



**MINUTES**

**Meeting:** EXTRAORDINARY  
PARISH COUNCIL

**Date:** 22nd January 2018

**Time:** 7.30PM

**Venue:** NORTH WEALD LIBRARY, 138 HIGH ROAD, NORTH WEALD

**PRESENT:**

**Councillors (9)** A Buckley (Chairman), B Bartram, D Stallan\*, Mrs S Jackman MBE,  
T Blanks, B Clegg, A Tyler, Mrs E Godwin-Brown, B Eldridge.

*\* for part of meeting*

**Officers in Attendance (2)**

Susan De Luca - Parish Clerk

Adriana Jones - Principal Finance Officer

**Members of the Public (7)**

**Members of the Press (1)**

**C17.150 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (3)**

**NOTED** that apologies for absence had been received from Councillors Mrs Grigg, Mulliner, and Bedford.

**C17.151 OTHER ABSENCES (1)**

Cllr Spearman.

**C17.152 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Cllr Blanks stated that in his opinion, all Councillors around the table had a personal interest in the Local Plan agenda item, and enquired as to what sort of declaration should be made. The Clerk stated that it was her understanding that if there was a shared non pecuniary interest that all members would have, dispensation would allow the matter to be discussed, and that she was confident this would be the case regarding this agenda item.

Cllr Clegg stated that without being disrespectful to the three District Councillors who were also members of the Parish Council, he was uncomfortable with the fact that the District Councillors agreed with the Local Plan submission at the 14th December meeting at District, and if the Parish Council took the decision at this meeting that the plan was unsound, would this create a conflict of interest, and possibly fetter the three District Councillors in any future comments that they may wish to make. The Clerk stated that she would need to take further advice.

Cllr Stallan stated that he was not required to justify his declarations, and that he made a decision at the 14th December meeting based on the facts. Cllr Stallan stated his understanding was that the vote at this meeting was regarding the regulation 19 consultation as to whether or not the Submission Version of the Local Plan was sound. Cllr Stallan confirmed he had requested with the Chairman that agenda item 6 was brought forward, and that he would not be voting on any decisions taken regarding agenda item 5 (Local Plan) as he would have left this meeting. With regard to conflicts of interest, this was why Cllr Stallan, Cllr Grigg and Cllr Bedford were

not on the Planning Committee as it could be perceived that they had already made their mind up in a particular way. Cllr Stallan continued, stating it would be down to other members, or individual members of the public, to decide if they felt he had come to this meeting with perceived idea because of how he voted on 14th December. Cllr Stallan confirmed he was happy to state how he voted at the 14th December meeting, and if he would have been at the remainder of this meeting during which the Local Plan would be discussed he would most probably, unless he heard something major to the contrary as to why he shouldn't support his original decision, vote the same way.

Cllr Mrs Jackman declared a non pecuniary interest as her son completes media work for Quinn Estates.

### **C17.153 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

None.

It was **AGREED** that agenda item number 6 would be moved forward due to Cllr Stallan notifying the Chairman that he would need to leave the meeting due to attending another meeting.

### **C17.154 MEETING WITH DEVELOPERS**

The issue of whether or not the Parish Council should meet with developers was raised at the 8th January Parish Council meeting. Cllr Stallan had requested that this item should be placed on the agenda for this Extraordinary meeting so it could be fully debated. At the 8th January meeting, the Clerk advised that the Neighbourhood Planning Steering Group had already stated its intention to meet with developers as part of the Neighbourhood Planning process. There is differing advice concerning whether or not Town and Parish Councils should meet with developers. Planning Aid England's advice to those preparing a Neighbourhood Plan is that early engagement and open discussions with landowners and developers can help them to understand what you hope to achieve and can influence their thinking about what is appropriate development. It also states that early engagement will help to pick up on any issues that may lead to an objection to a policy or policies in your plan. You can then explore and seek to resolve these through discussion. However, Councillors also need to ensure an open mind is maintained so that they are able to view any future planning application objectively and without fettering themselves.

