

COUNCIL held at COUNCIL CHAMBER - COUNCIL OFFICES, LONDON ROAD, SAFFRON WALDEN, CB11 4ER on TUESDAY, 19 JUNE 2018 at 7.00 pm

Present: Councillor L Wells (Chairman)

Councillors A Anjum, K Artus, H Asker, G Barker, S Barker, R Chambers, J Davey, P Davies, A Dean, P Fairhurst, T Farthing, M Felton, M Foley, J Freeman, R Freeman, A Gerard, T Goddard, J Gordon, N Hargreaves, S Harris, E Hicks, D Jones, T Knight, G LeCount, P Lees, M Lemon, B Light, J Lodge, A Mills, S Morris, E Oliver, V Ranger, J Redfern, H Rolfe, H Ryles and G Sell.

Officers in attendance: Dawn French (Chief Executive), Daniel Barden (Communications Manager), A Bochel (Democratic Services Officer), P Bylo (Planning Policy Manager), R Dobson (Democratic and Electoral Services Manager), G Glenday (Assistant Director - Planning), Roger Harborough (Director - Public Services), Simon Pugh (Assistant Director - Governance and Legal) and Adrian Webb (Director of Finance and Corporate Services).

Public speaking

Statements were made by M Tournalmain, B Ross, J Cheetham, P Milne, D Starr, A Armstrong, R Gilyead, P Hawke-Smith, J Emanuel, T Clarke, A Coote, J Fairhurst, G Mott, B Bampton, A Dodsley, K McDonald, J Smith, J de Vries, K Stannard, V Thompson, K Rodwell, S Merifield, C Cant, F Wilkinson and N Paterson. Statements made are available as an audio recording; summaries of statements are appended to these minutes.

C16 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Apologies were received from Councillors Howell and Loughlin.

Councillor Barker declared a non-pecuniary interest as a member of Essex County Council.

Councillor Dean declared a personal non-pecuniary interest as a member of Stop Stansted Expansion and as his wife was a member of the Board of the Gardens of Easton Lodge.

C17 REGULATION 19 PRE-SUBMISSION DRAFT LOCAL PLAN

Councillor Lodge said he wished to speak first. The Chairman said the motion would first need to be proposed and seconded.

Officers gave a presentation on the Regulation 19 pre-submission draft Local Plan.

The Director – Public Services gave a summary of the reports and documents for consideration, and reminded members of the sequence of events since the meeting of the Planning Policy Working Group on 31 May. Cabinet had generally agreed the changes proposed by the Working Group, and accepted additional changes proposed by members, which were identified in the papers before Members. The Leader had, at the meeting of Cabinet, agreed to consider further some of the points raised in public speaking and in the subsequent debate on these points by portfolio holders present. Consequently the Leader had made an urgent executive decision on these matters, which were included in the papers for consideration by Full Council, together with the officer advice on matters related to all the sites that the Leader agreed to consider further post Cabinet.

The Director – Public Services said all reports as just described were therefore set out for clarity and transparency, and as many of the changes particularly affected Chapter 3, this part of the report had been re-provided in full.

The Director – Public Services then spoke on a further issue which had arisen since the Cabinet meeting. This issue was the publication by the North Essex councils of a letter received from the Inspector appointed to examine their plans. The letter advised those councils of the steps that the Inspector considered necessary for the common section 1 element of those councils' respective local plans to be made sound and legally compliant. The Chief Executive had written to all Members of Uttlesford District Council about this matter.

The Director – Public Services said whilst the letter was not about the Uttlesford Local Plan, there were some key issues that were relevant to its preparation, which were: additional evidence about trunk road improvements; the proposed rapid transport system for North Essex; delivery of market and affordable housing.

