

**PLANNING POLICY WORKING GROUP held at COUNCIL CHAMBER -
COUNCIL OFFICES, LONDON ROAD, SAFFRON WALDEN, CB11 4ER, on
THURSDAY, 10 JANUARY 2019 at 5.30 pm**

Present: Councillor S Barker (Chairman)
Councillors A Dean, P Lees, J Lodge, E Oliver and H Rolfe

Officers in attendance: A Bochel (Democratic Services Officer), P Bylo (Planning Policy Manager), G Glenday (Assistant Director - Planning) and S Miles (Planning Policy Team Leader)

Public Speakers: Cllr J Redfern, D Hall and K McDonald

PP31 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Barker said Councillor Rolfe had asked her to chair the meeting as he was running late.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Loughlin and Ranger.

Councillor Barker declared a non-pecuniary interest as a member of Essex County Council, and because she had made representations regarding the Local Plan.

Councillor Rolfe entered the meeting.

PP32 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting on 20 November 2018 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman subject to the following amendment to PP29:

Original paragraph:

The Chairman said that officers had asked for a more fundamental, rather than light-touch, update of the sustainability appraisal. This was identified as a modification of option 3 in the report.

Updated paragraph:

The Chairman said that he had been informed of the update to the sustainability appraisal about a week before other members. Officers had asked for a more fundamental, rather than light-touch, update of the sustainability appraisal. This was identified as option 3 in the report.

PP33

LOCAL PLAN – UPDATED SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL

The Planning Policy Team Leader gave a summary of the report and the Sustainability Appraisal. The Sustainability Appraisal had been updated and was to be published for a representation period. It would then be submitted, as well as comments made during the representation period, to the Inspector for consideration alongside the Local Plan. The updated Sustainability Appraisal indicated that the strategy in the Local Plan was the most appropriate to deliver its objectives.

In response to a Member question, officers said previous legal advice shared with members of the Planning Policy Working Group had given guidance on the Council running the submission of the Local Plan and the consultation on the Sustainability Appraisal in parallel. This advice was subject to legal privilege. Officers would check whether it could be circulated more widely.

In response to a Member question, the Chairman said that the Sustainability Appraisal included references to alternative sites not included in the Local Plan. These could be brought into the Local Plan if other sites were found to be problematic to develop.

In response to Member questions, the Planning Policy Team Leader said the Local Plan would inevitably have some negative impacts, only some of which could be mitigated. Mitigation measures would not be addressed in the Sustainability Appraisal

The Chairman asked that officers try to correct many of the spelling errors in the Sustainability Appraisal.

Cllr Redfern and D Hall spoke on this item.

PP34

LOCAL PLAN – REPRESENTATIONS UPDATE

The Planning Policy Team Leader gave a summary of the report. Officers had summarised the representations from the Regulation 19 representation period in the summer and the Addendum of Focussed Changes representation period in the autumn. The summary of the representations and the full representations themselves would be submitted to the Secretary of State alongside the Local Plan in January.

The Planning Policy Team Leader noted the Regulation 19 representation period differed from the Regulation 18 consultation period, in that the former only gathered representations to pass onto the Inspector at the Local Plan examination, as opposed to gathering representations to which the Council would respond by seeking to amend the Local Plan.

The Planning Policy Team Leader noted it was expected the Water Cycle Study would be complete in February and the Sport and Recreation Study would be complete in April. The Heritage Impact Assessment would be updated and may

also be submitted later than the Local Plan. The Stansted to Braintree Rapid Transit System Progress Update and the North Uttlesford Mass Transit Opportunities Study were also still ongoing and might be submitted a week later than the Local Plan.

In response to a member question, the Planning Policy Team Leader said the two transit studies were very much focusing on specific areas, rather than links between the north and south of Uttlesford. Councillor Rolfe said the Council was taking account of links between north and south Uttlesford. Highways England was looking into turning north Junction 8 on the M11 into a smart motorway and there was discussion with the rail network about links between the airport and the north of the district. There was nothing regarding rapid transit systems, but this was something that officers should keep in mind.

The Planning Policy Team Leader said officers were aiming to submit the Local Plan and supporting documents on 18 January. The examination was likely to start following the district elections on 2 May.

Councillor Rolfe said there would be another meeting of the group in order to review supporting documents which had not yet been received.

K McDonald spoke on this item.

The meeting closed at 6.35.

