

COUNCIL MEETING held at 7.30 pm at COUNCIL OFFICES LONDON ROAD SAFFRON WALDEN on 13 DECEMBER 2005

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

Officers in attendance: - A Bovaird, M Brean, D Burrige, J Mitchell, M J Perry, R Pridham, M T Purkiss and T Turner

C57 WELCOME

The Chairman welcomed Councillor Tina Knight to her first Council meeting since her election in the Wimbish and Debden by-election.

C58 RAIL CROSSING TRAGEDY

Councillor C M Dean reported on the tragic death of Olivia Bazlington and Charlotte Thompson. The two teenagers had died following a collision with a train at Elsenham railway station on 3 December 2005. She said that an investigation had been launched into the accident and this would look at ways of making the crossing safer and a public meeting would also be held in January. On behalf of the Council she expressed her sympathy to the families involved and all Members stood in silent tribute to the memory of these two girls.

C59 STATEMENT BY MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC

Paul Ogborn, the Vice-Chairman of the Saffron Walden Skate Group attended the meeting and gave a presentation on the project to build a skate park in Saffron Walden. He said that the group was a non-political and totally dedicated group who were working hard to make young peoples' dreams a reality.

He identified how the project fitted into the objectives of the Government's "Choosing Health White Paper," Uttlesford's Community Safety Survey Report and the Quality of Life Corporate Plan.

He said that the skate park would be a concrete park which would be long lasting and difficult to vandalise and would have minimal maintenance costs and be low noise. He explained how the project would achieve value for money and the level of support which had been received from various groups and individuals.

He concluded that the group had now raised £165,000 but there could be a shortfall in total funding of up to £45,000.

The chairman thanked Mr Ogborn for his presentation and said that a Notice of Motion concerning the skate park would be considered later in the meeting.

C60

FIRE AND RESCUE

Paul Bowers and Steve Couch of the Essex Fire Authority gave a presentation on the work of the Essex Fire Service. They said that the service had a target that by 2010 it would reduce the number of accidental fire related deaths in the home by 20% and reduce the number of deliberate fires by 10%. They also referred to the community safety initiatives and then answered questions from Members.

Councillor Chambers thanked the Essex Fire Service for all its excellent work and in particular its assistance to the recent Hemel Hempstead oil fire and asked that the Council write to both the Essex and Herts Fire Brigades to pass on these thanks.

C61

REPORT OF THE INDEPENDENT REMUNERATION PANEL ON MEMBERS ALLOWANCES

Martyn Fiddler presented the report of the Independent Remuneration Panel for 2006/07. He explained that Ruth Whitlam, the Chairman, was unable to attend.

He said that in 2005/06 the panel had undertaken a comprehensive review of its work, so for the year 2006/07 it had concentrated on assessing the impact of the change in the Council's constitution on the scheme for Members Allowances. He said that the panel had also been asked to look at the unusual workload of the Licensing Committee during 2005/06 and whether this should be recognised within the scheme; and to consider flexibility in the calculation of the group leaders' allowance.

He said that it had been difficult to evaluate the impact of the revised constitution, in particular the work of the area panels and the role of vice-chairmen in the new structure and this would be fully reviewed in the summer of 2006. He concluded that he had been approached by some Members about the possibility of the Chairman of the Licensing Committee also receiving the "exceptional" allowance of £24 per meeting and said that the panel would reconsider this if so requested.

Councillor Morson thanked the panel for their hard work and deliberations and asked that the issue of the Chairman of Licensing Committee be reviewed as soon as possible. He also asked the panel to reconsider the new role of vice-chairmen of the policy committees as he said that they would be more proactive and should be appropriately remunerated. He added that there should not be a differential between the policy committees and the area panels as the Council did not wish to have a two-tier system and asked that

this also be reviewed. Councillor Sell also expressed some concerns about the corporate political capacity being reduced and said that vice-chairmen would have a more important role which would need to be recognised.

However, Councillor Godwin expressed her surprise that these additional allowances were being requested before the committees had got off the ground and said that it would be too early to review the situation in May 2006. Councillor Cheetham said that she agreed with Councillor Godwin and also suggested that the group leaders' allowance should be automatically changed whenever there were changes in the group membership. Councillor Godwin moved, and it was duly seconded, that the Remuneration Panel should be requested to reconsider these issues in a year's time when there had been a proper opportunity to review the workload of the new committees. On being put to the vote this amendment was lost. It was then

RESOLVED that the report of the Independent Remuneration Panel be accepted and the Panel be asked to undertake a review of the special responsibility allowances to Area Panel Chairmen and the issue of allowances to the Vice-Chairmen of the three Policy Committees by May 2006.

Basic Allowance	£4,760 (notionally 65 days p.a. @ £73.24 per day)
Chairman of the Council	£4,760 + £3,570 + civic expenses (basic allowance + $\frac{3}{4}$ basic allowance)
Vice-Chairman of the Council	£4,760 + £2,380 (basic allowance + $\frac{1}{2}$ basic allowance)
Leader of the Council	£4,760 + £7,140 (basic allowance + $1\frac{1}{2}$ basic allowance)
Deputy Leader of the Council	£4,760 + £2,380 (basic allowance + $\frac{1}{2}$ basic allowance)
Committee Chairmen	£4,760 + £3,570 (basic allowance + $\frac{3}{4}$ basic allowance)
Chairmen of Area Panels	£4,760 + £2,142 (basic allowance + 60% of SRA for committee chairmen)
Chairman of Standards Committee	£3,570 ($\frac{3}{4}$ basic allowance)
Group Leaders	One basic allowance + either £1,000 p.a. or £108 x group membership as at 1 st April (subject to a minimum group size of 2) whichever is the greater
Members of the Development Control Committee	£4,760 + £476 (basic allowance + 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ days @ £73.24 per day)
Carer's allowance	£10 per hour

C62

MEMBERS' QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION

Councillor Knight said that she had been astounded at the amount of paper which had been circulated for this meeting and asked that ways be looked at of reducing this. In relation to the Page 6

suggested that an electronic lockable gate and ticket machines on both sides of the track would assist the situation. She also said that the new timetable from One was unacceptable.

In response to the suggestion about Elsenham Station, Councillor C Dean said that a meeting would be held in January and she hoped that these and other suggestions would be taken into account. She added that a representative from One would be attending a meeting of Stansted Mountfitchet Parish Council to discuss rail services.

Councillor Savage asked questions about what financial provision and strategy had been made in relation to the new Gambling Act and Councillor Loughlin replied that these issues would be considered at a workshop in the New Year.

Councillor Lemon said that the Stansted Airport public meeting on 5 December had been badly handled and ill prepared. He questioned whether the Council had the ability to deal with the challenges which would need to be faced. Councillor Gayler said that he shared the concerns about the meeting but considered that the Council was well aware of the challenges which the Airport raised and was well placed to tackle these head-on.

