

**LOCAL PLAN PANEL held at COUNCIL CHAMBER - COUNCIL OFFICES,  
LONDON ROAD, SAFFRON WALDEN, CB11 4ER, on TUESDAY, 19  
NOVEMBER 2024 at 7.00 pm**

Present: Councillor R Freeman (Chair)  
Councillors J Emanuel, J Evans, J Moran, N Reeve, G Sell and  
M Tayler

Officers in attendance: C Edwards (Democratic Services Officer), A Maxted (Local Plan  
Manager), J Procter (Democratic Services Officer) and Charles  
Welham (Planning Policy Officer)

Also present: T Colocasidou, B Critchley, A Evans, J Johnson and A  
Ketteridge

11

**PUBLIC SPEAKERS**

The following individuals addressed the Panel. Summaries of their statements  
have been appended to these minutes:-

- A Ketteridge
- B Critchley
- J Johnson
- T Colocasidou
- A Evans

The Local Plan Manager responded to points raised by public speakers. He  
clarified that all comments received in relation to Regulation 19 would be sent to  
the Planning Inspector in their original form, without editing and including any  
images. He said that they would also be published on the Uttlesford District  
Council (UDC) website. He said that the only changes likely to be made were the  
redacting of any personal details included in the comments.

The Local Plan Manager said that the Council would also provide a report to the  
Inspector which would include a summary of responses.

12

**APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Pavitt.

The following declarations were made:-

Councillor Evans declared a non pecuniary interest in the form of a site adjacent  
to his property which had been put forward in the call for sites but was not  
included in either Regulation 18 or 19 of the Local Plan.

Councillor Emanuel declared a non pecuniary interest in the form of being a  
member of the Newport, Quendon and Rickling Neighbourhood Plan Steering  
Committee.

Councillor Freeman declared he was a member of the Saffron Walden Town Council.

### 13 **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved as an accurate record.

### 14 **LOCAL PLAN UPDATE**

The Chair expressed thanks to Councillor Criscione for his attendance and input and welcomed Councillor Moran to the panel.

The Local Plan Manager presented the Local Plan Update. He made the following comments:-

There was a mistake in the report, on page 10 paragraph 10 where it stated there had been 1700 responses received regarding Regulation 18 it should read approximately 1000.

Regulation 19 had received approximately half as many comments as Regulation 18.

All Local Plans were subject to modifications that was part of the process.

Henham had the highest volume of comments, most of which related to its classification as a Larger Village. Councillor Sell commented that Henham had not been included in Regulation 18, which may explain the high proportion of comments relating to it as this was the first opportunity for residents to object to its classification as a Larger Village.

The process was ongoing and at the date of the meeting not all comments had been processed.

The Local Plan was on track to be submitted to the Secretary of State by the end of December 2024.

The Secretary of State would likely appoint multiple inspectors to review the plan.

No 'showstopper' comments had been received that could affect the soundness of the plan.

In response to questions from members, the Local Plan Manager said that:

- Cllr Evans made a commitment to provide a brief verbal update at the next Full Council meeting.
- There were no more votes to be held on this matter, but all information included in the comments would be made available to councillors. The

primary purpose of the Regulation 19 stage was to collect comments that would be included in the plan sent to the Planning Inspector.

- There were two types of modifications. Main modifications, which could be considered “major,” were considered by the inspector, who would in turn make their own recommendations accordingly. Hearings for these recommendations, should there be any, would likely not occur until the autumn of 2025. The second type of modifications were additional modifications, which could be considered as “minor” modifications. These would consist of changes that would not affect the overall plan e.g. spelling mistakes or referencing errors, and would be for the Full Council to consider, although they would also be checked by the inspector.
- Uttlesford District Council chose to publish a full draft plan of Regulation 18 including policies and allocation with the aim to make the consultation as meaningful as possible, but there was no requirement for them to have done so.
- Officers would produce a report similar in format to that which followed Regulation 18. This would include summaries of and responses to comments. The inspector would have access to this report and may refer to it in conjunction with the comments in their original form in order to gain the council’s perspective on issues raised.
- In terms of potential risks e.g. flooding, the council had prepared their own risk evaluation which had been submitted as part of the plan.
- The local plan had considered Uttlesford’s employment needs outside of that provided by Stansted Airport, which while provides a significant level of employment within Uttlesford, serves a role beyond the district on a national level.
- Until the completion of an inspector’s report, an emerging plan had limited weight.
- If applications submitted since April of this year were approved, the commitments and completions figures of the plan would likely be updated as part of the modifications prior to the plan’s eventual adoption at the end of the inspection process.
- The amount of development that Larger Villages may need, could therefore be reduced if proposed applications were approved during the interim period.

Members also discussed neighbourhood plans and their relation to the Local Plan. Points discussed were:

- How the adoption of neighbourhood plans could allow parishes to steer non-strategic development within their communities. Members suggested that some parishes may have found the concept of neighbourhood plans daunting and others expressed concern that some larger parishes had not adopted them. Members emphasised the effectiveness of neighbourhood plans in conjunction with the Local Plan and would encourage parishes to adopt them where possible.
- It was noted that there was no current budget at UDC to assist with neighbourhood plans.
- Resources were available through the Rural Community Councils of Essex (RCCE), including seminars and written materials.

- Members expressed the importance of neighbourhood plans being steered by a group not only consisting of parish councillors but a diverse range of people within any given community. Councillor Emanuel spoke favourably of neighbourhood plans from experience as a member of a neighbourhood plan steering committee. The Local Plan Manager clarified that there were 7 settlements with a housing requirement and said that he would expect these to be planned for via non-strategic sites. All these communities would have the opportunity to steer developments through neighbourhood plans.
- There were no other villages with housing requirements and so therefore there would be no further non-strategic allocations that neighbourhood plans could plan for, however there were other reasons to develop neighbourhood plans.

The update was noted.

*The Meeting closed at 20:40.*