



Public Document Pack

Uttlesford District Council

Chief Executive: Dawn French

Scrutiny Committee Remote Meeting

Date: Wednesday, 23rd June, 2021

Time: 7.00 pm

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

Chairman: Councillor N Gregory

Members: Councillors A Coote, C Criscione, G Driscoll, V Isham, R Jones,
P Lavelle, G LeCount (Vice-Chair), G Sell and J De Vries

Substitutes: Councillors S Barker, M Caton, P Fairhurst, B Light, R Pavitt and
M Sutton

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. Please register your intention to speak at this meeting by writing to committee@uttlesford.gov.uk

Public speakers will be offered the opportunity for an officer to read out their questions or statement at the meeting, or to attend the meeting over Zoom to readout their questions or statement themselves.

Members of the public who would like to listen to the meeting live can do so [here](#). The broadcast will be made available as soon as the meeting begins.

**AGENDA
PART 1**

Open to Public and Press

1 Apologies for Absence and Declarations of Interest

To receive any apologies for absence and declarations of interest.

2 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

4 - 10

To consider the minutes of the previous meeting.

3 Local Plan Quarter 1 Project Management

11 - 26

To consider the Local Plan Quarter 1 Project Management report

COMMITTEE MEETINGS AND THE PUBLIC – MAY 2021 UPDATE

In light of the recent High Court judgement regarding the extension of remote meeting regulations, Council, Cabinet and Committee meetings will now be returning to in-person and will be held on-site from Thursday 6th May 2021. However, due to social distancing measures and capacity considerations in line with the Council's risk assessment, public access and participation will continue to be encouraged virtually until further notice.

Members of the public are welcome to listen live to the debate of any of the Council's Cabinet or Committee meetings. All live broadcasts and meeting papers can be viewed on the Council's calendar of meetings webpage.

Members of the public are permitted to speak at this meeting and will be encouraged to do so via the video conferencing platform Zoom. If you wish to make a statement via Zoom video link, you will need to register with Democratic Services by midday two working days before the meeting. There is a 15 minute public speaking limit and 3 minute speaking slots will be given on a first come, first served basis. Those wishing to make a statement via video link will require an internet connection and a device with a microphone and video camera enabled. Those wishing to make a statement to the meeting who do not have internet access can do so via telephone.

Technical guidance on the practicalities of participating via Zoom will be given at the point of confirming your registration slot, but if you have any questions regarding the best way to participate in this meeting please call Democratic Services on 01799 510 369/410/467/548 who will advise on the options available. 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. The broadcast will be unavailable when 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 510369/410/467/548 as soon as possible prior to the meeting.

For information about this meeting please contact Democratic Services

Telephone: 01799 510369, 510548, 510410 or 510467

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

SCRUTINY COMMITTEE (LOCAL PLAN) held at ZOOM, on TUESDAY 16 FEBRUARY 2021 at 7.00 pm

Present: Councillor N Gregory (Chair)
Councillors C Coote, C Criscione, G Driscoll, R Jones, P Lavelle, G LeCount (Vice Chair) , G Sell and J De Vries

Officers in Attendance: C Edwards (Democratic Services Officer), G Glenday (Assistant Director - Planning), S Miles (Local Plan and New Communities Manager), S Nicholas (New Communities Senior Planner) and S Payne (Local Plan Project Manager)

Also in attendance: Councillor J Evans (Portfolio Holder for Planning and the Local Plan) and Councillor G Bagnall (Chair of Local Plan Leadership Group)

SC61 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Apologies were received from Councillor Dean.

SC62 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting held on 10 December 2020 were approved and would be signed by the Chair as a correct record at the next opportunity.

SC63 STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT STRATEGY

The New Communities Senior Planner introduced the report. She said it had been adopted by the Council in 2006 following a requirement set out in the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act of 2004. It had been updated and reviewed regularly since then and the current update had taken into account the new Local Plan and the Covid 19 pandemic.

The role of the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) is to encourage participation from residents and involvement in the planning application and Local Plan process. The Council needed to comply with the SCI and demonstrate this to the Inspector. She gave a brief overview of how the community could be involved, and how this process had changed to invite discussion and more responses to a variety of themes.

She said that there was a lower number of people commenting on the SCI, but said it reflected the on going refinement, continued update of comments, and technical nature of the document.

The Local Plan and New Communities Manager highlighted that the SCI was intended to hold the Council to account on the consultation regarding planning applications and the Local Plan process.

Councillor Criscione said he had concerns about the SCI and, in the current format, he did not feel able to recommend the document to Cabinet. He said it needed to provide details of how the developer should engage with the Community so that at pre-application stage they understood what was expected from them. He asked if this could be revisited and a section on progression of strategic sites added. He gave Epping Forest's SCI as a good example and said he could share the details.

Councillor Evans thanked Councillor Criscione for his views. He said it might be difficult to incorporate and amend the SCI at this stage. He said the process should be about working together with promoters of strategic sites, and a statement of common ground could be devised, but not all developers had and would engage.

The Local Plan and New Communities Manager said there were a few issues:-

- The SCI was intended to hold the Council to account not developers.
- The Council was not able to force developers to comply; it would be better to engage and consult with developers to address these issues.
- The Development Management team would need to be involved.

The Chair said that if the proposals were relying on developer's good will rather than compulsion to act this would allow them to interpret the rules in their favour rather than that of the Community.