Councillor Cheetham asked why the Council Minute Book had not been available at the Council meeting. The Democratic Services Manager reported that due to other commitments it had not been possible to print the Minute Book on time and this would be circulated as soon as possible. However, any minutes which were required for the meeting were attached to the Council papers. Members were also reminded that the minutes of meetings other than the Council meeting were not dealt with at the Council meetings.

Councillor Flack referred to the purchase of vehicles and bins required for the proposed waste contract. She said that the Conservative administration had left substantial reserves and, in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 8, asked the Chairman of Resources Committee to provide within ten working days a breakdown of capital expenditure since May 2003 and the projected capital expenditure in the period to May 2007 and the balance at that date. Councillor Harris confirmed that a response would be provided.

Councillor Ketteridge referred to the length and nature of the Council agenda and expressed concern that major issues such as the waste strategy and Stansted Airport were among the many items to be discussed. He said that it had been folly to try to bring in a new constitution at this time and this had overloaded the agenda for this meeting. The Chairman said that he would ensure that there would be sufficient time to discuss all issues and some of the major items would be brought forward in the agenda.

Councillor Chambers asked that further consideration be given to the layout of the Council Chamber and suggested that the Chairmen should be at the top table. Councillor Gayler said that the layout would be reviewed shortly.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors H D Baker, J E Menell and A M Wattebot.

C63

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The following declarations of interest were made:

Councillor Cheetham – NWEPPHA, National Trust, Hatfield Forest Management Committee.

Councillor Flack - member of Essex County Council, National Trust, Essex Fire Authority and Chairman of Stansted Airport Community Trust Fund.

Councillor Murphy - SSE, Great Dunmow Town Council and the Council's representative on the Saffron Walden Skate Park Committee.

Councillor Chambers - Chairman of Essex Police Authority and member of Essex County Council.

Councillor Thawley - CPRE and National Trust.

Councillor Gregory - member of National Trust, English Heritage, Felsted Parish Council and taxi driver at Stansted Airport.

Councillor Bayley - member of CPRE and Saffron Walden Town Council.

Councillor Hibbs - member of Saffron Walden Town Council, Saffron Walden Outreach Project and National Trust.

Councillor Freeman - member of Saffron Walden Town Council.

Councillor Hughes - member of Saffron Walden Town Council, CPRE and National Trust.

Councillor Sell - member of Braintree and Uttlesford Police and Community Consultative Group.

Councillor Ketteridge - member of Saffron Walden Town Council.

Councillor Down - member of CPRE.

Councillor Marchant - member of National Trust and Stansted Mountfitchet Parish Council.

Councillor Tealby-Watson - member of National Trust, English Heritage and Home-Start.

Councillor Lemon - member of National Trust and Hatfield Heath Parish Council.

Councillor Knight - member of National Trust and Debden Parish Council.

Councillor C Dean - member of National Trust and Stansted Mountfitchet Parish Council.

Councillor Loughlin - member of Stansted Mountfitchet Parish Council.

Councillor Jones - member of Saffron Walden Town Council.

Councillor Silver - member of Dunmow Town Council.

Councillor Miller - member of Dunmow Town Council.

Councillor Artus - member of CPRE, National Trust, English Heritage and Hatfield Broad Oak Parish Council.

Councillor A Dean - member of CPRE, National Trust and SSE.

Councillor Gayler - member of Great Dunmow Town Council and employee of Essex County Council.

Councillor Morson - member of National Trust.

Councillor Pedder - member of Stansted Mountfitchet Parish Council.

Councillor Godwin - member of Birchanger Parish Council.

Councillor Savage - member of Hadstock Parish Council.

Councillor Abrahams - member of Clavering Parish Council.

Councillor Bowker - Chairman of Newport Parish Council.

C64 **MINUTES**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 18 October 2005 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman subject to minute C52 (i) being amended to clarify that Councillor Bowker took the Chair for this item and the heading of minute C55 being amended to read "micro generation".

C65 **BUSINESS ARISING**

(i) Minute C44 – Statement by Member of the Public

Councillor Flack said that she understood that Dr Moon had still not received a reply from the Council and Councillor Cheetham added that it would be common courtesy to keep him advised. Councillor Thawley understood their concerns and would ensure that Dr Moon was kept informed.

(ii) Minute C47 – Diversity Festival

Councillor Morson reported that funding had been received for the appointment of a Field Officer to work with some of the hard to reach groups

which had attended the Diversity Festival. Councillor Murphy declared a non-prejudicial interest as the Council's representative on the Uttlesford Drugs and Alcohol Strategy Group and asked whether a letter had now been sent to Canon Chris Bishop. The Chief Executive said that a letter had been sent and he would email a copy to Councillor Murphy.

(iii) Minute C47 – Stansted Airport

Councillor Ketteridge read extracts from a letter received from Julian Brazier MP confirming his position regarding a second runway at Stansted and stating that he was wholly against any cross subsidisation of airport development costs. Councillor Ketteridge said that he would copy this letter to other Members.

(iv) Minute C53 – Review of the Constitution

In response to a question from Councillor Ketteridge the Democratic Services Manager said that a copy of the Constitution would be circulated to Members together with details of the appointments to committees which would be confirmed later in the meeting.

In relation to the Constitution, Councillor Cheetham asked that the number of Members appointed to the Review and Petitions Committee should be reviewed as soon as possible and she pointed out that only three Councillors had attended the last Scrutiny meeting. She said that she was concerned about the future of scrutiny.

(v) Minute C55 – Notices of Motion

In response to a question from Councillor Freeman the Chief Executive said that he would check that letters had been sent to all relevant parties.

C66

CHAIRMAN'S COMMUNICATIONS

The Chairman reported that Mick Purkiss, the Democratic Services Manager, would be running the London Marathon on 23 April to raise money for cancer charities. He said that following the example of Councillor Godwin he would be abseiling from the Church Langley Water Tower on 30 April. He reminded Members that the Civil Carol Service would be held at Newport Church on 14 December and confirmed that no drinks would be served after the Council meeting because of the length of the agenda but drinks would be made available following the Staff Awards Ceremony on 22 December.

He said that the quiz night would now be held on 18 February 2006 and that he had attended 40 events since the last Council meeting and details of these were on the website. He said that he would like to introduce "speed dating" with Councillors and young people at a forthcoming Council meeting. He concluded that he had circulated a leaflet from the Mental Health Trust and urged Members to consider joining this.

C67

LEADER'S COMMUNICATIONS

Councillor Gayler said he had attended a meeting of the Essex Strategic Partnership and had met with the Chairman of the Uttlesford Futures Group. He said that a workshop on strategic issues would be held on 16 January and urged all Members to attend this. He said that ongoing meetings were being held with Braintree District Council and officers had agreed a number of areas to explore where both Councils could work together to achieve real economies including joint member training.

C68

NOTICE OF MOTION - SKATEBOARD FACILITIES

Councillors Bayley, Freeman, Hibbs, Hughes, Jones, Ketteridge and Murphy, having previously declared interests, left the meeting for the consideration of this item.

Members then considered the following Notice of Motion which had been submitted by Councillor Bayley.