The Director – Public Services said the proposals before Members did not seek to predetermine that the garden communities could only be delivered using the locally led development corporation. At examination, the Council's case would be supported by promoter representation. The North Essex letter confirmed how Inspectors had been asked by Government to work with councils in order to get a sound plan. This council had prior notice of the strength of evidence its inspector would be likely to need to see, and a window to further strengthen the case as required before submission, if it accepted the recommendations tonight. The proposals before Members were in locations benefitting from a stronger housing market than parts of North Essex, they did not include a proposal on the scale of Braintree/ Colchester borders and rapid transit was a simpler proposition in the Uttlesford context linking to the local and regional interchange at the airport.

The Director – Public Services said the scale of growth that the plan needed to address to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure

requirements was challenging and a step change from the previous experience of this community, but neighbouring authorities had had to plan to deliver even more, and some of these plans had completed their examinations and the main modifications recommended from their inspector been published. In summary, key features of the version of plan recommended to proceed to the Regulation 19 representation stage were: a hybrid strategy with a combination of development in the towns and villages and a start on creating new garden communities, previously identified as the preferred options from all the reasonable alternatives; the contribution from towns and villages had had to be strengthened so that it could be shown that the plan once adopted would deliver a 5 year land supply; as a matter of policy, the delivery of homes was profiled to reflect the need to start garden communities to protect the historic character and environmental quality of towns and villages, and taking into account their lead times; the commitment to garden principles had been emphasised by elevating them to policy requirements.

In response to representations, additional detail requirements had been added to the strategic policy frameworks for each of the garden communities, notwithstanding that more detailed development plans would supplement these garden community policies in due course as more in depth evidence was gathered.

The Director – Public Services said there had been other changes recommended in the plan before Members tonight. He highlighted two such changes: the development management policies had been the subject of a workshop with members of the Planning Committee; and the Stansted Airport strategic allocation site policy was essentially as in the Regulation 18 preferred options plan, in particular criteria 3 to 7, notwithstanding representations requesting changes to these elements during consultation last year. The policy referred to the airport being a local transport interchange as in the Regulation 18 Plan, and this was now reflected in the explanatory text.

The Planning Policy Team Leader then gave a further presentation to Members, referring to the way in which the housing requirement for the draft plan had been arrived at. He cited the strategic housing market assessment 2017 use of ONS household projections, from 2014, which were the latest projections available. He explained and gave reasons for the adjustments calculated, for household growth into dwelling growth to 11,733; a market signals adjustment, of 13.63%, although recent findings from the East Hertfordshire examination at which it was changed to 14%, had been taken into account to raise Uttlesford's plan to 13,376; an additional 504 for growth of people in communal establishments had to be added in, taking the need to 13,880. The plan had a housing requirement of at least 14,000 homes, to recognise uncertainties in forecasting, and build in robustness, so the supply was around 14,600 to provide flexibility to address delays in sites or sites not coming forward, to enable the Council to still meet its target.

The Planning Policy Team Leader demonstrated slides showing the hybrid strategy, for the three garden communities but also growth in existing communities. He referred to the TCPA garden city principles, as writing them into the policy texts would give weight to be given to the principles in

development plan documents. The local plan commits to producing such documents for each of the three garden communities, by recommending that development plan documents be written into policy, as these gave increased opportunity for public engagement and scrutiny.

The Chief Executive summed up the next steps of the process, should the draft plan be approved. She reminded members that if the plan were to be approved, the next stage, which had been referred to as a “consultation,” was technically an opportunity to make representations for the Planning Inspector conducted by the Council on behalf of the Inspector. Representations received would be reflected upon, and during the period the Council would have regard to representations relevant to the position with regard to the West of Braintree site. Subject to the timing of such matters and any work to be carried out, the submission date indicated of October might be slightly later, but given the anticipated date of publication of the new National Planning Policy Framework in July, there would be six months in which to submit the plan take advantage of the transitional provisions, including relying on the Council’s assessment of housing need, rather than use the Government’s methodology. Thereafter the next stages of the submission timetable would be an estimate only.