Councillor Criscione said he recognised that the document related to what is expected from the Council; however it would be interpreted and used by developers in community engagement terms. He was concerned about speculative developers and said it was important for the document to be prescriptive so they knew what the Council expected from them. He said that it could not be too late for input otherwise there was no point in bringing the report to Scrutiny.

Councillor Evans said he would revisit the points raised and asked the officers to see what could be done and how difficult it would be to incorporate.

Following a question from Councillor Criscione, Councillor Evans said there were only 10 responses received and no input from the developer community - he did not see how any document could be imposed.

The Local Plan and New Communities Manager said it was an issue of timing and he would start a discussion with the Development Manager to get his views. The deadline for Cabinet was the 9th March, so any changes and discussions would have to be quick.

Councillor Criscione said it could be an addendum to the report as in the case of the Covid situation.

Councillor Coote reminded the Committee that they had adopted a policy of pre-scrutiny, and therefore decisions were not made until members had put forward their resolutions.

He asked how there could be more involvement from the community, although he recognised that some responses were collated from a Town or Parish Council responding on their communities behalf. He asked what could be done differently to generate a better response.

The Local Plan and New Communities Manager agreed that the response was low but said it was similar to previous consultations. He reiterated that the SCI was a technical document on how the Council would consult with residents and organisations. He would prefer more engagement through the consultation for the planning function and the Local Plan.

Councillor Sell asked if the SCI could be more customer friendly, he said there should not be an expectation that residents were experts. He had looked at different Councils SCI's and suggested providing a glossary of planning terms and the use of diagrams and graphics. He had found an example SCI that explained how the Council would benefit from community engagement. He said residents would come up with good ideas if they felt their contribution would be taken into account.

The Local Plan and New Communities Manager said there was a glossary at the back which could be moved to the front and Councillor Sell agreed to send through the documents that he had found from other Councils.

In response to a question from Councillor Driscoll, the Local Plan and New Communities Manager and New Communities Senior Planner explained that the strikethroughs showed the changes that had made through representations received and the difference from the current plan. It showed that the Council was listening.

The New Communities Senior Planner said she hoped that the consultation was attractive to the public; they had tried to use plain English and diagrams with short facts and open questions to encourage people to comment. She said the actual planning documents were more important than the SCI which was a technical document that set out the procedure.

The Chair summarised the position of the Committee as:-

- The document needed to persuade the public to engage.
- Changes to the document should be considered to make it more prescriptive to developers in order to discourage speculative sites being brought forward.

The Committee recommended the proposal to Cabinet subject to the points made, consent was unanimous.

The Chair thanked Officers and particularly the New Communities Senior Planner for the hard work put into the document.

The Local Plan Project Manager explained the report, he said it was the third time the Committee had looked at the progress with the opportunity to ask questions and agree the letter to the Ministry of Housing Communities and Local Government (MHCLG).

He highlighted the appendices and the risk register on page 100 which was driving the project plan and identified the remedies that were needed.

- On page 101, number 15 - the revised standard housing methodology risk had changed. The Government had listened to the representations and the formula had been adjusted back to the previous level, therefore the risk had reverted to 15.
- On the last page, 103, number 33 - the process had multiple projects to procure. It was proposed to provide extra procurement resources from other local councils to help.

The Local Plan Project Manager said the dashboard had increased from 174 live tasks to 323 which gave an idea of the scale of the project - none of the tasks were identified as red, 21 were amber and 103 on target.

On page 105 the executive summary gave a snapshot of the progress made; the overall status of the Local Plan was suggested as amber due to the procurement issue. The Local Plan Project Manager explained the position of the various activities that were underway which included a tender for the infrastructure delivery plan and a decision on the SA consultants.

He said there was a further risk related to the planning appeal process – for instance recent appeals at Elsenham had seen a total of 450 houses approved – the Council needed to continue to resist unwelcome applications.

Page 107 provided a list of the live tasks.

Page 116 was the draft letter to government, which explained the progress made and addressed the risks.

The Chair was concerned about the procurement matter and wanted to know how long until the risk could be reduced to green.

The Local Plan Project Manager said it was close to being resolved, there had been e-mail exchanges with Essex County Council (ECC) and the procurement dates would be agreed shortly.

Councillor Coote had similar concerns. He was worried about using other authorities without stringent agreements. He said it was important to avoid ECC leaving the process without notice and to make sure Uttlesford District Council (UDC) would get first priority on the person or persons involved.

The Local Plan Project Manager said the Council had considered employing additional staff but the process would only be work heavy for the first 8 to 12 weeks and then the activity would slow down. He said ECC had the skill set that

was needed; it would be under the District Council's direction and rules. He did not think there would be an issue but had a fall back plan with two other authorities he could contact if necessary.

Councillor Criscione highlighted page 103, item 32 – Community Stakeholder Forum fails to make an effective contribution to the Issues and Options stage. He asked how the process was going and the effectiveness especially as engagement had been poor. He asked if the process had been a waste of time.

The Local Plan Project Manager said it had been very valuable, and could not be judged by numbers at this point. The idea was to generate a debate and derive value from the community's views. He said it was about the quality and style of approach, there needed to be more people in the discussion and help from members and parishes to encourage this would be welcome. He defended the breadth and range of topics and wanted more people to be engaged.

