assist with any works that were within its responsibility.

Councillor Hibbs said that the District Council had only permissive powers in relation to environmental works for flooding. He said the Council had a responsibility to its residents who had suffered in the recent floods and a budget provision would ensure a real commitment. Councillor Gayler commented that there were certain things that landowners and parish councils could do in relation to flooding and the Council could help to facilitate this. Councillor A Dean added that by putting the £30,000 in the budget there would be a cap on expenditure.

The amendment was then put to the vote and was carried 20 votes to 18.

RESOLVED that the recommendations in Minute RE35 be approved with deletion of the £30,000 per annum in the years 2002/03 and 2003/04 for environmental works relating to flooding.

C31

## **GENERAL FUND REVENUE ESTIMATES AND COUNCIL TAX 2002/03**

Councillor Chambers moved, and it was duly seconded, that the recommendations set out in Minute RE36 of the meeting of the Resources Committee held on 4 February 2002 be approved.

Councillor Chambers considered this to be a balanced budget, continuing the Administration's aim to have a sustainable budget for the future, having to overcome the £1m loss of negative housing subsidy since 1999. This budget

had achieved £697,000 of savings and additional income to overcome difficulties during the year. It had still been necessary to raise Council Tax by 6.5% but this was one of the lowest increases in Essex and there had been no loss of frontline services. For the future, he hoped there would be a revision of working methods, stronger local leadership and more partnerships and efficient ways of working.

Councillor A Dean then moved an amendment, which was duly seconded. He proposed that the following amendments be made to Appendix Rev1 recommended by the Resources Committee on 4 February 2002.

“Line 26 – Changes to become a “striving” Council - £90,000 in 2002/03 to be funded from the management of change reserve.”

This amendment would have no impact on the proposed Council Tax rise in 2002/03. He also suggested that the expenditure under this heading be funded from new savings of £175,000 in 2003/04 and £300,000 in 2004/05 expected from Best Value Reviews and similar initiatives.

Councillor Copping said the Council had not yet achieved a sustainable budget. It faced the prospect of continuing to use its reserves to pay for existing services. It was yet to face the challenge of the new demands to meet the expectations of the recent local government white paper. Drastic changes should be made to the way the Council operated and the use of the management of change budget would be appropriate. He considered that the budget should contain an allowance for achieving at least “striving” Council designation for Uttlesford.

Other Members questioned whether it was appropriate to commit funds at this stage. Councillor Chambers agreed that further provision for savings should be included in the budget for future years and proposed the sums of £200,000 for 2003/04 and £300,000 for 2004/05.

The amendment was then put to the vote and was lost by 19 votes to 20. The original proposal by Councillor Chambers was then put to the vote.

RESOLVED that the recommendations contained in Minute RE36 of the meeting of the Resources Committee on 4 February 2002 be approved.

It was further

RESOLVED that

1 it be noted that at its meeting on 11 December 2001, the Council calculated the following amounts for the year 2002/03 in accordance with regulations made under Section 33(5) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992:-

- (a) 29,608.00 being the amount calculated by the Council in accordance with regulation 3 of the Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) Regulations 1992, as its Council Tax base for the year.

- (b) **Table 1** (Tax Base for each part of the Council's area) being the amounts calculated by the Council in accordance with regulation 6 of the Regulations, as the amounts of its Council Tax base for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which one or more special items relate.

2 The following amounts be now calculated by the Council for the year 2002/03 in accordance with Sections 32 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992:-

- (a) £25,819,056 being the aggregate of the amount which the Council estimate for the items set out in Section 32(2)(a) to (e) of the Act.
- (b) £17,973,260 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimate for the items set out in Section 32(3)(a) to (c) of the Act.
- (c) £7,845,796 being the amount by which the aggregate at 2(a) above exceeds the aggregate at 2(b) above, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 32(4) of the Act as its budget requirement for the year.
- (d) £3,706,535 being the aggregate of the sums which the Council estimates will be payable for the year into its General Fund in respect of redistributed Non-Domestic Rates and Revenue Support Grant.
- (e) £21,521 being the aggregate of £21,521 which the Council estimates as Council Tax surplus will be transferred in the year from its Collection Fund to its General Fund in accordance with Section 97(3) of the Local Government Act 1988, and £Nil being the sum which the Council estimates as Community Charge surplus will be transferred from its Collection Fund to its General Fund pursuant to the Collection Fund (Community Charges) directions under Section 98(4) of the Local Government Act 1988 made on 15 February 2000.
- (f) £139.08 being the amount at 2(c) above, less the amount at 2(d) and 2(e) above, divided by 1(a) above, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 33(1) of the Act as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year.



