

**CHELMSFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK**  
**Public Examination of the Core Strategy & Development Control**  
**Policies Development Plan Document & the Chelmsford Town**  
**Centre Area Action Plan Development Plan Document**  
**Notes of the Pre-Examination Meeting held on Tuesday 5 June 2007**

**Introductions**

The Inspector introduced himself and confirmed that he had been appointed to conduct the independent Examination into the Soundness of the Chelmsford Borough Council's Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document and the Chelmsford Town Centre Area Action Plan Development Plan Document.

**Purpose of the PEM**

- 1 The Inspector confirmed that the oral Examination into the Council's submitted Core Strategy & Development Control Development Plan Document (DPD) will open at 10.00am on Tuesday 11 September 2007 at the Civic Centre, Duke Street, Chelmsford. The separate Examination into the Chelmsford Town Centre Action Area Plan DPD will commence at a date to be arranged following the publication of the Inspector's binding report on the Core Strategy (please see below). He said that suggestions made during the Regulation 31 consultation on the Area Action Plan DPD, which were published by the Council in April 2007 – *Alternative Development Sites & Boundary Changes* – will be dealt with at this second Examination.
2. He explained that the purpose of the Pre-Examination Meeting (PEM) was to provide an opportunity for procedural and administrative matters relating to the Core Strategy & Development Control Policies Examination to be explained and discussed, together with the form and content of the programme of hearings. It represented an opportunity for respondents to raise any issues that may be causing concern. The Inspector emphasised that this was not the time **for detailed discussion of the merits of the matters to be considered at the Examination**. He confirmed that notes of the PEM would be sent to all those who have made representations on the 2 Development Plan Documents. The Inspector said he hoped to clarify any queries and indicated there would be an opportunity for questions towards the end of the meeting.

**The Inspectors' role and further information**

3. The Inspector explained that his task is **to consider the soundness of the DPDs**, based upon the tests of soundness set out at paragraphs 4.23 and 4.24 of Planning Policy Statement 12<sup>1</sup>, *Local Development Frameworks* (PPS12). Further details of these tests and the Examination

---

<sup>1</sup> Copies of the Government's PPSs will be available to view in the Examination Library, or on the ODPM website at: <http://www.odpm.gov.uk/index.asp?id=1143803>

process in general, are contained in The Planning Inspectorate's booklet *Development Plans Examination – A Guide to the Process of Assessing the Soundness of Development Plan Documents*<sup>2</sup> (particularly section 1.4). An overview of the new process and a 'frequently asked questions' (FAQs) page can be viewed at the websites listed below together with the Planning Inspectorates Brief Guide<sup>3</sup>.

4. The Inspector explained that, following the close of the Examination he would prepare a report for the Council with conclusions and any changes required to, initially, the Core Strategy & Development Control Policies DPD. The report will not review in detail the content of every individual representation but he confirmed that he will concentrate on the main issues they raise. The report will be binding on the Council, which will then move to formally adopt the DPD, changed as necessary to reflect the decisions in his report. He said that the report and its recommendations will have implications for the matters to be considered at subsequent Examinations into other DPDs. He said that his report on the Chelmsford Town Centre Area Action Plan DPD will be delivered later following the hearings and his consideration of the representations made in respect to that document.

### **Council's introductions and Procedural Questions for the Council**

5. The Inspector then invited the Council to introduce the main members of their team. (see Appendix A)
6. The Inspector then asked the Council a series of procedural questions. He asked whether it had met the statutory procedural requirements set out in Regulations relating to the submission versions of both Development Plan Documents comprising the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies and the Chelmsford Town Centre Area Action Plan?
7. Mr Stebbing, on behalf of the Council, confirmed that it had met and satisfied the statutory procedural requirements set out in the Regulations for both DPD's. He said that the Council had decided to carry out an additional consultation under Regulation 32 on site specific representations made in respect to the Core Strategy. This would be undertaken between 26 June and 7 August (see paragraphs. 4.4/4.5 of the Council's Pre-Examination Statement BD/CFD/085).
8. The Inspector then asked whether the Government Office had been consulted regarding the both DPD's General Conformity with Regional Policy and, if so, what was the outcome (bearing in mind RSS is still emerging)?
9. Mr Stebbing confirmed that the Government Office for the East of England

---

<sup>2</sup> Available to view in the Examination Library or at:

