

**COUNCIL MEETING held at 7.30 pm at COUNCIL OFFICES LONDON ROAD SAFFRON WALDEN on 14 DECEMBER 2004**

Present:- Councillor E J Godwin – Chairman  
 Councillors E C Abrahams, C A Bayley C A Cant, R P Chambers, J F Cheetham, K J Clarke, A Dean, C M Dean, C D Down, M L Foley, R F Freeman, M A Gayler, E Gower, D W Gregory, R T Harris, M A Hibbs, E W Hicks, B M Hughes, S C Jones, A J Ketteridge, V J T Lelliott, R M Lemon, J I Loughlin, A Marchant, Mrs J E Menell, D J Morson, J P Murphy, A R Row, M J Savage, G Sell, F E Silver, E Tealby-Watson, A R Thawley, A M Wattebot, P A Wilcock,

Officers in attendance: - A Bovaird, D Burridge, S McLagan, J Mitchell, P O'Dell, M Perry, R Pridham and M T Purkiss

**C49 WELCOME**

The Chairman welcomed Councillor Emily Gower to her first Council Meeting and also extended a welcome to Ruth Whitlam and Martyn Fiddler from the Independent Remuneration Panel.

**C50 STATEMENT BY MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC**

Prior to the meeting Keith Beeson from Wendens Ambo Parish Council made a statement and a copy is attached to these minutes

**C51 REPORT OF THE INDEPENDENT REMUNERATION PANEL**

Ruth Whitlam and Martyn Fiddler of the Independent Remuneration Panel attended the meeting and presented the panel's report. Ruth Whitlam outlined the work undertaken by the panel and referred to the analysis of Members' responses to the questionnaire, discussions with members and a review of allowances payable in comparable local authorities. She said that the panel considered that the scheme that was commended to the Council in 2001 remained a robust, transparent, compliant and acceptable mechanism for the calculation and payment of allowances to Members.

However, a number of issues had arisen during the review which had been addressed including the group leaders' allowance, payment of multiple special responsibility allowances, payment of a special responsibility allowance to Vice-Chairmen and payment of a special responsibility allowance to Council's representatives on significant external bodies.

The panel had also noted that the Local Government Pension Scheme had been amended so that the basic and special responsibility allowances paid to local authority members could be treated as pensionable. The panel considered that as the pension scheme was now available to Members it did not seem equitable that they should be denied access.

The panel had also looked at the issue of suspension and felt that where a Member suspended by the Standards Committee or the Adjudication Panel, the allowance should be suspended.

Officers had also noted that in relation to the payment of special responsibility allowances the remuneration panel's recommendation that:

"in case of the extended absence of a Committee Chairman from Council duties (3 months or more) then the relevant Vice Chairman should be remunerated on a pro-rata basis as if Chairman until such time as the Chairman returns to his/her duties"

had not formally been included within the Members Allowances Scheme and it was recommended that it now be adopted. Ruth Whitlam clarified that such an allowance would be backdated to the start of the three-month period.

Ruth Whitlam thanked Members of the Council who had contributed to and informed the review by taking the time to complete the questionnaire. She also thanked the Officers of the Council who continued to provide excellent and efficient support which had enabled the panel's work to be completed.

Councillor Sell declared a prejudicial interest insofar as this item related to payments to a Vice-Chairman.

RESOLVED that:

- 1 An allowance be paid to group leaders of either £1,000 p.a. or the existing per capita sum whichever is the greater (para 2.1)
- 2 No Member should receive more than one special responsibility allowance in any financial year with the exception of group leaders who should be outwith this principle and eligible to receive the group leader's allowance described above and a maximum of one other special responsibility allowance (para 2.2.2).
- 3 All Members should be entitled to membership of the Local Government Pension Scheme (para 3).
- 4 The following allowances for payment in 2005/2006:

