

# Minutes



To: All Members of the Environment, Planning and Transport Cabinet Panel, Chief Executive, Chief Officers, All officers named for 'actions'

From: Legal, Democratic & Statutory Services  
Ask for: Stephanie Tarrant  
Ext: 25481

---

## ENVIRONMENT, PLANNING AND TRANSPORT CABINET PANEL, 7 SEPTEMBER 2017

### ATTENDANCE

### MEMBERS OF THE PANEL

D A Ashley (Chairman), D J Barnard, S Bedford, J Billing (substituted for A K Khan), S J Boulton, R C Deering, S J Featherstone, N A Hollinghurst, G McAndrew, A Stevenson (Vice-Chairman), J A West, A S B Walkington

Upon consideration of the agenda for the Environment, Planning and Transport Cabinet Panel meeting on 7 September 2017 as circulated, copy annexed, conclusions were reached and are recorded below:

*Note: No Declarations of interest were made.*

### PART I ('OPEN') BUSINESS

#### 1. MINUTES

- 1.1 The Minutes of the Cabinet Panel meeting held on 30 June 2017 were agreed.

#### 2. PUBLIC PETITIONS

- 2.1 There were no public petitions.

#### 3. BUS SERVICES ACT 2017

[Officer Contact: Matt Lale, Passenger Transport Manager, Tel: 01992 588633)

- 3.1 The Cabinet Panel reviewed a report which provided an update on the Bus Services Act 2017 and received a presentation at Panel from Steve Blackmore from the Department of Transport. The Presentation gave an overview of what the Bus Service Act 2017 could mean for the industry and passenger transport in Hertfordshire

### ACTION

**CHAIRMAN'S  
INITIALS**

.....

and can be viewed here: [Bus Services Act 2017 Presentation](#)

- 3.2 Members noted the three main elements of the act, which were franchising, partnership and open data ticketing.
- 3.3 In response to a Members question, it was confirmed that other than franchising all of the other powers were available for the County Council to move forwards with.
- 3.4 Members heard that an Enhanced Partnership Scheme would not be able to proceed if sufficient numbers of operators objected. Members queried what safeguards were in place to stop a multi-operational group from voting against the scheme and it was advised that any company with subsidiary companies would still be treated as one vote. It was added that additional regulations were due to be published.
- 3.5 Members noted that some of the measures to encourage bus use were approached negatively e.g. increasing car park prices and it was suggested that positive measures could be used e.g. subsidising services.
- 3.6 Members discussed the process for the Local Authority to be able to take over licencing from the traffic commissioner and it was advised that it was a straightforward process. Members heard that with the Enhanced Partnership Scheme the traffic commissioner would need to exchange the relevant data with the Local Authority, who would then take over the function.
- 3.7 In response to a Member question in relation to how the department for Transport would measure the success of the Act, Members heard that the Act was designed to act as a tool kit for Local Authorities and operators to improve bus services. Members were advised that if the mechanisms were not quite right, there would be the ability to change them in the future to ensure maximum benefits.
- 3.8 Members commented on the lack of bus connectivity within Hertfordshire and it was noted that the Act did not enable powers to enforce bus routes, as the bus network would remain deregulated. However, it was noted that the Act would enable the enforcement of zonal ticketing, so that passengers could use one ticket for the duration of their journey. Members discussed that the single ticketing system should also extend to the rail network, however, it was noted that the powers in this Act only related to buses.
- 3.9 In response to a Member question, it was noted that the Act did not have any implications on disabled access on buses as this was largely covered by different legislation.
- 3.10 The Cabinet Panel noted that the expected additional regulations

**CHAIRMAN'S  
INITIALS**

.....

would be important in terms of the next steps for the Authority and that this item would return to the Panel early next year.