[http://www.planning-inspectorate.gov.uk/pins/appeals/local\\_dev/develop\\_plan\\_docs.pdf](http://www.planning-inspectorate.gov.uk/pins/appeals/local_dev/develop_plan_docs.pdf)

<sup>3</sup> [http://www.planning-inspectorate.gov.uk/pins/appeals/local\\_dev/Soundness\\_of\\_DPD.htm](http://www.planning-inspectorate.gov.uk/pins/appeals/local_dev/Soundness_of_DPD.htm); and [http://www.planning-inspectorate.gov.uk/pins/appeals/local\\_dev/FAQs-general%202.pdf](http://www.planning-inspectorate.gov.uk/pins/appeals/local_dev/FAQs-general%202.pdf)

(GO-East) had been consulted at each stage in the preparation of both DPD's. GO-East had indicated, at each stage, that both documents are in general conformity with the emerging Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS 14). He also confirmed that the East of England Regional Assembly (EERA) had been consulted at each stage and, it too, was of the view that both DPD are in general conformity with RSS 14.

10. The Inspector then asked whether the Local Planning Authority had conducted its own self-assessment on soundness? Mr Stebbing confirmed that it had and that the relevant documents were published at the Submission stage, alongside the DPD's

### **The Role of the Programme Officer**

11. The Inspector then introduced Andrea Copsey who has been appointed Programme Officer (PO) for the Examination. He explained that, during the Examination she will be at the Examination office and can be contacted on the telephone number and e-mail address that appears on the letter of invitation to the PEM. He said that she can be contacted via telephone and e-mail even when she is not there in person. The Inspector explained that Mrs Copsey is acting as an impartial officer of the Examination under his direction.
12. He explained that the main tasks of the Programme Officer are to liaise with all parties to ensure the smooth running of the Examination, to organise the Examination Programme, to ensure that all documents received both before and during the Examination are recorded and distributed, and to keep the Examination Library. Copies of all the Examination documents, including the representation forms and written submissions, will be available in the Library that Mrs Copsey will be putting together. Both a hard copy library and a web based version will be available.
13. He said that it would be possible to view a regularly-updated programme on the Council's web site at <http://www.chelmsford.gov.uk/index.cfm?articleid=13328>. Any other procedural questions or other matters that anyone wishes to raise outside of the Examination should be made through the PO.

### **Number and scope of representations**

14. The Inspector went on to say that the Council published a Regulation 31 Statement in February 2007, which set out the number of representations received and the main issues raised by respondents. The Council had informed him that a revised Regulation 31 Statement was published in late May 2007 which has taken into account additional representations and amendments to referencing. The Inspector understood that these changes emerged during further processing of the representations. The Council has confirmed that all respondents affected by changes to referencing have been notified in writing.

15. The Inspector said that, taking into account the revisions, 1286 representations were received by the Council following the submission of the Core Strategy/DC Policies DPD. Breaking them down: 930 of these were to the Core Strategy (Sections 1, 2, 3 & 5) of which 731 were made on the basis that this part is unsound. These representations cover most aspects of the Core Strategy and some matters that are omitted from it. 293 representations were made to the Development Control Policies (Section 4) of which 200 find this section unsound. Of the 1286 representations received, 29 did not specify which part of the document the responses relate to, 28 were made to the Proposals Map and 6 to the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment.
16. The Inspector said that the Summary of Main Issues set out in the original and revised Regulation 31 Statement seem a fair précis of the points made in representations.

### **The Nature of the Examination**

17. The Inspector went on to say that there have been relatively few Examinations so far following the still quite new procedures set out in the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and subsequent Regulations.
18. The new Examination format is a significant departure from previous Local Inquiries into objections to a local plan. He said that the Examination will concentrate on the soundness of the Core Strategy, having regard to the representations made.
19. **The Inspector explained that his starting point will be that the Core Strategy is sound unless it is shown to be otherwise by the evidence presented in writing or at the hearings. Those seeking changes must demonstrate why the DPD is unsound by reference to one or more of the tests of soundness and say what they think should be done to make it sound.** He said that he is required to consider all representations made to the submission DPDs but only insofar as they relate to the tests of soundness. Therefore, unlike with the old system, the report does not have to deal with each and every objection.