- (g) £1,124,075 being the aggregate amount of all special items referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act.
- (h) £101.11 being the amount at 2(f) above, less the result given by dividing the amount at 2(g) above by the amount at 1(a) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34(2) of the Act as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year for which dwellings in those parts of its area to which no special item relates.
- (i) **Table 2** (Band D charge for Parish and District combined), being the amounts given by adding to the amount at 2(g) above, the amounts of the special item or items relating to dwellings in those parts of the Council's area mentioned above divided in each case by the amount at 1(b) above, calculated by the council in accordance with Section 34(3) of the Act, as the basic amounts of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in parts of its area to which one or more special items relate.

*Note:*

*A table is attached setting out the combined Parish and District Council Tax for each valuation band*

- (j) It be noted that for the year 2002/03 the Essex County Council and the Essex Police Authority have stated that the following amounts in precepts issued to the Council in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 for each of the categories of dwellings are as shown below:-

	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H	
	£	P	£	P	£	P	£	P	£	P	£	P	£	P	£	P
Essex County Council	511.92		597.24		682.56		767.88		938.52		1109.16		1279.80		1535.76	
Essex Police Authority	51.78		60.41		69.04		77.67		94.93		112.19		129.45		155.34	

- (k) **Table 3** (Total Council Tax for each valuation band) That having calculated the aggregate in each case of the amounts at (i) and (j) above the Council in accordance with Section 30(2) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the following amounts as the amounts of Council Tax for the year 2002/03 for each of the categories of dwellings shown.

**Tax Base for each part of the Council's area****Table 1**

<b><u>Parish</u></b>	<b><u>Tax Base</u></b>	<b><u>Parish</u></b>	<b><u>Tax Base</u></b>
Arkesden	181.7	Leaden Roding	238.7
Ashdon	337.2	Lindsell	104.3
Aythorpe Roding	102.8	Littlebury	381.0
Barnston	373.8	Little Bardfield	119.1
Berden	207.8	Little Canfield	141.6
Birchanger	398.8	Little Chesterford	101.1
Broxted	229.2	Little Dunmow	226.4
Chickney	24.2	Little Easton	211.5
Chrishall	240.8	Little Hallingbury	704.0
Clavering	564.4	Manuden	281.5
Debden	367.4	Margaret Roding	79.0
Elmdon and Wenden Lofts	281.6	Newport	886.4
Elsenham	934.0	Quendon & Rickling	251.1
Farnham	183.7	Radwinter	248.6
Felsted	1198.5	Saffron Walden Town	5848.4
Great Canfield	185.4	The Sampfords	354.5
Great Chesterford	601.8	Stansted	2248.4
Great Dunmow Town	2959.2	Stebbing	610.7
Great Easton	383.5	Strethall	14.7
Great Hallingbury	315.3	Takeley	972.6
Hadstock	154.3	Thaxted	1112.7
Hatfield Heath	548.0	Tilty	50.6
Hatfield Broad Oak	819.7	Ugley	194.6
Hempstead	206.6	Wendens Ambo	190.6
Henham	542.6	White Roding	167.2
High Easter	305.8	Wicken Bonhunt	103.8
High Roding	195.0	Widdington	239.7
Langley	167.6	Wimbish	514.5
	<b>Total</b>		<b>29608.0</b>

**Table 2**

<b>Parish</b>	<b>Band D Parish</b>	<b>Band D District</b>	<b>Band D Parish</b>	<b>Band D District</b>
Arkesden	23.12	101.11	16.76	101.11
Ashdon	40.51	101.11	0.00	101.11
Aythorpe Roding	17.51	101.11	27.17	101.11
Barnston	36.12	101.11	14.69	101.11
Berden	24.06	101.11	19.42	101.11
Birchanger	21.09	101.11	18.30	101.11
Broxted	21.82	101.11	22.08	101.11
Chickney	0.00	101.11	28.37	101.11
Chrishall	34.47	101.11	21.31	101.11
Clavering	11.52	101.11	51.51	101.11
Debden	12.52	101.11	21.52	101.11
Elmdon and Wenden Lofts	31.96	101.11	41.15	101.11
Elsenham	24.09	101.11	0.00	101.11
Farnham	24.50	101.11	28.96	101.11
Felsted	20.86	101.11	64.30	101.11
Great Canfield	24.27	101.11	14.10	101.11
Great Chesterford	41.54	101.11	44.95	101.11
Great Dunmow Town	55.79	101.11	34.39	101.11
Great Easton	23.47	101.11	0.00	101.11
Great Hallingbury	20.30	101.11	41.13	101.11
Hadstock	25.77	101.11	44.49	101.11
Hatfield Heath	19.16	101.11	0.00	101.11
Hatfield Broad Oak	21.11	101.11	15.42	101.11
Hempstead	31.46	101.11	26.23	101.11
Henham	13.82	101.11	11.66	101.11
High Easter	14.72	101.11	0.00	101.11
High Roding	30.77	101.11	31.91	101.11
Langley	14.92	101.11	12.63	101.11