“Council Notes:

- 1 The commitment to support skateboard facilities in the Quality of Life Corporate Plan.
- 2 The proposals for a new skate park adjacent to the Lord Butler Leisure Centre, and the wide spread support for this project from all sections of the community.

Council therefore resolves to provide financial support to the Saffron Walden Skatepark Association, and authorises the Community Committee to agree a capital grant subject to the completion of an operational management plan.”

Councillor Morson moved and it was seconded by Councillor Silver that the motion be approved subject to the amendment of the last paragraph to read “Council therefore resolves to provide financial support to the Saffron Walden Skatepark Association and authorises the Community Committee to agree a capital grant up to a maximum of £45,000 subject to the completion of an operational management plan”.

RESOLVED that the motion as amended above be approved.

C69

STANSTED AIRPORT INTERIM MASTER PLAN – RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION

Members gave further consideration to the document entitled “Stansted Airport Interim Master Plan” and the to the recent publication of BAA’s proposed options for a second runway at Stansted Airport.

Councillor Gayler said that the Council needed to be firm in taking a lead on behalf of the community and the right option was for there not to be a second runway. He said that such a proposal would cause noise and air pollution and would be environmentally damaging to this attractive part of Essex and said

that the consultation document was badly lacking in many aspects. He thanked all those who had been involved in putting the proposed response together.

Councillor Godwin said that all Members were united against a second runway. She said that it was incredible that BAA's proposals for the second runway were published following the recent Montreal Conference. She said that there had been months of doubt and anxiety for local residents and concluded that there were no options other than for there not be a second runway at Stansted.

Councillor Ketteridge reinforced that there was all party agreement for opposing a second runway. He urged the Council to be bolder and suggested that large signs should go up outside the Council Offices at Dunmow and Saffron Walden letting the public know that the Council firmly opposed further runways at Stansted.

Councillor A Dean had worked with officers to provide a draft formal response which incorporated the views as discussed at the Stansted Airport Advisory Panel.

Councillor C Dean said that Elsenham needed to be added to the list of parishes affected by the proposals. Councillor Cheetham also asked that the Government and BAA should be urged to look at noise issues in a different way. Councillor Hibbs asked that copies of the Council's response should be made available to neighbouring authorities and Councillor Flack added that liaison with neighbouring councils was vital. Councillor Foley said that the response did not address the issue of night flights and the Council needed to make the Department of Transport and BAA fully understand that the Council was opposed to this.

Members then voted on the proposal put forward by Councillor Gayler and seconded by Councillors Ketteridge and Godwin and it was unanimously

RESOLVED that:

- 1 The Council adopt the proposed response, as amended and set out as an appendix to these minutes.
- 2 The Council notes the recent publication of BAA's proposed options for a second runway at Stansted Airport and wishes to reaffirm its policy that no proposal for a second runway at Stansted is acceptable.

The Council further resolves that:

- All the options proposed by BAA for a second runway, while varying in detail, are damaging to the global and regional environment and to the surrounding communities and community life;

- No proposals can be fully assessed without information about developments in road and rail infrastructure and calls upon BAA to rectify this omission from their proposals;
- The series of options proposed has the effect of blighting homes that were not previously subject to blight and calls upon BAA to immediately extend the provisions of its Home Value Guarantee and Home Owner Support Schemes to those residents who find themselves in this position and to undertake to compensate all who suffer from general blight.

There was then an adjournment from 9.45-9.55pm

C70

MATTERS ARISING FROM COMMITTEES

(i) Licensing Committee 29 November 2005 – Licensing Policy

The Executive Manager Corporate Governance reminded Members that on 14 September 2005 the Licensing Committee had resolved to adopt a revised draft Licensing Policy as a basis of draft consultation. He said that the Licensing Committee had considered the responses at its meeting on 29 November and had recommended the draft revised Licensing Policy to Council for adoption.

RESOLVED that the draft revised Licensing Policy as submitted to the Licensing Committee on 29 November 2005 be adopted.

(ii) Extraordinary Environment Committee 28 November 2005 – Waste Strategy

Members considered the recommendations from the extraordinary meeting of the Environment Committee held on 28 November 2005 for a municipal waste strategy for Uttlesford to address four key aims of improving recycling performance, minimising waste, maximising recycling credits and minimising land fill tax penalties. Councillor Thawley explained the proposals and details of the proposed introduction of wheelie bins which would help bring the Council's recycling rate up to 48% and set it on its way to its target of 60%. He then moved the recommendations which were contained in minute E28 of the extraordinary meeting of the Environment Committee held on 28 November 2005.

Councillor Cheetham asked that the recommendation be amended to include provision for every household in the district to be assessed to see if three wheelie bins would be appropriate and that consultation should be held on boundary collection and that free collection of bulky household items should continue until a civic amenity site was provided in the south of the district.

In response, Councillor Thawley suggested that all these points were encompassed in the waste strategy which was intended to be flexible. Councillor Gayler added that the Council could not afford to continue to bury waste as this was both detrimental to the environment and to Council Tax

payers because of the LATS penalties. He concluded that an assessment would be made of the needs of residents and the strategy would be flexible.

Councillor Godwin said that it was essential that the scheme was properly publicised and that leaflets were delivered to all households in the district. She added that she was disappointed that the scheme did not include for recycling of garden waste or glass. Councillor Tealby-Watson said she had received many positive comments about the proposals and supported the need for adequate education and publicity and particularly with parish councils. She asked that the range of recyclables should be reviewed regularly particularly with regard to the types of plastics which could be recycled. She also said that the Local Government Association should be asked to lobby retailers.

Councillor Murphy agreed and said that the Government needed to look at reducing waste through a reduction in packaging. He added that charging for bulk waste collections needed to be looked at carefully and moved the following amendment which was duly seconded:

“In considering a review on the Council’s policy of the collection of bulky waste, any new policy will balance the costs against the risk of an increase in fly tipping and maximise the potential for reuse and recycling of bulky waste. It will also be equitable and consider the needs of elderly, infirm and disabled residents. It will also provide incentives to residents who cooperate with the Council on reuse and recycling and penalties to those who do not. It will also consider the environmental impact to travel to a Civic Amenity Site. The Council will also seek partnerships with commercial as well as voluntary organisations or any reuse scheme and will seek to dispose of abandoned cars at no cost to the Council through such partnership”.

Councillor Ketteridge in seconding the amendment said that the expense of dealing with fly tipping following the introduction of charges needed to be taken into account. Councillor A Dean suggested that the amendment was not valid but was merely a statement which could be looked at in the future. Councillor Hibbs suggested that it could be referred to the Environment Committee for consideration.

Councillor Knight referred to the problems faced by small businesses and added that land reclamation should form part of any waste strategy.

The amendment was then put to the vote and was carried.

Councillor C Dean said that the Government policy caused a number of problems and said that the Government should be lobbied to ensure that credits were provided for green waste.

Councillor Ketteridge then put forward the following questions:

Why were the Council leasing wheelie bins and what was the position with the Council’s debt free status?

