



Public Document Pack

Uttlesford District Council

Chief Executive: Dawn French

Council

Date: Tuesday, 17th July, 2018

Time: 7.30 pm

Venue: Council Chamber - Council Offices, London Road, Saffron Walden,
CB11 4ER

Chairman: Councillor L Wells

Members: Councillors A Anjum, K Artus, H Asker, G Barker (Vice-Chair),
S Barker, R Chambers, J Davey, P Davies, A Dean, P Fairhurst,
T Farthing, M Felton, M Foley, J Freeman, R Freeman, A Gerard,
T Goddard, J Gordon, N Hargreaves, S Harris, E Hicks, S Howell,
D Jones, T Knight, G LeCount, P Lees, M Lemon, B Light, J Lodge,
J Loughlin, A Mills, S Morris, E Oliver, V Ranger, J Redfern, H Rolfe,
H Ryles and G Sell

Public Speaking

At the start of the meeting there will be an opportunity of up to 15 minutes for members of the public to ask questions and make statements subject to having given notice by 12 noon two working days before the meeting. A time limit of 3 minutes is allowed for each speaker. Please refer to further information overleaf.

AGENDA PART 1

Open to Public and Press

1 Apologies for Absence and Declarations of Interest

To receive any apologies and declarations of interest.

2 Minutes of the previous meeting(s)

5 - 26

To receive the minutes of the previous meetings held on 15 May (attached) and 19 June (supplementary pack) 2018.

3 Chairman's Announcements

To receive any announcements from the Chairman.

4 Reports from the Leader and Members of the Executive

To receive matters of report from the Leader and members of the Executive.

5 Questions to the Leader, Members of the Executive and Committee Chairmen (up to 15 minutes)

To receive questions from members for the Executive and committee chairmen.

6 Matters referred from the Executive and the Council's committees

To consider any reports referred from the Executive and the Council's committees and receive questions and answers on any of those reports.

7 Matters received about joint arrangements and external organisations

To consider matters concerning joint arrangements and external organisations.

8 Procedure for moving amendments at Council Meetings

27 - 32

To consider the procedure for moving amendments at Council Meetings.

9 Public Engagement Working Group - update

To receive a verbal update from the Chairman of the Public Engagement Working Group.

10 Any other business the Chairman considers to be urgent

To consider any other business that the Chairman considers to be urgent.

11 Exclusion of Press and Public

Consideration of a report containing exempt information within the meaning of section 100I and paragraph 3 part 1 Schedule 12A Local Government Act 1972.

PART 2

Exclusion of Public and Press

12 Potential land acquisition (to follow)

To consider the report on a potential land acquisition.

MEETINGS AND THE PUBLIC

Members of the public are welcome to attend any of the Council's Cabinet or Committee meetings and listen to the debate. All agendas, reports and minutes can be viewed on the Council's website www.uttlesford.gov.uk. For background papers in relation to this meeting please contact committee@uttlesford.gov.uk or phone 01799 510433/369.

Members of the public and representatives of parish and town councils are permitted to speak or ask questions at any of these meetings. You will need to register with the Democratic Services Officer by midday two working days before the meeting.

The agenda is split into two parts. Most of the business is dealt with in Part I which is open to the public. Part II includes items which may be discussed in the absence of the press or public, as they deal with information which is personal or sensitive for some other reason. You will be asked to leave the meeting before Part II items are discussed.

Agenda and Minutes are available in alternative formats and/or languages. For more information please call 01799 510510.

Facilities for people with disabilities

The Council Offices has facilities for wheelchair users, including lifts and toilets. The Council Chamber has an induction loop so that those who have hearing difficulties can hear the debate.

If you are deaf or have impaired hearing and would like a signer available at a meeting, please contact committee@uttlesford.gov.uk or phone 01799 510430/433 as soon as possible prior to the meeting.

Fire/emergency evacuation procedure

If the fire alarm sounds continuously, or if you are instructed to do so, you must leave the building by the nearest designated fire exit. You will be directed to the nearest exit by a designated officer. It is vital you follow their instructions.

For information about this meeting please contact Democratic Services

Telephone: 01799 510433, 510369 or 510548

Email: Committee@uttlesford.gov.uk

General Enquiries

Council Offices, London Road, Saffron Walden, CB11 4ER

Telephone: 01799 510510

Fax: 01799 510550

Email: uconnect@uttlesford.gov.uk

Website: www.uttlesford.gov.uk

Agenda Item 2

COUNCIL held at COUNCIL CHAMBER - COUNCIL OFFICES, LONDON ROAD, SAFFRON WALDEN, CB11 4ER on TUESDAY, 15 MAY 2018 at 7.30 pm

Present: Councillor G Sell (Chairman)

Councillors H Asker, G Barker, S Barker, R Chambers, J Davey, P Davies, A Dean, P Fairhurst, T Farthing, M Felton, M Foley, R Freeman, A Gerard, S Harris, E Hicks, S Howell, D Jones, T Knight, P Lees, M Lemon, B Light, J Lodge, J Loughlin, A Mills, S Morris, E Oliver, V Ranger, J Redfern, H Rolfe, H Ryles and L Wells

Officers in attendance: Dawn French (Chief Executive), R Dobson (Principal Democratic and Electoral Services Officer), Roger Harborough (Director - Public Services), Simon Pugh (Assistant Director - Governance and Legal Services, P Snow (Democratic and Electoral Services Manager) and Adrian Webb (Director – Finance and Corporate Services).

Also present: Gary Hyams (Support 4 Sight) and Grant Maton (Essex Wildlife Trust).

C1 REMARKS OF THE OUTGOING CHAIRMAN AND ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN

Councillor Sell introduced the meeting, and spoke about his year as Chairman. He said he was keenly aware of the work of the voluntary sector in the District, and had met many people in the District of great talent. This was not an easy time to be a councillor or to be the Chairman of a Council, and it was with mixed feelings he would be handing over to a successor. The civic role was important, and needed to be adequately resourced. Thanks were due to the Communication Team and to the Executive Support Team, and in particular to the Chairman's Executive Assistant. Councillor Sell also expressed his gratitude to the Chief Executive for her advice and support, to the Vice Chairman, for attending events on his behalf and to his wife for attending many events with him.

Councillor Sell presented cheques in the sum of £2,450 to each of the representatives of the two charities which he had supported, Essex Wildlife Trust and Support 4 Sight.