**Table 3**

TOTAL COUNCIL TAX FOR EACH VALUATION BAND 2002/03 (includes Essex CC, Essex Police, Uttlesford DC and Parishes)

Band	A	B	C	D	E	F
Band 'D' equivalent proportions	6/9	7/9	8/9	9/9	11/9	13/9
	£	£	£	£	£	£
Arkesden	646.52	754.27	862.03	969.78	1185.29	1400.79
Ashdon	658.11	767.80	877.48	987.17	1206.54	1425.91
Aythorpe Roding	642.78	749.91	857.04	964.17	1178.43	1392.69
Barnston	655.19	764.38	873.58	982.78	1201.18	1419.57
Berden	647.15	755.00	862.86	970.72	1186.44	1402.15
Birchanger	645.17	752.69	860.22	967.75	1182.81	1397.86
Broxted	645.65	753.26	860.87	968.48	1183.70	1398.92
Chickney	631.11	736.29	841.48	946.66	1157.03	1367.40
Chrishall	654.09	763.10	872.12	981.13	1199.16	1417.19
Clavering	638.79	745.25	851.72	958.18	1171.11	1384.04
Debden	639.45	746.03	852.60	959.18	1172.33	1385.48
Elmdon and Wenden Lofts	652.41	761.15	869.88	978.62	1196.09	1413.56
Elsenham	647.17	755.03	862.89	970.75	1186.47	1402.19
Farnham	647.44	755.35	863.25	971.16	1186.97	1402.79
Felsted	645.01	752.52	860.02	967.52	1182.52	1397.53
Great Canfield	647.29	755.17	863.05	970.93	1186.69	1402.45
Great Chesterford	658.80	768.60	878.40	988.20	1207.80	1427.40
Great Dunmow Town	668.30	779.68	891.07	1,002.45	1225.22	1447.98
Great Easton	646.75	754.55	862.34	970.13	1185.71	1401.30
Great Hallingbury	644.64	752.08	859.52	966.96	1181.84	1396.72
Hadstock	648.29	756.33	864.38	972.43	1188.53	1404.62
Hatfield Broad Oak	643.88	751.19	858.51	965.82	1180.45	1395.07
Hatfield Heath	645.18	752.71	860.24	967.77	1182.83	1397.89
Hempstead	652.08	760.76	869.44	978.12	1195.48	1412.84
Henham	640.32	747.04	853.76	960.48	1173.92	1387.36
High Easter	640.92	747.74	854.56	961.38	1175.02	1388.66
High Roding	651.62	760.22	868.83	977.43	1194.64	1411.84
Langley	641.05	747.90	854.74	961.58	1175.26	1388.95