Basic allowance	£4,624 (notionally 65 days p.a. @ £71.14 per day)
Chairman of the Council	£4,624 + £3,468 + civic expenses (basic allowance + $\frac{3}{4}$ basic allowance)
Vice Chairman of the Council	£4,624 + £2,312 (basic allowance + $\frac{1}{2}$ basic allowance)
Leader of the Council	£4,624 + £6,936 (basic allowance + $1\frac{1}{2}$ basic allowance)
Deputy Leader of the Council	£4,624 + £2,312 (basic allowance + $\frac{1}{2}$ basic allowance)

	allowance)
Committee Chairmen	£4,624 + £3,468 (basic allowance + $\frac{3}{4}$ basic allowance)
Chairman of Standards Committee	£3,468 ( $\frac{3}{4}$ basic allowance)
Group Leaders	One basic allowance + either £1,000 p.a. or £105 x group membership as at 1 <sup>st</sup> April (subject to a minimum group size of 2) whichever is the greater
Members of the Development Control Committee	£4,624 + £462 (basic allowance + 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ days @ £71.14 per day)
Carer's allowance	£10 per hour

- 5 Where a Member is suspended by the Standards Committee or the Adjudication Panel in whole or part the allowance should be suspended, or a proportion thereof, in the event of a partial suspension.
- 6 In case of the extended absence of a Committee Chairman from Council duties (3 months or more) then the relevant Vice Chairman should be remunerated on a pro-rata basis as if Chairman until such time as the Chairman returns to his/her duties.

C52

## MEMBERS QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION

Councillor Row said that he understood that it was intended to hold a workshop in the New Year regarding scrutiny and he asked that the two-scrutiny chairmen be involved in this matter. He also referred to the problems of the internal telephone directory being out of date.

Councillor Cheetham said that the Freedom of Information Act would shortly be coming into force and had implications for Members in relation to the information they held on computer. She asked that a workshop be held on this issue. She also suggested that the Council Agenda and papers should be incorporated in the Council minute book. Councillor Gayler said that Officers would look at this suggestion.

Councillor Chambers referred to the increased corporate support which it was proposed to provide to the Leader and the Chief Executive and also referred to the amount of paper which was distributed to Members.

Councillor Hicks said that he was still not receiving papers concerning the Dunmow Office Working Group and officers agreed to investigate this matter and ensure that any further papers were sent to Councillor Hicks.

C53

## APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Artus, Baker, Boland, Bowker, Corke, Flack, Pedder and Schneider.

Councillor Bayley updated Members on Councillor Bowker's condition and the Chairman circulated a card for all Members to sign which would be sent to him and his wife and said that a bouquet of flowers would be sent to Councillor Bowker's wife before Christmas.

#### C54 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

The following Councillors declared interests as Members of SSE:-

Councillors Bayley, Cant, Cheetham, A Dean, C Dean, Down, Foley, Godwin, Harris, Hughes, Ketteridge, Marchant, Menell, Morson, Murphy, Savage, Thawley and Wilcock.

Councillor Chambers declared an interest as Chairman of the Essex Police Authority and a member of Essex County Council. Councillor Menell declared an interest as a non-executive Director of the Uttlesford Primary Care Trust and Councillor Hibbs declared an interest in relation to the item on the Local Plan as he was an architect and said that he would leave the meeting during this item.

#### C55 **MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 19 October 2004 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman subject to the addition of Councillor Tealby-Watson to the list of Members voting for the motion in minute C46 (ii)

#### C56 **BUSINESS ARISING**

##### **i) Minute C35 - Dunmow Offices**

Councillor Gayler confirmed that no further meetings of the Working Group had been held and it was likely that a meeting would be held following the outcome of the traffic survey which would probably be in late January 2005.

##### **ii) Minute C46(i) – Notice of Motion: Decriminalisation**

Councillor Cheetham asked if any contact had been made with Takeley Parish Council or the County Council concerning Airport Fly Parking and said that if contact had not been made, the matter should be looked at urgently by the Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement Task Group.

Councillor Hibbs, Chairman of the Task Group said that a meeting would be held shortly and he would also be contacting the County Council asking for a representative to attend the next meeting to discuss the review of traffic orders.

### iii) Minute C46 (2) - Notice of Motion: Bulk Waste Collection

Councillor Ketteridge said that a new recycling booklet had been circulated to all households and contained a statement that the Council provided a free collection service for bulky waste and he asked whether a decision had been made to continue with this. Councillor Thawley drew attention to the decision of the Environment Committee to review this matter as part of waste management strategy.

C57

### CHAIRMAN'S COMMUNICATIONS

The Chairman drew attention to the new Uttlesford Community bus which was operating in the district and said that a further one would be introduced in Spring 2005. She said that the bus could take people to the hospital and on planned outings and was also available for hire. It was also fully equipped for use by the disabled.

