

COUNCIL held at COUNCIL CHAMBER - COUNCIL OFFICES, LONDON ROAD, SAFFRON WALDEN, CB11 4ER, on TUESDAY, 9 OCTOBER 2018 at 7.30 pm

Present: Councillor L Wells (Chairman)
Councillors K Artus, 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, T Goddard, J Gordon, N Hargreaves, E Hicks, S Howell, D Jones, G LeCount, P Lees, M Lemon, B Light, A Mills, S Morris, E Oliver, V Ranger, H Rolfe, H Ryles and G Sell

Officers in attendance: Dawn French (Chief Executive), Rebecca Dobson (Democratic and Electoral Services Manager), Gordon Glenday (Assistant Director Planning and Building Control), Roger Harborough (Director – Public Services), Simon Pugh (Assistant Director – Governance and Legal), Stephen Miles (Planning Project Team Leader) and John Starr (Community Safety Officer).

Also present: Millicent Wolter (Chairman of Uttlesford Youth Council) and Tom Birkbeck (Youth Councillor).

C27 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Anjum, Knight, Lodge, Loughlin and Redfern.

Public speaking

Statements were made by Sandi Merifield and Mike Young. Summaries of their representations are appended to these Minutes.

Councillor Artus declared a personal interest as Chairman of the Strategic Aviation Special Interest Group in relation to the Stansted Airport planning application.

Councillor R Freeman declared a personal interest as a member of Saffron Walden Town Council.

Councillor Gerard declared a personal interest as a Substitute Member of the Planning Committee.

Councillor Dean declared a personal interest as a member of Stop Stansted Expansion.

Councillor Foley declared a personal interest in that he had applied for membership of Stop Stansted Expansion.

Councillor Lemon declared a personal interest in that he was a member of Hatfield Heath Parish Council.

The Assistant Director – Governance and Legal reminded members there was no need to declare as an interest membership of a town or parish council.

Councillor S Barker declared a personal interest as a Member of Essex County Council.

C28 **CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chairman paid tribute to the late David Westcott. She said he had been widely liked and respected, and that he had in 1990-1991 been Leader of this Council. She was sure all Members would join her in sending their condolences to his widow.

The Chairman said she also wished to express condolences to Councillor Oliver, whose wife had very recently died.

In accordance with a request from Councillor Chambers, a minute's silence was observed.

C29 **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 19 July 2018 were received and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

C30 **REPORTS OF LEADER AND MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE**

a **Report of the Leader of the Council**

The Leader offered his condolences to Councillor Oliver and to former Councillor Westcott's family.

He said his report was included in the agenda papers this evening, but that since the report had been written he had attended with the Chief Executive a meeting with the new Chief Inspector, Chief Inspector Rawlingson, and that there would be a public meeting of the Police, Fire and Crime Commissioner in November.

He apologised that there had been no explanation given for the withdrawal of the motion regarding the payback clause for the investment in a running track at Carver Barracks. The motion had sought the removal of the clause requiring a refund from the allocation of the approved sum of £500,000. The reasons for the withdrawal of the motion were that a communication had now been received from the MOD estates surveyor in response to queries the Council had raised, to the effect that whilst removal of the contingent liability (payback clause) was helpful, it was not the main issue causing delay.

The MOD had stated that a national review was being undertaken which included Carver Barracks within its scope. Following the review, a plan would be formulated which required ministerial approval to implement, which was anticipated next year. It was considered imprudent to embark upon the project immediately prior to a strategic level decision. The Army had indicated it hoped the Council could continue to be patient whilst a ministerial announcement was awaited.

The Leader said he had attended the Conservative Party conference. The news that the Housing Revenue Account borrowing cap for councils had been lifted was good news for Uttlesford. He had had a meeting with the Housing Minister and would, with East Hertfordshire, be inviting the Minister for Transport to attend a meeting in the area.

b Report of the Portfolio Holder for Environmental Services

Councillor S Barker said her report as Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for the Environment was included in the agenda papers. She would welcome any questions.

She said the late David Westcott had been her predecessor in serving the community of Dunmow, and had taught her a great deal about the role. She had been saddened to learn of his death, and sent her condolences and best wishes to his widow.

c Report of the Portfolio Holder for Finance and Administration

Councillor Howell referred Members to his report within the agenda papers as the Portfolio Holder for Finance & Administration.

