



Uttlesford District Council

Chief Executive: Peter Holt

Planning Committee Working Group

Date: Wednesday, 23rd March, 2022

Time: 2.00 pm

Venue: Zoom - <https://zoom.us/>

Chairman: Councillor S Merifield

Members: Councillors P Fairhurst, R Freeman, M Lemon, J Loughlin and R Pavitt

AGENDA PART 1

1 Apologies for absence and declarations of interest

To receive any apologies and declarations of interest.

2 Minutes of the previous meeting

4 - 7

To consider the minutes of the previous meeting.

3 Changes to the Protocol for Public Speaking

8 - 11

To receive a report detailing proposed changes to the protocol for public speaking.

4 The Introduction of Mandatory Training

12 - 18

To receive a report recommending the introduction of mandatory training.

5 Arrangements to Visit an Exemplar Planning Committee

To consider the details of visiting an exemplar Planning Committee.

6 Training Recommended by the Planning Advisory Service

To consider further training as advised by the Planning Advisory Service.

7 To review the Scheme of Delegation

19 - 24

To review the Scheme of Delegation.

8 Future Agenda Items

To consider items for discussion at future meetings.

For information about this meeting please contact Democratic Services

Telephone: 01799 510410, 510369, 510467 or 510548

Email: Committee@uttlesford.gov.uk

General Enquiries

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

Telephone: 01799 510510

Fax: 01799 510550

Email: uconnect@uttlesford.gov.uk

Website: www.uttlesford.gov.uk

Agenda Item 2

PLANNING COMMITTEE WORKING GROUP held at ZOOM on WEDNESDAY, 2 MARCH 2022 at 2.00 pm

Present: Councillor S Merifield (Chair)
Councillors R Freeman, M Lemon, J Loughlin and R Pavitt

Officers in attendance: N Brown (Development Manager), B Ferguson (Democratic Services Manager), A Lindsell (Democratic Services Officer) A Lockhart (Legal Manager), and J Walsh (Interim Planning Transformation Lead)

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no apologies for absence or declarations of interest.

2 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting held on 17 February 2022 were approved as accurate.

3 CHANGES TO THE CONSIDERATION OF MAJOR PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND CONSULTATIONS ON MAJOR APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED DIRECTLY TO THE PLANNING INSPECTORATE

The Development Manager presented the report on the consideration of major planning applications and consultations submitted directly to the Planning Inspectorate.

In response to the Designation Notice from the Secretary of State for Levelling Up Housing and Communities he asked Members to consider options to accommodate the anticipated increase in major applications being reported to Planning Committee, alongside the twenty one day consultation of major applications submitted directly to the Planning Inspectorate (PINS), in which case the Local Planning Authority would merely be a statutory consultee.

He went on to explain that the situation was moving dynamically and that the current suggested options were;

- The creation of a Sub-Committee of the Planning Committee and retain the current frequency of Planning Committee meetings.
- The creation of a Sub-Committee of the Planning Committee and to change the frequency of Planning Committee meetings to every three weeks.
- The implementation of an additional Planning Committee Meeting two weeks after the scheduled monthly Planning Committee Meeting from

May onwards. These meetings would be called Reserve Planning Committee Meetings and would only be utilised when necessary.

- To change the frequency of Planning Committee to fortnightly.

Members discussed;

- Concerns over Sub-Committees where far fewer Members would make decisions.
- Whether Members could now represent residents as they were no longer the decision maker.
- Where the money that would have gone to Uttlesford District Council (UDC) in planning fees now goes.
- The value and conversely pitfalls of including Substitutes in the pool of Members to be included.
- The need to move forward and work through the Designation.