The Chairman also referred to fund raising activities for Crossroads and mentioned the Christmas raffle and the second book of poetry by former Councillor Ron Dean. She said that the carol service would be held on 15 December at Stansted Church in conjunction with the Uttlesford Primary Care Trust and after Christmas she would be organising a sponsored slim for Members to be run in conjunction with the Leisure Centres. She drew attention to the staff awards presentations which would be held on 23 December and said that this would become an annual event. Also, there would be a Mexican style quiz night on 29 January and a Jazz evening in Stansted Church on 12 March 2005.

Councillor Gregory asked that the day centres be made aware of the facilities offered by the community bus.

C58

### LEADER'S COMMUNICATIONS

The Leader said that 2004 had been a year of steady progress and the Council was building its capacity so that it could do better in the future. He thanked all Members and Officers for their support during the year and wished them all a very happy Christmas.

He said that there was still some way to go and the capacity was still slim but he expected further improvements in 2005. He drew attention to an article in the Local Government Chronicle which referred to Councils being averse to risk taking and he said that Uttlesford should have the courage to take more risks in the future. He considered that the Council had a weak record in engaging with regional bodies such as EEDA and needed to engage with these organisations who held the purse strings for many projects and initiatives. He also suggested that the Council should work more closely with its neighbours as there were strength in numbers, and he and the Chief Executive had met with representatives of Braintree District Council to discuss areas of common interest and co-operation.

He said that the East of England Regional Assembly had recently voted to suspend its endorsement of the East of England Plan due to lack of Central Government funding for essential infrastructure for the region. The response from Lord Rooker and John Prescott was awaited.

The Leader said that he had attended part of the Judicial Review Hearing in the High Court this week and updated Members on the proceedings so far. The Judgement would not be announced until February 2005.

C59

## **UTTLESFORD LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATIONS – REPORT OF REPRESENTATIONS**

The Chairman agreed to the consideration of this item as a matter of urgency as delay would have been injurious to the timetable for the future planning of the District.

Councillor Hibbs , having declared an interest earlier, left the meeting during the discussion and voting on this item.

Councillor Thawley, the Chairman of the Environment Committee, reminded Members of the discussion at the Environment Committee on 9 November 2004 and said that the Committee had resolved unanimously that:

- i) the proposed further changes be approved as summarised above
- ii) notwithstanding the representations received, the plan is adopted as proposed to be modified and Members recommend to inform Council accordingly
- iii) appropriate additional weight be attached to the modified plan for development control purposes
- iv) the representations made at the meeting be addressed during the review of the local development framework at the earliest possible opportunity.

Councillor Thawley thanked Officers and Members for the enormous amount of work which have been put into the plan and said that the District would benefit from the policies contained in it. He then moved that the recommendations of the Environment Committee be adopted and this was seconded by Councillor A Dean.

Councillor Menell thanked Mr Beeson who had earlier put across the views of Wendens Ambo Parish Council. She said that the Council's logo was "it's our community" and that Wendens Ambo Parish Council worked for the local community and expected to work in partnership with the District Council. She said that the Parish Council had given full consideration to the Inspector's Report and had called a Parish Council meeting which had confirmed the views that no change should be made. The Inspectors' recommendation to support the development of the site at Duck Street had come as a surprise and she was disappointed that the Council Officers had not opposed this and had persuaded the Environment Committee to agree with the "man from the Ministry". She said that there were many reasons why the Duck Street site should not be developed and she could not understand why the Council had not defended this site and listened to the views of the local community. She

then moved, and it was seconded by Councillor Chambers that the Council reject the recommendation and the plan as proposed to be modified be not accepted.

Councillor Chambers added that he hoped that the Council would make progress and take the opportunity to demonstrate that it did take notice of the local community. Councillor Sell added that the Council should not ride roughshod over the views of the Parish Council and the residents of Wendens Ambo.

In response to a question from Councillor Cheetham, the Executive Manager Development Services explained the Inspector's decision and said that if the Council changed the local plan at this stage then it would be obliged to reopen the whole Local Plan Inquiry. The Council would then be vulnerable to planning decisions by appeal until the outcome of the Inquiry was known. He said that it was open to the owner of the land to submit a planning application and if this happened it would enable the local plan and other material factors including the issues raised by the parish council to be taken into account. He also confirmed that this site and a site at the Nurseries, Great Chesterford, would be re-examined at the earliest opportunity in the local development framework.