### **Methods of considering representations: hearings and written statements**

20. The Inspector said that respondents have already indicated whether they wish to attend to discuss their representations or to have their views considered in written form. **He emphasised that both methods will carry the same weight and he would have equal regard to views put orally or in writing.** He said attendance at a hearing session will only be useful and helpful, if participants wish and need to participate in a debate. In addition to those who have indicated they wish to appear, he said that he may invite others to attend to assist the debate. The

Inspector then, again, referred to the Council's "Summary of Main Issues" documents, which he endorsed as a helpful guide to the main topics he will need to consider in his report. He explained that he will focus on those that are most significant. He said he will rely on the Council to pick up the many helpful points contained within the representations that do not go the question of soundness.

21. **The Inspector went on to say that for those wishing to appear** at the Examination to amplify their representation, this oral part of the Examination will progress by way of a series of hearing sessions. He said that he will chair a separate hearing for each of the main topics identified. Should he decide it necessary, he may hold more than one hearing under a given topic. The hearings will follow an inquisitorial, rather than adversarial, approach, focusing on the main issues identified. They will be quite informal. Those attending may bring with them professional experts but there will be no formal presentation of evidence or cross-examination. Barristers and solicitors, if present, will be treated as part of their team. The Inspector said he will identify a series of matters and questions on which he would like participants to focus within each topic. He said he will issue an agenda for each session a week or two before the opening of the Examination.
22. **The Inspector said that when he opens any hearing** he will make a few brief comments on the matters he wants covered, then he will invite individuals to make their contribution in response to the points he has raised. He will draw those present into the discussion in such a way as to enable him to gain the information necessary to come to a firm conclusion and decision on the matters at issue. There will be an opportunity within each discussion to ask questions of the other side. He said he will endeavour to progress the Examination in an effective and efficient manner, keeping participants focused on the matters that will determine whether the Core Strategy can be considered sound, with or without any modifications.
23. **The Inspector explained that, whether participants intended to attend a hearing to amplify their views or rely on a written statement they would have an opportunity to amplify their representation if they so wished.** He emphasised that participants should concentrate on the tests of soundness and be clear about what should be changed. He said that "sound" is not a technical term – it has its ordinary meanings of "well founded", "trustworthy" or "showing good judgement". Participants will need to remember that the Inspector will not know what representations were made at the earlier stages of preparation of the Core Strategy – he has noticed that some of the representations refer to those earlier representations. If they are pertinent they will need to be summarised for him.

## **The Examination Programme**

24. The Inspector said that a draft Programme of hearings will be sent out

with the Notes of the PEM and will be put on the Council's website. If respondents wish to appear and consider their representations would not be adequately considered through that programme of sessions that have been drawn up please contact Mrs Copsey. He said that participants may decide that such matters could be addressed in a written submission but, failing that, he would consider how best to accommodate their wishes.

25. He made it clear that it will be up to individual participants to check the progress of the Examination, either on the website or with the PO, and to ensure that they are present at the correct time.
26. The hearings sessions will normally start at 10.00am and 2.00pm each day. A short break will be taken mid morning and mid afternoon. Lunch will be taken about 1.00pm.

## **Examination Documentation**

### **Reference Documents**

27. The Inspector explained that various Reference Documents will be assembled in the Examination Library. These will include the Regional Spatial Strategy, Planning Policy Guidance Notes (PPGs) and Planning Policy Statements (PPSs), Background Topic Papers and any other documents that the parties are likely to need to refer to. Accordingly, parties should **NOT** attach extracts of these documents to their statements as they are already Examination documents. A list of the Council's Reference Documents is available on its website at: <http://www.chelmsford.gov.uk/index.cfm?articleid=13328>

### **Timetable for Submission of other documents**

#### **Background Topic Papers**

28. The Inspector said that it would be no surprise to the Council that he will require them to produce a series of Background Topic Papers on the main key policy and core policy topics in the Core Strategy. The papers should summarise the evidence base and, in effect explain why the Core Strategy says what it does. He said that the Council may wish to prepare these so that they also serve as its Core statements of evidence on each policy topic. The Inspector said he would like these to be available to everyone by the **13<sup>th</sup> July** at the latest. An electronic version should also be made available on the Council's website.

#### **Statements of Common Ground**

29. The Inspector said he hoped that discussions would already be under way between the Council's officers and those seeking changes to the Core Strategy and, if not, that they start swiftly. He explained that, in this way misunderstandings can be resolved and facts agreed at an early stage. Where possible Statements of Common Ground should be agreed and

submitted to him. These Statements can provide opportunities to save time, cost, remove duplication and reduce the amount of paper.