How could the service be provided with fewer staff than at present?

How much would the new arrangement cost for each council tax payer?

Would the Council still encourage home composting?

What would happen with redundant bins?

How would the Council stop people storing bins at the front of their properties?

How much had been put aside for engaging the communications consultant?

Was there an adequate market for all the recyclables collected?

Councillor Flack asked how many bins had been examined in the trials. Councillor A Dean referred to the memorandum from the Services Officer and asked whether the County Council had a real appreciation of this Council's position. Councillor Pedder said that she would continue to recycle and would make use of her existing compost bin. Councillor Loughin asked that people should be dissuaded from having bonfires now that all waste could be dealt with by the Council. Councillor Artus also asked for clarification of why garden waste was not being included when this was collected by some other councils.

The questions raised by Members were then addressed by officers and Councillor Thawley as follows.

The Executive Manager Finance and Asset Strategy confirmed that the Council would continue with debt free status and said that the cost per band D property would be £59.03, an increase of 11%. He said that he would provide information to Members about the cost of the communications consultant.

Councillor Thawley said that he felt that the County Council had a clear understanding of Uttlesford's concerns. He said that there was a market for recyclables and this was expanding and developing. With regard to the issue of bins in front of properties he said that the Environment Committee could look at a policy to address this issue. He confirmed that the existing boxes were recyclable but would probably continue to be used for storage. Most bins could also be recycled. He added that the Council would encourage the continuation of home composting. He explained that the savings on staffing costs would come about by having alternate weekly collections and having vehicles with greater capacity and there would also be the advantage of boundary collection. He considered that land reclamation was just another form of landfill. He said that he was confident that the communications consultant would provide a good package. He also explained how methane would be dealt with and concluded that there was little the Council could do to deal with those who did not recycle.

The Services Officer then reported that recycling statistics would be produced on a monthly basis and he referred to the number of properties which had been involved in the MEL study and the number of bins which had been examined in the trials. He concluded that taking garden waste would incur extra costs for little gain and stressed the importance of encouraging home composting.

RESOLVED that:

- 1 The Waste Management Strategy Model 4 be adopted.
- 2 In view of the higher costs to Uttlesford District Council's tax payers of this collection model and the potentially even greater financial savings to the disposal authority, Essex County Council, through the avoidance of LATS penalties and the receipts of LATS credits, officers continue negotiations with the County Council to reduce Uttlesford net costs through a fair and equitable sharing of costs with the disposal authority.
- 3 The County Council be asked to compensate Uttlesford for its extra collection costs in achieving high recycling targets resulting from the County Council's continued omission to provide a Civic Amenity Site at Dunmow.
- 4 Officers implement a strategy in accordance with the implementation plan.
- 5 A communications consultant be employed to prepare and deliver a campaign of education and community engagement.

C71

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NEW CONSTITUTION

Members considered a comprehensive report which recorded the recommendations made by various committees in respect of the implementation of the new constitution. The changes proposed are set out as an appendix to these minutes.

RESOLVED that:

- 1 All the recommendations of the various committees detailed in appendix 1 to these minutes be agreed.
- 2 Where no date has been identified for a task group (whether "entitled" task group or working under some other designation) to be wound up, then that date should be 31 May 2006.

C72

REPORT OF RETURNING OFFICER

The Chief Executive reported that the result of the Wimbish and Debden by-election was as follows:

Tina Knight (Conservative) 300 votes

David Morgan (Liberal Democrat) 260 votes

Tina Patricia Knight had accordingly been elected as the District Councillor for the Wimbish and Debden Ward

POLITICAL BALANCE ON THE COUNCIL

The Democratic Services Manager presented a report on the political composition of the Council and asked Members to consider the allocation of seats to Committees as set out in the report.

Councillor Ketteridge said that he was disappointed that the Chairman of the Performance Select Committee would be appointed from the controlling group. He also said that he understood there was a rule that a Member could not scrutinise a committee on which they served. However, the Executive Manager Corporate Governance explained that this only applied where the Member had been involved in the decision. Councillor Ketteridge said that he was concerned that this might result in the Committee not having a quorum at certain times. Councillor Cheetham urged the Constitution Task Group to review the number of Members on each of the two new scrutiny committees. Councillor Gayler confirmed that all these issues would be reviewed before annual council.

RESOLVED that:

- 1 The Council allocates the seats on its main and other Committees as follows:

Committee	Members
Operations	14
Environment	15
Community	15
Performance Select	11
Review and Petitions	8
Development Control	14
Licensing	11
Standards	4
Staff Appeals	8
Emergency	4 (all ex-officio)
Internal Audit Partnership	3 (all ex-officio)

- 2 The Council designates Task Groups and Working Parties as follows:

Bridge End Gardens	5
Museum Management	4
Museum Resource Centre Project Team	6
Stansted Airport Panel	11
Strategic Development Advisory Group	15
Housing Strategy	4
Community Achievement	6
Local Joint Committee	3
Saffron Walden Town Centre	6
Constitution	6
IT Working Group	5
Corporate Support	3
Local Service Agreement	6

Decriminalisation	6
Uttlesford Transport Forum	4
Risk Management	3
Local Development Framework	5
Master Plan	5
Uttlesford Futures	4

C74

APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEES 2005/2006

RESOLVED that Members be appointed to the following Committees, Working Parties and Task Groups for the remainder of 2005/6:

POLICY COMMITTEES	LIBERAL DEMOCRAT	CONSERVATIVE	INDEPENDENT
OPERATIONS (14)	M L Foley M A Gayler E Gower D W Gregory R T Harris (VC) S C Jones (C) M J Savage G Sell P A Wilcock	R P Chambers A J Ketteridge T P Knight A R Row	V J T Lelliott
ENVIRONMENT (15)	W F Bowker C A Cant A Dean C M Dean B M Hughes V Pedder (VC) E Tealby-Watson A R Thawley (C) A M Wattebot	K R Artus C D Down J F Cheetham S Flack	E C Abrahams E J Godwin
COMMUNITY (15)	H D Baker C A Bayley P Boland M A Gayler M A Hibbs (VC) A Marchant D J Morson (C) G Sell F E Silver	E W Hicks J E Menell M J Miller S V Schneider	R M Lemon J P Murphy

SCRUTINY AND REGULATORY COMMITTEES	LIBERAL DEMOCRAT	CONSERVATIVE	INDEPENDENT
PERFORMANCE SELECT (11)	A Dean (C) M L Foley B M Hughes M J Savage E Tealby Watson (VC) F E Silver P A Wilcock	R P Chambers A J Ketteridge T P Knight	V J T Lelliott
REVIEW AND PETITIONS (8)	E Gower D W Gregory M A Hibbs V Pedder A M Wattebot	S Flack (C) S V Schneider (VC)	J P Murphy
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (14)	P Boland W F Bowker C A Cant (C) C M Dean (VC) R F Freeman R T Harris J I Loughlin A R Thawley	J F Cheetham C D Down J E Menell M J Miller	E C Abrahams E J Godwin
LICENSING (11)	H D Baker C A Bayley R F Freeman (VC) J I Loughlin (C) S C Jones A Marchant D J Morson	K R Artus E W Hicks A R Row	R M Lemon