Councillor Morris asked whether Councillor Howell was aware that that some claimants of Universal Credit had to wait eight months before receiving the benefit.

Councillor Howell said there were no cases of such delays for any claimants of Universal Credit in Uttlesford. Whilst there were challenges, the Council was managing those challenges by ensuring new claimants were supported by provision of appropriate advice and information. Any concerns could be raised directly with officers.

d **Report of the Portfolio Holder for Housing**

In the absence of Councillor Redfern, Councillor Felton presented the report of the Portfolio Holder for Housing, referring to the successful redevelopment of Reynolds Court sheltered housing scheme, and forthcoming developments in respect of Frambury Lane in Newport and in Great Dunmow.

Councillor Dean said, in relation to David Westcott, that he had been a great individual, tolerant towards those from other political groups.

Councillor Dean said he had been impressed by his visit to Reynolds Court, and congratulated all those who had participated in the redevelopment.

e **Report of the Portfolio Holder for Communities and Partnerships**

Councillor Ranger referred Council to his report as Portfolio Holder for Communities. As an update, he said he had attended a very productive meeting with the West Essex Clinical Commissioning Group; that plans were being put forward to provide primary care plans across the District, and that he would be attending the Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee in Chelmsford later this month to consider Winter pressures.

Councillor Davies joined the meeting at 7.50pm.

f **Report of the Portfolio Holder for Economic Development**

Councillor Ryles presented his report as Portfolio Holder for Economic Development, highlighting various points, in particular the updates provided in the report on Saffron Walden Business Improvement District, a car park work plan to ensure the ticket machines were fit for purpose and the roll out programme for superfast broadband.

C31

QUESTIONS TO THE LEADER, MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE AND COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN (UP TO 15 MINUTES)

Councillor Dean said there had been discussion at Scrutiny Committee regarding the potential impact of the UK's exit from the EU on the expansion to the Wellcome Trust at Hinxton Hall. He referred to press reports questioning how the Council would deal with the possible impact.

Councillor Howell said he was disappointed that this matter had been raised. The Council had set up arm's length governance arrangements via the company Aspire (CRP) Ltd regarding its investment in Chesterford Research Park. The

matter had been debated at length by Scrutiny Committee and at other meetings, and he was aware that Councillor Dean had taken account of some of the points which had been raised. It was wrong to grandstand on this matter.

Councillor Howell said the press release referred to was speculative. Science business in the District brought in much employment. Chesterford Research Park competed with other science parks and it was wrong for the Council as landlord to undermine the businesses at CRP. The Council had undertaken the investment for good reason. Without the investment in Aspire there would be serious cuts to the Council's services.

Councillor Dean said reports of economic implications for the Chesterford Research Park were a matter of public interest, and he was disappointed to have had what he considered to be a defensive reaction.

Councillor Howell said the directors of Aspire had attended the meetings of the Scrutiny and Governance, Audit and Performance Committees and answered questions. There were other avenues to discuss such matters, rather than at Council.

Councillor Sell referred to recent ram raids in the District. He was aware that Broadland District Council had invited senior police officers to give a presentation on crime to their Members. He asked whether such an invitation could be extended to the Police in Uttlesford to enable Members to ask questions.

The Leader said this suggestion was an excellent one, and that he would invite the new Chief Inspector to arrange to meet Members to give an overview of the work of the Police in this area.

Councillor Light asked the Leader for information on the bid that was being prepared for the support package for the Garden Communities.

The Chief Executive said no figure for financial support was yet available, and officers were working on the bid. The Director of Public Services was arranging briefing meetings with Homes England to explore how funding to increase the capacity of the organisation could be obtained and for feasibility studies. Members would be kept informed.

C32

ADDRESS FROM MEMBERS OF THE YOUTH COUNCIL

The Chairman of the Uttlesford Youth Council, Councillor Wolter addressed the meeting. She said the Youth Council was holding a seminar on 1 December to engage young people in the crucial topic of housing. The Youth Council would report back. The Youth Council was working on its constitution and was holding elections in schools across the District this month to increase the number of youth councillors. The elections process had been redesigned, and members were looking forward to working with new Youth Councillors, whom it was hoped would take an active role. Next year the Youth Council intended to work on plastic, mental health, school links and providing green spaces for young people.