The Local Plan and New Communities Manager said discussions at the Stakeholder forums were dealing with a broad range of issues. He was disappointed that this was not translating into more representations at this stage but thought that some people were waiting to contribute at the end of the process.

Councillor Bagnall agreed that engagement was disappointing. The feedback was good regarding topics and how they were discussed. Changes had been made to make the sessions better and methods to encourage residents had been assessed.

Councillor Evans said Members needed to remind their communities that it was taking place. The communications were regular and efficient and should be included in monthly reports and village magazines.

Councillor Criscione said he was satisfied with the replies, and thought there could be improvement and value in the process. He asked when the future value of the Community Stakeholder Forum would be seen, when it would be at the maximum level and what was to follow. He said he would leave this question to be considered.

Councillor Sell asked if an Officer or Councillor Evans could send information out that could be used in local Parish magazines to promote the forums.

He also raised concerns regarding the risk issues on page 105, item number 12 with the unacceptable planning applications granted through the appeal process. He said it felt like Elsenham and Henham were under siege with planning applications whilst there was no Local Plan.

Councillor Le Count agreed and thought the risk should be red and not amber. He said UDC were losing appeals and there needed to be more co-ordination between UDC and Essex County Council (ECC).

The Local Plan Project Manager said it was important to resist unwanted development in addition to supporting the Local Plan. The Local Plan should not be worked on in isolation. He agreed that there needed to be a continued focus to work with ECC and said recently commissioned evidence compiled which supported the Local Plan would also strengthen the Development Management process.

Councillor Evans said it was difficult to quantify the risk in a precise way, it was determined on a case by case basis. He brought up a recent case where there was a win through the court of appeal; he said if policies were consistent with the NPPF they would be taken into account and add extra weight to the Council's case.

He said that any relevant material evidence should be given to the Inspector and passed onto Parish Councils and the Planning Committee especially relating to any neighbourhood plan.

Councillor Driscoll said he had been to the Forum discussion regarding transport. At the end only 2 questions were answered, he said members of the public felt ignored.

The Local Plan and New Communities Manager said further to the forum meeting on transport, discussions had taken place with the Chair who now provided a better explanation of the purpose of the meeting as well as how the questions worked at the end. The questions raised were voted on and those with the highest votes were answered. The primarily purpose of the forum was to have a discussion rather than a question and answer session.

Councillor Jones said he had attended the transport meeting and would agree with earlier comments, however the biodiversity forum had been much better and the process had been well explained. He thought the issues had been resolved.

There was further discussion and it was agreed that an extended question time of 15 minutes would be considered for future meetings.

Councillor Coote reminded the meeting again that Scrutiny was there to look at reports and to suggest amendments during the process.

The Chair asked members if they were content with the draft letter to the MHCLG on page 116. Members agreed and the letter was commended for dispatch.

The Chair thanked Officers for the reports, he said the Committee had drilled down into some of the issues that needed to be resolved and addressed in regards of the SCI and this had added value to the process.

He said the Local Plan project management was very impressive and thought the Local Plan Project Manager had erred on the side of safety in his rating.

He summarised as follows:-

- Members had explored the opportunity for broader consultation with residents who were engaged with specific topics and content.
- The plan was on track and reported accurately to MHCLG in accordance with requirements.

Members were in agreement.

The meeting ended at 8.26pm.

Agenda Item 3

SCRUTINY REPORT CHECKLIST

Committee:	Scrutiny
Date of meeting:	23.6.21
Title:	Local Plan Quarter 1 Project Management
Lead Officer:	Gordon Glenday

Impact:	Approved by:
Financial	Not required
Legal	Not required
Service	Report Author

PART 2 REPORTS	
All of the exemptions are subject to a qualification in that they can only be used if the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.	
<i>Explanation of how the public interest test is satisfied</i>	<i>Approved by:</i>
<i>The proposed allocation of the Strategic Initiatives Fund makes sums available for</i>	
<i>(Report Author)</i>	<i>(Legal)</i>

Committee:

Scrutiny

Date:

23 June 2021

Title: Local Plan Project Management – Quarter 1**Portfolio Holder:** Councillor John Evans Portfolio Holder for Planning and the Local Plan**Report Author:** Simon Payne, Local Plan Project Manager
01799 510465**Key decision:** No**Summary**

1. This report provides an update report on risks and project management for the local plan during Quarter 1 of the current financial year.

Recommendations

- 2.1 That the Committee note the conclusions of the report on risk and project management and endorses the proposed actions.
- 2.2 That the Committee notes the attached draft letter update to the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government for Quarter 1 of the current financial year.

Financial Implications

3. The project management arrangements are funded from the approved local plan budget.

Background Papers

4. No additional papers were referred to by the author in the preparation of this report.

Impact

- 5.

Communication/Consultation	No impact
Community Safety	No impact
Equalities	No impact

Health and Safety	No impact
Human Rights/Legal Implications	No impact
Sustainability	No impact
Ward-specific impacts	No impact
Workforce/Workplace	No impact

Situation

- At the meeting on 7 October 2020 the Committee endorsed the arrangements for regular project and risk management reports on the local plan, including formal quarterly updates for the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) in accordance with a Full Council resolution. This report provides an update for Quarter 1 in accordance with the agreed arrangements and seeks any comments to the proposed MHCLG update.