Cllr Stallan thanked members for agreeing to move this item forward, stating that however the Parish Council votes on the Local Plan Regulation 19 consultation, the response will be submitted to the District Council who will consider its content, and if the decision is taken to continue with the Plan in its current form, it will be presented to the inspector by 31st March 2018. Cllr Stallan stated that once this happens, it was his view that the Parish Council will be in a different place as to where we have been up to now, and that is where the Parish Council will be having to represent its residents on the Plan that is going forward. Cllr Stallan stated that there are some sites that have not been included in the submission version of the plan, some that were in the last consultation which have been taken out since, and these are the ones that the Parish Council may have to argue the case on behalf of its residents. Cllr Stallan emphasised that any decision taken with the next agenda item would be the stance of the Parish Council as a body, and for this reason and as a member of the Parish

Council he felt that at that stage the Parish Council should not be meeting with Developers. Cllr Stallan stated that if the Parish Council did decide to meet with developers, it would have to be opened up to all of the developers - ones that have not had their sites put forward and ones that have - and that these parcels of land could have a number of owners, and that it would be a significant amount of works to establish exactly who all these land owners / developers were. This would also include Epping Forest District Council as owner of the Airfield. Cllr Stallan stated that the Parish Council should be coming to its own view, and not listening to the views of developers, concerning the sites that have gone forward, and for this reason he felt the Parish Council should not meet with developers regarding the future development in the Parish at this stage.

The Chairman advised that this was discussed at the last meeting, at which time the Clerk advised that the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (NPSG) had expressed its intention to meet with developers, stating that in his view this referred to developers who had approached the NPSG. The Chairman advised that as there were three Parish Council members that sit on the Steering Group, that the way forward could be that the Parish Council look at what the Steering Group are doing initially. The Chairman asked whether himself and the Vice Chairman could join the NPSG, making 5 Parish Councillors, in attendance when the meetings with developers were held, and then report back to Parish Council. The Clerk advised, that the Chairman and Vice Chairman were 'Ex Officio' Members of all Parish Council Committees, and you could consider the NPSG a 'de-facto' committee.

The PFO confirmed that the NPSG had expressed its intention to meet with developers who are interested, both those whose sites will be included in the Local Plan and those that aren't, and that the reason for this is that the NPSG want to be as inclusive as possible and also take into account that the Neighbourhood Plan might extend beyond the period of the Local Plan, and that the Local Plan will be reviewed every 5 years. If, at such a review, it is decided that there is a greater need for houses than those included in the Local Plan, then the Steering Group (by way of the Neighbourhood Plan) would have wanted to have thought about this beforehand. The PFO confirmed this would not be a commitment to any developer, but about being open and having the discussion, and the guidance recommends that the NP groups engage with developers and land owners at an early stage in the neighbourhood plan process.

Cllr Mrs Jackman stated that the Parish Council has a duty to the community of North Weald Bassett, and suggested that the village hall should be hired, and members of the Steering Group, Parish Council, and members of the community should all be present to hear what any developer has to say. It should be one meeting at which everybody hears the same thing with any interested developers being given a specific time to address those present. Cllr Clegg stated that this was an excellent idea which was in fact discussed at length at a NPSG meeting, however the SG felt that with the Local Plan being progressed at this time, and considering the stage it is at, any public meeting would not be conducive to a succinct and managed event, possibly causing confusion with local residents. The PFO advised that the NPSG had agreed that any meeting with developers would follow a strict schedule and set questions which would be uniform for each developer, and that these meetings would be held over 1 or 2 days.

The Chairman suggested that a suitable way forward would be for himself plus one other councillor to attend any meetings the SG held with developers, which would result in five Parish Council members being party to the meetings, thereby ensuring all interested parties were involved. Cllr Mrs Jackman stated that this would not allow the community to be involved, and that they had a right to hear what was going on. The Clerk advised that the NPSG was there to represent the community, and that in light of the consultation fatigue currently being experienced by this Parish, she felt this was the most appropriate way forward at this time. This could of course be expanded to involve the community in the future at a more suitable time.

Cllr Blanks stated that generally speaking Parish Councils haven't been encouraged to speak with developers previously with all sorts of warnings coming from the District Council, perhaps because of fettering themselves, however a month or two ago it was discovered that Chigwell Parish Council had put forward plans for a hub, costing £6.5m, paid for by two developers, which seems to be a very clear indication that the Parish Council had been speaking quite seriously with developers. Councillors have had presentations from three or four developers over the past year or so, and Cllr Blanks confirmed he found them very interesting and did not fetter himself, and that he was very keen to speak to anybody who wanted to speak to him or the Parish Council about any developments.