**Conclusion:**

3.11 The Cabinet Panel noted the report and presentation.

**4. GOVIA THAMESLINK RAILWAY PERFORMANCE UPDATE**  
[Officer Contact: Trevor Mason, Team Leader – Rail Strategy and Liaison, Tel: 01992 556117]

4.1 The Cabinet Panel reviewed a report which provided an update on Govia Thameslink Railway performance and received a presentation at Panel from Stuart Cheshire, Passenger Service Director, Thameslink & Great Northern, Phil Hutchinson, Head of Strategic Planning, GTR and Larry Heyman, Local Development Manager, Thameslink and Great Northern. The Presentation gave an overview of the progress made by Govia Thameslink Railway since their attendance at Panel in December 2016. The presentation can be viewed here: [Govia Thameslink Railway Performance Update Presentation](#)

4.2 Members heard that phase 2 of the timetable consultation had received over 10,000 responses and that the proposed changes would redesign the timetable. It was noted that all of the comments were currently being reviewed with a full revised timetable due to be issued to passenger stake holders in 2018.

4.3 The Cabinet Panel discussed the additional platform at Stevenage and noted that the project had been postponed by Network Rail. Members heard that strong representations were made about what the postponed plans meant for local services and that at this point it was not possible to provide train services on all routes.

4.4 Members discussed the reasons behind the train route between Hertford North and Letchworth being replaced by a bus service and it was advised that following assessment and three independent reviews it was concluded that there were not any other viable options at this time as the train lines were at full capacity. Members were advised that copies of the independent reviews could be requested via the Department for Transport. It was advised that the plan was for the replacement bus service to run every half an hour during the day and that standby vehicles were being considered to add into service, if required, with controllers in place at both ends of the route. It was added that time trials would be undertaken to set a realistic timetable and understand journey requirements.

4.5 Members expressed concerns around the length of time that replacement bus services would be required for and noted that customer care should be maximised during this period. Members

**CHAIRMAN'S  
INITIALS**

.....

were advised that the replacement bus service was likely to be in place for approximately three years, in order for the track work to be undertaken.

4.6 The Chairman advised Members that they had written to the Department for Transport and the Transport Minister highlighting the importance of having passenger friendly connecting bus services.

4.7 Members noted that there had been another downturn in performance and it was advised that new Siemens trains that were introduced in 2016 were having failures after 600 miles. It was advised that this had now increased to around 4,400 miles but the trains that had been replaced used to run to 30,000 miles without failure. It was noted that this issue had been raised with Siemens.

4.8 The Cabinet Panel noted the new 2x2 seating layout on the new trains and acknowledged that this would mean that a higher proportion of passengers would have to pay the same fare to stand for the same journey. It was also noted that fares were not decreased for passengers who had to use replacement bus services or those travelling early morning off-peak. Members were advised that the Govia Thameslink Railway fares were set by the Department for Transport and therefore, the Department for Transport needed to be lobbied on the matter. With regards to the seating, it was noted that although there was 5-6% less seats, the trains carried 50% more passengers.

4.9 Members commented on the under capacity for car parking at stations and the poor quality of some stations and level of onsite service provided. It was agreed that Larry Heyman, Local Development Manager, Thameslink and Great Northern, would feedback on these issues.

Larry Heyman,  
Local  
Development  
Manager,  
Thameslink and  
Great Northern

4.10 In response to a Member question, it was confirmed that delay repay was only payable in delays relating to an emergency change in timetable and would not be payable on delays caused by planned engineering works.

4.11 Members noted that the performance of Govia Thameslink Railway would be revisited in 6-8 months.

Trevor Mason,  
Team Leader –  
Rail Strategy  
and Liaison /  
DSO to note

**Conclusions:**

4.12 The Cabinet Panel noted the report and presentation.

**5. RAIL UPDATE INCLUDING EAST MIDLANDS FRANCHISE CONSULTATION**

[Officer Contact: Trevor Mason, Team Leader – Rail Strategy and Liaison, Tel: 01992 556117]

**CHAIRMAN'S  
INITIALS**

.....

- 5.1 The Cabinet Panel reviewed a report detailing the County Council's response to the East Midlands Franchise consultation, as well as updates on other key rail issues affecting Hertfordshire.
- 5.2 Members were advised that whilst the East Midlands Franchise does not directly service Hertfordshire, it stopped at Luton Airport Parkway, which provided links from stations such as St Albans to Leicester and Nottingham. It was noted that if there was a reduction in service, as planned, it would have a knock on effect for Hertfordshire. Therefore, the response, as included at Appendix 2 to the report, suggested that an increase in the number of trains stopping at Luton Airport Parkway would improve connecting services for Hertfordshire residents.
- 5.3 The Cabinet Panel noted the updates in the report in relation to the GTR 2018 consultation, Crossrail 2, East West Rail, West Midlands Franchise, West Coast Main Line Post HS2 and the West Midlands and Chilterns Route Study.
- 5.4 Members noted appendix 3 to the report which set out future important Rail Dates and the table which highlighted possible returns to Panel with updates on rail issues.