Risk Register Update

- The latest version of the Risk Register is attached as Appendix 1.
- There are ten changes since the last report to committee. The two most significant relate to staffing (ID refs 2 and 17 move to a higher risk), a senior planner in the local plans team has been offered career opportunities elsewhere and is leaving and this has resulted in an increased risk in relation to skills and capacity. Two risks have been closed following the successful completion of the Community Stakeholder Forum's contribution (ID ref 32) to the Issues and Options stage and also resolution of procurement support in commissioning work on the evidence base (ID ref 33).
- Four new risks have been added in (ID refs 35 – 38). The two most significant of these are risks associated with evidence base work being completed on time and officers are working closely with consultants to ensure timetables are met and that the work is effectively co-ordinated between consultants.

Project Plan Update

- The format of the update follows the approach agreed at the October Scrutiny Committee which is in three parts, the overview 'Dashboard', the 'Workstream Status' and an extract from the live Project Plan. An additional diagram (Appendix 2) has been added which shows the overall process to prepare the Regulation 18 Draft of the Plan over the next six months.

Workplan Dashboard

11. This document is shown in Appendix 3, and provides a high level summary of what is happening. The arrow changes refer to the Quarter 1 dashboard as it was reported to Committee in February. In comparison with last quarter the total number of live tasks has increased. It is important to note that there are currently no 'Red' rated tasks (ie critical tasks that require to be urgently resolved) but there are six 'Amber' rated tasks that require prompt action. Details of all the tasks are summarised in the following sections.

Workstream Status

12. This document is shown in Appendix 4 and is intended to provide a single assessment of the overall status of the project (with a Red/Amber/Green RAG rating) and then a commentary. Significant progress has been made since the last report with the completion of the work of the Community Stakeholder Forum during the Issues and Options Stage. The Call for Sites period has ended and around 300 sites are currently being verified and logged. The Leadership Group and the Cabinet have discussed and agreed a draft vision and objectives for the local plan.
13. The main areas of risk that are being attended to are the loss of a senior planner and arrangements are being made to recruit to the post as soon as possible with interim arrangements to ensure no loss of cover. Other risks relate to co-ordination and management of the evidence base work which comprises seventeen studies with a range of different consultants. On the governance side it is important that the Leadership Group and Cabinet agree both the housing numbers and also the Preliminary Outline Strategy. Both of these issues are required to allow the officers to complete the site assessment work in line with the agreed local plan timetable.

Project Plan Live Tasks

14. This document is shown in Appendix 5, and is an extract from the live database in Microsoft Project for Quarter 1. It shows all the tasks which have been or are due to be progressed within the current quarter with a description of the task, assigned officer, key dates, a RAG rating and comments which set out what needs to be done to change all ratings to green ones.

Draft Progress Letter to MHCLG

15. A draft update letter is shown in Appendix 6 based on the information above and the Committee is requested to note the contents.

Conclusions

16. The current progress on the local plan is in accordance with the timetable set out in the approved Local Development Scheme and the actions identified in the Risk Register and Project Plan are being actively undertaken.

Risk Analysis

17.

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigating actions
Failure to successfully Project Manage the Local Plan will result in an unsound Plan	1 – Provided robust and effective project management system established	4 - Lack of Spatial Strategy and planning policies leading to potentially unacceptable development	Establish a robust and effective project management system with appropriate oversight by the Scrutiny Committee

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 - LOCAL PLAN RISK REGISTER
OFFICER NAME - SIMON PAYNE JOB TITLE - PROJECT MANAGER
DATE OF LATEST REVISION - 14.06.21

Page 17

ID REF.	DATE RAISED	RISK DESCRIPTION	RISK SCORE			MITIGATION MEASURES	AFTER RISK MITIGATION			ASSIGNED	STATUS	UPDATES & COMMENTS	COMPLETE
			LIKELIHOOD	IMPACT	TOTAL SCORE		LIKELIHOOD	IMPACT	TOTAL SCORE				
1	24.08.20	Insufficient Resources to complete the plan	4	5	20	Effective project plan, approved budget and successful bids for external funding.	2	5	10	Gordon Glenday	open		
2	24.08.20	Insufficient capacity and lack of skills to complete the plan	4	5	20	Skills audit, training programme and recruitment of any additional staff	4	5	20	Gordon Glenday	open	Changed Risk - a senior planner within the policy team is leaving and recruitment processes have been initiated to fill the post.	
3	24.08.20	Evidence base flawed, incomplete or not up to date	3	5	15	Effective project management and governance	1	5	5	Stephen Miles	open		
4	24.08.20	Failure of community engagement to inform decision making	4	5	20	Approved project plan and effective project management	1	5	5	Stephen Miles	open		
5	24.08.20	Failure of DtC with stakeholders and statutory consultees	3	5	15	Effective project management and governance	1	5	5	Stephen Miles	open		
6	24.08.20	Failure to address corporate vision and objectives	2	5	10	Effective governance and project management	1	5	5	Gordon Glenday	open	Note - Cabinet has now approved the draft vision and objectives 27.05.21	
7	24.08.20	Plan is unsound due to failure to comply with statutory requirements	4	5	20	Effective project management and project leadership	2	5	10	Stephen Miles	open		
8	24.08.20	Preparation of the plan is delayed or slow and overtaken by events	4	5	20	Effective project management and governance	2	5	10	Simon Payne	open		
9	24.08.20	The plan will not address the full impact of economic and social change arising from Covid 19	4	5	20	Develop evidence base and ensure effective community engagement	3	5	15	Stephen Miles	open		
10	24.08.20	The Plan will fail to secure community benefit through lack of land value capture or public investment	4	5	20	Develop methodology including effective negotiations and funding bids	3	5	15	Simon Payne	open		
11	24.08.20	Failure to convince inspector that housing land supply is sufficient	4	5	20	Prepare sound housing land policies based on evidence	2	5	10	Stephen Miles	open		
12	24.08.20	Applications being granted on appeal undermine emerging strategy	5	5	25	Planning policy and development management to liaise closely in the determination of application and dealing with any subsequent appeals	3	5	15	Gordon Glenday	open		
13	24.08.20	Social distancing and the impact of Covid 19 will undermine the effectiveness of community engagement	4	5	20	Prepare a community engagement programme that takes social distancing into account.	1	5	5	Stephen Miles	open	(Changed Risk) - Corporate Overview Board on 14.04.21 felt there was no evidence that Covid19 had devalued the process because video conferencing and webinars were seen as a useful tool to reach a broader demographic in the district.	
14	24.08.20	National changes to the plan making system through Planning for Change undermine the local plan making process	5	5	25	Continuing to review proposals arising from White Paper, formal representations as required and ongoing project plan review	3	5	15	Roger Harborough	open	New Comment - Planning Reform included in the Queen's speech. Keeping close eye on the emerging debate. Consultants and officers to continue to discuss future impact of changes.	
15	24.08.20	Revised standard housing methodology leads to unacceptable and undeliverable housing numbers	5	5	25	Discussion and meeting with officials at MHCLG, formal representations and project plan review	2	5	10	Stephen Miles	open		