Councillor Sell then said he had a further duty to perform. The Council had been fortunate to retain for over 45 years the Democratic and Electoral Services Manager, Peter Snow, as no elections had gone wrong at Uttlesford District Council. On 21 June 2018, there would be a reception for him, and for Denise Greenwood and Val Rogacs, who were also retiring, at the Chesterford Research Park, to acknowledge their collective contribution of huge service to

the District Council. He invited members to show their appreciation for the Democratic and Electoral Services Manager.

Members gave a standing ovation.

Councillor Rolfe said the three officers mentioned had between them given 126 years of service. This was a fantastic achievement. Mr Snow had always shown absolute professionalism, unbiased management and instilled confidence that elections were correct. He wished him a happy retirement.

Councillor Lodge said that as a new and junior political leader he did not have the experience of Mr Snow's service over many years. Nevertheless, he had admiration for him. During his five years in local politics, Mr Snow had been a beacon of the organisation of political process. He had poured oil on troubled waters and kept truculent politicians in order. Councillor Lodge thanked him on behalf of his party for his impartial help and advice, and wished him a long and happy retirement.

Councillor Dean said he recalled Mr Snow's administration of the by election of a Stansted councillor, Ron Walton, many years ago. Ever since then, whatever the result was, all elections had been friendly. He welcomed the support that Mr Snow had given the Liberal Democrat group and wished him well.

Councillor Sell invited Councillor Chambers, as the longest-serving member, to speak.

Councillor Chambers said he had known Mr Snow a long time. He was the epitome of Uttlesford, always fair-handed and unbiased. He recollected his adroit performance in the staff versus members cricket matches. Councillor Chambers also remembered his own election and the kind words Mr Snow had said then, and thanked him for all he had done.

The Democratic and Electoral Services Manager said it was an honour to have served the Council. He thanked Members for their expressions of goodwill.

Councillor Sell called for nominations for the Chairman of the Council.

Councillor Rolfe nominated Councillor Wells. The nomination was seconded by Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Wells was duly elected as Chairman of the Council.

Councillor Rolfe thanked Councillor Sell for his excellent chairmanship during the past year, which he had accomplished with a and congratulated Councillor Wells.

Councillor Wells thanked Councillor Sell for having been an excellent Chairman.

C2 CHAIRMAN'S STATUTORY DECLARATION OF ACCEPTANCE OF OFFICE

Councillor Wells made the statutory declaration as Chairman of the Council for 2018/19.

C3 APPOINTMENT OF VICE CHAIRMAN

Councillor Wells called for nominations for the Vice Chairman of the Council.

Councillor Rolfe nominated Councillor G Barker. The nomination was seconded by Councillor Dean.

Councillor G Barker was duly appointed Vice Chairman of the Council.

C4 VICE CHAIRMAN'S STATUTORY DECLARATION OF ACCEPTANCE OF OFFICE

Councillor G Barker made the statutory declaration as Vice Chairman of the Council for 2018/19.

C5 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Anjum, Artus, J Freeman, Goddard, Gordon, Hargreaves and LeCount.

C6 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting held on 10 April 2018 were received and signed by the Chairman as a correct record of the meeting, subject to the following amendments.

(i) Minute C82 – Public Speaking – occupation of land at Stortford Road by travellers

To substitute for the phrase “temporary barriers had now been put up”, the phrase “temporary barriers would be put up”.

(ii) Minute C84 – Minutes of the meeting held on 22 February 2018

To substitute for the wording:

“Councillor Knight said that, while Minute 56 was accurate, it was not fully representative of the meeting. She asked whether members would agree to add a document to the Minutes amplifying the salient points reflecting on her career and integrity”,

the following wording:

“Councillor Knight said that Minute 56 was not fully representative of the meeting. She asked whether members would agree to add a document to the Minutes stating what she had actually said, as a summary was inadequate, given the fact that the matter reflected on her career and integrity.”

C7 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

Councillor Wells said she had chosen as her charities Essex Air Ambulance, which provided free life-saving support in emergencies, and Addenbrookes Charitable Trust, which was an organization dedicated to making a difference over and above what the NHS could afford.

C8 POLITICAL BALANCE

Members considered the report on the review of political balance and allocation of places on the Council's committees.

Councillor Rolfe said the report before Council was self-explanatory. He drew attention to the fact that in relation to the Standards Committee, the allocation of places was for three members from each Group, on the basis set out in the report. He moved the recommendation.

Councillor Dean seconded the motion.

RESOLVED that the political balance of the Council and the allocation of seats on the Council's committees be approved.

C9 APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEES 2018-19

Members received the nominations for the appointments of membership of committees, including Chairmen, Vice Chairmen and substitutes where indicated.

Councillor Lodge referred to the nomination for Vice Chairman of the Planning Committee. He proposed Councillor R Freeman to be Vice Chairman of that Committee. The proposal was seconded by Councillor Gerard.

Councillor Dean proposed Councillor Loughlin as Vice Chairman of the Planning Committee. The proposal was seconded by Councillor S Barker.

Councillor Mills said the Council should select the best candidate, and that as Councillor Loughlin had joined the Council in 2001, her experience was valuable to him as Chairman of the Planning Committee. He supported Councillor Loughlin. He thanked Councillor R Freeman and all other members of the Committee for their hard work.

The nomination being put to a vote, Councillor Loughlin was appointed Vice Chairman of the Planning Committee, with 22 votes for Councillor Loughlin and 7 votes for Councillor Freeman.

Councillor Rolfe said there had been no Substitute Members on the Standards Committee last year, but there was a nomination for Councillor LeCount from the Residents Group. He nominated Councillor Chambers as the Substitute Member for the Conservative Group.

Councillor Dean nominated Councillor Foley as the Substitute Member of the Standards Committee for the Liberal Democrat Group.

RESOLVED to appoint the committee membership, Chairmen, Vice Chairmen and Substitute Members in accordance with the nominations made at the meeting and as indicated in the report (appended to these minutes).

C10 APPOINTMENT OF COUNCIL WORKING GROUPS

Members received a schedule of nominations of membership of working groups of the Council.

RESOLVED to appoint membership of working groups of the Council, including Chairmen and Vice Chairmen where indicated as set out in the report (appended to these minutes).

C11 ESSEX POLICE AND CRIME PANEL

Nominations were received for the appointment of Councillor S Barker as a member of the Essex Police and Crime Panel, and of Councillor Ranger as a Substitute Member.