Councillor Thawley endorsed the officer's comments and asked Members to think very carefully before they voted on this matter. Councillor Cant also urged Members to reject the amendment and said that it was vital that the Council had a Plan in place to help determine planning applications and to defend the area against inappropriate development.

Councillor Clarke expressed his concerns with part of the plan and said that expediency should not take precedence over matters of principle.

Councillor Tealby-Watson understood Members anxiety but said that the most pragmatic way of protecting the sites was by adopting the plan.

At this stage of the meeting Councillor Chambers asked for a recorded vote.

Councillor Cheetham again expressed concern that the parish council would not have the opportunity to fight its corner and asked if it was possible for the Council to approve the Plan with the exception of the extension to the village development limits for Wendens Ambo. The Executive Manager Corporate Governance suggested some amended wording which could reflect this. However, it was explained that such a course of action would reopen the whole local plan and officers were asked to advise on the competency of the original amendment and the suggested revised wording.

Councillor Loughlin said that some Members were unclear as to what would be the impact if the amendment were approved and Councillors Cheetham and Lemon said that the matter should be deferred due to this uncertainty. However, the Chief Executive said that deferment would not be appropriate as officers could bring nothing further to a future meeting and no advantage would be gained by this. The amendment mooted by Councillor Menell was not competent since it would negate the original motion and an amendment to reject the recommendation only in relation to Wendens Ambo would not be

possible since any amendment to the plan would reopen the whole local plan and necessitate a new Inquiry.

He advised that if Members wished to achieve the result advocated by Councillor Menell, they should vote against the recommendation from the Environment Committee.

Councillor Thawley moved and it was agreed by the seconder that paragraph 4 of the Motion be amended to read that the representations made in respect of sites at Duck Street, Wendens Ambo and the Nurseries, Great Chesterford, be looked at during the review of the local development framework at the earliest possible opportunity.

The Motion, as amended was then put to the vote and the voting was as following:

<b>For</b>	<b>Against</b>	<b>Abstain</b>
Cant	Abrahams	Bayley
A Dean	Chambers	Clarke
C Dean	Cheetham	Freeman
Foley	Down	Godwin
Gayler	Hicks	Gower
Harris	Ketteridge	Gregory
Hughes	Lemon	Lelliott
Jones	Menell	Loughlin
Marchant	Row	Sell
Morson		Silver
Murphy		
Savage		
Tealby-Watson		
Thawley		
Wattebot		
Wilcock		

The voting was therefore 16 for the Motion, 9 against and 10 abstentions. The Motion, as amended, was carried.

Councillor Menell asked for a transcript of what the Executive Manager, Development Services had said at the meeting and asked that this be copied to the Parish Council.

C60

#### **AMENDMENT OF PROCEDURE RULES TO ENABLE THE APPOINTMENT OF AN ACTING VICE-CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL**

Members considered a report dealing with the procedures which would be necessary to enable the appointment of an acting Vice-Chairman of the Council in the event that the elected Vice-Chairman was unable to act in that capacity. Officers advised that the Council's constitution required that any motion to vary the Council's Rules of Procedure stood adjourned till the next ordinary meeting of the Council (Procedure Rule 19.2).



The Chairman emphasised that such an appointment was necessary because of the pressures on the position of Chairman and it was not intended to replace the current Vice-Chairman.

It was proposed and seconded that

- (i) Members approve the addition of the following Council Procedure rule – ‘Appointment of Acting Vice-Chairman
  - 1. In the event that the Vice-Chairman appointed at the Annual Meeting of the Council shall be incapable of acting in that capacity by reason of injury, illness or for any other cause, the Council may, by resolution, at an ordinary meeting of the Council appoint one of its Members to be Acting Vice-Chairman until such time as the Vice-Chairman shall again be able to act in that capacity.
  - 2. An Acting Vice-Chairman so appointed shall assist the Chairman of the Council by representing the Council at civic functions and events and shall also assist the Chairman of the Council in the conduct of Council Meetings.
  - 3. In the event that the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Council are both absent from a meeting of the Council then the Members of the Council present at that meeting shall appoint one of the Members present to be the Chairman of the meeting who may or may not be the Acting Vice-Chairman’.
- (ii) That following the proposing and seconding of recommendation (i) consideration of the same be adjourned without discussion to the Council Meeting on 15 February, 2005 pursuant to Procedure Rule 19.2.