The Chief Executive set out the options before Members, including the option that if that they did not accept the recommendations the Council could decide to have a cooling off period. Council could also reject the plan; or refer the plan back to Cabinet. Finally Members could defer the consideration of the plan to a future meeting. Such options would impact on the timetable.

The Chief Executive said she needed to set out the risks if the plan were not to be approved, as it was critical that decision makers take into account relevant factors, and not irrelevant factors in reaching decisions. She highlighted the risk that if the plan were not to be approved, the Council, as was currently the case, would not be able to demonstrate it had a five year land supply, which would expose the Council to the risk of speculative development at locations which members and the Council might not consider suitable. She reminded members that if the regulation 19 plan were approved, and the representation stage concluded, weight could be attached to the plan where representations had not been received, which could protect development management policies. The Council could lose control over the allocations identified, as these had been stated to be sustainable locations, but the requirements attached in the policies could be watered down. After expiry of the transition arrangements under the new NPPF, the Council would not be able to rely on its objectively assessed housing need, but would have to follow the Government’s standard approach, previously indicated to be 16,200 for Uttlesford District Council. Whilst this number might not be the final position, the figure indicated a direction of travel to provide for higher levels of housing numbers. A delay in submitting the plan might result in review being needed for reviewing evidence for the whole plan as evidence would go out of date, and changes in national policy might need to be reflected in further work and new applications would be approved during such time. Intervention by the Government could occur, with plan making taken over, in which circumstances the local planning authority would have to bear the cost.

The Chief Executive said recommendations 3 to 7 were consequential to recommendations 1 and 2, and summarised what those recommendations were. The Chairman had said she would take those recommendations en bloc.

The Chairman confirmed that Councillor Lodge could not speak until after the motion had been seconded.

Councillor Lodge queried what the motion was.

The Assistant Director – Governance and Legal said the recommendations from Cabinet and the Leader were for Council to consider, comprising the motion. In response to a further query from a councillor, the Chairman said the motion was the recommendation to Council.

The Chairman invited Councillor S Barker to speak. Councillor Barker thanked members of the public for making representations to Members this evening, and said she had taken note of the points made. She reminded members of the progression of the regulation 18 draft local plan, and that a hybrid solution had been proposed, to which strategy no Member or group had proposed an alternative. The plan before Council protected the green belt and provided a stepped approach to housing delivery. It allowed a buffer for the five year land supply. The plan would ensure delivery of housing for the children and grandchildren of residents, and that affordable homes were available. It provided opportunity for businesses to grow locally. The process conducted by the Planning Policy Working Group had been open and transparent. She proposed the recommendations.

Councillor Rolfe seconded the proposal, and reserved his right to speak until later.

The Chairman reminded members of the Council's process for the meeting. She said group leaders would have unlimited time to speak and members would have up to 5 minutes.

Councillor Lodge proposed an amendment in that the Regulation 19 plan should be deferred in order to rectify shortcomings, and in view of the comments recently made by the Government Inspector in relation to the Braintree local plan.

The Chairman sought clarification as to the wording of the amendment. She offered to adjourn the meeting to enable such wording to be specified.

Councillor R Freeman said, as a point of order, the meeting was over two hours' duration and should not continue.

Councillor Jones proposed the meeting should continue. Councillor Ranger seconded the proposal. A vote being taken, and carried unanimously, it was resolved to continue the meeting.

The Chairman adjourned the meeting at 9.15pm to enable clarification to be sought as to the amendment Councillor Lodge wished to move.

At 9.25pm the meeting resumed.

The Chief Executive read out the wording proposed by Councillor Lodge, as follows:

“That the Regulation 19 plan be deferred to rectify the shortcomings of the plan, including a viable financial plan for new communities; proper consideration of expansion at Stansted Airport; a workable transport plan; a workable sports strategy; a scientific assessment of housing need; assurance of an adequate water supply and real affordable housing for key workers.”