Statements for the hearing sessions can then be shorter, focusing on the key issues which separate the parties. The Inspector said he is looking to those seeking changes to take the initiative, prepare first drafts and arrange discussions with the Council's officers. This work should commence now, with the aim of completing the Statements by **28<sup>th</sup> of August**, sending them to the PO and arranging with the Council to have them put on their website.

### **Hearing Statements and amplified written representations**

30. The Inspector asked for hearing statements and amplified written representations to be submitted to the Programme Officer no later than **3 August** for those topics being dealt with in the first week of hearings and the **10 August** for those being dealt with in the second and subsequent weeks. He appreciated that this timing will in most cases be interrupted by summer holidays, but this is unavoidable if the hearings are to start as timetabled. The Inspector confirmed it would help him greatly if participants could make their points clearly and succinctly - unnecessary detail and repetition should be avoided. He emphasised that it is the quality of the reasoning that carries weight, not the bulk of the documents! For the most part participants have indicated the precise changes that they are seeking in order to make the DPD sound. Where precise changes have not already been indicated in representations these should also be sent to the Programme Officer by **3 or 10 August**. The Inspector made it clear that this is **not** an opportunity to raise new matters, or revise a submitted representation by, for example making a representation on another test of soundness. There is no need for verbatim quotations from the DPD or other sources of policy guidance. Also it is important to remember that the Examination is not the place to spring surprises. Nothing should be before the Examination which has not been raised in the previous consultations on the Issues and Options and Preferred Options documents except insofar as new national and regional policy is concerned.

31. The Inspector reiterated that the Examination starts from the basis that the DPD is **sound unless otherwise shown**. Essentially he needs to know the following from those submitting statements:

- What part of the DPD is unsound?
- Which test(s), set out in paragraphs 4.23 and 4.24 of PPS12, does it fail?
- Why does it fail?
- How can the DPD be made sound?
- What is the precise change/wording that you are seeking?

### **Council's Statements (on issues not covered in Core Proofs) for both hearings and written representations**

32. The Inspector said that these should be submitted at the very latest by **24th August** for topics dealt with in the first week of Hearings and by the **31 August** for the second and subsequent weeks of Hearings. They should set out why the Local Planning Authority considers the DPD to be sound in the relevant respect and why the changes sought by other parties would make it less sound or unsound.

**The Inspector explained that his final list of questions for discussion on each main topic would be issued shortly afterwards.**

### **Numbers of copies and target length of documents required**

33. The Inspector said that those appearing at Examination hearings should ensure sufficient copies of all statements are provided to the Programme Officer for issuing to each participant, plus four (for the Inspector, Council and Library). For example, if 4 people are listed for a hearing, then the PO will require 8 copies (one of which should be unbound to allow for any necessary copying). Four copies of statements for written representations (one unbound) should be submitted. None of the statements should exceed 3,000 words, be they for a hearing session or amplification of written representations. **He emphasised that any submissions longer than this would be returned for editing.** Some appended reference material will be accepted **but only where essential to the points being made.** It should not contain extracts from any publication that is already before the Examination, such as the Reference Documents and nationally available Government guidance. Any appendices should have a contents page and be paginated throughout. Whilst the word limit does not include text in appendices, **they should respect the aim of succinctness.** The parts of any appended material that is particularly pertinent and on which particular reliance is made should be clearly referenced in the statement. If possible, an electronic version of the statement should also be submitted so that it can be included on the Examination website.
34. Each statement/piece of paper submitted in advance of, or at the Examination, will be accepted only if it is clearly marked, **at the top, right hand corner**, with the relevant respondent reference and appropriate matter number, e.g. Matter 2/35 for respondent 35's statement on Matter 2. The Council's documents should be referenced CBC, followed by the matter and policy number, e.g. CBC/Matter 7-CP10. Reference Documents to be numbered RD01, RD02, etc.
35. Statements should take into account any national and regional policy developments since the close of the submission period for representations.

### **Site visits**

36. The Inspector said he will be making a tour of the District to familiarise himself fully with the area. He said that he already has some familiarity with parts of the District from planning appeal work. He expected to make his tour unaccompanied, before during and after the Examination. Should

he need to make an accompanied site, because he is unable to view the land from a public vantage-point, he would make arrangements, through the PO, with the land owner and the Council. He anticipated such instances would be rare.