C61

### **ELECTION OF A DISTRICT COUNCILLOR FOR THE GREAT DUNMOW SOUTH WARD**

Members noted the result of the election of a District Councillor for the Great Dunmow South Ward on 21 October 2004 and congratulated Councillor Emily Gower on her election to the Council

C62

### **APPOINTMENT TO COMMITTEES ETC**

RESOLVED that the following appointments be confirmed:

Business Development Services (North West Essex – Councillor Sell  
 National Housing and Town Planning Council (Eastern Region  
 Council) – (substitute) - Councillor Bayley  
 Councillor Gower to replace Councillor Gregory on Health and Housing  
 Committee  
 Councillor Gower to fill the vacancy on Scrunity Committee 2  
 (Resources and Environment)  
 Councillor Gregory to replace Councillor Foley on Scrunity Committee  
 1 (Community and Housing)

C63

**JOINT MUNICIPAL WASTE MANAGEMENT CONTRACT**

Councillor Thawley introduced a comprehensive report asking Members to consider entering into a proposed joint procurement exercise with Essex County Council along with other Essex Local Authorities. He said that this would enable a joining up of both waste/recycling collections with disposal across Essex. He also emphasised that if the recommendations were agreed at this meeting, there would be no commitment and the exercise would enable an evaluation of the costs involved if the Council moved into joint arrangement for waste disposal.

Councillor Cheetham said that she was satisfied to go along with the proposals but said some safeguards were needed to ensure that the Council's representatives on the joint committee had the full support of the Council and provided regular updates to Members. Councillor Thawley gave this reassurance and suggested that a small group of Members could be set up to monitor progress.

Councillor Tealby-Watson congratulated the Services Officer on the excellent briefings which he had given on waste management.

**RESOLVED that**

1. The draft joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy be adopted.
2. The Council enters into the joint procurement process for long term waste management solution with a view to utilising PFI credits to support three area contracts.
3. The Council agrees that, subject to satisfactory contract outcome, contractual integration of some or all of the relevant services is envisaged. Relevant services for these purposes may be regarded as refuse and recycling.
4. The establishment of an area joint committee to manage the procurement process be agreed
5. The Council agrees the financial contribution to the procurement process as previously advised.
6. The draft communications plan be agreed.

C64

**MEMBER DEVELOPMENT**

The Chief Executive introduced a report proposing that the IDeA was commissioned to work with Members to develop their thoughts and views into an agreed and supported way forward. He also circulated copies of the East of England Charter for Elected Member Development which had been launched the previous week.

Due to the nature of the work that the IDeA had undertaken, it was suggested that they were best placed on this occasion to offer the support and guidance required. The IDeA had suggested that the following areas could be considered by Members:

- Review and evaluate the political framework
- Roles and responsibilities
- Decision making

Whether the above or other subject headings were agreed the approach they would use to assist Members would be through desk research and workshops with Members and Officers. The consultant recommended to Members by the IDeA was Siobhan Coughlan, Principal Consultant. The Chief Executive said that the cost associated with the brief was £15,000. However, full costs and time would depend on the brief set by Members.

Councillor Ketteridge asked what measurable outcomes there would be and the Chief Executive said that Members would design the brief and could include measurable outcomes in these.

Councillor Loughlin suggested that the reference in the recommendation to “leading Members” should be deleted and it was suggested that this be replaced by a Member Reference Panel of 5 Members who would agree the brief.

In response to a question from Councillor Sell, the Chief Executive said that the programme and timing could be designed to meet Members’ needs. Councillor Hicks said that he could see no benefit from an outside body evaluating Members’ abilities and capabilities and said that the money would be better spent on training for Members’ individual skills needs such as the use of I.T. The Chairman confirmed that gaps in knowledge would be looked at in the brief.

RESOLVED that

1. The Chief Executive and a Member Reference Panel of 5 Members be asked to set and agree a brief
2. The IDeA be commissioned to undertake the work.

C65

### **DRAFT CORPORATE PLAN 2005-2008**

The Executive Programme Manager, Quality of Life introduced a report containing information regarding the timetable and process for the development of the Council’s Corporate Plan. She asked Members for comments and feedback on the draft plan and to confirm the arrangements for the production and distribution of it. She said that once the final Corporate Plan was confirmed in February, Officers would seek details of the Members that wished to be associated with particular projects contained in the plan.