OTHER COMMITTEES	LIBERAL DEMOCRAT	CONSERVATIVE	INDEPENDENT
STANDARDS (4)	C A Cant R T Harris	C D Down	R M Lemon
STAFF APPEALS (8)	H D Baker C A Cant D W Gregory R F Freeman J I Loughlin	R P Chambers E W Hicks	E C Abrahams
EMERGENCY (4)	Leader Deputy Leader Chairman of Council Chairman of Operation		

TASK GROUP ETC			
IT WORKING GROUP	W F Bowker R F Freeman A R Thawley	K R Artus	R M Lemon
RISK MANAGEMENT	S C Jones	A J Ketteridge	V J T Lelliott
MUSEUM MANAGEMENT TASK GROUP	J I Loughlin D J Morson V Pedder	R P Chambers	
** ALL OTHER TASK GROUPS TO CONTINUE WITH CURRENT MEMBERSHIP **			

C75 CALENDAR OF MEETINGS

RESOLVED that the calendar of meetings as set out as an appendix to these minutes be adopted.

C76 AREA PANELS – SUPPORT

The Executive Manager Strategy and Performance submitted a report setting out how the three area panels would be supported and how the officers involved would manage area work programmes and act as area champions for the north, south-west and east area panels. The proposal would involve moving posts in Environment and Cultural Services to Strategy and Performance, within a community development section. She explained that consultation had begun in order to explore with staff and Unison how the roles, responsibilities, structure, job descriptions, job titles etc needed to be built to support area panels and to develop the service. A possible new staff structure was set out for Members and it was also noted that the post of the Tourism Officer and Joint Research and Intelligence Officer would be transferred to Development Services to support the economic development function set out on the original Council structure document in 2004.

In answer to a question from Councillor Ketteridge the Executive Manager said that whilst there might be some cost implications in job evaluations it was not anticipated that the overall costs would increase. Councillor Ketteridge also expressed concern at the Tourism Officer being transferred away from the Tourist Information Centre. The Chief Executive explained that the Tourist Information Centre was customer focused, whereas the work of the Tourist Development Officer was more related to strategy and this proposal had been outlined in the report to Members last year.

C77 MEMBER WORKSHOPS

The Chief Executive circulated a list of forthcoming meetings including workshops on Strategy Partnerships on 16 January and Housing and Planning on 20 February 2006.

He said that he would prepare similar timetables for future Council meetings.

C78 NOTICES OF MOTION

(i) Regional Government

Members considered the following Notice of Motion proposed by Councillor Ketteridge and seconded by Councillor Cheetham.

“That this Council writes to the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister with a copy to our Member of Parliament to express our dismay at the continual undermining of our local services in order to facilitate regional government by subversive means. As examples, we include:

The Government’s stated desire to set what amounts to new regional health authorities abandoning existing Primary Care Trusts which here in Uttlesford have done much to focus on our local needs.

The Government’s desire to amalgamate Police authorities into much larger units. Essex Police Authority has made it clear that it does not support being amalgamated with other police forces. Consultation with the public on this is to be short and clearly meaningless.

Now on top of these very recent developments comes the deliberately leaked letter from David Milliband, Minister for Communities and Local Government, to John Prestcott, stating in essence that the time has come to create Unitary Local Authorities and again is a clear steer towards the Government’s desire for Regional Assemblies.

If we sit back and do nothing this Government will have achieved its objective without the necessity of referendums as they learned this lesson in the north-east”.

Councillor Gayler then moved the following amendment which was seconded by Councillor Morson:

“That this Council writes to the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister with a copy to our Member of Parliament to express our dismay at the continual undermining of our local services.

The Council is concerned about new proposals to create large unitary local authorities and to undermine effective local councils and true local community leadership, as revealed in the deliberately leaked letter from David Milliband, Minister for Communities and Local Government, to John Prestcott.

This Council believes that local services should be accountable to local people, and that democratic decision making should take place as locally as is practical.

The Council therefore calls upon the Government to:

- 1 Abandon plans to abolish the existing Primary Care Trusts, which here in Uttlesford have done much to focus on our local needs.
- 2 Abandon plans to amalgamate Police authorities into much larger units. Essex Police Authority has made it clear that it does not support being

amalgamated with other police forces. Consultation with the public on this is to be short and clearly meaningless.

- 3 Preserve local district councils like Uttlesford, to ensure the continuation of local democratically accountable decision making in a way that would not be possible if services were provided by a larger authority, and continue to allow district councils to enhance capacity and effectiveness through partnership working with neighbouring authorities.
- 4 Encourage county councils to be true partners with district councils within a continuing two-tier system.
- 5 Ensure that any moves towards more regional government should involve greater democratic accountability, and the devolution of central government powers, not the centralisation of local services.

The amendment was put to the vote and was carried. It was therefore RESOLVED that the Notice of Motion, as amended, be approved.

(ii) Education and Local Democracy

The following Notice of Motion was proposed by Councillor Morson and seconded by Councillor Gayler:

“This Council notes the launch of the Government’s Education White Paper, *Higher Standards, Better Schools for All*, on 25 October 2005”.

This Council supports:

- High quality local schools for all pupils.
- The work of governors, teachers and others to improve educational standards and to raise the attainment of pupils.
- Collaboration between schools where this helps to deliver improved outcomes for children.
- Avoiding unnecessary tinkering with structures for the delivery of schooling.
- Schools autonomy, including Heads and governors setting their own budgets, choosing which staff to employ and deciding on matters to do with teaching and learning in the classroom.
- The understanding of and quest to meet parental aspirations.
- The right of all pupils to be treated equally in school admission policies.
- The role of democratically elected local authorities as champions for children, young people and families to hold schools to account, and to ensure that autonomy does not work against the interests of any young people in the area.
- Funding of schools through local taxation rather than through the Dedicated Schools Grant, which is the nationalisation of school funding.
- The retention of decision making on school funding within democratically elected local authorities rather than transferring it to school forums.
- The retention of a designated LEA as a well understood reference.

This Council believes that the White Paper:

- Is inappropriate for dispersed rural areas, like Uttlesford. Geography dictates that the choice agenda is a phantom except for parents willing to go to expense and inconvenience.
- The free transport limit (up to 6 miles) displays a ludicrous failure to comprehend rural geography.
- Undermines the viability of small schools through funding based on pupil head count.

This Council is concerned that implementing the White Paper will create:

- An admissions “free for all” where schools will choose the pupils they want. Existing fair admissions systems could be rendered worthless and hard-to-place pupils will suffer discrimination.
- A commissioning role for local government.
- Many expensive and unnecessary additional school places when school rolls are falling.
- The closure of some good schools where “more popular” schools expand, and neither the parents of children in these schools nor their local council may have any choice in the matter.
- An even greater concentration of power in the hands of Whitehall bureaucrats through measures like the proposal for a new DfES Schools Commissioner and insisting that all new schools are trust schools or academies.
- An impossible timescale (1year) for turning round poor schools.