**Conclusion:**

- 5.5 The Cabinet Panel noted the report and agreed the response to the East Midlands Franchise consultation.

**6. RESPONSE TO DRAFT LONDON MAYOR'S TRANSPORT STRATEGY**

[Officer Contact: James Povey, Team Leader Transport Policy and Growth, Tel: 01992 556798]

- 6.1 Members reviewed a report detailing the County Council's draft response to the London Mayors Transport Strategy 2017, as part of a public consultation.
- 6.2 The Cabinet Panel noted that the London Mayors Transport Strategy highlighted the major proposals for London Transport over the next 25 years and that the County Councils proposed draft response was attached at appendix 2 to the report.
- 6.3 Members noted that the strategy placed a huge emphasis the relationships between health, air quality and transport in London and making walking and cycling a more attractive option.
- 6.4 The Cabinet Panel acknowledged that the County Councils' response considered cross-border issues that had not been included in the strategy. This included the omission of the Metropolitan Line

**CHAIRMAN'S INITIALS**

.....

Extension (MLX) scheme from the strategy, the M25 and other cross-border road networks and cycling routes.

6.5 Members welcomed the letter and added that there was an issue of coach access to airports which could also be raised, as there was not a service from St Albans to Stansted, which would help take traffic off the road. It was also noted that more services were to be introduced as 24 hours and that the levels of service provided needed to be considered.

6.6 The Cabinet Panel noted that the consultation process was due to close on 2 October 2017 and any additional representation could be made online.

**Conclusions:**

6.7 The Cabinet Panel:

- Considered the Mayor's draft Transport Strategy and commented on the draft County Council response, as above.
- The response was to be finalised by the Director of Environment in consultation with the Executive Member of Environment, Planning and Transport and sent off to the GLA by 2<sup>nd</sup> October 2017.

**7. SITES TO BE IDENTIFIED IN THE DRAFT MINERALS LOCAL PLAN**

[Officer Contact: Julie Greaves, Minerals and Waste Policy Manager, Tel: 01992 556227]

7.1 The Cabinet Panel reviewed a report which outlined the process undertaken for the site selection work for the potential site options to be included in the draft Minerals Local Plan.

7.2 Members were informed that all of the sites considered were subject to the same assessment with Appendix 3 setting out the full assessments. It was noted that ecology advice had also been sought on the sites, along with an informal consultation with internal officers and external statutory bodies (Environment Agency, Historic England, and Natural England).

7.3 The Cabinet Panel noted the four options given and acknowledged that option 4 [Furze Field, Hatfield Aerodrome, Land Adjoining Coopers Green Lane (all three being specific sites) and Briggens Estate (as a preferred area)] was the preference to be recommended for inclusion in the draft Local Minerals Plan. It was noted that this was because the sites would provide the necessary

**CHAIRMAN'S INITIALS**

.....

tonnage and had the best overall mix of factors in terms of the conclusion, as set out at section 13 of the report.

- 7.4 Members discussed the preferred option and noted that three of the four sites were on the eastern stretch of Hatfield Road, which to date, has already had a lot of sand and gravel extracted from the area and should therefore be monitored.
- 7.5 In response to a Member question on the significance of the Harry's Field site being used for brick clay extraction to the Brickworks ceasing production, Members heard that it was due to the NPPF introducing a requirement for Mineral Planning Authorities to provide a stock of permitted reserves. It was therefore noted that if the Brickworks had ceased production, the clay in the ground may not be worked at present and the resource would be safeguarded.
- 7.6 Members queried the process for extractions to be monitored and heard that regular site visits took place to ensure that planning consent was being complied with. Members with any concerns were advised to contact the department with further details.
- 7.7 In response to a Member question on bromate plume, it was advised that a historic chemical spillage had polluted the ground water and had travelled under the sites in question as a plume. The presence of this plume would not stop sand and gravel extraction. Any extraction would need to be carefully managed in line with guidance from the environment agency.
- 7.8 Members were advised that it was anticipated that the draft Local Minerals Plan would return to the 1<sup>st</sup> November 2017 Cabinet Panel, to see Cabinet approval for the plan to be consulted on.