RESOLVED to appoint Councillors Barker and Ranger accordingly.

C12 DELEGATION OF EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS TO PORTFOLIO HOLDERS

A report was received summarising the Leader's list setting out which individual members of the executive were responsible for the exercise of particular executive functions.

The report was noted.

C13 REPORTS FROM THE LEADER AND MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE

Councillors Howell, S Barker, Ryles Redfern and Ranger reported on the work undertaken in relation to their portfolios during the preceding administrative year.

Councillor Rolfe concluded reports from executive members with a summary of the areas addressed during 2017/18. He said work on the business described would continue during 2018/19, which would also include member development. He said the Council was efficient and robust, and was a council which cared. Good governance was a priority, and it was to the credit of the Chief Executive that corporate objectives were highly focused.

C14 QUESTIONS TO THE LEADER, MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE AND COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN

Councillor Dean addressed the Leader. He said regarding the focus on litter-picking and the maintenance of the District, there were areas in his ward, such as Chapel Hill, where parked cars were preventing street cleaning, and where organic material accumulated. A greater effort needed to be made by both the District and Parish Council to discourage parking on such roads when the street cleansing vehicle was due to attend.

Councillor Rolfe said dialogue with Essex County Council was needed, as they were responsible. The community also had to play a part, and there was a role for educating people to stop throwing rubbish out of car windows.

Councillor Dean said the problem was not only irresponsible people but the accumulation of leaf mould.

Councillor Ranger suggested the Highways Rangers be asked to clear the leaf mould.

Councillor Foley asked the Leader regarding a plan to invest in a facility at Carver Barracks.

Councillor Rolfe said the Army had changed personnel and procedures, and the Council would only proceed with the investment if the money was protected. Members were working with the Army, but if the money could not be protected there was a problem.

Councillor Knight said on the subject of management of rubbish, there was a disgraceful area by the Gasworks where litter collected. Regarding the proposed investment at Carver Barracks, the Government, not the Army, changed the rules, as a result of which a new scrutiny process was being demanded, setting back the starting date. The Commanding Officer was trying to reach a deal and commit to a date, but the Army were now in a difficult position. The proposal for the running track was something the Council should do, but it would now require patience.

C15 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

The Chairman said the next meeting of the Council on 19 June 2018 would start at 7pm.

The meeting ended at 8.30pm

Schedules referred to at Minutes C9 and C10:

COUNCIL COMMITTEES

PLANNING

Chairman: Alan Mills
Vice-Chairman: Janice Loughlin

Robert Chambers	Eric Hicks
Howard Ryles	Mark Lemon
Paul Fairhurst	John Lodge
Richard Freeman	Lesley Wells

Substitutes:
Anthony Gerard Julie Redfern
Terry Farthing Geoffrey Sell
Garry LeCount

GOVERNANCE, AUDIT AND PERFORMANCE

Chairman: Edward Oliver
Vice-Chairman: Derek Jones

Graham Barker	Neil Hargreaves
John Davey	Stephanie Harris
Geoffrey Sell	Garry LeCount
Jim Gordon	Barbara Light

Substitutes:
Aisha Anjum John Freeman
Alan Dean Mark Lemon

STANDARDS COMMITTEE

Chairman: Derek Jones
Vice - Chairman: Keith Artus

Alan Dean	Petrina Lees
Neil Hargreaves	Janice Loughlin
Tina Knight	Geoffrey Sell
Barbara Light	

Substitutes:
Robert Chambers Martin Foley

LICENSING AND ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH

Chairman: Robert Chambers
Vice-Chairman: Thom Goddard

Aisha Anjum	Jim Gordon
Graham Barker	Eric Hicks
John Davey	Sharon Morris
Anthony Gerard	Martin Foley

Substitutes:
Heather Asker Derek Jones
John Freeman Janice Loughlin
Richard Freeman

SCRUTINY

Chairman: Alan Dean
Vice-Chairman: Graham Barker

Heather Asker	Stephanie Harris
Robert Chambers	Garry LeCount
Paul Davies	Mark Lemon
John Davey	Barbara Light
	Edward Oliver

Substitutes:
Anthony Gerard Geoffrey Sell
Alan Mills Lesley Wells

Independent Members (non-voting)

Georgina Butcher-Doulton
David Pearl
Catherine Wellingbrook-Doswell

Garry LeCount

COUNCIL WORKING GROUPS

LOCAL JOINT PANEL

Chairman: Howard Rolfe

Alan Dean
Sharon Morris

PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT WORKING GROUP

Chairman: Mark Lemon

Martin Foley	Barbara Light
Paul Fairhurst	Julie Redfern
Marie Felton	
Stephanie Harris	

COUNCIL held at COUNCIL CHAMBER - COUNCIL OFFICES, LONDON ROAD, SAFFRON WALDEN, CB11 4ER on TUESDAY, 19 JUNE 2018 at 7.00 pm

Present: Councillor L Wells (Chairman)

Councillors A Anjum, K Artus, H Asker, G Barker, S Barker, R Chambers, J Davey, P Davies, A Dean, P Fairhurst, T Farthing, M Felton, M Foley, J Freeman, R Freeman, A Gerard, T Goddard, J Gordon, N Hargreaves, S Harris, E Hicks, D Jones, T Knight, G LeCount, P Lees, M Lemon, B Light, J Lodge, A Mills, S Morris, E Oliver, V Ranger, J Redfern, H Rolfe, H Ryles and G Sell.

Officers in attendance: Dawn French (Chief Executive), Daniel Barden (Communications Manager), A Bochel (Democratic Services Officer), P Bylo (Planning Policy Manager), R Dobson (Democratic and Electoral Services Manager), G Glenday (Assistant Director - Planning), Roger Harborough (Director - Public Services), Simon Pugh (Assistant Director - Governance and Legal) and Adrian Webb (Director of Finance and Corporate Services).

Public speaking

Statements were made by M Tourlmain, B Ross, J Cheetham, P Milne, D Starr, A Armstrong, R Gilyead, P Hawke-Smith, J Emanuel, T Clarke, A Coote, J Fairhurst, G Mott, B Bampton, A Dodsley, K McDonald, J Smith, J de Vries, K Stannard, V Thompson, K Rodwell, S Merifield, C Cant, F Wilkinson and N Paterson. Statements made are available as an audio recording; summaries of statements are appended to these minutes.