This Council calls for:

- A statutory code of practice on admissions which is binding on all state funded schools whatever their status, enforced by local authorities to ensure fair access for all, including hard-to-place children, and which recognises that a fair admissions policy cannot be delivered on a school-by-school basis.
- The status of the community school to remain for all schools that want it; for new community schools to open where this is what the local community wants; for local authorities not to be forced to close schools if the local community wants them to remain open.
- A recognition that education does not stop at the school gates. In particular, it is essential that there is a clear duty on schools to co-operate with local authorities to deliver the “Every Child Matters” agenda.
- The restoration of financial and planning powers to local authorities for 16-19 education to enable a coherent 14-19 education policy to be developed.
- Root and branch reform of local government finance so that more local government services can be funded through local taxation, with a corresponding reduction in the rate of national income tax.
- All members of this authority to lobby local MPs to actively campaign for education services to remain accountable to local people through

local democracy, and to vote for this principle when the measures contained in the White Paper are debated in Parliament.

- These concerns to be put to the Secretary of State for Education and Skills, to the local Member of Parliament and to appropriate representative bodies in Essex.

Councillor Flack submitted an amendment but later withdrew this.

RESOLVED that the Notice of Motion as set out above be approved.

Members considered the following Notice of Motion which had been proposed by Councillor Tealby-Watson and seconded by Councillor Jones.

(iii) Advertising Signs

Members considered the following Notice of Motion which had been proposed by Councillor Tealby-Watson and seconded by Councillor Jones.

“Uttlesford District Council believes

1. That the current stringent guidelines on the advertising of local community events put unnecessary restrictions on advertising events which benefit local community societies, fundraising and smaller enterprises such as farmers' markets.
2. That as advertising for such events is often only needed for a matter of days it should be treated differently from similar hoardings and advertisements relating to purely commercial activity or to permanent signage.
3. That in a rural community good quality banners and hoardings are a valuable way of notifying a dispersed population of forthcoming events which are, in these cases, to their own benefit.
4. That the increasing popularity of events such as farmers' markets are an essential funding plank for community venues hosting these events and that undue restrictions on advertising have a detrimental affect on attendance, which in the long term could result in their failure and subsequent loss of income to our community facilities. The same is true for amateur arts productions and local fetes and carnivals.

Uttlesford District Council therefore resolves to lobby the ODPM to review its guidelines and the legal requirements for advertising of local community events. The Council notes that electoral advertising is already exempt from many of the regulations and urges the ODPM to look at practical ways to extend these exemptions for short-term advertising of events where the benefit is primarily to the community rather than commerce.

Uttlesford District Council further resolves to instruct its legal counsel to use its best endeavours to discover ways in which advertising signage may be erected for short periods without violating current planning law and that a report be made to the Development Control Committee, in the first instance, within six weeks from this date”.

The Chief Executive suggested that the Notice of Motion should be considered by the appropriate committee and the Executive Manager Development Services would take a report to that committee in support of the Motion.

The mover and seconder of the Motion accepted an amendment that the Council should not write to the ODPM at this stage.

RESOLVED that the Notice of Motion as amended be referred to the Environment Committee for further consideration.

C79

SEASONS GREETINGS

The Chairman extended his best wishes to Officers and Members for a merry Christmas and happy New Year.

The meeting ended at 12.10am.

Appendix 1

RECOMMENDATION TO THE COUNCIL FROM THE STANSTED AIRPORT ADVISORY PANEL

That the Council's formal response to BAA be as follows:

The Council's Resolution of 13 December 2005, which takes full account of the report of community research commissioned by the Council, supersedes the interim views as discussed at the Stansted Airport Advisory Panel on 24 October, which were communicated to BAA to meet its 31 October deadline.

The Council:

- a) Maintains its position as set out in its response to the Department for Transport consultation on the Future Development of Air Transport in the UK that growth in air travel is incompatible with the Government's carbon emissions reduction obligations. This has recently been strengthened by the Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research report "Decarbonising the UK" published September 2005, which stresses that "if the UK Government does not curb aviation growth, all other sectors of the economy will eventually be forced to become carbon neutral". The Council will continue to press the Government to change its policies on air travel so that there is a coherent climate change strategy across all its departments consistent with the Energy White Paper.
- b) Is dedicated to the Nottingham Declaration on Climate Change, which commits local authorities to work with central government to contribute, at local level, to the delivery of the UK Climate Change Programme, the Kyoto Protocol and the target for carbon dioxide reduction. This will support the recent agreement at the UN Climate Change Conference in Montreal that member states should work together through the UN to examine the way forward, including the process for fixing targets beyond 2012. There is increasing acknowledgement of the costs of inaction and the considerable economic, social and environmental benefits of action. The Council will develop plans with our partners and local communities progressively to limit the causes and the impacts of climate change, according to our local priorities. This initiative includes encouraging all sectors of our local community to reduce their own greenhouse gas emissions and to make public their commitment to action. The Council considers that Stansted Airport and its associated aviation operations fall within this commitment. The Minister of State (Climate Change and Environment) DEFRA and the Parliamentary Under Secretary of State, ODPM are signatories of the Declaration.
- c) Is not convinced that proposals for greenhouse gas emissions trading in aviation in future years will be successful in achieving reductions on emissions associated with Stansted Airport and its aviation operations and therefore expects BAA to come forward with alternative proposals to reduce the current trend for total emissions at Stansted Airport to increase.
- d) Notes the requirements of the 1998 Transport White Paper, The Air Transport White Paper, PPG13 and the draft East of England Plan to reduce dependence on the car as a means of surface access to airports and increase the proportion of passengers using public transport. It expects BAA to introduce a low car strategy at Stansted for

existing and any future developments and invites BAA to relinquish some of its existing permitted public car parking provision.

- e) Maintains its opposition to the principle of a second runway at Stansted
- f) Insists that there must be further consultation opportunities for stakeholders and the public throughout the planning process.
- g) Insists that BAA accepts responsibility for the impact of the airport on local services, such as public rail transport, and ensures that local services are not downgraded to accommodate the demands of airport-related growth.
- h) Urges BAA to take very seriously the level of community opposition to its proposals for increased use of the existing runway and to desist from publishing proposals that they claim to be 'green' in their environmental credentials.
- i) Criticises BAA for being unable to provide an opportunity to comment on the nature of the airport in 2015 that BAA is actually planning as the context for its proposals to increase the use of the existing runway and insists that all future plans are merged into a single Master Plan. This was one of the intended purposes of airport master plans. BAA is presenting a description of the Airport in 2015 that it does not expect to be extant in 2015.
- j) Makes clear that it expects that any application for planning permission to increase use of the existing single runway must demonstrate that the environmental impacts on those living nearby will be reduced and minimised in accordance with the requirement to that effect laid down in the Air Transport White Paper Executive Summary.
- k) Reiterates the need for detailed evidence to back up the assertions as to the effects of 35 mppa with no second runway stated in the Interim Master Plan and pre application consultation document. BAA will need to provide a robust justification.
- l) Warns that it is inappropriate to use impacts predicted at 25 mppa in 2010, based on assumptions made in 2000 or earlier, as a benchmark for effects now predicted at 35 mppa in 2015. Information as to the current position is necessary from the community perspective, but it is also necessary to be able to compare the predicted impact at 35 mppa with revised assessments of impact at 25 mppa.
- m) Requires that any agreement associated with any planning application for growth at the airport is related to airport activity as well as physical facilities.
- n) Informs BAA that in advance of ongoing work from both the Council's consultants and BAA, there is little to say in response to BAA's cursory consultation material. The four Stansted area local authorities are taking a pro-active approach to BAA's proposals and have commissioned consultants to advise on airport economics and forecasting; air noise; and surface access issues. The consultants' findings will enable the authorities both to comment on the material to be supplied by BAA in support of their application for increased use of the existing runway and to advise on the outcomes to which BAA could reasonably be asked to commit before the application could be determined.

