

Democratic Services

PPWG

6 April 2017

At the last Local Plan examination consultants acting for property developers were out in force. They questioned and challenged almost every figure in the draft Plan including, to my surprise, the figure for windfalls. This was one figure that I thought was eminently defensible and it was reassuring that the Inspector thought so too.

I welcome this document and think it is an excellent report. It is clearly laid out, the arguments are well presented and the basis for the calculations are shown. The various tables follow a logical pattern, the evidence is clear and I believe the conclusions are very defensible.

It has that magical ingredient – an audit trail.

But I do wish to raise one point. I note that no figures are included for potential rural exception sites. As chairman of a parish council that has instigated three such projects I can understand the uncertainty about the effect of government policy on the future for these schemes.

I do believe that there are some landowners who would consider this option but are waiting to see how Uttlesford's Local Plan might affect their location. Of course we can't put a figure on that.

However there are a number of Rural Exception Sites that are in the course of construction, some of which may not be completed until after the draft Plan is submitted. I trust that there is a way of reflecting these developments in the figures that are presented.

Turning back to the report I accept that it is a relatively small self-contained exercise and very much smaller and less complex than the SHMA. But its style of presentation demonstrates how a report can be put together in a logical sequence with a clear audit trail something sadly lacking in the SHMA report. If these same principles had been applied to the SHMA I feel sure that many of the difficulties presently being encountered could have been avoided.

Michael Young

~~Michael Young~~