The Chairman thanked Councillor Wolter for her address. Members showed their appreciation of the attendance of Youth Council representatives with a round of applause.

C33 REPORT FROM THE PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT WORKING GROUP

Councillor Lemon referred members to a report from the Public Engagement Working Group. He identified key areas for note, such as members' training and citizens' access. He said he was amazed at the good level of public engagement, but that the report identified areas where improvements could be made. The Working Group had endorsed the actions set out in the report for the Council to focus its efforts to better engage with the public.

C34 ADDENDUM OF FOCUSED CHANGES TO THE LOCAL PLAN REGULATION 19 PRE-SUBMISSION DOCUMENT

At the request of the Chairman, the Planning Policy Team Leader gave a briefing to set out the reasons for the report and recommendations to Council on an Addendum of Focussed Changes to the Local Plan. He said the report reflected the elevated level of risk around the West of Braintree Garden Community as a consequence of the examination into the North Essex Authorities' local plans including West of Braintree and the fact that the examiner had asked the three authorities to consider three options. Braintree District Council was now proceeding with option two, to obtain evidence to satisfy the Inspector's concerns. Uttlesford had had legal advice that Uttlesford needed to reflect this elevated level of risk within the Local Plan and to set out what it would do if West of Braintree was not deliverable.

The report also set out other changes in the Plan including the identification of the strategic policies for the purposes of neighbourhood planning and clarification of the policy relating to impacts on internationally protected sites such as Epping Forest.

The Planning Policy Team Leader referred to the 2016 based household projections published last month, compared to the 2014 based projections. He said if these new projections were to be incorporated, the work would need to be commissioned with the SHMA partners, and in a fair and transparent way. There would be a need for a consultation period with submission on or by 24 January to the Secretary of State. There was not time to do this. If submission were to be after 24 January then the standardised methodology would need to be used, however the Government had said it would consider reviewing that methodology if the new household projections would result in the Government's national delivery target of 300,000 homes year not being met.. Legal advice had been obtained, and in short, there was not sufficient time.

Other evidence-based updates which were now published were the spatial strategy background paper and the review of employment policies. The review suggested changes to the Plan, however officers were not recommending

changes as they considered such changes did not go to the soundness of the Plan and would dilute the focus of the document.

The Planning Policy Team Leader set out next steps if the Addendum were to be agreed.

The Planning Policy Team Leader addressed questions raised by the first public speaker, regarding the possibility that a pause at the time the regulation 19 plan was considered could have allowed for it to be fixed at that point in time. The Council had made the decision on the advice before them at that point, when the first letter from the North Essex Authorities inspector had been published, which was on 15 June, four days prior to the full Council meeting. Officers from Braintree District Council had indicated they would select option 2, which had then been confirmed. The decision of this Council to issue an Addendum related to the third letter of the North Essex Authority Inspector on 2 August, in which the Inspector set out more details on the options before the Councils.

In relation to the question on the 5 year housing land supply, papers at the meeting of the Planning Policy Working Group had set out the Council's 5 year housing land supply position. The Council had, for Development Management purposes, approximately 3.5 years without taking account of the draft allocations in the Local Plan, 4.5 taking into account the allocations in the draft Local Plan and with the Local plan allocations, 5.1 years. He outlined the difference between the 5 year housing land supply calculation in the Local Plan, and that used for development management purposes with the allocations in the draft Local Plan, which was the stepped trajectory in the Local Plan.

In relation to the question on determining the delivery model, the Planning Policy Team Leader said at this point officers were not advising any particular model, as a separate process had to be concluded first.

Regarding the points raised by the second speaker, the Planning Policy Team Leader said that at East Hertfordshire it was correct that communal establishments were not included in the overall figure, however they had a separate target and therefore had to have identified a supply to meet that requirement. For this Council, this approach was not advised, as the Council did not have an identified supply to meet such a requirement, so it was included in the overall figure.

On the question as to the use of the most up to date household projections being used, he had explained there was not time to take these into account with the Council's partners in a fair and transparent manner, and legal advice had been obtained on this point. As it was a lower requirement, it was not something which had to be taken into account in the Local Plan.