- o) Reiterates the importance of the Scoping Opinion issued by the Council, which sets out advice to BAA on the information that the local planning authority considers should be submitted as part of the planning application. Notwithstanding the feedback BAA has provided on this advice, the Scoping Opinion as issued still stands.
- p) Criticises BAA for missing an opportunity to present information to the community as to the effects of increased use of the existing runway, even within the constraints of an Interim Master Plan. BAA has failed to use techniques in addition to or instead of those more appropriate to the technical reports that constitute a formal Environmental Assessment. For example, it could have used other noise metrics besides LAeq to provide more information on air noise effects, as requested in the Scoping Opinion. It is already clear that air noise is one of the issues that most concerns communities over an extensive area and further work on assessing and explaining the impacts is essential.
- q) Notes that there is considerable doubt that a second runway will be built within the East of England Plan horizon to 2021 and therefore requires BAA to provide a capacity projection for maximum use of the existing runway to 2021 together with environmental and health impact assessments, noise and air quality projections, a surface access strategy and proposals for road and rail infrastructure proposals for such level of usage on the existing runway,
- r) Remains sceptical about BAA claims of the economic benefits of airport growth, especially as these claims ignore any downside factors. For example, concern has been identified in a recent report by EEDA about the welfare of immigrant workers in the East of England Region. There is no detailed evidence in West Essex on this subject, yet as a consequence of the prevailing tight local labour market it is known that the airport is reliant on the importation of labour. These and other social and economic impacts of airport growth should be addressed.

Appendix 1 Summary of Stansted consultation documents

Economic and social considerations

The Interim Master Plan and best use consultation document state that Stansted provides both national and local economic benefits. The local benefits are stated as:

- Employment opportunities across a range of job types and skills
- Opportunities for businesses to access a growing range of destinations, and potential markets
- Increased attractiveness of the East of England region for businesses wishing to locate in the area through the presence of and connections provided by a major international airport
- Tourism opportunities for in-bound and out-bound travellers: and
- Cargo facilities, particularly catering for express and next day deliveries.

Forecasts

BAA's forecast for total aircraft movements (comprising passenger, cargo, general aviation and other movements), air passengers and air cargo tonnage at Stansted in 2015 are summarised in the table below. The permitted number of aircraft movements (ATMs) is 240,000.

	2004 Actual	2015 Forecast
Total Aircraft Movements ATMs	192,249	274,000
Passenger ATMs	165,652	243,000
Passengers	20.9 m	35m
Cargo Tonnage	227,451	600,000

Of course, any long range forecast needs to be treated cautiously, as the inability of previous forecasts to predict the rapid growth of the low-cost market at Stansted illustrates. While some new long haul services are expected (which also contribute to the cargo tonnage) most of the growth is in the existing low cost sector.

Airport Employment

In 2003 some 10,600 workers were employed at the Airport. There were 1770 passengers for every airport employee, compared to 860 passengers for every employee in 1998. BAA put this 16% per annum (1998-2003) productivity increase down to technological innovation, leaner low cost airline supply chains and consolidation amongst low-cost carriers. Almost a quarter of the airport's direct employees (24%) live in Uttlesford and 18% in East Herts (previously 18% were in Bishops Stortford). Essex provides 59% of all employees and Hertfordshire 21%. Whilst much is made of the efforts to encourage workers from areas of high unemployment particularly north and east London, the numbers are small (7% from all of London and 6% from Harlow).

Airport Employment Forecasts	2003 Actual	25mppa forecast for 2010 (estimated-Aug 2001)	35 mppa forecasts for 2015
Direct on airport employment	10,600	16,000	16,800
Direct off airport employment	200	-	300
Indirect Employment	1,200	1,130	1,810
Induced Employment	2,880	4,110	4,540
TOTAL	14,480	21,240	23,450

The overall forecast increase in employment in total as a result of airport expansion 2003-2015 is about 9,000 jobs of which 6,000 would be on airport. The on-airport employment forecast is only some 800 more than that forecast in 2001 for a 25 mppa airport. Should the level of Bishop Stortford resident employees continue at a rate approaching 18% then this would mean an additional 1,500 resident based on airport employees living in the town plus a proportion of the indirect and induced employment.

Surface Access

BAA state that targets for the use of public transport (bus, coach and rail) for the surface access trips associated with non-transfer air passengers at Stansted were established when permission was granted in 2003 for further growth at the airport. These targets were for 37% public transport mode share by 2010 with a longer term goal of achieving a 40% mode share. The document states that the current 2004 mode share for passengers is:

Private car	50%
Hire car	3%
Taxi	8%
Bus or coach	11%
Rail	28%

BAA state that the latest CAA data for 2004 indicate that the target for public transport mode share has been achieved with 39% of non-transfer air passengers currently using public transport for their surface access journeys to and from the airport. BAA state that this level has been achieved by enhanced bus and coach services which have seen a mode share increase from about 6% in 2011 to about 11% in 2004. The rail passenger proportion of non-transfer airport passengers remains at around 28% of the increasing numbers.

The percentage of air passengers arriving by private car has now fallen to about 50% and according to BAA the challenge for the developing strategy will be to ensure that this achievement is maintained. Total on site public car parking spaces are expected to increase by nearly 17,000, from 26,750 in 2004 to 43,700 in 2015, though of these 15,950 have already been permitted.

In terms of surface access by employees, a target for the maximum level of single car-occupancy airport employee vehicles was also established in 2002 and this was not to exceed 80% of staff driving to work in 2010.

The position that BAA appear to be putting forward is that because the forecast 25mppa position for 2010 was acceptable their similar forecast for 35mppa at 2015 should be as well. This, however, does not take into account that 2015 must be seen against the background of general traffic growth at 2015 and the implications of the Draft EEP proposals.