C16 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Apologies were received from Councillors Howell and Loughlin.

Councillor Barker declared a non-pecuniary interest as a member of Essex County Council.

Councillor Dean declared a personal non-pecuniary interest as a member of Stop Stansted Expansion and as his wife was a member of the Board of the Gardens of Easton Lodge.

C17 REGULATION 19 PRE-SUBMISSION DRAFT LOCAL PLAN

Councillor Lodge said he wished to speak first. The Chairman said the motion would first need to be proposed and seconded.

Officers gave a presentation on the Regulation 19 pre-submission draft Local Plan.

The Director – Public Services gave a summary of the reports and documents for consideration, and reminded members of the sequence of events since the meeting of the Planning Policy Working Group on 31 May. Cabinet had generally agreed the changes proposed by the Working Group, and accepted additional changes proposed by members, which were identified in the papers before Members. The Leader had, at the meeting of Cabinet, agreed to consider further some of the points raised in public speaking and in the subsequent debate on these points by portfolio holders present. Consequently the Leader had made an urgent executive decision on these matters, which were included in the papers for consideration by Full Council, together with the officer advice on matters related to all the sites that the Leader agreed to consider further post Cabinet.

The Director – Public Services said all reports as just described were therefore set out for clarity and transparency, and as many of the changes particularly affected Chapter 3, this part of the report had been re-provided in full.

The Director – Public Services then spoke on a further issue which had arisen since the Cabinet meeting. This issue was the publication by the North Essex councils of a letter received from the Inspector appointed to examine their plans. The letter advised those councils of the steps that the Inspector considered necessary for the common section 1 element of those councils' respective local plans to be made sound and legally compliant. The Chief Executive had written to all Members of Uttlesford District Council about this matter.

The Director – Public Services said whilst the letter was not about the Uttlesford Local Plan, there were some key issues that were relevant to its preparation, which were: additional evidence about trunk road improvements; the proposed rapid transport system for North Essex; delivery of market and affordable housing.

The Director – Public Services said the proposals before Members did not seek to predetermine that the garden communities could only be delivered using the locally led development corporation. At examination, the Council's case would be supported by promoter representation. The North Essex letter confirmed how Inspectors had been asked by Government to work with councils in order to get a sound plan. This council had prior notice of the strength of evidence its inspector would be likely to need to see, and a window to further strengthen the case as required before submission, if it accepted the recommendations tonight. The proposals before Members were in locations benefitting from a stronger housing market than parts of North Essex, they did not include a proposal on the scale of Braintree/ Colchester borders and rapid transit was a simpler proposition in the Uttlesford context linking to the local and regional interchange at the airport.

The Director – Public Services said the scale of growth that the plan needed to address to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure

requirements was challenging and a step change from the previous experience of this community, but neighbouring authorities had had to plan to deliver even more, and some of these plans had completed their examinations and the main modifications recommended from their inspector been published. In summary, key features of the version of plan recommended to proceed to the Regulation 19 representation stage were: a hybrid strategy with a combination of development in the towns and villages and a start on creating new garden communities, previously identified as the preferred options from all the reasonable alternatives; the contribution from towns and villages had had to be strengthened so that it could be shown that the plan once adopted would deliver a 5 year land supply; as a matter of policy, the delivery of homes was profiled to reflect the need to start garden communities to protect the historic character and environmental quality of towns and villages, and taking into account their lead times; the commitment to garden principles had been emphasised by elevating them to policy requirements.

In response to representations, additional detail requirements had been added to the strategic policy frameworks for each of the garden communities, notwithstanding that more detailed development plans would supplement these garden community policies in due course as more in depth evidence was gathered.

The Director – Public Services said there had been other changes recommended in the plan before Members tonight. He highlighted two such changes: the development management policies had been the subject of a workshop with members of the Planning Committee; and the Stansted Airport strategic allocation site policy was essentially as in the Regulation 18 preferred options plan, in particular criteria 3 to 7, notwithstanding representations requesting changes to these elements during consultation last year. The policy referred to the airport being a local transport interchange as in the Regulation 18 Plan, and this was now reflected in the explanatory text.

The Planning Policy Team Leader then gave a further presentation to Members, referring to the way in which the housing requirement for the draft plan had been arrived at. He cited the strategic housing market assessment 2017 use of ONS household projections, from 2014, which were the latest projections available. He explained and gave reasons for the adjustments calculated, for household growth into dwelling growth to 11,733; a market signals adjustment, of 13.63%, although recent findings from the East Hertfordshire examination at which it was changed to 14%, had been taken into account to raise Uttlesford's plan to 13,376; an additional 504 for growth of people in communal establishments had to be added in, taking the need to 13,880. The plan had a housing requirement of at least 14,000 homes, to recognise uncertainties in of forecasting, and build in robustness, so the supply was around 14,600 to provide flexibility to address delays in sites or sites not coming forward, to enable the Council to still meet its target.

The Planning Policy Team Leader demonstrated slides showing the hybrid strategy, for the three garden communities but also growth in existing communities. He referred to the TCPA garden city principles, as writing them into the policy texts would give weight to be given to the principles in

development plan documents. The local plan commits to producing such documents for each of the three garden communities, by recommending that development plan documents be written into policy, as these gave increased opportunity for public engagement and scrutiny.

The Chief Executive summed up the next steps of the process, should the draft plan be approved. She reminded members that if the plan were to be approved, the next stage, which had been referred to as a “consultation,” was technically an opportunity to make representations for the Planning Inspector conducted by the Council on behalf of the Inspector. Representations received would be reflected upon, and during the period the Council would have regard to representations relevant to the position with regard to the West of Braintree site. Subject to the timing of such matters and any work to be carried out, the submission date indicated of October might be slightly later, but given the anticipated date of publication of the new National Planning Policy Framework in July, there would be six months in which to submit the plan take advantage of the transitional provisions, including relying on the Council’s assessment of housing need, rather than use the Government’s methodology. Thereafter the next stages of the submission timetable would be an estimate only.

The Chief Executive set out the options before Members, including the option that if that they did not accept the recommendations the Council could decide to have a cooling off period. Council could also reject the plan; or refer the plan back to Cabinet. Finally Members could defer the consideration of the plan to a future meeting. Such options would impact on the timetable.