16	07.09.20	Devolution White Paper leads to administrative changes that undermine the LP making process	5	5	25	Engage in informal discussions with Stakeholders and respond to White Paper when published	2	5	10	Dawn French	Open	(Changed Risk) - Corporate Overview Board on 14.04.21 noted that re-structuring was not as high on the agenda as previously thought when the White Paper was published.	
17	07.09.20	Loss of staff and or difficulty in recruiting people with the appropriate skills and experience	4	5	20	Training programme, effective HR procedures and recruiting measures	4	5	20	Gordon Glenday	Open	Changed Risk - a senior planner within the policy team is leaving and recruitment processes have been initiated to fill the post.	
18	07.09.20	Volume and nature of consultation responses unmanageable	4	5	20	Approved project plan and effective project management	1	5	5	Stephen Miles	Open	New Comment - Level of representations now clear following Issues and Options stage. Officers managing work programme	
19	07.09.20	Lack of capacity of Stakeholders to respond in an effective and timely manner	3	5	15	Approved project plan and effective project management	1	5	5	Stephen Miles	Open		
20	07.09.20	Unexpected events making call on corporate resources	5	5	25	Ability to modify project plan and resourcing to respond to unexpected events	3	5	15	Gordon Glenday	Open	New Comment - The departure of the Chief Executive is not expected to impact on the progression of the Local Plan. Director of Public Services to continue to lead on overall process.	
21	07.09.20	Lack of political consensus	4	5	20	Establish LPLG with regular briefings and engagement with members	2	5	10	Gordon Glenday	Open		
22	07.09.20	Inconsistencies arising between LP and NP's	3	4	12	Review emerging strategy in the light of provisions in NP's	2	4	8	Stephen Miles	Open		
23	07.09.20	Problems with deliverability/viability of sufficient sites to needs/requirements	4	5	20	Effective site selection assessment and negotiation methodologies	2	5	10	Stephen Miles	Open		
24	07.09.20	Legal challenge on proposed adoption	3	5	15	Effections project management and sound legal advice	1	5	5	Gordon Glenday	Open		
25	07.09.20	Impact of use classes order on Town Centres undermine spatial strategy	3	4	12	Review implications in preparing LP strategy	1	4	4	Stephen Miles	Open		
26	07.09.20	Permitted development changes undermine spatial strategy	3	4	12	Review implications in preparing LP strategy	1	4	4	Stephen Miles	Open		
27	07.09.20	Climate emergency and international agreements are not taken into account	3	5	15	Review implications in preparing LP strategy	1	5	5	Stephen Miles	Open		
28	07.09.20	Implications of Brexit adversely affect economic and growth proposals in the LP	3	4	12	Review implications in preparing LP strategy	1	4	4	Stephen Miles	Open		
29	08.10.20	Government Intervene to take over Local Plan Process	4	5	20	Approve LDS and deliver to approved timetable. Effective project management.	1	5	5	Stephen Miles	Open		
30	08.10.20	Project Plan Document becomes corrupted	3	4	12	Agree protocol for backing up updated Risk Register and Project Plan	1	4	4	Simon Payne	Open		
31	05.11.20	Community Engagement is not effective due to technical platform issues	3	4	12	Pre- Event practice sessions. Host officer to be trained in technical support and deliver solutions during event	1	4	4	Hayley Coles	Open		
32	25.11.20	Community Stakeholder Forum fails to make an effective contribution to the Issues and Options stage	4	5	20	Balanced membership of panel, clear operating rules and effective communications to encourage public participation with proactive support from all elected members.	2	5	10	Stephen Miles	Closed	(Changed Risk) - Issues and Options stage now successfully completed by forum.	19.05.21