### **Close of the Examination and submission of Inspector's Report**

37. The Inspector said he would not close the Examination until he had almost completed his report. This would allow him to seek further information if necessary. He said he would complete his binding report as soon as possible after the last session of the Examination.

### **Provisional "Matters" for discussion**

38. The Inspector said he thought it would be helpful if he indicated **the Matters on which he anticipated he will conduct joint hearings or "round table sessions" together with some of the sub-issues to be debated.** He said he would welcome comments from participants, especially if there are other major topics that need to be examined in that way. He asked that suggestions should be sent to the Programme Officer before 5pm Monday (11 June). **This has been extended to 5pm Monday 18 June to allow time for participants not present at the PEM to respond. He then outlined the following matters:**

- Firstly, given the main requirements set out in the core strategy for the region, is the proposed spatial distribution of housing/employment/shopping proposed in the Core Strategy (CS) DPD sound? The CS relies for more than a quarter of its new housing to be provided in 2 new neighbourhoods to the north of the District. What would be the implications of the non-or late availability of that land and the necessary new infrastructure? Is that land to the NW still required if Broomfield Hospital's employment has peaked? Is the Core Strategy capable of being adapted to meet the housing target(s) if the land or infrastructure does not come forward in time? Should other land be made available, if yes, where should it be sought? Would there be implications for the Green Belt - should the Core Strategy say more about that?
- Secondly, there are some **more general housing issues** including whether it is right to predicate growth in housing numbers on expansion of employment and transport improvements; also the sourcing, proportion and site thresholds for affordable housing. Are the assumptions right about the numbers of dwellings that can be predicted from urban intensification? What are the implications of the Special Policy Areas?
- Thirdly, where are the **extra jobs** envisaged in the East of England Plan to come from; and of what type will they be and where are they to be located? What do we know about employment trends and employment land availability in the District?

- Fourthly, how and when are improvements to **transport, flood defences and other necessary infrastructure** going to happen within the District as a whole? Are the proposals soundly based, affordable and capable of being in place in time to permit the main elements of the Core Strategy to be built? Does the Core Strategy put an unjustified burden on developers to provide for these and for social infrastructure?
- Fifthly, is the evidence base supporting the quantum, type and general location of extra **retail capacity** sufficiently robust and are the infrastructure requirements to support it affordable, practical and attainable within the envisaged timescale?

39. The Inspector said that a number of the foregoing issues, particularly those relating to infrastructure, have been touched upon at the Preliminary Meeting that he held on 16 May. He said that the Council produced a paper for that meeting and he expected it would be a starting point for the Council's response to the issues raised. He said, a copy of that paper and the correspondence which gave rise to it can be viewed on the Council's website:

<http://www.chelmsford.gov.uk/index.cfm?articleid=13328>.

## Finally

40. The Inspector emphasised:

- he would have equal regard to views put orally or in writing;
- the need for succinctness, respecting the letter and spirit of the 3,000 word limit on any necessary further submissions;
- the need to meet the target dates for further work;
- that any further submissions should focus on the Matters for Examination and the tests of soundness.

## **The Inspector then gave a List of the main relevant legislation and guidance that would form the basis of the Examination: It includes:**

- Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004
- The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004
- European Directive on Strategic Environmental Assessment (2001/42/EC)
- The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004
- Planning Policy Statement 12: Local Development Frameworks
- Creating Local development Frameworks: A Companion Guide to PPS12
- Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Documents
- Development Plans Examination – a Guide to the Process of Assessing the Soundness of Development plan Documents: published by The Planning Inspectorate

**The Inspector then asked if there were any questions.**

**Questions raised were as follows:**

**Paul Cronk, HBF:**

**Asked whether the background topic papers would include a more detailed housing trajectory, up to date provision and satisfy the requirements of PPS3?**

Derek Stebbing replied for CBC – He confirmed that it would and directed Mr Cronk to section 2 of the Council’s Reference Document BD/CFD/085. Mr Stebbing explained that this is a list of the Council’s ongoing, updating of the LDF Evidence Base.

As a supplementary question to that the Inspector asked Mr Stebbing whether the updated evidence would be available in time for those participants wishing to make amplified statements?