The Development Manager confirmed;

- That PINS would liaise with the majority of county related statutory consultees directly. UDC would continue to manage the consultation with Parish Councils and other local groups, although all responses would be submitted directly to PINS.
- That UDC are working alongside PINS and maintain a good relationship.
- The planning fees previously received by UDC would now be directed to PINS, who are an agency separate to the government department that designated UDC.
- It was not envisaged that many applications would be submitted directly to PINS, with none currently identified or submitted

The Planning Transformation Lead confirmed;

- The Designation process was a sanction for poor performance and designed to be a deterrent and there is expensive for the Local Authority.
- There would be a Parish Forum scheduled 29 March 2022 where the discussion topics would be Enforcement and Designation. Parish Councils could be directed to this forum where there would be a Q&A session.
- UDC would be designated for a minimum of 12 months, and that PINS assessment of UDC comments would in all probability inform any wider decision about how long designation might last. To bring UDC out of designation The Department for Levelling Up Housing and Communities would have to be satisfied with the quality of comments from UDC on applications being determined by PINS and confident that UDC understood how to apply current planning policy.
- Two weekly cycles are not unusual in other authorities. A new rhythm could be quickly achieved and work would be completed more efficiently and in a more streamlined manner

The Legal Manager confirmed that the Designation created an unusual situation regarding probity and agreed to investigate further and feedback to Members. He noted that the consultation fed back to PINS would still give weight to cohesive planning objections over non-planning related comments.

The Chair proposed to recommend Option Three to the Governance, Audit and Performance Committee (GAP). Councillor Freeman seconded the proposal.

AGREED to recommend to the GAP Committee the introduction of an additional Planning Committee Meeting two weeks after the scheduled monthly Planning Committee Meeting from May onwards. These meetings would be called Reserve Planning Committee Meetings and would only be utilised when necessary.

The Development Manager confirmed his intention to inform the Planning Committee that the Planning Committee Working Group would make this recommendation to GAP.

The Planning Transformation Lead suggested that Members consider;

- The logistics of site visits and briefings in relation to the proposed changes.
- Site visits only to be undertaken during the morning.
- Viewing a video of sites rather than visiting sites recommended for refusal.

The Development Manager acknowledged that agendas have been larger currently but were likely to be shorter following the introduction of the proposed changes to the scheme of delegation.

The Chair suggested the reintroduction of the coach for site visits to save time and be more environmentally friendly.

The Development Manager confirmed that under the current Covid restrictions Officers were not currently permitted to share a car, so a coach would not be possible for the March site visits.

The Democratic Services Manager indicated he would raise the issue with the CEO and see if the coach arrangements can be reinstated moving forward.

The Chair confirmed that the March Planning Committee meeting would run over two days, 16 and 17 March 2022. She proposed the following timetable if Covid restrictions permit;

10:00am - 1:00pm including a 15 minute coffee break

1:00 – 2:00pm break for lunch

2:00 - 5:00pm including a 15 minute coffee break (extended to 5:30pm only if this would secure completion of the meeting)

Officers would present reports hybridly and doors would remain open.

Members discussed;

- The importance of breaks for Officers and Members.
- Whether provision of lunch should be reinstated when so much time would be spent in the chamber.
- The need for training sessions on how to be more efficient within meetings.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

- Report recommending changes to the protocol for public speaking
- Report recommending the introduction of mandatory Training
- Arrangements to visit an exemplar Planning Committee

- The next round of training recommended by the Planning Advisory service

The Democratic Services Officer reminded Members and Officers that the Planning Enforcement Training scheduled for 3 March 2022 at 7pm would be delivered through Teams. The link has already been circulated.

The Planning Transformation Lead requested that the PCWG meeting scheduled for 31 March 2022 be brought forward to 23 March 2022. This was agreed

The meeting ended at 15:12

Agenda Item 3

Committee:	Planning Committee Working Group	Date:	23 March 2022
Title:	Changes to Section 2 Part 5 – codes and protocols. Procedure for public attendance at meetings of the Planning Committee		
Report Author:	Jeanette Walsh, Interim Planning Transformation Lead		

Summary

1. The role of the Planning Committee Working Group (PCWG) is to agree the recommendations made in the EELGA PEER Review of Planning report to change and improve the procedures for public attendance at meetings of the Planning Committee.
2. The current wording of the procedure is at Appendix 1 of this report.
3. The recommended changes are identified in the Appendix attached to this report
4. Where an application is recommended for approval and there are no other registered speakers, the applicant/agent will not have a right to speak
5. The proposal is to reduce the overall time taken for public speaking. Members of the public would have a speaking time reduced from 4 to 3 minutes.
- 6.
- 7.
- 8.
- 9.