**Conclusion:**

- 7.9 The Panel considered the site options presented and the recommended Option 4 as set out in Section 13. The Panel recommended that Cabinet approves these sites for inclusion in the Draft Minerals Local Plan.

**8. MINERALS AND WASTE LOCAL PLAN – AUTHORITY'S MONITORING REPORT**

[Officer Contact: Emma Chapman, Apprentice Planner, Tel: 01992 556275]

- 8.1 Members reviewed a report detailing the key findings of the Authority's Monitoring Report for the period covering 1 April 2016 to 31 March 2017. The Authority's Monitoring Report as attached at Appendix A to the report reflected on whether the policies within the County Council's Minerals and Waste Local Plans were being implemented.

**CHAIRMAN'S INITIALS**

.....

8.2 The Cabinet Panel were informed that overall 14 minerals and waste applications were determined and that it was important to note that none of the eight waste planning applications that had been approved contributed any additional capacity to the shortfalls identified in Waste Core Strategy, due to the nature of the applications. It was noted that the AMR would no longer report on the need for organic waste treatment capacity for Local Authority Collected Waste as the Waste Disposal Authority have updated their capacity requirements. Further updates on the monitors used would be bought back to panel in the future.

8.3 The Cabinet Panel noted that the Authority's Monitoring Report found the Minerals and Waste Local Plan was a sound basis on which to consider applications. It was also noted that the County Council was in the process of procuring new software for the recording of planning and enforcement information.

**Conclusion:**

8.4 The Cabinet Panel:

- i) commented on the AMR as outlined in the report and attached at Appendix 1 to the report, and;
- ii) acknowledged that it will be placed on the County Council's website

**9. ENVIRONMENT, PLANNING & TRANSPORT PERFORMANCE MONITOR**

[Officer Contact: Simon Aries, Assistant Director Transport, Waste & Environmental Management, Tel: 01992 555255 / Jan Hayes-Griffin, Assistant Director Planning & Economy, Tel: 01992 555203]

9.1 The Panel considered a report which detailed the performance of Environment, Planning and Transport Services for the first quarter, April - June 2017, against the Environment Department Service Plan 2016-2020 including key performance indicators, major projects, contracts and identified risks.

9.2 The Cabinet Panel noted that the indicators used in the performance monitor were still under review to improve their relevance and usefulness. Members were invited to make recommendations to Officers on indicators that they would like to be included in the report.

9.3 Members noted that there had been a fall in the number of definitive map cases this quarter and it was explained that this had been due to the complexity of on-going cases, which had been taking longer to resolve.

**CHAIRMAN'S  
INITIALS**

.....



**Conclusion:**

9.4 The Cabinet Panel noted and commented on the performance monitor for Quarter 1 2017-18.

**10. PRELIMINARY FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT REVIEW**

[Officer Contact: Charlotte Kemp, Senior Flood Risk Officer, Tel: 01992 556791 / Andy Hardstaff, Flood Risk Management Team Leader, Tel: 01992 556470]

10.1 Members received a report detailing the statutory Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment review undertaken by the County Council, which was required to be reviewed every six years and had last been updated in 2011. The review was detailed at Appendix 1 to the report.

10.2 The Cabinet Panel noted the main findings of the review and it was acknowledged that there was no evidence to suggest that any significant Flood Risk Areas were required to be identified within Hertfordshire.

10.3 Members noted Section 5.2 of Appendix 1 that related to the consequences of other local sources of flooding in Hertfordshire. Officers agreed to modify the wording of this section to ensure it was clear. Subsequently, this has been amended to say the following: "There are areas of local sources of flood risk in Hertfordshire, but they are not within the definition of a Flood Risk Area".

**Conclusion:**

10.4 The Cabinet Panel endorsed the Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment review, as included at Appendix 1 to the report, to be submitted to the Environment Agency.

**11. OTHER PART I BUSINESS**

11.1 There was no other part I business.

**KATHRYN PETTITT  
CHIEF LEGAL OFFICER**

**CHAIRMAN** \_\_\_\_\_

**CHAIRMAN'S  
INITIALS**

.....