In reply Mr Stebbing said that all evidence listed in 2.1 of BD/CFD/085 was by way of **amplification** of existing Evidence Base documents. He felt it would not be essential for respondents to see these in advance of preparing amplified statements.

The Inspector, in another supplementary, asked if respondents thought that some of the additional evidence/research was pertinent to a point they intended to make, could they contact CBC to seek advice and clarification as to the relevance/availability of the emerging evidence?

Derek Stebbing replied that the Council would welcome such approaches.

**David Vicary, Melvin Dunbar for Wickford Development Agency**

Following on from the previous exchange Mr Vicary asked whether the new Evidence Base documents would be available before the start of the Examination hearings (ideally two weeks before)?

The Inspector said he felt sure that there was sufficient evidence/material/research in the public domain to enable respondents to prepare amplified statements by the issued deadlines (see paragraph 30). However if respondents thought that the additional evidence being worked on by the Council was critical to finalising a statement, he advised respondents to take up Mr Stebbing’s invitation to contact the Council. **(The Inspector has added the postscript that this will not be accepted as an excuse for late delivery of statements beyond the set deadlines.)**

Derek Stebbing said that the additional evidence listed in Section 2.1 of

BD/CFD/085, will be published when available. He re-stated his invitation to respondents to contact the Council if it is felt necessary to see the emerging studies/research.

### **Edmund Robb, Hamilton Bentley and Partners – Rettendon Site**

Asked whether he could submit a representation at this stage? The Inspector asked whether he meant, "submit a new representation." To which the answer was, yes.

The Inspector said, no, he was sure it was too late. He asked the Council to confirm that was its position.

Derek Stebbing confirmed that the Council would not be accepting any more representations to either DPD.

### **Wickford Development Company – Philip Smith (Land Use Consultants)**

Asked whether the Inspector would be holding any formal hearing sessions?

The Inspector said he had carefully considered the respondent's letter (24/5/07) asking for a formal hearing. He proposed to hold no formal hearings. He said that, if during an informal session he felt a more formal approach would be useful, he would be prepared to provide an opportunity for cross-examination in a formal setting. However, at the present time, he sees no reason to go down that route.

Subsequent questions:

The Inspector asked whether the Council would consider it necessary to have consultants present at sessions to answer questions relating to methodology and how evidence has been gathered etc?

Mr Stebbing CBC said, yes that could be arranged if necessary, but would require advance notice to organise their attendance. The longer the notice, the better.

### **Charles Planning Associates – Amanda Sutton**

Said that they had made representations under test 3 (Procedural tests) – when will these be considered in the programme?

The Inspector confirmed that they would be considered at the beginning of the Examination – Session 1

### **Michael Gallimore, Lovells (Prudential)**

Asked whether the Inspector would issue additional guidance on Regulation 32 before PEM?

Inspector – No. The Council had decided to carry out a consultation under Regulation 32 on alternative sites that had been put forward in representations to the CS.

Derek Stebbing (CBS) confirmed that details are given in paragraphs 4.4-4.5 of the Council's Pre-Examination Statement passed that day to the Inspector (Reference Document BD/CFD/085).

### **Brian Lingard, Brown Family and Others**

Asked when the new UCS would be published and whether it would accord with PPS3?

Derek Stebbing – replied that it is **NOT** a new study, it is an update, which addresses PPS3 and rolls the baseline to 31.3.07 – (see item 2.1 (iii) of BD/CFD/085). It will be available this month.

Further question by Mr Lingard – he asked whether a Sustainability Appraisal would be necessary on Alternative Development Sites?

Inspector replied that if a site would be strategic in its impact then, when considering it, one of the first questions he would ask is whether a Sustainability Appraisal had been carried out.

**The Inspector thanked those attending and closed the meeting at 10:55am.**

## Appendix A:

List of Chelmsford Borough Council Officers-see paragraph 5.

David Green BA Dip TP MRTPI - Director of Planning & Building Control

Derek Stebbing BA Dip EP MRTPI - Planning Policy Manager

Roger Estop BA MA (UD) MRTPI - Design & Development Co-ordination  
Manager

John Pollard BSocSC MSc CMILT - Principal Transport Planner

Jeremy Potter BSc MA MRTPI - Senior Planning Officer

Claire Stuckey MSc MRTPI - Senior Planning Officer

Paul MacBride BSc Dip TP MRTPI - Senior Planning Officer