The proposal for amendment was seconded by Councillor Gerard.

Councillor Lodge spoke to the amendment, stating he wanted a plan that worked, but referring to the comments of the Inspector on the Braintree plan. He said if the plan went forward to Regulation 19 now, it would be rejected and thus be delayed. The Inspector's comments on the Braintree plan indicated the financial plan was unworkable, yet there was more work on that aspect than Uttlesford had done. There was a need for a traffic plan that was workable, and to provide infrastructure before building homes, and to provide affordable housing before housing for key workers. Work was needed on jobs and schools. The Inspector had stated the plan to deliver a garden community per district was overambitious, and unviable due to cost yet Uttlesford wanted to build three garden communities. He made various further points, and asked members to vote to defer the plan.

Councillor Rolfe said residents were at the heart of the plan. Deferment would derail the timetable, and it was best to stay in control. The Inspector for Braintree had made helpful comments, and had not rejected Braintree's plan: Uttlesford had had two visiting inspectors, both of whom had indicated Uttlesford was on the right path. The Council was committed to principles of garden communities, and fundamental to those principles was land value capture. Schools and infrastructure would be built in also. The Inspector had said Uttlesford was further ahead than some other councils, and work on development plans would be done in further detail. Deferring was not the right course of action, and he asked members to reject the amendment.

A number of Members then spoke raising points in favour of deferral of the plan. Issues which were raised included lack of allocation of sites for sports pitches or community halls outside of garden communities, and a lack of an up to date sports strategy; the prospect of traffic congestion within Saffron Walden, and the failure of the County Council to grant a 20mph speed limit in the town centre; the lack of evidence of cooperation between the district and county councils; the aspiration of Stansted Airport for planning permission to extend to the size of Gatwick, which would increase traffic; the inadequacy of the capacity of the M11; concerns regarding the evidence for the numbers of homes required; the over-ambitious nature of the proposals for three garden communities.

Councillor S Barker responded. She said deferral would potentially lead to the imposition of the Government's standardised housing number; the fact that it was inappropriate to assume the Airport application was in the local plan, as this was a matter for the Planning Committee, and new evidence could be presented to the Inspector, rather than deferring the plan.

Councillor Dean spoke against the amendment. He said it was an attempt to avoid making difficult decisions and that many points which had been made seemed to be based on the inspector's comments on the Braintree plan. He too had asked questions on those comments, but it was very unlikely the site at West of Braintree would disappear. The rapid transport system was the subject of ongoing discussions, and the development plan process would start in the Summer, and it was important to remember the plan did not include all the details at this stage. More work was needed by the North Essex authorities, but there was great scope for land value capture. Until this Council made a decision then those negotiations could not start. He opposed the amendment.

Further comments against the plan and for deferral were made by a number of members. Issues raised included the need to listen to residents; the lack of truly affordable housing; the environment and air quality, and concerns that future reliance on electric cars would be insufficient mitigation; and that there was no provision for identifying where the extra water needed would come from.

In seconding the motion to defer, Councillor Gerard said Development Plan Documents would be a leap of faith, in that they were a "plan to plan": this gave no clarity and simply invited people to "trust us" following which there would be no opportunity for communities to shape their future. He requested a recorded vote on the amendment and on the substantive vote. He seconded the motion to defer.

Further points in support of deferral were made, including concerns about reliance on the agricultural nature of the district for food production; the potential for the use of the Community Infrastructure Levy as opposed to Section 106 agreements and concerns about the veracity of the housing need. Further points against deferral were made, with reference to risks and costs of deferral; and to the difficult choices facing those members most affected by the proposed garden communities in representing their communities' best interests.

The amended motion, to defer the local plan, was put.

A recorded vote was taken, the outcome being as follows:

For the amendment: Councillors Anjum, Asker, Fairhurst, Foley, R Freeman, Gerard, Hargreaves, Knight, LeCount, Lees, Light, Lodge and Morris.