The Chief Executive said she needed to set out the risks if the plan were not to be approved, as it was critical that decision makers take into account relevant factors, and not irrelevant factors in reaching decisions. She highlighted the risk that if the plan were not to be approved, the Council, as was currently the case, would not be able to demonstrate it had a five year land supply, which would expose the Council to the risk of speculative development at locations which members and the Council might not consider suitable. She reminded members that if the regulation 19 plan were approved, and the representation stage concluded, weight could be attached to the plan where representations had not been received, which could protect development management policies. The Council could lose control over the allocations identified, as these had been stated to be sustainable locations, but the requirements attached in the policies could be watered down. After expiry of the transition arrangements under the new NPPF, the Council would not be able to rely on its objectively assessed housing need, but would have to follow the Government’s standard approach, previously indicated to be 16,200 for Uttlesford District Council. Whilst this number might not be the final position, the figure indicated a direction of travel to provide for higher levels of housing numbers. A delay in submitting the plan might result in review being needed for reviewing evidence for the whole plan as evidence would go out of date, and changes in national policy might need to be reflected in further work and new applications would be approved during such time. Intervention by the Government could occur, with plan making taken over, in which circumstances the local planning authority would have to bear the cost.

The Chief Executive said recommendations 3 to 7 were consequential to recommendations 1 and 2, and summarised what those recommendations were. The Chairman had said she would take those recommendations en bloc.

The Chairman confirmed that Councillor Lodge could not speak until after the motion had been seconded.

Councillor Lodge queried what the motion was.

The Assistant Director – Governance and Legal said the recommendations from Cabinet and the Leader were for Council to consider, comprising the motion. In response to a further query from a councillor, the Chairman said the motion was the recommendation to Council.

The Chairman invited Councillor S Barker to speak. Councillor Barker thanked members of the public for making representations to Members this evening, and said she had taken note of the points made. She reminded members of the progression of the regulation 18 draft local plan, and that a hybrid solution had been proposed, to which strategy no Member or group had proposed an alternative. The plan before Council protected the green belt and provided a stepped approach to housing delivery. It allowed a buffer for the five year land supply. The plan would ensure delivery of housing for the children and grandchildren of residents, and that affordable homes were available. It provided opportunity for businesses to grow locally. The process conducted by the Planning Policy Working Group had been open and transparent. She proposed the recommendations.

Councillor Rolfe seconded the proposal, and reserved his right to speak until later.

The Chairman reminded members of the Council's process for the meeting. She said group leaders would have unlimited time to speak and members would have up to 5 minutes.

Councillor Lodge proposed an amendment in that the Regulation 19 plan should be deferred in order to rectify shortcomings, and in view of the comments recently made by the Government Inspector in relation to the Braintree local plan.

The Chairman sought clarification as to the wording of the amendment. She offered to adjourn the meeting to enable such wording to be specified.

Councillor R Freeman said, as a point of order, the meeting was over two hours' duration and should not continue.

Councillor Jones proposed the meeting should continue. Councillor Ranger seconded the proposal. A vote being taken, and carried unanimously, it was resolved to continue the meeting.

The Chairman adjourned the meeting at 9.15pm to enable clarification to be sought as to the amendment Councillor Lodge wished to move.

At 9.25pm the meeting resumed.

The Chief Executive read out the wording proposed by Councillor Lodge, as follows:

“That the Regulation 19 plan be deferred to rectify the shortcomings of the plan, including a viable financial plan for new communities; proper consideration of expansion at Stansted Airport; a workable transport plan; a workable sports strategy; a scientific assessment of housing need; assurance of an adequate water supply and real affordable housing for key workers.”

The proposal for amendment was seconded by Councillor Gerard.

Councillor Lodge spoke to the amendment, stating he wanted a plan that worked, but referring to the comments of the Inspector on the Braintree plan. He said if the plan went forward to Regulation 19 now, it would be rejected and thus be delayed. The Inspector’s comments on the Braintree plan indicated the financial plan was unworkable, yet there was more work on that aspect than Uttlesford had done. There was a need for a traffic plan that was workable, and to provide infrastructure before building homes, and to provide affordable housing before housing for key workers. Work was needed on jobs and schools. The Inspector had stated the plan to deliver a garden community per district was overambitious, and unviable due to cost yet Uttlesford wanted to build three garden communities. He made various further points, and asked members to vote to defer the plan.

Councillor Rolfe said residents were at the heart of the plan. Deferral would derail the timetable, and it was best to stay in control. The Inspector for Braintree had made helpful comments, and had not rejected Braintree’s plan: Uttlesford had had two visiting inspectors, both of whom had indicated Uttlesford was on the right path. The Council was committed to principles of garden communities, and fundamental to those principles was land value capture. Schools and infrastructure would be built in also. The Inspector had said Uttlesford was further ahead than some other councils, and work on development plans would be done in further detail. Deferring was not the right course of action, and he asked members to reject the amendment.

A number of Members then spoke raising points in favour of deferral of the plan. Issues which were raised included lack of allocation of sites for sports pitches or community halls outside of garden communities, and a lack of an up to date sports strategy; the prospect of traffic congestion within Saffron Walden, and the failure of the County Council to grant a 20mph speed limit in the town centre; the lack of evidence of cooperation between the district and county councils; the aspiration of Stansted Airport for planning permission to extend to the size of Gatwick, which would increase traffic; the inadequacy of the capacity of the M11; concerns regarding the evidence for the numbers of homes required; the over-ambitious nature of the proposals for three garden communities.

Councillor S Barker responded. She said deferral would potentially lead to the imposition of the Government's standardised housing number; the fact that it was inappropriate to assume the Airport application was in the local plan, as this was a matter for the Planning Committee, and new evidence could be presented to the Inspector, rather than deferring the plan.

Councillor Dean spoke against the amendment. He said it was an attempt to avoid making difficult decisions and that many points which had been made seemed to be based on the inspector's comments on the Braintree plan. He too had asked questions on those comments, but it was very unlikely the site at West of Braintree would disappear. The rapid transport system was the subject of ongoing discussions, and the development plan process would start in the Summer, and it was important to remember the plan did not include all the details at this stage. More work was needed by the North Essex authorities, but there was great scope for land value capture. Until this Council made a decision then those negotiations could not start. He opposed the amendment.

Further comments against the plan and for deferral were made by a number of members. Issues raised included the need to listen to residents; the lack of truly affordable housing; the environment and air quality, and concerns that future reliance on electric cars would be insufficient mitigation; and that there was no provision for identifying where the extra water needed would come from.