Cllr Tyler stated he agreed with Cllr Blanks in that all interested developers should be spoken to so there is a concise opinion across the board, giving the example that by 2040 30% of cars will be electric and these type of factors need to be considered in any new development. Cllr Tyler stated that he also agreed with Cllr Mrs Jackman in that there should be a public consultation at some time, but that at this particular time 5 Parish Council members sitting in with the Steering Group is the way forward. This will ensure the Parish Council is kept informed.

The PFO stated that whilst she understood what Cllr Mrs Jackman was saying, there is a degree of managing expectations and understanding, and many residents in the Parish would require a great deal of explanation before any discussion with developers as they may not understand where in the process, or in fact what process, this was related to. So at this stage, it was essential this was managed properly in a private setting.

Cllr Stallan advised that there would be no further consultation after this Regulation 19 consultation, and his concern was that members of the public would attend a public meeting with developers thinking sites were up for further discussion. In addition, Councillors must represent their electors, and his concern was that going forward there may be a piece in a letter to the inspector from a developer that says 'we met with the Parish Council'. This may give weight to a developers argument. Once such a statement is put a writing, words can say a lot as it may imply that the Parish Council supports said developer. The Clerk stated that she fully understood Cllr Stallan's concerns, but that national policy actively encourages the Parish Council to liaise with developers, and that on the other side of the coin she didn't want developers saying they tried to meet with the Parish Council but they were not interested. Cllr Blanks stated that whatever a developer says to an inspector is nothing to do with the Parish Council, and that the inspector will make up their own

mind. In addition, Cllr Blanks stated that the Parish Council would not need to contact each and every developer or land owner in the Parish, but that they would only need to talk to people who wanted to talk to the Parish Council, and that the Parish Council could easily advertise as such.

The Clerk advised that some months ago the District Council wanted to meet with the Parish Council to discuss local issues including a possible hub for the village, and this was an unusual request. But this request only came about because the Parish Council had expressed a desire for a local community hub. This opened up a dialogue which can only be a good thing regardless of who you are talking to. The Clerk stated that this was her recommendation.

Cllr Tyler advised that he agreed with Cllr Blanks and the Clerk in that dialogue with those developers who wishes to meet with the Parish Council could only be a good thing.

Cllr Clegg advised that some time back, it was agreed that members of the Parish Council (by way of the Neighbourhood Plan Sub Committee) would oversee the NPSG, and that in this instance, with the Chairman and one other Councillor, this would be the best way forward at this time.

The Chairman **PROPOSED** that the Parish Council did not meet with developers, but that this is left to the NPSG upon which three Councillors already sit, but with the addition of himself and one other Councillor sitting in on the process. This was **SECONDED** by Cllr Stallan. A vote was taken, the result of which was as follows:

7 -For  
2 - Against

[Cllr Stallan left the meeting]

### **C17.154 EPPING FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL LOCAL PLAN - REGULATION 19 CONSULTATION**

Councillors noted that on 14th December 2017, Epping Forest District Council approved their Submission Version of the Local Plan for the Epping Forest District. The Local Plan sets out the strategy for meeting the District's needs from 2011 up to 2033, which includes housing, employment and infrastructure. A period of public consultation (known as the pre-submission Regulation 19 consultation) began on 18th December 2017 and will end at 5pm on 29th January 2018.

The main body of the agenda included detailed information concerning the Regulation 19 consultation, in that it related to the 'Tests of Soundness'. Councillors were asked to consider if, in their opinion, the submission version of the Local Plan met this test, i.e. that it is:

*1. Positively prepared – the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development;*

**2. Justified** – the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence;

**3. Effective** – the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities; and

**4. Consistent with national policy** – the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework.

A full copy (including electronic links) of the Local Plan documents had been provided for Councillors for review prior to the meeting. The PFO had spent considerable time reviewing the documents, and provided Councillors with a summary of some of the main points in the plan, including:

- Half the Districts working residents commute out of the district for work, the largest proportion going to London.
- North Weald Airfield is classed as one of the main employment sites within the District.
- District residents most commonly travel to work using a car or van, following the pattern for Essex.
- The successful implementation of the plan depends upon a range for agencies and organisations as well as the private sector and developers.
- Under the duty to co-operate banner, Cooperation should be a continuous process of engagement from initial thinking through to implementation resulting in a final position where plans are in place to provide the land and infrastructure necessary to support current and projected future levels of development.
- One of the local plan objectives is to locate new development where there are the greatest opportunities for utilising public transport and cycling and walking instead of private car use.
- Smaller sites have been identified for development before larger sites, as they are less likely to depend on the provision of strategic infrastructure.
- In determining sites, development around Harlow was prioritised, then the council has taken account of the previous consultation responses which considered that new housing should be distributed across the district.
- It is expected that all new development will maximise densities on housing sites.
- If over a three year period the housing delivery rate is less than 75%, the council will undertake a partial review of the plan. In undertaking the review, the council will ensure that the potential allocation of additional housing sites will not prejudice delivery of the infrastructure required by the plan
- Broad density ranges are set (30-50 dph for large villages). The Plan considers density appropriate to the location taking into account relevant factors.....including transport and social infrastructure.
- Place shaping policy provides for sustainable movement and access to local and strategic designations (including rail, bus and pedestrians, cycling).
- There will be a Latton Priory masterplan, North Weald Airfield masterplan, and North Weald Bassett masterplan.
- EFDC will 'oversee' the production of strategic masterplans through the developer forums. Strategic masterplans will be produced by the landowners / promoters of

allocated sites, in partnership with the council and relevant stakeholders (inc parish councils).

- EFDC will establish a Quality Review panel.
- The provision of sustainable transport options together with a significant modal shift from car to non car use (including walking, cycling and public transport) are central to the successful growth of the Garden Town
- Council aspires to see 60% of journeys to and from the garden town communities to be made by non car modes
- Policy SP4 - ensure the provision of integrated and sustainable transport systems that put walking, cycling and public transit networks and connections at the heart of growth in the area to create a step change in modal shift through providing for and encouraging more sustainable travel patterns.

The PFO stated that with regard to the four tests of soundness, and after reviewing the Local Plan documents, she was unable to confirm to the Parish Council that the necessary and required infrastructure to support sustainable growth in the three villages that make up the Parish had been secured. She stated that Local Plan documents, including the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, did not confirm in detail how the necessary infrastructure would be funded, by whom, or whether in fact it is actually even going to happen. Members noted that in terms infrastructure needs, the Local Plan had split these into three categories:

- Critical - it must happen in order for development to proceed
- Essential - it is necessary to mitigate impacts arising from the development
- Desirable - it is required for sustainable growth to achieve good place making objectives...but would not prevent or delay the delivery of further development.

Members noted the following 'interventions' that were set out in the Infrastructure delivery schedule:

- *Improved bus services between Epping and North Weald Bassett, including opportunity to convert the disused Epping – Ongar line into a bus rapid transport line to North Weald Bassett and future extension to Ongar, and potential Park and Ride at North Weald Bassett.* Classed as 'Essential'. Cost - Unknown. Funding gap - Unknown. Notes - Feasibility work required.
- *Explore the potential and viability of new bus services and increased frequency of existing bus services to connect key settlements.* Classed as 'Essential'. Cost - Unknown. Funding gap - Unknown.
- *Installation of Real Time Travel Information at train stations and bus stops across the District.* Classed as 'Desirable'. The Parish Council had advised this would be critical to ensure trust in a public transport system. Phasing - Unknown. Notes - Initial cost estimate provided by ECC - costs depend on number of interventions and may be refined accordingly.
- *641 sqm additional GP floorspace across the Harlow strategic sites.* Classed as 'Essential'. Delivery Phasing - to be considered further by CCG.
- *Reference Latton Priory - Minor upgrades to Junction 7 to provide access to Latton Priory and improvements to B1393.* Classed as 'Essential'. Notes - Project scoped and fully costed. If funding is not available from Road Investment Strategy 2 the cost will need to be borne by developers.
- For North Weald - only one 'Critical' item - *Local upgrades to wastewater network infrastructure.* Cost - Unknown. Notes - Anticipated that developers would meet

the cost of local upgrades in accordance with the charging schedule proposed by Defra.

- Most of the open space provision for the Parish Council is classed as 'Desirable'.
- Thornwood, which is in-between two massive areas of development, i.e. Latton Priory and Epping, has no highway infrastructure suggested at all.

