

Robert Gurr

In Shakespeare's day Saffron Walden smelled sweet with the saffron crocus. But today to misquote the Bard...'there is something rotten in this state of Uttlesford'.

The ghost of the Stansted Planning decision, which haunts this ~~room~~<sup>room, room</sup>, needs exorcising by this Scrutiny Committee; to restore the electorate's faith in transparent and accountable democratic process.

5 Conservative councillors including the chairman colluded to vote a previously agreed outcome. This was an affront to local voters who had resoundingly given their opinion. The poorly framed and biased reports from Planning Officers were not challenged despite the glaring anomalies. Planning Officers appear to have an attitude of underlying contempt for the electorate but are happy to take instruction from the applicant <sup>MAG</sup> without any challenge. This is neither accountable nor transparent

For their decision the 5 made no reference to compliance with formal planning policy.

Mills and Ryles ...claimed to take a wide broad perspective including Brexit which is completely outside their remit. Chambers made reference to voting for his grandchildren despite the fact that his vote ignored WHO health guidelines and increased carbon emissions which will both greatly damage his grandchildren's future. It is unclear whether Hicks who was silent all day was actually awake and no-one remembers what Wells reason was

No intelligent person accepts that this planning decision will not materially adversely affect the environment. Yet we are told by officers that The Planning Committee is an expert, trained committee; clearly when half the committee give no evidence of understanding or having read the application this is hard to believe

officers ~~strongly~~ advise this committee that its scope should ~~clearly~~ exclude a review of the merits of the decision made by the Planning Committee, including any review of the merits of planning officers advice ....Why? that is at the crux of this issue

They also write the Stansted application is still "live" and it would not be appropriate to review it now .....on the contrary this is the ideal; it should inform the 'live' continuing debate <sup>time</sup>

<sup>just</sup> THIS advice CANNOT BE RIGHT AND IT IS A WAY OF KICKING THIS ISSUE INTO THE LONG GRASS ...it should be ignored. RESIDENTS DESERVE GREATER transparency and accountability

to conclude

Shame on this councils planning officers for not challenging mags application in an unbiased and professional manner

Shame on you councillors mills, ryles hicks chambers and wells in not representing your communities and not being independent and unbiased showing little integrity given the lack of attention to the application and comments.

And prospectively shame on this scrutiny committee if the matter and decision is not investigated end to end'

47 communities will not forget how this planning application was dealt with