Against the amendment: Councillors Artus, G Barker, S Barker, Chambers, Davey, Davies, Dean, Farthing, Felton, J Freeman, Goddard, Gordon, Harris, Hicks, Jones, Lemon, Mills, Oliver, Rangers, Redfern, Rolfe, Ryles, Sell and Wells.

Abstentions: there were no abstentions recorded.

The motion to defer the Regulation 19 local plan was duly defeated by 24 votes against to 13 in favour.

Councillor Dean then spoke in support of the substantive motion. He said demand for housing was outstripping supply, and that younger generations were far less able to buy houses based on a reasonable multiplier of their income. He referred to the history of the local plan at Uttlesford, which had taken various forms. There was a need for a coherent local plan. Party politics should be dismissed in this context. It would be irresponsible not to proceed with the local plan tonight. He urged fellow councillors to vote for the plan.

A request to move to the motion was put. The Chairman said it was her view that as only one person had spoken on the substantive motion, and the seconder had not yet spoken, there had not been adequate discussion, so the motion should not be put at this point.

A member expressed concern at the role of development corporations. The Chairman said she would reserve comment on that concern until later.

Members raised points in favour of the motion, in that the experience of communities living without a local plan was that they were subjected to the torment of having to go to court to get facilities such as a community centre, and that inadequate affordable housing was provided for; and that the process during the consideration of the draft plan by the cross-party working group had left no stone unturned in seeking evidence and obtaining expert input.

In response to the earlier references to community infrastructure levy, and to development corporations, officers provided clarification.

Councillor Lodge thanked officers for the clarification provided. He said he wanted this plan to work, but approval today was not the fastest or best route to make it work. Members had heard members of the public speak, including a developer who had expressed his concerns. The plan would be rejected on day 1 of the examination hearings for the reasons given and he therefore urged members to reject it now to enable it to be worked on so that it was right.

Councillor Rolfe seconded the substantive motion. He said there was no evidence that the plan would be rejected at the outset: a clear steer from two inspector visits had been given, and the comments on the North Essex plan were not a rejection but to seek more information.

Councillor Rolfe said members had collectively agreed on a spatial strategy that would start new communities in the form of garden communities, which would link back to the Development Plan documents process. He took the point regarding sport, and he had listened carefully to all points made on the new settlements, including the community infrastructure levy and on affordable housing. A key point was that this plan would give the council the opportunity to work to the garden community principles, including on the level of the market rate on which affordable housing would be based, and air quality issues, as

sustainable transport would help. He was committed to working in partnership with local communities, and he proposed the motion.

Councillor S Barker summed up, and the recommendations in full were put to the vote. A recorded vote was taken, the outcome being as follows:

For the recommendations: Councillors Artus, G Barker, S Barker, Davey, Davies, Dean, Farthing, Felton, J Freeman, Goddard, Gordon, Harris, Hicks, Jones, LeCount, Lemon, Mills, Oliver, Ranger, Rolfe, Ryles, Sell and Wells.

Against the recommendations: Councillors Anjum, Asker, Chambers, Fairhurst, Foley, R Freeman, Gerard, Hargreaves, Lees, Light, Lodge, Morris and Redfern.

The recommendations were passed by 23 votes in favour, and 13 against.

Abstentions: no abstentions were recorded.

RESOLVED

- 1 That Council notes the amendments recommended by Cabinet and the Leader to the draft Local Plan at, and following, the Cabinet meeting on 12 June 2018.
- 2 That Council, being satisfied that the preparation of the Local Plan has complied with the relevant regulatory requirements and being of the view that the Regulation 19 Pre-Submission Local Plan document is ready for submission to government for independent examination, approves the Regulation 19 Pre-Submission Local Plan recommended by the Leader and Cabinet for publication in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.
- 3 That following the conclusion of the Regulation 19 publication period, the Local Plan be submitted to the Secretary of State for Independent Examination under section 20 of the Planning Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) ("the 2004 Act"), together with the submission documents prescribed by Regulation 22 of the 2012 Regulations before 31 March 2019.
- 4 That the Director of Public Services, in consultation with the Environmental Services Portfolio Holder, be authorised to make non-material typographical, formatting, mapping and

other minor amendments to the Plan prior to the submission of the Plan to the Secretary of State.