Minute Item 3

PPWG Meeting - 10th January, 2019 Comments on behalf of Great Chesterford Parish Council

Since early 2016 Great Chesterford Parish Council has engaged extensively with UDC regarding possible selection of the NUGC site: apart from numerous appearances at PPWG and elsewhere:

- in April 2016 the Parish Council provided detailed written criticisms of UDC's preliminary assessment of the site put forward in response to the Call for Sites - to which no response of any kind was received, despite reminders;
- in August 2017 a detailed response to the Regulation 18 Local Plan was submitted, including external Consultants' reports relating to transport, heritage and location - again to which no substantive response was received;
- in September 2018 a very detailed response to the Regulation 19 Plan was submitted, which included updated Consultants' reports on the issues previously provided: once more, no substantive response of any kind has been received - save disclosure, in late November 2018, of AECOM's heavy criticism of the SA report that accompanied the proposals. This has now been followed by publication, just before Christmas, of AECOM's rewrite of the SA previously written-off as "non-compliant" and defective.

My Council will in due course be submitting a detailed response to AECOM's doomed attempt to save UDC's SA by seeking to "cure" the numerous failings of its flawed predecessor. Suffice it to say that you can rearrange the order of words as much as you like, but you cannot alter the facts - including the chaotic manner in which NUGC came forward for serious consideration only in January 2017, and the reverse engineering employed to justify that selection.

In the event that UDC submits its Local Plan to the Planning Inspector as proposed, it will be for UDC, and UDC alone, to satisfy the Inspector at the Inquiry that the Plan is sound; my Council intends to play a full part in objecting to the proposal as regards NUGC for the many reasons previously detailed.

Regarding preparation of UDC's Development Plan Document - Great Chesterford set out as long ago as January 2018 its detailed Red Lines regarding NUGC in the event that it is permitted to proceed, and UDC, Officers and Grosvenor are well aware of its concerns. Going forward, pending and subject to the outcome of the Inquiry, the Parish Council remains ready to review proposals submitted to meet these objections.

I am here again as Member representing The Chesterfords. Having been a member of this council for nearly 12 years, I am fully aware of the amount of work that has been put in to produce a Local Plan. As you all know, I have not supported the inclusion of North Uttlesford Garden Community at Gt Chesterford and my position on this has not changed.

Whilst I am in no doubt that UDC can do a great job of new garden communities and what is inside them, I am totally frustrated that there is no consideration given for what is happening 500yds over our border in South Cambs. The planning application for huge expansion at Wellcome's Genome Campus is now in, which increases their research space dramatically and brings with it 1500 new homes. The proposed Agritech site next door to that known as Smithson Hill for a huge employment area for 1000's of new jobs is now with the Secretary of State for a decision.

You have the Acoms new SA and this takes no account of this cross-border problem and it will be an issue because we know Wellcome will have government support, just as they did before.

How can this new SA not even consider this when it really is more than just a possibility? It could have permission for development before the inspector even looks at our LP, what then?

Without acknowledging what is going on, Udc are not doing the best for the community that I represent. Can we please have agreement that this cross border problem will be given the serious consideration that it ~~should be getting~~ and that is not in the report you are discussing this evening?
deserves

Minute Item 4

Uttlesford Planning Policy Working Group meeting 10 January 2019
Statement and Question by Ken McDonald, 2 Greenfields, Stansted
Mountfitchet, CM24 8AH.

Good evening. My name is Ken McDonald.

In good faith, I have responded to Uttlesford's various Local Plan consultations, hoping to help shape the future of our District.

I have continued to perform this, what I regard as my public duty, despite having less and less faith that my - or anyone else's - comments would ever be considered by you, the councillors.

Despite the persistent disregard by UDC of my contributions, I have continued to engage in the process in the hope that, one day, an independent inspector would actually consider my comments.

I note that the summary of Representations presented to this Working Group includes what appear to be only limited and random elements from my Regulation 19 comments, some re-written so as to obscure the point I was making, others omitted entirely.

In particular, I failed to find any reference to my submissions as to why the draft Plan is not legally compliant and why it is unsound.

In fact, the report before you doesn't seem to address those points at all. Yet anyone who responded online was required first to give an opinion on those key questions - legal compliance and soundness - before being allowed to comment in any detail on the Regulation 19 draft. What seemed to be the main purpose of the consultation has simply been ignored in the report before you.

Now, it has been my understanding that all responses to the Regulation 19 consultation would be passed to the Inspector. However, if the Inspector is to receive only the summary which you have before you, he or she will not get any feel for respondents' views on legal compliance or soundness.

From a personal perspective, my efforts to make what I regard as important points, clearly and with evidence, will have been in vain.

My question, therefore, is:

Will all responses to the Regulation 19 consultation be given, in full and without censorship, to the Inspector?