**TOTAL COUNCIL TAX FOR EACH VALUATION BAND 2002/03 (includes Essex CC, Essex Police, Uttlesford DC and Parishes)**

Band	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Band 'D' equivalent proportions	6/9	7/9	8/9	9/9	11/9	13/9	15/9	18/9
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Leaden Roding	642.28	749.33	856.37	963.42	1177.51	1391.61	1605.70	1926.84
Lindsell	631.11	736.29	841.48	946.66	1157.03	1367.40	1577.77	1893.32
Littlebury	649.22	757.42	865.63	973.83	1190.24	1406.64	1623.05	1947.66
Little Bardfield	640.90	747.72	854.53	961.35	1174.98	1388.62	1602.25	1922.70
Little Canfield	644.05	751.40	858.74	966.08	1180.76	1395.45	1610.13	1932.16
Little Chesterford	643.31	750.52	857.74	964.96	1179.40	1393.83	1608.27	1929.92
Little Dunmow	645.83	753.46	861.10	968.74	1184.02	1399.29	1614.57	1937.48
Little Easton	650.02	758.36	866.69	975.03	1191.70	1408.38	1625.05	1950.06
Little Hallingbury	645.31	752.87	860.42	967.97	1183.07	1398.18	1613.28	1935.94
Manuden	665.45	776.35	887.26	998.17	1219.99	1441.80	1663.62	1996.34
Margaret Roding	645.45	753.03	860.60	968.18	1183.33	1398.48	1613.63	1936.36
Newport	658.54	768.30	878.05	987.81	1207.32	1426.84	1646.35	1975.62
Quendon & Rickling	631.11	736.29	841.48	946.66	1157.03	1367.40	1577.77	1893.32
Radwinter	650.41	758.82	867.22	975.62	1192.42	1409.23	1626.03	1951.24
Saffron Walden Town	673.97	786.30	898.63	1,010.96	1235.62	1460.28	1684.93	2021.92
The Sampfords	640.51	747.26	854.01	960.76	1174.26	1387.76	1601.27	1921.52
Stansted	661.07	771.25	881.43	991.61	1211.97	1432.33	1652.68	1983.22
Stebbing	654.03	763.04	872.04	981.05	1199.06	1417.07	1635.08	1962.10
Strethall	631.11	736.29	841.48	946.66	1157.03	1367.40	1577.77	1893.32
Takeley	658.53	768.28	878.04	987.79	1207.30	1426.81	1646.32	1975.58
Thaxted	660.77	770.89	881.02	991.15	1211.41	1431.66	1651.92	1982.30
Tilty	631.11	736.29	841.48	946.66	1157.03	1367.40	1577.77	1893.32
Ugley	641.39	748.28	855.18	962.08	1175.88	1389.67	1603.47	1924.16
Wendens Ambo	648.59	756.69	864.79	972.89	1189.09	1405.29	1621.48	1945.78
White Roding	638.88	745.36	851.84	958.32	1171.28	1384.24	1597.20	1916.64
Wicken Bonhunt	631.11	736.29	841.48	946.66	1157.03	1367.40	1577.77	1893.32
Widdington	652.38	761.11	869.84	978.57	1196.03	1413.49	1630.95	1957.14
Wimbish	639.53	746.11	852.70	959.29	1172.47	1385.64	1598.82	1918.58

## TOWN AND PARISH REQUIREMENTS

285

	Amount required by Parish £	Parish Tax Base (band 'D' equivalent) No of Properties	Amount per band 'D' Property £
Arkesden	4,200.00	181.7	23.12
Ashdon	13,660.00	337.2	40.51
Aythorpe Roding	1,800.00	102.8	17.51
Barnston	13,500.00	373.8	36.12
Berden	5,000.00	207.8	24.06
Birchanger	8,412.00	398.8	21.09
Broxted	5,000.00	229.2	21.82
Chickney	0.00	24.2	0.00
Chrishall	8,300.00	240.8	34.47
Clavering	6,500.00	564.4	11.52
Debden	4,600.00	367.4	12.52
Elmdon & Wenden Lofts	9,000.00	281.6	31.96
Elsenham	22,500.00	934.0	24.09
Farnham	4,500.00	183.7	24.50
Felsted	25,000.00	1,198.5	20.86
Great Canfield	4,500.00	185.4	24.27
Great Chesterford	25,000.00	601.8	41.54
Great Dunmow	165,105.00	2,959.2	55.79
Great Easton	9,000.00	383.5	23.47
Great Hallingbury	6,400.00	315.3	20.30
Hadstock	3,976.00	154.3	25.77
Hatfield Broad Oak	10,500.00	548.0	19.16
Hatfield Heath	17,300.00	819.7	21.11
Hempstead	6,500.00	206.6	31.46
Henham	7,500.00	542.6	13.82
High Easter	4,500.00	305.8	14.72
High Roding	6,000.00	195.0	30.77
Langley	2,500.00	167.6	14.92
Leaden Roding	4,000.00	238.7	16.76
Lindsell	0.00	104.3	0.00
Littlebury	10,350.00	381.0	27.17
Little Bardfield	1,750.00	119.1	14.69
Little Canfield	2,750.00	141.6	19.42
Little Chesterford	1,850.00	101.1	18.30
Little Dunmow	5,000.00	226.4	22.08
Little Easton	6,000.00	211.5	28.37
Little Hallingbury	15,000.00	704.0	21.31
Manuden	14,500.00	281.5	51.51
Margaret Roding	1,700.00	79.0	21.52
Newport	36,479.00	886.4	41.15
Quendon & Rickling	0.00	251.1	0.00
Radwinter	7,200.00	248.6	28.96
Saffron Walden	376,075.00	5,848.4	64.30
Sampfords, The	5,000.00	354.5	14.10
Stansted	101,068.00	2,248.4	44.95
Stebbing	21,000.00	610.7	34.39
Strethall	0.00	14.7	0.00
Takeley	40,000.00	972.6	41.13
Thaxted	49,500.00	1,112.7	44.49
Tilty	0.00	50.6	0.00
Ugley	3,000.00	194.6	15.42
Wendens Ambo	5,000.00	190.6	26.23
White Roding	1,950.00	167.2	11.66
Wicken Bonhunt		103.8	0.00
Widdington	7,650.00	239.7	31.91
Wimbish	6,500.00	514.5	12.63
	1,124,075.00	29,608.0	