- 5 That the Director of Public Services be authorised to write to the Local Plan Inspector appointed to carry out the Examination of the submitted Local Plan ("the Local Plan Inspector") asking him/her to recommend such modifications of the submitted Local Plan as may be necessary to make the Plan sound and legally compliant, in accordance with section 20(7C) of the 2004 Act.
- 6 That the Director of Public Services, in consultation with the Environmental Services Portfolio Holder, be authorised to submit a schedule of proposed main modifications of the submitted Local Plan to address any issues relating to soundness and legal compliance identified by the Local Plan Inspector; and
- 7 That the Local Plan Submission Version 2018 be endorsed as a material consideration to be used in the determination of planning applications and enforcement decisions to be given appropriate weight in accordance with paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

The meeting ended at 11.55pm.

Public Speaking

Moyra Tourlamaine spoke on behalf of residents Great Chesterford on a lack of evidence to support the draft Local Plan. She said the plan would not stand up to scrutiny. Uttlesford District Council would need to amend the plan further to satisfy the residents of Great Chesterford.

Brian Ross spoke on behalf of Stop Stansted Expansion. He said he was satisfied to note amendments agreed at Cabinet to Policy SP11. He questioned the accuracy of the employment figure used in the plan, due to Manchester Airport Group having revised its employment forecast downwards and because few airport workers actually lived in Uttlesford.

Jackie Cheetham spoke on behalf of Takeley Parish Council about airport-related car parking. Offsite parking was detrimental to the area surrounding the airport. Stansted should remain an airport in the countryside and parking should remain on the airport site.

Philip Milne spoke on behalf of Great Dunmow Town Council. He said the LtCAN 1 site should be removed from the draft plan. The West of Braintree site could not go ahead, so he asked what would happen to the

970 houses allocated in Stebbing. Additional traffic would be a major problem.

Dan Starr spoke on behalf of weareresidents.org. He said there were similarities between the Braintree, Colchester and Tendring plan and the Uttlesford plan. The former had been rejected for a number of reasons, many of which would be directly relevant to Uttlesford if the plan was submitted in its current form.

Alexander Armstrong spoke on behalf of Great Dunmow Town Council. The Dunmow Neighbourhood Plan was now being ignored. There was no sign of infrastructure coming first in the plan. He supported a local plan, but not Uttlesford's draft Regulation 19 plan.

Richard Gilyead spoke in support of a sustainable transport strategy. Facts about transport were in short supply in the plan, and it did not answer many questions about sustainable transport links, such as how these would be funded. There needed to be firm costed plans in place before the plan was submitted.

Patrick Hawke-Smith said a local plan should be soundly based on fact, well thought-out and visionary. He asked what was the Council's vision for the future development of Uttlesford and how they proposed to deliver it in the local plan.

Judy Emanuel said development in Uttlesford had recently been reactive, ad hoc and driven by developers. Future development would intensify existing problems. The Infrastructure Development Plan contains a lack of identifiable projects and did not seek to make up for historic deficits in infrastructure. The documents would not stand up to scrutiny during the inspection.

Tony Clarke said landowners and developers controlled the procurement process. Local authorities could not rely on high quality settlements built by development corporations and so could do little to configure development. Going ahead with the plan would result in large housing estates built to low standards.

Arthur Coote said the plan did not address issues for the young and elderly of Saffron Walden. Community interest companies could be used to provide for these people, but this was not addressed in the local plan. He asked the Council to reconsider the plan in order to provide for the young and the elderly.