Recommendations

10. To recommend to GAP Committee that the changes set out in the track changed document Appendix 1 Extract from procedure for public attendance at meetings of the Planning Committee should be agreed as changes to the constitution and recommended to Full Council for adoption:

Financial Implications

11. Any proposed changes to the constitution to be facilitated within existing budgets.

Background Papers

12. Appendix 1 Extract from the constitution with track changes Section 2 Part 5 - Codes and Protocols. Procedure for public attendance at meetings of the Planning Committee

Impact

13.

Communication/Consultation	This group is a working group and will make recommendation to GAP
Community Safety	None
Equalities	None
Health and Safety	None
Human Rights/Legal Implications	None
Sustainability	None
Ward-specific impacts	None
Workforce/Workplace	None

14.Risk Analysis

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigating actions
That a review does not take place in accordance with good governance and best practice as recommended by the East of England Local Government Association (EELGA)	3	3	The recommended changes are intended to improve the efficiency of the Local Planning Authority

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.

Report Appendix – Extract from Section , Part 5

PROCEDURE FOR PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVES/ MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ATTENDING MEETINGS OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

1.1

2. Attendance by Parish/Town Councillors and Members of the Public

2.1 Town/parish councils and applicants/agents, objectors and supporters may make representations on all applications. **If an application is recommended for approval and there are no registered speakers the applicant/agent will not have the right to make representations.**

2.2 Two representatives of the town or parish council may also attend site visits. (see Procedure for Members' Site Visits above).

2.3. The Town or parish council representative and members of the public may attend the meeting and speak on any application. They must register with the Democratic Services Officer at Uttlesford District Council (telephone 01799 510410) or email: committee@uttlesford.gov.uk by 2pm on the day

before the meeting. The order of speaking for each

application will be as follows

1. Non-committee member
2. Supporters
3. Objectors
4. Town or parish council
5. Applicant or Agent

2.4 The town/parish council representative may speak for up to 5 minutes, members of the public may speak for up to (~~delete 4 minutes and replace with 3~~) minutes. Applicants and their representatives may speak for up to (~~delete 15 minutes and replace with 10~~) minutes. ~~Supporters have five slots available and objectors have five slots available. This is a change from Ten slots are available between supporters/ objectors.~~

2.5 At the meeting those making representations should sit in the public area until the relevant item is to be considered.

2.6 Those making representations should sit at the allotted desk alongside members to make their statement and having made their statement should then return to the public area (or leave the meeting).

Agenda Item 4

Committee: Planning Committee Working Group **Date:**
Title: Changes to Member Training Requirements 23 March 2023
February 2022 for Planning Committee

Report Author: Jeanette Walsh, Interim Planning Transformation Lead

Summary

1. At the previous meeting of the [Planning Committee Working Group](#) (PCWG), members discussed the current wording contained in the council's Constitution regarding Planning Committee training.
2. Particular attention was paid to the need to stipulate the mandatory nature of annual training for Committee members as this is a recommendation from the EELGA PEER Review of Planning and has been agreed as a recommendation to be implemented.
3. AT PCWG on 17 February Members discussed the exact wording proposed. Following further discussion and debate this item was deferred to allow for members of the PCWG to make comments.
4. Comments were received from Cllr Fairhurst and Cllr Loughlin. They are at Appendix 1
5. In order to respond to the concerns expressed by Cllrs about the wording it is has been revised and is at Appendix 2
6. Legal officer will be at the meeting to discuss any concerns

Financial Implications

7. Any proposed changes to the constitution to be facilitated within existing budgets.

Background

None

Impact

9.

Communication/Consultation	None
Community Safety	None
Equalities	None

Health and Safety	None
Human Rights/Legal Implications	None
Sustainability	None
Ward-specific impacts	None
Workforce/Workplace	None

10.Risk Analysis

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigating actions
Inadequately trained committee members are more likely to make poor decisions.	3	3	To ensure the Constitution reflects the need for committee members to attend basic training on an annual basis.

1 = Little or no risk or impact

2 = Some risk or impact – action may be necessary.

3 = Significant risk or impact – action required

4 = Near certainty of risk occurring, catastrophic effect or failure of project.

APPENDIX 1

Note from Cllr Fairhurst

Dear Ben, At yesterday's meeting of the Planning Committees Working Group, we were requested to commit to writing our thoughts on the amended wording regarding compulsory training.

The proposal was to replace the current wording:

Officers will arrange training on planning issues. All members of the Council will be invited to attend. All members of the Planning Committee should attend.