Councillor S Barker then presented the report, which set out further detail around an Addendum of Focussed Changes to the Regulation 19 Local Plan. She referred to the additional recommendation which had now been tabled in relation to SP5 Garden Community Principles, and drew members' attention to the fact that legal advice indicated that not proceeding with the Addendum could cost the Council more money and time than the costs associated with printing the Addendum and engaging consultants to undertake sustainability appraisal and

habitats regulation assessment. There were two updates to the evidence base, and the Planning Policy Team Leader had explained that there was not enough time to update and re-submit the Local Plan before 24 January. She proposed the recommendations.

The Leader seconded the proposal.

Members debated the proposal. Councillor R Freeman asked that the recommendations be taken one at a time. He expressed concern that it was proposed to give authority to individuals to take various actions such as submission of proposed modifications.

Councillor Hargreaves questioned the arguments put forward regarding the housing numbers, as he considered it likely the Government's housing requirement was coming down. He was not convinced by assertions that care homes should not be treated in a different category.

Councillor Light said the report indicated there was a continuing lack of sufficient evidence, and that last June she had proposed postponing the Plan to resolve various issues.

Councillor Gerard questioned whether appropriate analysis of risks had taken place. He questioned whether a comparison had been made as to which was a more significant risk: not submitting the plan before 24 January because the timetable was too tight, or the risk of submitting a Plan that was not right.

Councillor S Barker said in response to Councillor R Freeman's question, that the submission of a schedule of proposed main modifications of the submitted Local plan to address any issues relating to soundness and legal compliance was looking ahead to the examination to enable officers to respond to requests from the Inspector for modifications to address soundness matters.

The Leader said the date of 24 January was set by the National Planning Policy Framework. He did not understand the desire for delay, as the evidence to support the plan was significant, and it would only cost more, and would risk more unwarranted development without a Plan. The Inspector in relation to North Essex was looking at three different Garden Communities, and the Council had taken legal advice to progress the plan, which was to submit the Addendum of Focussed Changes. He urged Council to sign off on the Addendum.

Councillor Fairhurst said the Addendum was a Band-Aid, and that the Council had pushed on regardless. There was no sports strategy, or air quality strategy, and it was important to get the Local Plan right.

Councillor Dean said he would support the proposals. The Council should continue on the trajectory it started on in June, there was no substantial change to the plan and he recommended Members should support the proposal.

Councillor Chambers said he was opposed to the Local Plan, and Members still had the opportunity to fight their own corners, but it was time for the Plan to be submitted and he proposed it was now put to the vote.

The Chairman said she would take the recommendations as one item. A vote being taken, the recommendations were approved with 24 votes in favour, four against and two abstentions.

RESOLVED that

1 Council being satisfied that the preparation of the Local Plan, as amended by the Addendum of Focussed Changes, 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 for publication in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012;

2 following the conclusion of the Regulation 19 publication period on the Addendum of Focussed Changes, 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 2018;

3 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;

4 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;

5 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

6 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.

C35

VOTING BY BALLOT AT COUNCIL MEETINGS

Councillor Oliver presented a report which had been considered by the Governance, Audit and Performance Committee on voting by ballot at Council meetings. The report recommended that the Council adopt changes to the Constitution to provide for contested appointments made by the Council to be decided by way of ballot.

Councillor Sell said he could not support the proposals as he believed in transparency.

Councillor Chambers said he had openness was important, and he was against the secrecy of a private ballot.

Councillor Hargreaves said the ballot only related to the election of Chairmen and Vice Chairmen where there was a contested vote. This approach was taken at national level for Members of Parliament and the Welsh Assembly, and the Scottish Parliament. The role of Chairman was impartial and non-political, and in May 2017 there had been a contested vote, at which there had been a ballot. At the meeting there was a request for a recorded vote, which trumped a ballot, at which he had heard a comment indicating that a member then felt obliged to vote with their political Group. The vote then became a political vote for a non-political position. These were only internal elections, in which the public had little interest. The proposal only related to ballots for appointments.

Councillor R Freeman said he agreed with Councillor Chambers that transparency was important, but he considered it was hard to vote against one's own party. This method was good enough for national Government, so should be adopted. The Council would in future be a different political make-up and there was a need for a secret ballot in what could be a fractured council.

Councillor LeCount said he had heard the arguments at the meetings of the Governance, Audit and Performance Committee and he was in favour of the proposal.

Councillor Dean said he was against the proposal, and did not wish to adopt an antediluvian practice of Westminster. Members should be open and transparent, and grown up enough to vote for whoever they thought best for the appointment.