The PFO advised that the feedback from many residents is that generally they are accepting of development, however it was essential in their minds that the appropriate infrastructure was planned for and secured before the development progressed. Furthermore, she advised that she could not confirm to the Parish Council that this was the case. She stated that there was nothing concrete in the Local Plan or supporting documents that confirmed the necessary infrastructure had been secured.

Members noted the following points from the National Planning Policy Framework:

*There are three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental.*

●● **an economic role** – contributing to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth and innovation; and by identifying and coordinating development requirements, including the provision of infrastructure;

●● **a social role** – supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community's needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being; and

●● **an environmental role** – contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; and, as part of this, helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently, minimise waste and pollution, and mitigate and adapt to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy.

Para 152. Local planning authorities should seek opportunities to achieve each of the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development, and net gains across all three. Significant adverse impacts on any of these dimensions should be avoided and, wherever possible, alternative options which reduce or eliminate such impacts should be pursued. Where adverse impacts are unavoidable, measures to mitigate the impact should be considered. Where adequate mitigation measures are not possible, compensatory measures may be appropriate.

Para 154. Local Plans should be aspirational but realistic. They should address the spatial implications of economic, social and environmental change. Local Plans should set out the opportunities for development and clear policies on what will or will not be permitted and where. Only policies that provide a clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal should be included in the plan.

Para 157. Crucially, Local Plans should plan positively for the development and infrastructure required in the area to meet the objectives, principles and policies of this Framework;

Planning Practice Guidance states that where the deliverability of critical infrastructure is uncertain then the plan should address the consequences of this, including possible

contingency arrangements and alternative strategies. The detail concerning planned infrastructure provision can be set out in a supporting document such as an infrastructure delivery programme that can be updated regularly. However the key infrastructure requirements on which delivery of the plan depends should be contained in the Local Plan itself. A Local Plan is an opportunity for the local planning authority to set out a positive vision for the area, but the plan should also be realistic about what can be achieved and when (including in relation to infrastructure). This means paying careful attention to providing an adequate supply of land, identifying what infrastructure is required and how it can be funded and brought on stream at the appropriate time;

Planning Practice Guidance states under the question 'How detailed should a Local Plan be?' the following: 'While the content of Local Plans will vary depending on the nature of the area and issues to be addressed, all Local Plans should be as focused, concise and accessible as possible. They should concentrate on the critical issues facing the area – including its development needs – and the strategy and opportunities for addressing them, paying careful attention to both deliverability and viability. Where sites are proposed for allocation, sufficient detail should be given to provide clarity to developers, local communities and other interests about the nature and scale of development (addressing the ‘what, where, when and how’ questions).

Cllr Mrs Jackman stated that much of the infrastructure was not in the gift of the District Council to provide, for example health facilities and education, and asked what either the CCG or ECC has committed to provide. The PFO advised that those particular bodies had identified what requirement for health provision and education was needed according to the quantum of growth, however the documents had not identified any undertaking from the body to confirm they would provide this.

Cllr Clegg stated that after reviewing the documentation provided, at best the infrastructure information is bland, and at worst is nonexistent or non deliverable, giving the example that the idea is that the Epping Ongar Railway will be turned into some sort of fast bus route. EFDC do not own this line, and it is unclear if this is even a reasonable possibility at this stage, or whether or not discussions had even begun. Cllr Clegg stated that he was leaning quite vociferously toward saying the plan was unsound. This may well frighten a few people from the point of view of a veiled threat of double the housing. Cllr Clegg stated that he believed the Parish Council needed to say it as it is, and that is that the infrastructure provision is simply not there.

Cllr Eldridge supported Cllr Clegg, stating that the infrastructure plans are practically nonexistent, and that he couldn't see how the Parish Council could find the plan sound without this.