With the following wording:

Officers will arrange an annual mandatory training session for Councillors who are members or substitute members of Planning Committee. This training must be undertaken before participating in decision making at Planning Committee. All members of the Council who are not on Planning Committee or a substitute member of planning committee will be invited to attend on a voluntary basis.

And this raises a number of issues that ought, at least to be, at least, debated and fully understood before changes are approved.

Perhaps most obviously, it suggests that training is causal to the quality of the decisions and to the "performance" of the Planning Committee.

The value of Training

As was evident at our meeting, all members wholeheartedly agreed that regular training is essential for a member to adequately assess all variables in their decision and to arrive at a dependable decision. It was even suggested that a single "basic session" annually might not be sufficient and that in a case where, for example, the NPPF had been amended, a more frequent training programme was more appropriate.

I believe that it was agreed at the meeting that members on the committee have an obligation to discharge their duty in a well considered and well informed way and that if they lacked the necessary training (and indeed attitude) this would be to the detriment of the whole committee. But it was the opinion of all members at the meeting that members were both mindful of this obligation and were willing to prepare adequately for this undertaking.

Another issue raised by the proposed new wording would be to impose a "mandatory" obligation on all current and future members of the committee to attend these training sessions. This would change the existing requirement from a "should attend" to a "must attend" obligation.

It is this issue that I raised as a major change and one that comes with a number of extra considerations.

Although one might argue that the better informed and trained the members are the better the quality of their decision might be, of course this is not a guarantee. But before this amendment the legal "competence" was founded exclusively on their election by the resident and a subsequent appointment and delegation to the committee by the full council. This is a profound competence and soundly based on democratic principles. We choose our representatives to hear and decide planning applications.

However if the council chooses to raise the bar of qualification to attend the planning committee it effectively reduces the democratic element of competence and demands a level (quite hard to prove and open to subjective assessment) of academic competence before being able to attend planning committee.

This has several interesting implications apart from the value of democratic representation.

Legal Competence

Practically, when a new member is elected without any “training” at all, how long does it take to be “competent” to fulfil their obligations as councillor on the Planning committee and who is the arbiter or judge of this competence? It may even be argued that this places a burden on the council to adequately train and “lead” the competence. Anecdotally, I have learned a substantial amount about Planning over the last 7 years and continue to do so. Even after my own post graduate training and the training provided by the council, there is still much to be learned. Does this imply that all decisions that I’ve taken, especially those taken seven years ago are inferior, perhaps even legally “incompetent”, through lack of training? Do we need to impose a means of testing “competence” to ensure a “basic” level of understanding or are we in fact imposing an arduous extra step just to pay lip service to the Planning Authority or the public? Surely, without testing, all training is simply providing the information to members that they may “attend” or understand. Members are drawn from varied backgrounds. Some of us have many years in academe or in professional practice, others work in entirely different fields. Are we to consider this when appointing members to the committee?

Risk

A more serious issue is that each decision taken under this new regime would then have an added risk at appeal. Each member would need to be shown to have attended all and “adequate” training, in order for their vote to be “competent”.

Certainly if I was an aggrieved developer with an application refused by a single vote, I would look to the competence of each refusing vote against a constitution that required mandatory training for competence. I might even look to the quality of the training and argue that it was not adequate and failed to explain a salient issue in the application. There is no doubt that the symmetry between legal representation at appeals always favours the Applicant with “deeper pockets”.

Yet the current status is that our legal competence derives from our election to the council. The planning system does not demand that we become planning specialist. Only that we apply our best judgement, taking into account all evidence policy and advice in weighing benefits and harms and arriving at a conclusion. It is to our advantage to attend training and acquaint ourselves fully with all laws, policies and issues pertaining to our decision. But this should determine our “competence”.

Other issues worth mentioning are;

By severely limiting competence to attend, we might find insufficient members for a particular meeting particularly after an election,

and

In light of our current “designated” status, this change may be interpreted to be an admission that our under-performance is as a result of insufficient training and therefore an “incompetent” committee.

I would strongly suggest that instead of restricting the competence of members by making training mandatory and excluding those who have not attended, we simply clarify our commitment to the benefits of training and increase the amount and regularity of training sessions.