Rail services are to be 4 X 8-car Stansted expresses an hour plus a stopping train and Cambridge service once an hour. The proposal for 25 million was for some 12-car trains and longer platforms at Broxbourne and Stansted Mountfitchet but the new One timetable apparently make these unnecessary, though at the cost of unacceptable degradation to local train services. The rail capacity issue is a critical one that requires infrastructure investment. The long lead times and high cost for new rail infrastructure make it a key potential constraint on airport expansion.

BAA state that their studies have also indicated that airport related traffic will form up to 20% of the peak flows on any motorway and trunk roads near the airport in 2015. The impact of this on those routes and of traffic on local roads is not known at present.

Airport related Traffic Forecast

Time	2004 Observed		25mppa (in 2010 as predicted August 2001)		35 mppa initial forecasts	
	Arrive	Depart	Arrive	Depart	Arrive	Depart
Am peak	1,550	690	3,100	1,300	2,800	1,400
Pm peak	1,180	1,630	1,300	2,400	1,750	2,600

Environmental effects

The consultation documents cover the following areas of environmental impact: Air Noise; Ground Noise; Air Quality; Landscape and visual impacts; Biodiversity; Archaeology; Water Management; Waste Management; and Energy and Climate Change. Of these, air noise is the factor that is considered to be the greatest area of concern in the context of full use of the existing runway.

BAA is relying on the use of increasingly quiet aircraft to lower the impact of air noise, but this will need to be set against the increase in flight numbers and the variable impacts of noise on different individuals and areas. Also, BAA assumes that 57 Leq dBA is an adequate threshold for noise annoyance using the 54 Leq dBA level as a sensitivity test. The four Stansted local authorities have commissioned consultants to assess BAA figures and develop alternative measures, which are being discussed with BAA in line with the scoping opinion.

Contour dBA	Area Sq Km		
	Summer 2003	2010 (as predicted for 25 mppa)	2015 (now predicted for 35 mppa)
>54	n/a	72.7	61.0
>57	33.5	42.9	35.9
>63	11.7	15.4	11.6
>69	3.5	4.8	3.3

BAA state that 3850 people live within the predicted 2015 57Leq dBA contour, 1,000 less than that originally predicted for 2010 but 1,000 more than in 2003. This, the implications for night noise and the proposed mitigation measures all need further consideration.

Amongst the ongoing work BAA have commissioned a Health Impact Study which is being carried out with the Essex Strategic Health Authority in consultation with Primary Care Trusts and other NHS interests.

BAA's attitude to the increasingly important threat of climate change is that it is an issue 'requiring multinational governmental attention rather than one that can be meaningfully addressed by piecemeal action at individual airports'. The contribution increased capacity at Stansted will make to global greenhouse gas emissions by enabling air transport growth may however become an issue for the public.

Appendix 2:

Recommendations from Committees

In accordance with the resolution of council on 18 October, each of the council's policy and scrutiny committees considered recommendations they wished to make to the council in respect of implementing the new constitution. The recommendations of each of the committees are listed below.

Community and Leisure Committee

- 1 That the Museum Resource Centre Task Group and the Bridge End Gardens Task Group continues to meet until conclusion of their tasks and make recommendations to the Community Committee.
- 2 That, the Museum Management Task Group and the Community Achievement Awards Panel are redefined as Work Groups and report to Community Committee.
- 3 That any presentation takes place prior to the meetings of the Community Committee allowing meetings to commence at 7.30 p.m.
- 4 That the Community Committee advises Officers to notify Members of issues 'for noting' in the Members Bulletin.

Environment Committee

- 1 Any presentation took place prior to the meetings of the Environment Committee allowing meetings to commence at 7.30pm.
- 2 The Environment Committee advised Officers to notify Members of Issues 'for noting' in the Members Bulletin.
- 3 Officers prepared a regular schedule of items for decision in the Members Bulletin or equivalent and that Members could selectively call in those for decision by the Committee.
- 4 Consideration was to be given to the delegation of the making of traffic orders to the appropriate area forums.

Health and Housing Committee

- 1 the Housing Strategy Working Group continues to meet on an occasional basis to consider, in detail, specific issues and make recommendations to the Community Committee. The future need for this Working Group to be reviewed by the Council at its annual meeting in 2006.
- 2 the newly appointed Homelessness Task Group continues to meet to consider the specific issues relating to homelessness provision in the District until it makes a final report/recommendation to the Community Committee. The future life of the Task Group to be reviewed by the Community Committee after the annual Council meeting in 2006.
- 3 the Tenant Forum be invited to send two representatives (one being the Chair) to attend the Community Committee in a non-voting capacity.

- 4 the annual rents setting meeting for 2006/07 be dealt with during a normal meeting of the Community Committee.
- 5 any presentation takes place prior to the meetings of the Community Committee allowing meetings to commence at 7.30 pm.
- 6 the Community Committee advises Officers to notify Members of issues 'for noting' in the Members Bulletin.
- 7 the area panels consider the most appropriate way of involving Tenant Forum representatives at their meetings.

Resources Committee

- 1 The Asset review Task continued to meet with a view to a report being brought to the first meeting of the newly constituted Operations Committee in February 2006.
- 2 That the information Technology Working Group, Corporate Support Working Group, Corporate Procurement Group, Risk, Management Work Group and Local Service Agreement Working Party continued to meet and report issues to the Operations Committee as appropriate with a review of their roles and functions being taken to the Committee in March 2006.
- 3 Presentations to the Operations Committee would normally take place prior to the official starting time of 7.30pm.
- 4 The Members Bulletin be used where appropriate for issues that would otherwise only require noting by the Operations Committee.

Transport and Highways

- 1 Any presentation would take place prior to the meetings of the Environment Committee allowing meetings to commence at 7.30pm.
- 2 That the Executive Manager Development Services bring a draft scheme of delegation to the first meeting of the new Environment Committee.
- 3 Traffic Regulation Orders be delegated to the appropriate area forums.
- 4 The Decriminalisation Task Group continued to meet until conclusion of their tasks had been made and recommendations were to be made to the new Environment Committee.

Scrutiny 1

- 1 Scrutiny investigations into Climate Change and Fees and Charges transfer to the Review and Petitions Committee.
- 2 That the newly created Review and Petitions Committee allocate Members to the investigations where committee membership changes have occurred.
- 3 The Review and Petitions Committee consider new ways of working to reinforce and support the scrutiny function.

COMMITTEE TIMETABLE 2005/06

	Day	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May
Community	Thur									26		16		
Environment	Tue									24		14		
Licensing	Wed									18		15		
Operations	Thurs										2 9	23		
Performance Select	Wed									25			19	
Review and petitions	Wed										8		5	
Council	Tues										16 Thurs		25	16 annual
Development Control 2pm	Wed									11	1 22	15	5 26	17
Standards Cttee* 4pm	Mon									16		20		
Stansted Airport AP	Mon									23		6	24	
Workshops	Mon									23	20	27	10	
North Area Panel										10	28			
East Area panel										11		1		
South West Area Panel										31		2		

All meetings held at Saffron Walden except for the Area Panels. Meetings to start at 7.30pm except Development Control which starts at 2.00pm and Standards Committee which starts at 4.00pm.