Juliette Fairhurst said the plan would determine the ability of 10,000 young people to build a life in Uttlesford. They had been to some extent ignored during the consultation. She knew what she wanted the district to look like. It was costly to live and commute in Uttlesford. Young people should be considered.

Graham Mott spoke on behalf of Elsenham Parish Council. The parish council offered general support for the plan, but asked for the removal of the Land South of Rush Lane, Elsenham from the plan. Health and transport infrastructure in Elsenham were already inadequate. The proposed dwellings were not needed.

Bill Bampton said the plan overestimated the speed of delivery, and so would mean a lack of a five year land supply for at least ten years, benefitting developers. Approval of the new settlements would be committing to 28,000 new houses over the course of this and the next local plan period. The number of new houses necessary for the district was lower than the figure in the plan.

Andy Dodsley spoke on behalf of Little Easton Parish Council, and said he believed the plan was not sound. He questioned the reasons for building a town next to Stansted Airport, and a large number of houses in various locations with few feasible proposals for infrastructure. People would continue to use cars rather than other transport, local needs for affordable housing would not be met, and there would be significant harm to heritage assets.

Ken McDonald said the population and job forecasts in the plan were questionable, and the local plan planning process had been deficient. There was no clear audit trail for how the figures in the plan had been reached. There needed to be an independent audit of numbers and a clear statement of assumptions and calculations. Overblown employment figures for Stansted Airport were in part responsible for the questionable figures.

Jenny Smith said a local plan was needed to halt a developer free-for-all, and to provide affordable homes for local people. The choice of sites and lack of information about how infrastructure would be addressed were primary concerns. Local people needed input into the development plan documents. Further work needed to be done on the detail of the plan.

James de Vries said he had two serious concerns. The affordability of homes for local residents was an important issue, with infrastructure being a key priority. There was a lack of industrial and office space available in the local plan, and the issue had been overlooked as a whole.

Karmel Stannard said she wanted the local plan to improve quality of life and protect public health. However, hundreds of new houses and vehicles would push air pollution to more dangerous levels. There was also a need for affordable housing for local residents. The plan should address these issues.

Vincent Thompson spoke on behalf of Stop Easton Park. He said there was a need for houses, but the plan was fundamentally flawed. It took no account of the likely availability of Carver Barracks, a brownfield site, in 2031. The selection of Easton Park as a site for a garden community was irrational, and there were other alternative sites.

Katy Rodwell said the conservation appraisal stated the historic environment of Little Easton could not be replaced, and was a fragile and finite resource. However the local plan threatened the conservation of this special place. The planned development would mean it would be lost rather than preserved.

Sandi Merifield spoke on behalf of Stebbing Parish Council. She said the parish council felt it ignored. The government inspector's letter about the Braintree, Colchester and Tendring local plan which questioned the plan's viability meant the West of Braintree site in Uttlesford's plan was fundamentally flawed.

Christina Cant spoke on behalf of Stebbing Parish Council. She said concerns with the plan included the likely coalescence between villages and towns in the district, the inclusion of Andrews Airfield in the plan, and the proposal to build under flight paths at Stansted Airport.

Fiona Wilkinson spoke on behalf of Little Chesterford Parish Council. The development of the North Uttlesford Garden Community and the expansion of Chesterford Research Park were problematic. There was a lack of sufficient detail on infrastructure in the plan. South Cambridgeshire had made housing provision for biotech workers and so the site was not needed, and the park was not growing at the expected rate.

Neil Paterson spoke on behalf of the North Uttlesford Garden Communities Action Group. The housing need figure in the plan was questionable and there was a lack of detail on supporting infrastructure and funding for this. The impact of an additional 1500 houses at the Genome Campus had been ignored. The balance of housing should be market-led and development needed supporting infrastructure. North Uttlesford did not meet either of these requirements.