33	13.01.21	Capacity constraints in the inhouse procurement team lead to delays in procurement	2	5	10	Consider additional procurement capacity to support multiple projects	1	5	5	Gordon Glenday	Closed	(Changed Risk) - Corporate Overview Board 14.04.21 agreed the deletion of this risk because arrangements made with County procurement.	14.04.21
34	10.03.21	Extent and timing of evidence base work is not coordinated and delays the preparation of the plan or compromises its content	3	4	12	Effective Project Planning to coordinate evidence base work	1	4	4	Simon Payne	Open		
35	07.04.21	Failure to procure consultancy work to achieve evidence base work on time	4	5	20	Effective procurement processes and programmes	3	5	15	Simon Payne	Open	New Risk - Procurement is taking place when there are high levels of consultancy work nationally and officers are giving careful consideration to this when procuring services to ensure success.	
36	07.04.21	Delays in making decisions during governance process results in failure to achieve agreed LP timetable.	4	5	20	Realistic programme and effective member management of governance decision making	2	5	10	Gordon Glenday	Open	New Risk - LPLG have agreed the methodology and identified key decision to be made in time and officers are working to facilitate this.	
37	17.05.21	Failure to prepare the plan on the agreed timetable due to evidence base work not being completed or available on time.	4	4	16	Effective project management of key work streams	2	4	8	Simon Payne	Open	New Risk - Project Leads in discussion with consultants to ensure work programme can be met to achieve LP timetable. Identify measurements to minimise risk of slippage.	
38	19.05.21	Transport Evidence will not be available in time for the LP programme	5	5	25	Identification and introduction of mitigation measures to ensure that the evidence is available when needed.	2	5	10	Ben Kennedy	Open	New Risk - Project Lead in discussion with consultant to ensure work programme can be met to achieve LP timetable. Identify measurements to minimise risk of slippage.	

Local Plan - Preferred Options Timetable

Officer Work								
April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December
CALL FOR SITES	SITE ASSESSMENT STAGE 1		SITE ASSESSMENT STAGE 2					DRAFT REG 18 WRITTEN
PREPARE STRATEGIC EVIDENCE			COMPLETE EVIDENCE BASE					
NEGOTIATE/DISCUSS/MASTERPLAN WITH PROMOTORS & LANDOWNERS			→					
CONSULT/WORK WITH DTC STAKEHOLDERS			→					
LPLG Work								
April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December
AGREE METHODOLOGY	AGREE STRATEGIC PLANNING OBJECTIVES	CONFIRM HOUSING NUMBERS	STRATEGIC CONTEXT	RECEIVE VARIOUS EVIDENCE STUDIES				
			AGREE PRELIMINARY OUTLINE STRATEGY & SETTLEMENT HIERACHY	UPDATES ON DTC & DEVELOPER DISCUSSIONS				
Cabinet Decisions								
	May 27th		July 1st		September 2nd			
	AGREE STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES		CONFIRM HOUSING NUMBERS		AGREE PRELIMINARY OUTLINE STRATEGY & SETTLEMENT HIERACHY			

Local Plan Workplan Dashboard - (14.06.21)

Period Q1 01.04.21 - 30.06.21

TOTAL TASKS TO DATE	
389	TOTAL TASKS

BREAKDOWN IN STATUS		
359	TOTAL COMPLETED (from commencement of project to date of report)	
13	TOTAL STARTED (in period)	↓
17	TOTAL NOT STARTED (in period)	↑

RAG STATUS OF ALL WORK TASKS*completed tasks do not show in RAG rating		
	0	↔
	6	↓
	24	↓

APPENDIX **DATE OF UPDATE: 14/06/21**
LOCAL PLAN WORKSTREAM STATUS
PERIOD: QUARTER 1
01.04.21 - 30.06.21

RAG Status		AMBER
Reasons	Actions	Date
Procurement arrangements underway with ECC. Competitive market given plenty of consultancy work.	Lead officers working with ECC procurement and actively working on consultants appointments.	07/04/21 - 30/06/21
Consultants do not deliver evidence base on time and/or within specification. Transport consultants in particular have identified some risks in terms of the timetable for the transport study.	Lead officer to manage relationship with consultants and project timetable to ensure compliance with agreed brief	various
Senior Planner leaving the Planning Policy team in August. This post is key in preparing the Local Plan.	Initiate recruitment process to secure permanent replacement. Arrangements for interim cover whilst recruitment is completed.	14/06/21 - 01/10/21
Required Decisions		
Description	Expected by	Due Date
Agree Preliminary Outline Strategy for the Local Plan	LPLG and Cabinet	29/07/21 and 02/09/21
Confirm Housing Numbers for the Local Plan	LPLG and Cabinet	24/06/21 and 01/07/21

Previous Section on Risk issues now incorporated in main Risk Register under updates and comments.

Executive Summary

The LP has now moved into the Preferred Options stage with an extensive amount of procurement activity. A paper on methodology and programme was agreed by LPLG in April and the Group and Cabinet agreed the Local Plan objectives during May. LPLG and Cabinet are due to confirm housing numbers in June. The Preliminary Outline Strategy for the Local Plan is due to be discussed by LPLG 29.07.21 with a decision to be made at Cabinet 02.09.21.