Email from Cllr Loughlin dated Friday 18/02/2022 18.26

I have given this subject a great deal of thought, not only before yesterday’s meeting but also since.

Councillors are transitory and are subject to the whims of the electorate; The council’s constitution, however, may remain in place for some years. Making training mandatory and part of the council’s constitution is, I believe, counter productive.

Not all councillors want to be a part of the planning committee, not only because of the time spent at site visits, meetings, etc., but also because some worry about the rules and regulations that the committee are expected to adhere to sometimes to the detriment of their constituents whom they are unable to represent on occasions for fear of contravening the rules of pre-determination, probity, etc. Adding an ‘edict’ that training is mandatory and is liable to a penalty, such as not being able to sit on the committee if the mandatory training is not attended is going to put even more people off. (It sounds like a threat).

I have always believed that training is imperative, especially on regulatory committees where the threat of judicial review is always present. The committee has had some excellent training from officers and the PAS in the past and I like to think that members are intelligent enough to email officers for information or advice should they need to do so. They may also look on line or elsewhere for any information they wish to find out. I have done this on many occasions. The NPPF is on line, The Localism Act is on line and there is much more. Sometimes there is guidance from the government and planning lawyers. Some time ago we were told we were in breach of Wednesbury. I had no clue what that was until I looked it up on line (Wednesbury unreasonableness) We went against officer advice and on that occasion won at appeal. I have always remembered it.

There will be an election next year; in all probability the make up of the committee/council will change. I don’t think we should put new members off of joining the planning committee by making training mandatory with dire consequences if they don’t attend which could frighten them off. At the time of the next election we may still be under designation, a daunting prospect for any new member. Regular training sessions will not only keep the committee up to date which an annual training session won’t is, I believe, the best solution.

As I said yesterday saying members are 'expected to undertake training' is not only self-explanatory it is less like an order.

Have a good weekend,

Janice.

Appendix 2

Current wording:

Officers will arrange training on planning issues. All members of the Council will be invited to attend. All members of the Planning Committee should attend.

To be replaced with:

Officers will arrange an annual basic mandatory training session for Councillors who are members or substitute members of Planning Committee. This training must be undertaken before participating in decision making at Planning Committee. All members of the Council who are not on Planning Committee or a substitute member of planning committee will be invited to attend on a voluntary basis. Officers will arrange and offer (in consultation with the Chair of Planning) a programme of topic focussed training including to run throughout the year. Topics to include review of decision made, visits to implemented schemes and updates on changes to planning law.

Mandatory Training throughout Essex

Authority	Mandatory Training	Comments
Essex County Council	Yes	
Southend on Sea	Yes	
Castlepoint Borough	Yes	
Colchester	Yes	
Maldon	Awaiting reply	Do have training
Tendring	Awaiting reply	Do have training
Uttlesford	No	
Chelmsford	Yes	
Basildon	Awaiting reply	Do have training
Harlow	Awaiting reply	Do have training
Thurrock	Yes	
Epping Forest District	Awaiting reply	Do have training
Brentwood	Awaiting reply	Do have training

Best Practice – PAS Probity in Planning.

Agenda Item 7

Committee: Planning Committee Working Group **Date:** 23 March 2022
Title: Changes to Section 2 Part 3 – responsibility for function relating to planning
Report Author: Jeanette Walsh, Interim Planning Transformation Lead

Summary

1. On 27 January [Planning Committee Working Group](#) (PCWG), members received a report with recommendations about changes to the general delegations to committees chief officers and deputy chief officers as they relate to Planning Committee and to Assistant Director of Planning. Now called the Director of Planning and Building Control. See Appendix 1
2. The Interim Director of Planning and Building Control has requested that one of the five changes is re-considered given that the Local Planning Authority was designated on 08/02/2022
3. The proposed change relates to paragraph 1.4. See Appendix 2.
4. On 27 January 2022 it was recommended that all major applications whether recommended for approval or refusal should be considered at Planning Committee. Members agreed this.
5. The wording is now recommended to be changed to allow for major applications to be refused under delegated powers.

Recommendations

6. To recommend to GAP Committee that the changes set out in Appendix 2 paragraph 1.4 contained in Section 2 Part 3 – Responsibility for Functions should be agreed as changes to the constitution and recommended to Full Council for adoption:

Financial Implications

7. Any proposed changes to the constitution to be facilitated within existing budgets.

Background Papers

8. Appendix 1 Extract from the constitution with track changes Section 2 Part 3 - Responsibility for Functions

Impact

9.