Councillor Wilcock congratulated the Executive Manager on the work that had gone in to the Corporate Plan and suggested that the main format for distribution should be by CD Rom with paper copies being made available on request.

Councillor Cheetham agreed that a glossy publication was not necessary but suggested that a summary would be useful.

Councillor Silver asked whether the Council could realistically meet all the targets and the Executive Manager said that the targets had been agreed with Executive Managers who considered that they were achievable, but stressed that, in some cases, targets might have to change as projects are developed.

Councillor Ketteridge said that the Council seemed to be producing book after book and he was confused as to how some of these publications fitted in with the Quality of Life Corporate Plan and questioned whether the Council was getting value for money. He also asked what would happen to those projects which had not been completed in the Quality of Life Corporate Plan.

Councillor Gayler said that the Corporate Plan was updated and reviewed on an annual basis and explained the link to the Quality of Life Corporate Plan. Councillor Mrs Cheetham asked that the names of the opposition Members who had agreed to take part in the process of supporting the delivery of projects in the Quality of Life Corporate Plan, be included in the document.

Councillor Hibbs thanked the Officers for the work which they had put into these plans and said that the Corporate Plan was a clear and concise document and urged Members to provide feedback to Officers.

RESOLVED that

1. The draft Corporate Plan be progressed to the next stage and submitted to the Council meeting on 15 February 2005
2. The main format for distribution of the Plan be on CD ROM and that a summary leaflet be prepared.

C66

## **LICENSING POLICY**

Councillor Savage thanked the Executive Manager, Corporate Governance and the Solicitor (Non Contentious) for the work which they had put into preparing the draft Licensing Policy. He said that the Licensing Act 2003 was the first major reform of Licensing Law for over a century and transferred responsibility for Liquor Licensing from the Magistrates to local authorities so that all licensing activities were dealt with under one regime.

He said that the Act required Licensing Authorities to have a Licensing Policy and to publish this by 7 January 2005. A draft policy had been agreed by the Licensing Committee on 9 August 2004 and details had been published on the Council's website and it had received wide press publicity. A public meeting had also been held on 13 October and invitations were sent to all members of the licensed trade and other consultees within the District. Following the consultation exercise, some amendments had been made to the draft policy

document and the Licensing Committee had recommended approval of the final version at its meeting on 10 November 2004. Councillor Cheetham referred to the importance of consultation with bed and breakfast operators and Councillor Row asked if extra staff would be needed to deal with the new procedures. Officers confirmed that there would be a need for an additional Enforcement Officer but this would be funded by fee income.

Councillor Loughlin thanked Councillors Savage and Lelliott and the Licensing Committee for the work which they had put into this matter.

RESOLVED that the draft Licensing Policy Statement submitted to the Council meeting be adopted as the Licensing Policy for Uttlesford District Council.

C67

## **FINANCIAL STRATEGY AND SERVICE PLANNING PROCESS**

The Executive Manager Finance and Asset Strategy submitted a comprehensive report proposing an approach to finalising the Council's 2005/06 General Fund Budget. He referred to details of the recently announced Local Government Finance Settlement, proposed savings or additional income targets for services based on the principles of the Council's prioritisation approach, and spending pressures which the Executive Management Team supported as necessary to develop services and respond to external and internal pressures. He said that the report had been brought direct to the Council due to the timing difficulties arising from the delay in the Local Government Finance Settlement and the different approach to preparing the Council's budget this year, using a prioritisation process which had taken time to develop. He considered that it was important that savings targets, in particular were endorsed by the Council, so as to give policy committees clear guidance and to ensure that the process was open and transparent.

Councillor Gayler confirmed that all items would go to individual committees in detail so that they would have the opportunity to discuss these matters in full. At this stage the Council was being asked to agree the approach to the budget strategy.

Councillor Ketteridge referred to the press release, which had expressed concern at the amount of money being made available by the Government and said that this was a problem which the previous administration had had to face on a regular basis. He also referred to the previous and likely increase in Council Tax by the current administration. Councillor Gayler said that the Council would continue to provide excellent value for money services.

C68

## **NOTICE OF MOTION London Olympic Bid**

Members considered the following Notice of Motion which had been proposed by Councillor Gregory and duly seconded:

“The Council welcomes and supports the bid to hold the Olympic Games in London in 2012 and writes letters of support to the appropriate authorities.