LPLG on the 24.05.21 considered the remaining responses to the final three themes of the I&O consultation. The Call for Sites period has now ended and officers are currently verifying and logging the bids made. Around 300 sites have been suggested. It is intended to complete and publish the list of sites in June, although this does depend on the capacity of the officers and systems to do this. The site assessment methodology has been agreed and officers will review the sites as soon as they have been verified and logged.

There are currently 17 separate studies which are in various stages of procurement. Inception meetings have already been held with the consultants leading on the Sustainability appraisal and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Duty to cooperate meetings continue to take place including recent meetings with Greater Cambridge and a forthcoming meeting with East Hertfordshire.

Unique ID	Task Name	Start	Finish	Resource Names	% Complete	RAG Rating	Progress Notes
0	LP Project Plan 14.06.21	Wed 01/07/20	Wed 06/08/25		46%		
831	Community Engagement Programme	Fri 31/07/20	Thu 04/01/24	Luke Mills	99%		Inform LPLG
693	Theme 1 - Where You Live 11.11.20	Wed 07/10/20	Wed 30/06/21	Joanna Hill,S Nicholas	99%		coordinator briefed Theme leads
710	Theme 3 - Climate Change 09.12.20	Mon 26/10/20	Wed 30/06/21	Lois Bowser,Luke Mills,Nathan Drover	97%		coordinator briefed Theme leads
1106	Produce final summary document	Mon 31/05/21	Wed 30/06/21	Alishba Emanuel	50%		
727	Theme 4 - Transport 13.01.21	Tue 01/12/20	Wed 30/06/21	Nathan Drover,S Nicholas	99%		coordinator briefed Theme leads
744	Theme 5 - Leisure, Culture and Healthy Lifestyles 27.01.21	Mon 07/12/20	Tue 24/08/21	Joanna Hill,Sarah Nicholas,Lois Bowser	99%		coordinator briefed Theme leads
778	Theme 7 - Local Economy 24.02.21	Mon 04/01/21	Wed 30/06/21	Lois Bowser,Demetria Macdonald,Joanna Hill	99%		coordinator briefed Theme leads
795	Theme 8 - Homes 10.03.21	Fri 08/01/21	Wed 30/06/21	Sarah Nicholas	99%		coordinator briefed Theme leads
812	Theme 9 - Creating New Places and Communities 24.03.21	Fri 08/01/21	Wed 30/06/21	Luke Mills	99%		coordinator briefed Theme leads
1537	Corporate Overview Board	Mon 17/05/21	Thu 14/10/21	Simon Payne	44%		
1535	Corporate Overview Board 24.06.21 Prep and Submission of Documents	Fri 18/06/21	Fri 18/06/21	Simon Payne,Hayley Coles	0%		Papers being presented by TBC
1376	EVIDENCE BASE	Tue 04/08/20	Tue 06/08/24	Stephen Miles	31%		
1439	Assessment of Employment needs - Topline input into Strategic context	Mon 17/05/21	Wed 30/06/21	Joanna Hill	0%		To inform POS report to LPLG Jul '21
1378	Housing	Tue 04/08/20	Tue 06/08/24	Stephen Miles,Joanna Hill	26%		
1321	Windfall Allowance (Housing) - internal	Wed 07/04/21	Wed 30/06/21	Joanna Hill	0%		Report to LPLG June '21 to confirm housing numbers.
1336	Infrastructure and Design	Tue 01/09/20	Fri 02/12/22	Jack Bennett,Joanna Hill,Lois Bowser	26%		
1563	Arrange meeting with Water and Energy Stakeholders	Tue 02/02/21	30/06/21	Lois Bowser	0%		Technical meeting with water and energy companies and other agencies in advance of SIDG session HC to assist in organisation
1608	Carbon Study - evaluate applications	Mon 28/06/21	Tue 29/06/21	Lois Bowser	0%		Report to LPLG Nov '21
1607	Carbon Study - finalise brief and go out to tender	Tue 01/06/21	Fri 25/06/21	Lois Bowser	0%		Report to LPLG Nov '21
1562	Engagement with Infrastructure Providers	Wed 10/03/21	31/06/21	Ben Kennedy,Lois Bowser	88%		Agree programme
1174	IDP Baseline Study Report Complete	Mon 17/05/21	Wed 30/06/21	Lois Bowser	0%		to be reported to LPLG and SIDG Jul '21
1605	Verification - appoint consultants	Fri 02/07/21	Fri 02/07/21	Lois Bowser	0%		
1611	Verification - Evaluate submissions	Fri 25/06/21	Mon 28/06/21	Lois Bowser	0%		