Communication/Consultation	This group is a working group and will make recommendation to GAP
Community Safety	None
Equalities	None
Health and Safety	None
Human Rights/Legal Implications	None
Sustainability	None
Ward-specific impacts	None
Workforce/Workplace	None

10.Risk Analysis

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigating actions
That a review does not take place in accordance with good governance and best practice as recommended by the East of England Local Government Association (EELGA)	3	3	The recommended changes are intended to improve the efficiency of the Local Planning Authority and create space for controversial applications to be considered by Planning 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.

Committee: Planning Committee Working Group **Date:** 23 March 2022
Title: Changes to Section 2 Part 3 – responsibility for function relating to planning
Report Author: Jeanette Walsh, Interim Planning Transformation Lead

Summary

1. At the previous meeting of the [Planning Committee Working Group](#) (PCWG), members agreed to receive a report with recommendations about changes to the general delegations to committees chief officers and deputy chief officers as they relate to Planning Committee and to Assistant Director of Planning. Now called the Director of Planning and Building Control.
2. There are five key changes recommended. The text is set out as track changes in Appendix 1 of this report. All of the recommended changes are designed to increase the efficiency of the authority and to remove applications from the Planning Committee agenda which would otherwise appear on it when they are not controversial. It should be remembered that changes to the scheme do not remove the right of Members to call an application to Planning Committee should they wish to do so.
3. The first proposed change is to para 1.1 is to allow officers to deal with variation of conditions applications on all types of previously approved applications where they have been determined by Planning Committee, except where the application was accompanied by an Environmental Statement. Those applications will always go to Planning Committee.
4. The second proposed change is to para 1.4 to extend the delegation for approval of major applications district wide and remove the requirement for schemes of more than 5 dwellings outside of Great Dunmow, Saffron Walden and Stansted to be reported to Planning Committee. There is also new proposed wording to raise the threshold for schemes of less than 20 dwellings in Great Dunmow and Saffron Walden to be determined by officers.
5. The third proposed change is to insert a new paragraph 1.6 to ensure applications where the applicant is an officer of the Local Planning Authority or an elected Member it should be determined by Planning Committee.
6. The final proposed change is to paragraph 2. It is proposed to delete the need for enforcement notices to be jointly authorised by the Assistant Director – Governance and Legal. Whether to serve an enforcement notice is a matter of planning judgement and is dependant on whether in the opinion of the planning authority it is expedient to do so. Accordingly this is not a legal decision and there is no need to have a joint sign off arrangement.

Recommendations

7. To recommend to GAP Committee that the changes set out in the track changed document Appendix 1 Extract from the constitution with track changes, Section 2 Part 3 – Responsibility for Functions should be agreed as changes to the constitution and recommended to Full Council for adoption:

Financial Implications

8. Any proposed changes to the constitution to be facilitated within existing budgets.

Background Papers

9. Appendix 1 Extract from the constitution with track changes Section 2 Part 3 - Responsibility for Functions

Impact

- 10.

Communication/Consultation	This group is a working group and will make recommendation to GAP
Community Safety	None
Equalities	None
Health and Safety	None
Human Rights/Legal Implications	None
Sustainability	None
Ward-specific impacts	None
Workforce/Workplace	None

11.Risk Analysis

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigating actions
That a review does not take place in accordance with good governance and best practice as recommended by the East of England Local Government Association (EELGA)	3	3	The recommended changes are intended to improve the efficiency of the Local Planning Authority and create space space for controversial applications to be considered by Planning 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 2

Wording agreed on 27/01/22 at PCWG

1.4

~~Approval of Major Applications (as defined by the GDPO) in Great Dunmow, Saffron Walden and Stansted and approval of applications of more than 5 dwellings elsewhere.~~ All applications which fall into the category of a major application (as defined by the GDPO).

Wording proposed on 23/02/2022

1.4

~~Approval of Major Applications (as defined by the GDPO) in Great Dunmow, Saffron Walden and Stansted and approval of applications of more than 5 dwellings elsewhere.~~ Approval of Major Applications (as defined by the GDPO)