It welcomes the opportunity given by such a major event in challenging our youth to take part in sports activities and resolves to work closely with local youth organisations and local sports clubs to develop the sporting prowess of our youth across many disciplines.

Furthermore it welcomes the opportunity to develop our appeal to tourists that will follow from targeting the many competitors, team managers and spectators that will travel to the games via Stansted Airport.”

Councillor Silver questioned whether London could organise such an event satisfactorily due to traffic congestion in the city and also said that most of the previous events had lost a considerable amount of money. Councillor Cheetham also said that it would be very expensive to hold such an event in London and could put pressure on the provision of a second runway at Stansted. Councillor Foley agreed with this and suggested that the words “via Stansted Airport” be deleted from the Motion. The mover and seconder of the Motion agreed to the exclusion of these words and it was then:

RESOLVED that the Motion as amended be approved.

#### C69 **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

RESOLVED that under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraphs 7 and 12 of part 1 of schedule 12a of the Local Government Act 1972.

#### C70 **PENSION FUND**

Councillor Gayler declared a non-prejudicial interest as a member of the County Council’s pension fund.

The Executive Manager Finance and Asset Strategy informed Members of an issue regarding the pension fund and set out options for the way forward.

RESOLVED that

1. Essex County Council be advised that unless it can provide a satisfactory revised solution to the issue within the previously understood framework, this Council will seek Counsel’s advice on whether it has a legal claim for compensation against Essex County Council.
2. Officers work with officers of the County Council on the phasing of required payments to meet the Pension fund deficit over the next twenty years consistent with (1) above.

3. A further report be brought to the next meeting of Resources Committee.
4. A Member Workshop be arranged on the Pension Fund.

The meeting ended at 10.50pm

**STATEMENT BY MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC**  
**Keith Beeson – Wendens Ambo Parish Council**

On behalf of Wendens Ambo Parish Council, I ask the Council not to adopt the Local Plan insofar as it includes an extension of the development boundary to include an area of land off Duck Street.

There are democratic and procedural reasons why rejection is appropriate.

I will not re-iterate the reasons why the Inspector's recommendation to extend the development boundary should be rejected. The extension was strongly opposed by your officers, the Inspector's decision was strange and not based on fact.

I was not present at the Committee Meeting at which the Parish's representations were made, but I understand that guidance provided was in error.

It was suggested that the Parish Council had been tardy, had not taken every opportunity at an early stage to make its representations and it was in some way "to blame" for finding itself in the current position.

We have checked the record and have had discussions with your officers, and can advise you that the Parish Council has not only adopted the advice provided by Uttlesford District Council's officers, but have made appropriate representations at every stage. Indeed, earlier this year, I was assured by one of your officers that there was plenty of time to resolve our concerns.

The extension arises as a result of an objection from a Mr Joslin. Uttlesford rebutted this objections for reason which the Parish Council entirely support, and the Parish Council was advised that it was not required to comment separately to the Inspector.

The Inspector's recommendation to support Mr Joslin came as a great surprise to us, and your officers can confirm that we have been active at every stage in making our representation.

There is a separate issue related to the inconvenience and penalties that may arise should the Council refuse to confirm the Plan. If the Council does confirm the Plan for these reasons – the very least that the residents of Wendens Ambo are entitled to are an apology and assurance that, notwithstanding the extension of the development boundary, no development of the site that the Parish Council believes to be inappropriate will be permitted.

This is our village, we do not want this extension of the development boundary, and we expect your support. We also look forward to your support when pressing your officers to permit flexibility on sites elsewhere in the village where we are keen to see low cost housing.

Our position is not that we are against development in the village; what we want are developments in the right place, and developments that meet local peoples' needs.

Your officers should have recommended rejection of this proposal immediately following the receipt of the Inspector's report; indeed you may wish to carry out an enquiry to discover why this did not take place.



At this late stage your correct decision is still rejection.

Changing the subject somewhat, I would like to put on record that one of Planning Inspector's recommendations – to include a property called the Lodge within the settlement boundary – is not included in the documentation that you are being asked to approve. What is more I am not aware that you have seen any documentation giving reasons why you are rejecting the Inspector's recommendation. Oddly, the Parish Council has no objection to this recommendation.