C32 **COMMITTEE TIMETABLE 2002/03**

Members received a draft timetable of meetings for 2002/03. It was noted that it would probably still be necessary to have an additional meeting of Health and Housing to deal with the rent setting. Also, an extra meeting of the Resources Committee on Monday 3 February might be required prior to the Council Tax setting meeting on 11 February 2003.

It was agreed that meetings of the Stansted Airport Advisory Panel should be included.

RESOLVED that the Committee Timetable 2002/03 be approved.

C33 **THE COUNCIL'S CONSTITUTION – AMENDMENTS**

*Councillor M A Hibbs declared a non-pecuniary interest in this item and took no part in the debate nor spoke thereon.*

Members received a report which set out the Constitution Task Group's recommendation that the Council's delegation scheme be amended so that

- (a) in future, the Development Control and Licensing (DC&L) Committee would determine all planning applications without exception.
- (b) the relevant paragraph in the scheme states that all such decisions must be documented and clearly stated, and
- (c) Other sequential amendments be made to the Council's Constitution.

RESOLVED that the following amendments be made to the Council's Constitution.

- 1 references to the Environment and Transport Committee having authority to determine referred applications be deleted from paragraph (i) of the summary constitution and "**POLICY COMMITTEES: OVERALL ROLE**" in the delegation scheme,
- 2 item 13 in **THE ROLE OF THE FULL COUNCIL** in the delegation scheme be amended to read (changes shown in italics) "Also, any matter may be referred to the Council if that is the wish of the majority of Members of the relevant committee, *except for individual planning and licensing applications*",
- 3 the first Term of Delegation to the Development Control and Licensing Committee be amended to read "The determination of planning applications, enforcement matters and other relevant matters. *The reasons for all planning decisions, whether approvals, refusals or deferrals, must be documented and clearly stated*".

- 4 Note 2 be deleted from paragraph 16 of the Terms of Delegation to the Development Control and Licensing Committee.

C34

### **PUBLIC SERVICE AGREEMENT WITH ESSEX COUNTY COUNCIL**

It was reported that Essex County Council was proposing to enter into a Public Service Agreement (PSA) with the Government and had invited all districts in the county to join. The County was committing itself to achieving improved performance in key areas over a three year period. In return, the Government would help towards the achievement of these targets with a pump priming grant of £2m and a performance reward grant of £26m on condition that the County achieved the targets. The report outlined the Council's involvement with the PSA in terms of what this Council would have to do and how it might benefit. Districts had been asked to assist in up to four of Essex's targets and six cost effective indicators for Uttlesford had to be put forward.

Councillor Mrs Flack asked about the status of the reward grant if the countywide targets were met by this District but not by the other authorities. The Chief Executive explained that for countywide targets, countywide compliance was required. However, the cost effectiveness indicators were unique to Uttlesford.

Councillor O'Neill considered that the proposed local target relating to the number of unemployed young adults with special needs taken on by the New Deal project, was an uncertain target that the Council would not be able to influence. He proposed that this target be deleted.

RESOLVED that the Council's involvement with the Public Service Agreement between Essex County Council and the Government be confirmed in principle and authority delegated to the Chief Executive to sign the agreement between Essex County Council and Uttlesford District, subject to the deletion of the indicator relating to young adults with special needs taken on by the New Deal project in the district.