In seconding the motion to defer, Councillor Gerard said Development Plan Documents would be a leap of faith, in that they were a "plan to plan": this gave no clarity and simply invited people to "trust us" following which there would be no opportunity for communities to shape their future. He requested a recorded vote on the amendment and on the substantive vote. He seconded the motion to defer.

Further points in support of deferral were made, including concerns about reliance on the agricultural nature of the district for food production; the potential for the use of the Community Infrastructure Levy as opposed to Section 106 agreements and concerns about the veracity of the housing need. Further points against deferral were made, with reference to risks and costs of deferral; and to the difficult choices facing those members most affected by the proposed garden communities in representing their communities' best interests.

The amended motion, to defer the local plan, was put.

A recorded vote was taken, the outcome being as follows:

For the amendment: Councillors Anjum, Asker, Fairhurst, Foley, R Freeman, Gerard, Hargreaves, Knight, LeCount, Lees, Light, Lodge and Morris.

Against the amendment: Councillors Artus, G Barker, S Barker, Chambers, Davey, Davies, Dean, Farthing, Felton, J Freeman, Goddard, Gordon, Harris, Hicks, Jones, Lemon, Mills, Oliver, Rangers, Redfern, Rolfe, Ryles, Sell and Wells.

Abstentions: there were no abstentions recorded.

The motion to defer the Regulation 19 local plan was duly defeated by 24 votes against to 13 in favour.

Councillor Dean then spoke in support of the substantive motion. He said demand for housing was outstripping supply, and that younger generations were far less able to buy houses based on a reasonable multiplier of their income. He referred to the history of the local plan at Uttlesford, which had taken various forms. There was a need for a coherent local plan. Party politics should be dismissed in this context. It would be irresponsible not to proceed with the local plan tonight. He urged fellow councillors to vote for the plan.

A request to move to the motion was put. The Chairman said it was her view that as only one person had spoken on the substantive motion, and the seconder had not yet spoken, there had not been adequate discussion, so the motion should not be put at this point.

A member expressed concern at the role of development corporations. The Chairman said she would reserve comment on that concern until later.

Members raised points in favour of the motion, in that the experience of communities living without a local plan was that they were subjected to the torment of having to go to court to get facilities such as a community centre, and that inadequate affordable housing was provided for; and that the process during the consideration of the draft plan by the cross-party working group had left no stone unturned in seeking evidence and obtaining expert input.

In response to the earlier references to community infrastructure levy, and to development corporations, officers provided clarification.

Councillor Lodge thanked officers for the clarification provided. He said he wanted this plan to work, but approval today was not the fastest or best route to make it work. Members had heard members of the public speak, including a developer who had expressed his concerns. The plan would be rejected on day 1 of the examination hearings for the reasons given and he therefore urged members to reject it now to enable it to be worked on so that it was right.

Councillor Rolfe seconded the substantive motion. He said there was no evidence that the plan would be rejected at the outset: a clear steer from two inspector visits had been given, and the comments on the North Essex plan were not a rejection but to seek more information.

Councillor Rolfe said members had collectively agreed on a spatial strategy that would start new communities in the form of garden communities, which would link back to the Development Plan documents process. He took the point regarding sport, and he had listened carefully to all points made on the new settlements, including the community infrastructure levy and on affordable housing. A key point was that this plan would give the council the opportunity to work to the garden community principles, including on the level of the market rate on which affordable housing would be based, and air quality issues, as

sustainable transport would help. He was committed to working in partnership with local communities, and he proposed the motion.

Councillor S Barker summed up, and the recommendations in full were put to the vote. A recorded vote was taken, the outcome being as follows:

For the recommendations: Councillors Artus, G Barker, S Barker, Davey, Davies, Dean, Farthing, Felton, J Freeman, Goddard, Gordon, Harris, Hicks, Jones, LeCount, Lemon, Mills, Oliver, Ranger, Rolfe, Ryles, Sell and Wells.

Against the recommendations: Councillors Anjum, Asker, Chambers, Fairhurst, Foley, R Freeman, Gerard, Hargreaves, Lees, Light, Lodge, Morris and Redfern.

The recommendations were passed by 23 votes in favour, and 13 against.

Abstentions: no abstentions were recorded.

RESOLVED

- 1 That Council notes the amendments recommended by Cabinet and the Leader to the draft Local Plan at, and following, the Cabinet meeting on 12 June 2018.
- 2 That Council, being satisfied that the preparation of the Local Plan has complied with the relevant regulatory requirements and being of the view that the Regulation 19 Pre-Submission Local Plan document is ready for submission to government for independent examination, approves the Regulation 19 Pre-Submission Local Plan recommended by the Leader and Cabinet for publication in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.
- 3 That following the conclusion of the Regulation 19 publication period, the Local Plan be submitted to the Secretary of State for Independent Examination under section 20 of the Planning Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) ("the 2004 Act"), together with the submission documents prescribed by Regulation 22 of the 2012 Regulations before 31 March 2019.
- 4 That the Director of Public Services, in consultation with the Environmental Services Portfolio Holder, be authorised to make non-material typographical, formatting, mapping and

other minor amendments to the Plan prior to the submission of the Plan to the Secretary of State.

- 5 That the Director of Public Services be authorised to write to the Local Plan Inspector appointed to carry out the Examination of the submitted Local Plan ("the Local Plan Inspector") asking him/her to recommend such modifications of the submitted Local Plan as may be necessary to make the Plan sound and legally compliant, in accordance with section 20(7C) of the 2004 Act.
- 6 That the Director of Public Services, in consultation with the Environmental Services Portfolio Holder, be authorised to submit a schedule of proposed main modifications of the submitted Local Plan to address any issues relating to soundness and legal compliance identified by the Local Plan Inspector; and
- 7 That the Local Plan Submission Version 2018 be endorsed as a material consideration to be used in the determination of planning applications and enforcement decisions to be given appropriate weight in accordance with paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

The meeting ended at 11.55pm.

Public Speaking

Moyra Tourlamaine spoke on behalf of residents Great Chesterford on a lack of evidence to support the draft Local Plan. She said the plan would not stand up to scrutiny. Uttlesford District Council would need to amend the plan further to satisfy the residents of Great Chesterford.

Brian Ross spoke on behalf of Stop Stansted Expansion. He said he was satisfied to note amendments agreed at Cabinet to Policy SP11. He questioned the accuracy of the employment figure used in the plan, due to Manchester Airport Group having revised its employment forecast downwards and because few airport workers actually lived in Uttlesford.

