

**LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK MANAGEMENT GROUP held at
COUNCIL OFFICES LONDON ROAD SAFFRON WALDEN at 10.00 am on
4 SEPTEMBER 2006**

Present:- Councillors S C Jones, A J Ketteridge and J I Loughlin.

Officers in attendance:- R Harborough, H Hayden, M Jones, S Nicholas
and M T Purkiss.

LDF16 APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN FOR THE MEETING

In the absence of the Chairman it was

RESOLVED that Councillor A J Ketteridge be appointed Chairman for
the meeting.

LDF17 APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors C A Bayley and
E J Godwin.

LDF18 MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 26 June 2006 were approved as a correct
record and signed by the Chairman.

LDF19 BUSINESS ARISING

It was noted that the Landscape Character Study had been completed in draft
and it was hoped that the final version would be available by the end of
September 2006. It was also noted that the Urban Capacity Study was now
available on the website and that the reference to land at Bell College and the
Friends' School had been deleted.

In relation to the Core Strategy it was noted that there had been 880 returned
questionnaires and 35 other responses. All the data had been captured ready
for analysis.

A workshop had been held on 17 July to consider the Independent Panel's
report on the Draft East of England Plan and the Secretary of State was due
to issue a response in November. Officers would report to Members on the
impact for Uttlesford and would also report on any significant changes to other
districts in the region.

LDF20 ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION

In July, officers had submitted a copy of the Issues and Options paper to the
Development Plans Team of Go East.

Go East were pleased to see that Uttlesford was making progress with the
Core Strategy Development Plan document and had set out its role in seeking
to identify any serious omissions and obvious errors in relation to the
soundness tests.

The Planning Policy and Conservation Manager highlighted the main areas which had been raised by Go East. He said that Go East had pointed out that they would expect that as the Issues and Options stage progressed and alternative options were developed further, (and any others that might be introduced were considered) that they were tested against the agreed appraisal framework and the Strategic Environmental Assessment result presented when any further Issues and Options consultation took place. This would include a commentary on the relevant appraisal outcomes in relation to options to help stakeholders and the community make more informed choices on what should go forward as preferred options.

Go East had also expressed the hope that as the Core Strategy Issues and Options process developed the Council would be able to provide some more information and greater clarity about how the spatial strategy for the district could respond to the RSS. They also emphasised that at examination, the Council would need to show a clear trail of options generation, appraisal and rejection and the role that the strategic environmental assessment and community engagement had played in the process. Go East had also felt that the questionnaire provided only a limited opportunity for consultees to present further options and/or provide supporting statements for the preferences that had been chosen and thus provide more insight into the underlying reasons for those choices. They therefore encouraged the Council to undertake further consultation with a view to trying to establish an understanding of the reasons behind people's preferences.

Go East had concluded that they were generally pleased with the progress that had so far been made. However, they felt that a move towards publishing preferred options directly after this consultation would not necessarily meet the Government's expectations for front loading. They would normally expect the community and the stakeholders to have a greater role in building the consensus upon what the authority took forward as its preferred options. They state that this could be achieved through further rounds of engagement before the preferred options stage.

The Planning Policy and Conservation Manager said that there had been two cases in the West Midlands where the Panel had found that the Local Development Framework was unsound and the authorities had to start the process again. He emphasised that it was essential to take the advice from Go East very seriously and said that the additional work would not cause serious delay. He said that Go East had offered to meet officers to discuss the next steps and this offer had been taken up.

In answer to questions from Councillor Jones about the relationship between the Local Transport Plan, the Core Strategy and proposals for Stansted Airport, the Planning Policy and Conservation Manager said that the current Local Transport Plan was a five year plan for 2006 to 2011. In relation to Stansted it set out the current study work to determine the surface access implications of any increase in passenger numbers at Stansted. However, there was a lack of consensus and the relationship between processes for resolving Stansted Airport issues and the Core Strategy would be raised at a further meeting to be held with Go East.

LDG21

REVISIONS TO THE LOCAL DEVELOPMENT SCHEME

The Principal Planning Policy Officer submitted an extract from the Local Development Scheme GANTT chart showing revised timetables for the Core Strategy, General Development Control Policies and sites specific policies Development Plan Documents.

LDF22

NEXT MEETING

It was agreed that the next meeting would be held on 15 January 2007 at 10.00 am.