Cllr Blanks stated that it was difficult to argue at all with what Cllr Clegg had stated concerning infrastructure, and that his objections were a little more basic in that the first tangible element of this started in July 2012 when EFDC undertook their first consultation entitled 'Planning our Future - Issues and Options'. Even at this early stage, North Weald was treated differently from all other areas in the district. Other areas had all their own precise identity, however we had North Weald, North Weald Airfield, Thornwood Common, and a large part of the parish simply designated as land around Harlow. The responses to the consultation were analysed by EFDC and

published on 10th June 2013, where the most significant overall response was that new development should take place proportionately across the District so as to not change the character of any of the individual areas. However, some of the more affluent areas such as Buckhurst Hill and Chigwell expressed a view that the majority of development should take place on North Weald Airfield rather than on the edge of their own areas. It was clear at this stage that there was a bias in favour of development at North Weald, even though the Council leader maintained for a long time that development would be proportionate across the district. The Foreword of the submission version of the Local Plan states that 'we have been clear all along that we will do our best to follow what you told us', however it does not mention proportionality. North Weald Bassett is getting 25% of the development for the district, which is unfair, undeliverable and in his view, unsound.

Cllr Clegg stated that he recalled that the Thornwood Action Group had undertaken an assessment and felt that Thornwood could proportionally accommodate roughly 60 homes so that it did not change the character of the village. Roughly a year ago, he along with members of the Parish Council and Steering Group, met with officers of EFDC where it was stated that 'EFDC doesn't work on proportionality', and 'EFDC doesn't work on fairness'.

The Clerk reminded members that the question they needed to ask themselves as part of this consultation is whether or not the Plan meets the test of soundness. It was stated that the Parish Council generally has been extremely supportive of the Local Plan process, and it is extremely disappointing that the infrastructure planning is so lacking in this plan. The Clerk advised that whatever the decision of this Council, there remains the very real threat of double the housing, however this should not justify the Parish Council finding the plan 'sound' if it has identified clear deficiencies within it. In effect, the Parish Council were caught between a rock and a hard place.

Cllr Tyler stated that in his opinion the Local Plan was lacking on plans for infrastructure, and that it was highly likely that the additional housing would come our way after 2033 anyway, stating that the threat had been issued to bully us. Cllr Tyler continued, stating that Councillors were there to represent the people of this Parish and that the Council could get it right or get it wrong. Cllr Tyler stated he would represent the people of this Parish and do what he felt was right, stating he believed this should be challenged. Cllr Blanks stated that one of the District Council members said at the 14th December 2017 meeting that that the District were being asked to vote with a gun to their head.

The Clerk advised that the threat of additional housing and the new calculation is a very real threat and should not be taken lightly, and that Councillors would need to reconcile themselves with the decision they make in terms of letting something go through if they feel it is inadequate.

Cllr Clegg again reiterated that he felt the Parish Council needed to stand up and be counted even in light of the veiled threat, asking what happens if the Government changes.

Cllr Eldridge stated that his conscience simply could not accept that the plan was sound, even in the light of the threat of additional housing.

Cllr Mrs Godwin-Brown enquired as to what happens if the plan is found 'unsound' by the inspector, to which it was stated that the inspector would have an opportunity to view any comments made as part of this Regulation 19 consultation, and that there were three options. Firstly, the plan could be found sound, secondly the plan could have proposed modifications in order to find it sound, or thirdly it could be found unsound, in which case EFDC would need to start again with the new housing calculation being applied.

Cllr Blanks stated that in March 2017, there was a meeting of joint body encompassing Harlow, EFDC and East Herts Councils, during which Harlow stated two responses had been submitted in response to the Regulation 18 consultation, one of which was from the Portfolio Holder for the Environment who had indicated that Harlow Council objects to development to the west and south of Harlow unless, or until such time, that it has been demonstrated that transportation and infrastructure requirements can be delivered at a rate and scale necessary to meet the needs of the Harlow urban area.

The Chairman agreed that a member of the public could address the Council. The member of the public stated that it may well be that the issue of inadequate infrastructure was an issue not only for this Parish, but across the entire district, and that this perhaps should be given consideration in terms of the response.

A vote was taken in terms of whether or not in the opinion of the Parish Council, the submission version of the Local Plan met the four tests of soundness, and was by virtue 'sound', the result of which were as follows:

0 - For  
9 - Against

It was **AGREED** that the plan failed the following two tests of soundness with regard to inadequate infrastructure provision:

**1. Positively prepared** – the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development;

**4. Consistent with national policy** – the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework.

It was **AGREED** that a response to the consultation would be formulated on the basis of what was discussed and agreed at this meeting, and agreed by both the Clerk and Chairman prior to submitting to EFDC.

Date .....