Councillor Rolfe said, speaking as an individual, he respected colleagues on the Governance, Audit and Performance Committee, but this was a retrograde step and the example set by other places was not necessarily relevant. Members should do what they considered right.

Councillor Light said she would vote for the proposal, as in this case it was right that people should have a free and fair vote, and not be influenced by others.

Councillor Howell said everything the Council did should be transparent, and he did not support the proposal.

Councillor Foley said he understood the reason behind the proposal, but people should not be afraid to speak their mind, and transparency was key.

Councillor Ranger said it should be borne in mind that the aim was to select someone who would be the best candidate to be the public face of the Council, so it was fair that this process was open and transparent.

Councillor Asker said she did not see a problem with voting by means of a piece of paper, in the same way that the public had elected Members.

The recommendation being put to the vote, it was lost by 23 votes against to 8 votes in favour.

C36 CLLR ANJUM - APPROVAL OF ABSENCE FROM MEETINGS

RESOLVED to approve the absence of Councillor Anjum from meetings by reason of ill-health for the purposes of section 85(1) of the Local Government Act 1972.

C37 NOTICE OF MOTION RECEIVED FROM COUNCILLOR FOLEY: STANSTED AIRPORT PLANNING APPLICATION - PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT SESSIONS

Members considered a motion on notice received from Councillor Foley, as set out on the agenda.

Councillor Foley asked for the meeting's consent to alter the motion. Such consent being granted, he read out the altered motion.

Councillor Farthing said Councillor Foley was a supporter of Stop Stansted Expansion, which many regarded as a pressure group. This motion was an advertorial for Stop Stansted Expansion.

Councillor Asker said she was happy with the proposal.

Councillor Mills said he supported the motion, which had been superseded by events, however, Members of Planning Committee should be wary of expressing support for Stop Stansted Expansion.

Councillor Lemon said the Stansted Airport application affected a lot of people, and whilst he was not a member of Stop Stansted Expansion, he felt the group did represent the point of view of many people.

Councillor Hicks said he found the motion very difficult to support because it did not specify any details as to time to be allocated.

Councillor Fairhurst said he was a member of the Planning Committee and the question of what was adequate time for representations to be made was a matter for the Chairman. He was not a member of Stop Stansted Expansion, and he considered Councillor Farthing's statement prejudiced his role as a member of the Committee. He would like the statement withdrawn.

Councillor Mills said everyone was entitled to his or her opinion.

The Leader said members should stay closely to the motion which was about process.

The Assistant Director – Governance and Legal said nothing had been said that would prejudice the Planning Committee’s consideration of the application, and it was not a matter for the full Council to debate.

The motion being put, it was carried with 24 votes in favour, three against and with three abstentions.

RESOLVED The local community group Stop Stansted Expansion deserves this Council’s respect for championing democratic accountability, transparency and public representation over many years with technical professionalism on matters such as the environment and health and other impacts on the local community associated with the London Stansted Airport.

The Council also recognises the employment and other economic benefits that the Manchester Airport Group-owned local airport brings to this district and to the adjacent sub-region.

In forthcoming public engagement sessions, the Council welcomes that Stop Stansted Expansion will be given adequate facilities and time in its role as community champion and representative of many residents and parish councils to explain its interpretation of the airport’s current growth proposals.

Furthermore, the Council considers that the Manchester Airport Group should be afforded commensurate facilities and time to explain its proposals, if it so desires.

The meeting having continued for two hours, under procedure rule 8, the Chairman sought the view of the meeting. It was confirmed the meeting should continue.

C38

NOTICE OF MOTION RECEIVED BY COUNCILLOR SELL: REDUCING PLASTIC WASTE

Councillor Sell said he was grateful to the Portfolio Holder for Environmental Services for her suggestions regarding this motion. He therefore now sought to make an alteration, to propose that the existing Waste Strategy Panel be asked to carry out the work proposed, rather than establishing a new working group to do so. Members consented to this alteration.