Jackie Cheetham spoke on behalf of Takeley Parish Council about airport-related car parking. Offsite parking was detrimental to the area surrounding the airport. Stansted should remain an airport in the countryside and parking should remain on the airport site.

Philip Milne spoke on behalf of Great Dunmow Town Council. He said the LtCAN 1 site should be removed from the draft plan. The West of Braintree site could not go ahead, so he asked what would happen to the

970 houses allocated in Stebbing. Additional traffic would be a major problem.

Dan Starr spoke on behalf of weareresidents.org. He said there were similarities between the Braintree, Colchester and Tendring plan and the Uttlesford plan. The former had been rejected for a number of reasons, many of which would be directly relevant to Uttlesford if the plan was submitted in its current form.

Alexander Armstrong spoke on behalf of Great Dunmow Town Council. The Dunmow Neighbourhood Plan was now being ignored. There was no sign of infrastructure coming first in the plan. He supported a local plan, but not Uttlesford's draft Regulation 19 plan.

Richard Gilyead spoke in support of a sustainable transport strategy. Facts about transport were in short supply in the plan, and it did not answer many questions about sustainable transport links, such as how these would be funded. There needed to be firm costed plans in place before the plan was submitted.

Patrick Hawke-Smith said a local plan should be soundly based on fact, well thought-out and visionary. He asked what was the Council's vision for the future development of Uttlesford and how they proposed to deliver it in the local plan.

Judy Emanuel said development in Uttlesford had recently been reactive, ad hoc and driven by developers. Future development would intensify existing problems. The Infrastructure Development Plan contains a lack of identifiable projects and did not seek to make up for historic deficits in infrastructure. The documents would not stand up to scrutiny during the inspection.

Tony Clarke said landowners and developers controlled the procurement process. Local authorities could not rely on high quality settlements built by development corporations and so could do little to configure development. Going ahead with the plan would result in large housing estates built to low standards.

Arthur Coote said the plan did not address issues for the young and elderly of Saffron Walden. Community interest companies could be used to provide for these people, but this was not addressed in the local plan. He asked the Council to reconsider the plan in order to provide for the young and the elderly.

Juliette Fairhurst said the plan would determine the ability of 10,000 young people to build a life in Uttlesford. They had been to some extent ignored during the consultation. She knew what she wanted the district to look like. It was costly to live and commute in Uttlesford. Young people should be considered.

Graham Mott spoke on behalf of Elsenham Parish Council. The parish council offered general support for the plan, but asked for the removal of the Land South of Rush Lane, Elsenham from the plan. Health and transport infrastructure in Elsenham were already inadequate. The proposed dwellings were not needed.

Bill Bampton said the plan overestimated the speed of delivery, and so would mean a lack of a five year land supply for at least ten years, benefitting developers. Approval of the new settlements would be committing to 28,000 new houses over the course of this and the next local plan period. The number of new houses necessary for the district was lower than the figure in the plan.

Andy Dodsley spoke on behalf of Little Easton Parish Council, and said he believed the plan was not sound. He questioned the reasons for building a town next to Stansted Airport, and a large number of houses in various locations with few feasible proposals for infrastructure. People would continue to use cars rather than other transport, local needs for affordable housing would not be met, and there would be significant harm to heritage assets.

Ken McDonald said the population and job forecasts in the plan were questionable, and the local plan planning process had been deficient. There was no clear audit trail for how the figures in the plan had been reached. There needed to be an independent audit of numbers and a clear statement of assumptions and calculations. Overblown employment figures for Stansted Airport were in part responsible for the questionable figures.

Jenny Smith said a local plan was needed to halt a developer free-for-all, and to provide affordable homes for local people. The choice of sites and lack of information about how infrastructure would be addressed were primary concerns. Local people needed input into the development plan documents. Further work needed to be done on the detail of the plan.

James de Vries said he had two serious concerns. The affordability of homes for local residents was an important issue, with infrastructure being a key priority. There was a lack of industrial and office space available in the local plan, and the issue had been overlooked as a whole.

Karmel Stannard said she wanted the local plan to improve quality of life and protect public health. However, hundreds of new houses and vehicles would push air pollution to more dangerous levels. There was also a need for affordable housing for local residents. The plan should address these issues.

Vincent Thompson spoke on behalf of Stop Easton Park. He said there was a need for houses, but the plan was fundamentally flawed. It took no account of the likely availability of Carver Barracks, a brownfield site, in 2031. The selection of Easton Park as a site for a garden community was irrational, and there were other alternative sites.

Katy Rodwell said the conservation appraisal stated the historic environment of Little Easton could not be replaced, and was a fragile and finite resource. However the local plan threatened the conservation of this special place. The planned development would mean it would be lost rather than preserved.

Sandi Merifield spoke on behalf of Stebbing Parish Council. She said the parish council felt it ignored. The government inspector's letter about the Braintree, Colchester and Tendring local plan which questioned the plan's viability meant the West of Braintree site in Uttlesford's plan was fundamentally flawed.

Christina Cant spoke on behalf of Stebbing Parish Council. She said concerns with the plan included the likely coalescence between villages and towns in the district, the inclusion of Andrews Airfield in the plan, and the proposal to build under flight paths at Stansted Airport.

Fiona Wilkinson spoke on behalf of Little Chesterford Parish Council. The development of the North Uttlesford Garden Community and the expansion of Chesterford Research Park were problematic. There was a lack of sufficient detail on infrastructure in the plan. South Cambridgeshire had made housing provision for biotech workers and so the site was not needed, and the park was not growing at the expected rate.

Neil Paterson spoke on behalf of the North Uttlesford Garden Communities Action Group. The housing need figure in the plan was questionable and there was a lack of detail on supporting infrastructure and funding for this. The impact of an additional 1500 houses at the Genome Campus had been ignored. The balance of housing should be market-led and development needed supporting infrastructure. North Uttlesford did not meet either of these requirements.

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee: Council
Title: Procedure for moving amendments at Council Meetings
Report Author: Simon Pugh, Assistant Director - Governance and Legal
spugh@uttlesford.gov.uk
Date: Tuesday, 17 July 2018

Summary

1. A report on this subject has been considered by Governance, Audit and Performance Committee on 8 February and on 17 May 2018. At both meetings the report provoked much debate. Some members expressed concern that the proposals might go too far and limit flexibility in decision-making. However there was also recognition of the merits of the changes proposed.
2. After consideration at the meeting on 17 May, the Committee recommended the changes proposed in this report for adoption by the Council.
3. The change proposed is that notice of amendments to motions and recommendations must be given by 10.00 AM two working days preceding the meeting, subject to exceptions. This is to allow adequate time for members to consider the implications of proposed amendments and for officers to give professional advice.