The Chief Executive said that an alternative indicator would need to be found and this would be reported to the Resources Committee meeting in March.

C35

### **MUSEUM MANAGEMENT JOINT WORKING PARTY/MUSEUMS IN ESSEX COMMITTEE**

RESOLVED that

- 1 Councillor Hibbs be appointed as the Council's representative on the Museums in Essex Committee, and
- 2 Councillor Morson be appointed as one of the Council's representatives on the Museum Management Joint Working Party.



C36 **ROAD SAFETY SUB-GROUP**

RESOLVED that Councillor W F Bowker be appointed as the Council's representative on the Road Safety Sub-Group of the Community Safety Action Team.

C37 **NOTICES OF MOTION**

- (i) Councillor Copping moved the following motion which was seconded by Councillor D M Jones.

“That this Council

- (1) Views with serious concern the allocation of resources for policing our community which has resulted in remote and inadequate law enforcement;
- (2) Demands that positive action is taken by the police authority to reduce acts of burglary, vandalism and anti-social behaviour in our towns and villages;
- (3) Co-ordinates a district-wide approach by all communities to make representations to the Essex Police Authority, the Police Federation, the Chief Constable and the Home Secretary in support of proposals to increase police presence and visibility in all areas;
- (4) Makes provision to ensure that community policing is reviewed at regular intervals within the Council's business programme.”

*Councillor R P Chambers declared a pecuniary interest and left the meeting, during the discussion of this item.*

Councillor Copping stated that the cost of policing continued to rise but the service to this District was deteriorating. He said the public expected good value, and demanded that more action be taken to improve the service. He considered the standard of community policing to be a problem throughout the District. He hoped that the Council would monitor the service provided and assist in raising the profile of the problem. He asked that the Council contact all parish and town councils for additional information about the adequacy of law enforcement in their areas that could be used to lobby the appropriate body.

Councillor Smith referred to the increasing cost of providing the police service and mentioned the recent increase in allowance that had been awarded to the Police Authority members.

RESOLVED that the motion be approved.

- (ii) Councillor O'Neill moved the following motion which was seconded by Councillor Mrs Cheetham.

“Uttlesford District Council is very strongly opposed to a second runway at Stansted Airport

The Council regards it as important that Uttlesford should continue to be an area not blighted by an excessively high level of noise and pollution from commercial operations. The construction of a second runway at Stansted Airport would have a major adverse impact on traffic, housing and industrial development and seriously impair the amenity of a particularly beautiful part of Essex and East Hertfordshire.

Any further increase in capacity for civil aviation in the south east if the need is proven should be directed to an off-shore site providing an environmentally and sustainably acceptable solution.”

Councillor O’Neill said it was very important that the Council made its position on a second runway known to the Government as soon as possible. Members were disappointed that, at a time when authorities were waiting for a major strategy report on airport development, the Government should widely leak a report on the possibility of an additional runway in the south east.

RESOLVED that the motion be approved and representations be made to the Secretary of State with a copy to Sir Alan Haselhurst MP and the Member for Hertford and Stortford.

- (iii) Councillor Jones moved the following motion which was seconded by Councillor Merrion.

“Raves in unauthorised indoor venues pose a serious and unacceptable problem in Uttlesford District and apparently cannot be dealt with satisfactorily under existing legislation. We therefore call upon the Government to review the legislation urgently and bring about essential changes to enable the problems to be addressed effectively.”

Councillor Jones referred to recent incidents of raves in the District and said it appeared that current legislation was confused and did not appear to give either the police or the Council appropriate powers to act. Members agreed that representations should be made to the Home Secretary.

RESOLVED that the motion be approved.

C38

## **QUESTIONS UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 8.2**

Councillor A Dean put the following questions to the Leader of the Council.

- 1 Has Councillor Chambers or any other Member participant in the Corporate Service – Office Accommodation Best Value Review Team held any formal or informal discussions directly with officers or members of the Uttlesford Primary Care Trust in connection with the Council’s accommodation in Great Dunmow?

- 2 If so, when and where did the discussions take place? What was the substance of such discussions?
- 3 Was any commitment or indication made to people from the PCT that might have encouraged them to believe that they would have first choice on the premises were they to be vacated by the Council?

Councillor Chambers gave the following replies:

- 1 Yes.
- 2 I have met with the Uttlesford PCT twice and discussed various different issues including that of partnership working.
- 3 No, I cannot commit the Council to anything.

The meeting ended at 10.45 pm.