Councillor Sell read out the altered motion as follows:

“The council notes that the prime minister has declared war on plastic, with an announcement that the government hopes to “eliminate all avoidable plastic waste” within 25 years. This council therefore resolves to play its part locally and lead by example in helping to reduce plastic waste. To this end the Council will ask the Waste Strategy Panel to consider:

- i. ways in which single issue plastics used by the Council can be replaced with sustainable or reusable alternatives where practicable
- ii. How the Council can play its role in helping to educate members of the public about plastic waste,
- iii. The provision of public drinking fountains across Uttlesford and encouraging a culture of refillable bottles, to promote health, reduce litter and cut the use of plastic an
- iv. How to use the links we have with businesses in Uttlesford to encourage them to reduce the amount of plastic waste produced and encourage participation in refill schemes in town centres
- v. Lobbying for a plastic bottle deposit return scheme and support for the campaigns from Keep Britain Tidy, the Marine Conservation Society, Campaign to Protect Rural England and ReLoop.

Councillor Sell said the motion attempted to ensure that this Council led by example on a very serious issue, given the inordinate amount of plastic which was sent to landfill and which was in the wider environment. Unless the situation changed, there would be more plastic in the oceans than fish. This motion was not intended to be prescriptive, but was to look at ways to tackle plastic waste. He proposed the motion.

Councillor Fairhurst seconded the motion.

Councillor S Barker thanked Councillor Sell for accepting her suggestions for changing the motion. The proposed work should be focussed and should be reported to Council in December. The Secretary of State was expected to produce a report on the use of plastics, consideration of which should be incorporated into the review.

Councillor Fairhurst said it was good to lead, and to encourage people to take small actions themselves, as if everyone did so it would make a difference.

Councillor Hargreaves asked whether the working party could look at collections out of street bins.

Councillor S Barker said the County Council had a Materials Recovery Facility for black bin waste, which did reduce residual waste. Regarding street bins, the suggested advice to the public was to take recyclables home for disposal.

The motion was put to the vote and carried.

RESOLVED The council notes that the prime minister has declared war on plastic, with an announcement that the government hopes to “eliminate all avoidable plastic waste” within 25 years. This council therefore resolves to play its part locally and lead by example in helping to reduce plastic waste. To this end the Council will ask the Waste Strategy Panel to consider:

- i. ways in which single issue plastics used by the Council can be replaced with sustainable or reusable alternatives where practicable

- ii. How the Council can play its role in helping to educate members of the public about plastic waste,
- iii. The provision of public drinking fountains across Uttlesford and encouraging a culture of refillable bottles, to promote health, reduce litter and cut the use of plastic an
- iv. How to use the links we have with businesses in Uttlesford to encourage them to reduce the amount of plastic waste produced and encourage participation in refill schemes in town centres
- v. Lobbying for a plastic bottle deposit return scheme and support for the campaigns from Keep Britain Tidy, the Marine Conservation Society, Campaign to Protect Rural England and ReLoop.

The meeting ended at 9.35pm.

Summaries of Public Speaking Statements

Statement of Sandi Merifield

Please note the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Policy Working Group held on 4 October 2018 are incorrect in that the representatives of Stebbing Parish Council only met with officers, not with the Council's barrister.

Stebbing Parish Council feels it is meant to feel grateful to officers for sharing with us the advice of the Council's QC, but we do not. The District Council is simply protecting itself. Stebbing feels let down by the District Council. Land West of Braintree featured in all of the scenarios in the Regulation 18 sustainability appraisal. It is clear that this option is a risk, but the Council is ploughing on regardless. Stebbing Parish Council does not believe the Inspector will be satisfied, and is worried that if the Garden Community is sited at West of Braintree that the area would face the threat of 1500 to 2000 homes. If it does not go ahead then I am sure the District Council's planners would look for the rest of the requirement elsewhere in the District.

Is there a five year housing supply? Has the District Council been seeking to fill the gap the loss of land West of Braintree would leave? How many planning applications are there at present? It is left to the development plan to test the delivery model. We have no experience of how collaboration works so how can the Council make comments?

Statement of Mike Young

I wish to make three points concerning housing need:

First, the present calculation is illogical, as it principally affects Epping and Uttlesford; secondly, the addition for communal establishments is incorrect, as rooms in care homes should be deducted as they are not classified as properties, but more importantly, they should not be included, as was accepted by the East Herts examination.

Third, from 24 January, housing need will be based on a new government formula. Government advice is to use the most up to date figures, which means the household projections issued in September should be used. Methodology of leading consultants which has been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate shows a housing need figure of 3,000 less than that proposed. The changes could be recalculated, but there is time, with will and determination.