

Committee: Environment Committee

Agenda Item

Date: 17th March 2011

10

Title: Uttlesford Local Development Scheme - 4th Revision

Author: Melanie Jones, Principal Planning Officer,
01799 510461

Item for decision

Summary

1. The Local Development Scheme LDS is the project plan for the preparation of the documents that will make up the Uttlesford Local Development Framework, The previous LDS was approved by Members in January 2009 and submitted to the Government Office for the East of England. This LDS has been prepared to take into account changes which have happened since that date.

Recommendations

2. That the Committee approve the LDS.

Financial Implications

3. There will be a financial implication for the additional stage of consultation included in the programme. This additional expenditure will come from the Planning Development Reserve for the 2011/12 financial year. Costs will depend on Members' views on appropriate methods of consultation but as a guide the total cost of the last consultation for printing the main consultation documents and sending a questionnaire leaflet to every household in the district was around £16,500.

Background Papers

4. The following papers were referred to by the author in the preparation of this report and are available for inspection from the author of the report.

Uttlesford Local Development Scheme – 3rd Revision 2009
Housing Trajectory and Statement of 5 year land supply, December 2010

Impact

- 5.

Communication/Consultation	When the revised LDS comes into effect it will be put on the website and made available for inspection.
Community Safety	N/A

Equalities	The policy documents which will be prepared are subject to separate equalities impact assessments
Health and Safety	N/A
Human Rights/Legal Implications	N/A
Sustainability	The policy documents which will be prepared are subject to separate Sustainability Appraisals
Ward-specific impacts	All
Workforce/Workplace	The programme can be delivered with existing resources.

Situation

6. The revised LDS is attached. Key changes to the 2009 LDS have been made for the following reasons;
7. Following the election in May 2010 the new coalition government announced its intention to abolish the regional tier of government including the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) and the district wide housing targets. The RSS is currently still a material consideration but its abolition is included in the Decentralisation and Localism bill which is going through parliament.
8. Following consultation on the preferred options in 2009 the Council carried out more consultation on further preferred options between Feb and April last year. After considering the representations from this consultation and following the election and the government’s proposals to abolish the regional spatial strategy Members resolved at the Environment Committee on 7th September 2010 to review the housing targets. This work is currently underway (see item 9 on this agenda) but the additional work involved and the implications for the housing strategy means that more consultation will be needed on the housing requirements and the possible implications of this for options in the Core Strategy. The additional consultation stage has been included in the timetable which shows that the Core Strategy is now unlikely to be adopted before the end of 2013. This delay in adopting the Core Strategy will also have implications for the programmes for the other two DPDs (development management policies and site allocations) which have to be in accordance with the Core Strategy. The programmes for these documents have been updated, and on the current timetable they will be adopted in 2015.
9. The Government has announced new proposals for neighbourhood plans. These plans must be in conformity with the Core Strategy. A Neighbourhood Planning Vanguard scheme has been launched by the Government where Local Authorities can apply for grant aid to work in partnership with a parish

council or community groups to prepare a draft plan. This Council has submitted a bid for Stansted Mountfitchet and Newport Parish Councils and the decision is awaited. Work will proceed alongside the Core Strategy. Although Neighbourhood Plans are community led there will be resource implications in terms of staff time and other resources required to help support the production of these Plans.

10. Despite the proposed revocation of Regional Strategies the guidance from the Department for Communities and Local Government is that authorities should continue to have a 5 –year land supply of deliverable sites. The housing trajectory and statement of 5-year land supply published in December 2010 and available on the Council’s website highlights a potential issue with housing delivery from 2015 when it is predicted that the annual completion rate will fall reflecting the fact that the sites identified in the Adopted Local Plan have been completed and the Local Development Framework has not progressed far enough to propose new sites. Providing the Core Strategy is adopted this could give a steer for sustainable locations where new housing growth would be appropriate but specific sites will not be allocated until the site allocations DPD is adopted in 2015. The SHLAA will assist the Council in identifying suitable, available and achievable sites to make sure there is a continuous supply of housing.
11. Following approval by committee the LDS will be sent to DCLG and the Planning Inspectorate for information.

Risk Analysis

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigating actions
That the plans contained in the LDS are not delivered in a timely manner in accordance with the programme.	2 - There are still some unresolved issues in relation to changes to legislation etc which could impact on the programme.	2 - Delivery of appropriate housing sites will be delayed and there is a risk of planning through the appeals process.	The LDS needs to be realistic and take these risks into account but also deliver the plans in a timely manner Progress of the plans through the system needs to be monitored

- 1 = Little or no risk or impact
 2 = Some risk or impact – action may be necessary.
 3 = Significant risk or impact – action required
 4 = Near certainty of risk occurring, catastrophic effect or failure of project.