1610	Verification - External finalise brief and go out to tender	Mon 14/06/21	Mon 14/06/21	Lois Bowser	0%		
1612	Verification - Hold interviews	Tue 29/06/21	Wed 30/06/21	Lois Bowser	0%		
1598	Viability appoint consultant	Wed 23/06/21	Wed 23/06/21	Lois Bowser	0%		
1599	Viability Evaluate submissions	Tue 15/06/21	Thu 17/06/21	Lois Bowser	0%		
1600	Viability hold interviews	Fri 18/06/21	Tue 22/06/21	Lois Bowser	0%		
1602	Water Cycle Study - evaluate applications	Mon 21/06/21	Wed 23/06/21	Lois Bowser	0%		Report to LPLG Nov '21
1601	Water Cycle Study - finalise brief and go out to tender	Fri 28/05/21	Tue 15/06/21	Lois Bowser	0%		Report to LPLG Nov '21
1603	Water Cycle Study - hold interviews	Fri 25/06/21	Mon 28/06/21	Lois Bowser	0%		Report to LPLG Nov '21
1550	Retail	Tue 09/02/21	Fri 01/10/21		65%		
1596	Evaluation of tender applications	Fri 25/06/21	Mon 28/06/21	Demetria Macdonald	0%		
1386	Strategy - Internal	Tue 04/08/20	Thu 30/11/23	Stephen Miles, Luke Mills	43%		
1391	Settlement Hierachy	Wed 07/04/21	Wed 30/06/21	Sarah Nicholas	75%		To inform LPLG Jul '21
1305	Sustainability Appraisal (Prefered Options) External	Fri 30/10/20	Tue 30/11/21		19%		
1560	Scoping Report from AECOM	Wed 21/04/21	Tue 15/06/21	Luke Mills	85%		AECOM undertaking work to complete report by 02.06 to be presented at LPLG 24.06.21
1338	Transport	Tue 01/09/20	Fri 30/09/22		48%		
878	Transport Accessibility Settlements- TRACCS External	Tue 01/09/20	Wed 30/06/21	Sarah Nicholas, Ben Kennedy	75%		Town and PC given their feedback, Tetrattech have responded to the comments and updated the base mapping for the modelling. Awaiting models to be run by Tetrattech to inform report to LPLG on POS Jul '21
1366	Transport Study - Main Settlements and Corridors Stage 1 Work - Appointment of Consultants	Mon 03/05/21	Wed 30/06/21	Ben Kennedy	90%		To inform report to LPLG on POS Jul '21
1263	Local Plan Leadership Group Governance	Mon 03/08/20	Thu 02/12/21		65%		
1620	Report confirming housing numbers	Mon 14/06/21	Thu 17/06/21	Stephen Miles	20%		present report to LPLG and follow on to Cabinet 01.07
1547	Scrutiny Committee	Wed 02/06/21	Thu 29/07/21	Stephen Miles	19%		
1546	Scrutiny Committee 23.06.21 Prep and Submission to Democratic - Quarterly Project Plan Update	Wed 02/06/21	Mon 14/06/21	Simon Payne, Hayley Coles	50%		
1003	Stategic Infrastructure Delivery Group	Thu 15/10/20	Wed 28/09/22		76%		
1627	Strategic Transport and programme for rest of '21 Meeting 28.06.21	Mon 07/06/21	Fri 18/06/21	Simon Payne	80%		BK appointed speakers 28.06.21 - Andrew Summers and Linda Haysey. SP to draft report for RH to approve for agenda
1245	Strategic Land Availability Assessment SLAA	Mon 03/08/20	Fri 02/12/22		54%		
1450	Complete initial suitability assessments	Fri 30/04/21	Wed 30/06/21	Luke Mills	12%		

1511	Engagement with Parish Councils to ID sites	Mon 03/05/21	Wed 30/06/21	Stephen Miles	2%		Will be done through Parish Workshop. Meeting arranged with portfolio holders and housing to discuss. 10.06.21
1449	Upload Sites onto GIS	Tue 01/06/21	Wed 30/06/21	Luke Mills	6%		Sampson trialling upload to GIS with first 10 sites. SN assisting in initial assessments.

XXXXX PLEASE ADD LETTERHEAD XXXX

Jonathan Blathwayt
Senior Planning Officer
Planning Development Plans
The Ministry of Housing Communities & Local Government
Fry Building,
2 Marsham Street,
London SW1P 4DF

XX June 2021

Our ref: Please ask for Simon Payne on 07789 816405

email: spayne@uttlesford.gov.uk

Dear Mr Blathwayt,

Uttlesford Local Plan Update

I refer to my previous letters when I provided you with an update on progress by the Council to prepare a new local plan. This letter deals with the position up to the end of Quarter 1 of the current financial year.

I am pleased to advise you that work continues to progress in accordance with the revised Local Development Scheme which was adopted by the Cabinet of the Council on 20 October 2020. The attached diagram shows the next six months of work.

The Issues and Options stage of the local plan was completed last month with the involvement of an online Community Stakeholder Forum which met over a five month period exploring nine separate local plan topics. The public and all stakeholders feedback will form a central part of the local plan evidence base. In addition the following progress has been made:

- A call for development sites period recently ended and around 300 sites are currently being verified prior to publication as part of the evidence base of the local plan;
- Procurement of studies to form part of the evidence base are underway; all together seventeen studies are being commissioned with a total budget of £1 million;
- Work on the Sustainability Appraisal and Infrastructure Delivery Plan have all commenced;
- The Cabinet of the Council has agreed a draft vision and objectives for the new local plan;
- A Strategic Infrastructure Delivery Group, comprising senior councillors from the district and the county council, has meet four times and received presentations from leading practitioners on climate change, rural issues and strategic transport;
- Duty to Co-operate meetings continue to be held with a range of stakeholders including Greater Cambridge and East Hertfordshire.
- Meetings of the Local Plan Leadership Group and Cabinet are planned to confirm housing numbers and also a Preliminary Outline Strategy for the local plan.

The Scrutiny Committee of the District Council continues to carefully monitor progress on the local plan through regular updates on the Risk Register and Project Plan. It is expected that you will receive the next update before the end September 2021.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you require any further information.

Yours sincerely,

Stephen Miles.....

DRAFT