Recommendations

4. That Council adopts the changes to the Council Procedure Rules set out in the Appendix to this report.

Financial Implications

5. Notice of amendments will allow for advance consideration of any financial implications.

Background Papers

6. Reports to Governance and Audit Committee meetings on 8 February and 17 May 2018, and the minutes of those meetings. These are available on the Council's website.

Impact

- 7.

Communication/Consultation	The proposals have been considered on
----------------------------	---------------------------------------

	two occasions by Governance, Audit and Performance Committee and have also been discussed with Group Leaders.
Community Safety	None
Equalities	None
Health and Safety	None
Human Rights/Legal Implications	Notice of amendments will allow for advance consideration of any legal implications.
Sustainability	None
Ward-specific impacts	None
Workforce/Workplace	None

Situation

8. Under the Council Procedure Rules, it is possible at present to move an amendment at Council without notice and with no prior discussion with officers. This can cause difficulties with major items, such as the Local Plan and the budget.
9. Particular risks associated with budget amendments moved without notice include:
 - There is little time to consider their merit and whether they stack up, for instance whether proposed revenue allocations are adequate for the purpose intended.
 - One budget change may have knock-on implications for the remainder of the budget and it is difficult to assess this without notice of an amendment.
 - It is difficult for officers, especially the s151 officer, to provide professional advice in these circumstances.
10. There are also risks associated with planning policy amendments moved without notice. It is difficult for officers to provide advice on the impact or legality of local or other plan amendments moved without advance notice. There is a risk that changes made without proper consideration or advice could risk legal challenge or undermine the strength of local plan or development plan document proposals and the prospect of confirmation following the inspection in public.
11. The benefits of providing for notice to be given of amendments include:

- Officers would have opportunity to assess the impact of amendments and to provide advice.
 - Members would have opportunity to give careful consideration to the merits of amendments, to ask questions and to seek advice.
 - Where it considers that amendments have merit, the Cabinet or majority group could indicate support, which would promote consensus, or could negotiate a compromise amendment likely to have support across the Council.
 - It would aid good conduct of the meeting.
12. It is important that care is taken to ensure that rules requiring notice to be given of amendments do not undermine the right of members to offer alternatives to Cabinet or other proposals or undermine the effectiveness of opposition groups.
13. There is a high degree of visibility of Cabinet recommendations to Council. Reports to Cabinet will have been published in advance and Cabinet will have met to deliberate. There is opportunity for non-Cabinet members to make their views known at this stage and to seek to influence debate. There is significant time to identify a case for amendment, to seek officer advice and to draft the amendment.
14. Cabinet recommendations to Council almost always relate to significant budget or policy decisions. If the Council is to consider adopting a different course, then it needs time for consideration and it needs appropriate professional advice. It will not have these if amendments are produced on the night. Officer advice is that it is good practice to require notice of amendments to Cabinet recommendations to Council.
15. The considerations identified above apply equally to recommendations made by regulatory committees and amendments to motions brought before the Council.
16. Officers suggest that, if these proposals are adopted, their effectiveness is reviewed after a period of, say, twelve months. If it is apparent that there are problems within that period, an earlier review can be undertaken.
17. Appendix 1 sets out a proposed amendment to the Council Procedure Rules, requiring notice to be given of amendments to Cabinet recommendation. It allows for some flexibility where, for instance, the need for an amendment became apparent late in the day, or where amendments improve, rather than materially alter, a recommendation, or to allow a response to an amendment.
18. There is also the safeguard that, if the Council is of the view that it makes sense to consider an amendment despite these rules, it can do so by majority agreement.

19. These proposals relate only to Council meetings, and not to Committee or Working Group Meetings.

Risk Analysis

20.

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigating actions
That the current rules for moving amendments at Council allow for their consideration without opportunity for proper advice or consideration.	3	3	The action proposed in this report of providing for notice to be given of amendments, subject to exceptions to provide for flexibility.

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.

Appendix 1.

Notice of amendments at Council (proposed additional text in bold)

12.6 Amendments to motions and recommendations

12.6.1 An amendment to a motion **or recommendation** must be relevant to the motion **or recommendation** and will either be:

- (i) to refer the matter to an appropriate body or individual for consideration or reconsideration;
- (ii) to leave out words;
- (iii) to leave out words and insert or add others; or
- (iv) to insert or add words as long as the effect of the amendment is not to negate the motion **or recommendation**.

12.6.2 Only one amendment may be moved and discussed at any one time. No further amendment may be moved until the amendment under discussion has been disposed of.

12.6.3 If an amendment is not carried, other amendments to the original motion or recommendation may be moved.

12.6.4 If an amendment is carried, the motion as amended takes the place of the original motion. This becomes the substantive motion to which any further amendments are moved.

12.6.5 After an amendment has been carried, the Chairman will read out the amended motion or recommendation before accepting any further amendments, or if there are none, put it to the vote.

12.6.6 Subject to the exceptions in Rule 12.6.7, amendments to motions or recommendations shall only be considered if they have been delivered in writing to the Democratic and Electoral Services Manager or to a Democratic Services Officer by 10 am on the day which is two working days preceding the meeting. Amendments submitted shall then be circulated to all members of the Council.

12.6.7 The exceptions to Rule 12.6.6 are:

1. The Chairman shall have discretion to permit amendments from members when satisfied that the need for the amendment could not have been anticipated before the deadline. The Chairman should also be satisfied that advance notice of such amendments was given as soon as reasonably practical, and not left to the day of the meeting unless this was unavoidable.

2. Further amendments are permitted that directly respond to amendments submitted in accordance with these rules. Notice of such further amendments should be given as soon as reasonably practical.

3. The Chairman may permit amendments if satisfied that they are necessary to improve the wording or to correct factual inaccuracies and do not make substantive changes to motions or recommendations, or to amendments of which notice has been given in accordance with rule 12.6.6. The Chairman shall give reasons for permitting such amendments to the meeting.

4. The Leader of the Council may amend a Cabinet recommendation in the light of discussion.