

# 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: Michelle Diprose  
Ext: 25566

## ENVIRONMENT, PLANNING AND TRANSPORT CABINET PANEL, MONDAY, 5 FEBRUARY 2018

### ATTENDANCE

#### MEMBERS OF THE PANEL

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

#### OTHER MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE

R H Smith

Upon consideration of the agenda for the Environment, Planning and Transport Cabinet Panel meeting on Monday, 5 February 2018 as circulated, copy annexed, conclusions were reached and are recorded below:

#### PART I ('OPEN') BUSINESS

##### 1. MINUTES

- 1.1 The Minutes of the Cabinet Panel meeting held on Wednesday, 1 November 2017 were agreed.

##### 2. PUBLIC PETITIONS

- 2.1 Brenda Heninghem and Tansy Rothwell presented the petition below:

*'We the undersigned petition the council to open up the Lower Bengoe railway land, making it a footpath and cycle track to provide a safe and traffic free route through Lower Bengoe from Port Hill to Beane Road. In so doing we can retain the trees and green embankments and a corridor for wildlife too.'*

#### ACTION

**CHAIRMAN'S  
INITIALS**

.....

2.2 The online petition attracted over 250 signatories by the date of receipt verified as living or working in Hertfordshire. The petitioner also presented the chairman with further hard copy of the signatures.

2.3 The petitioner addressed the Panel on the subject of the petition, the text of which can be viewed at the link below:

[Lower Bengeo Railway Land](#)

The Chairman received the petition.

2.4 Members considered an officer report in relation to the Lower Bengeo Railway Petition. Members noted there was not a budget identified but officers made a suggestion that funding could be used from locality budgets or section 106 funding to carry out a feasibility study.

2.5 The local Member said he was very supportive of this petition and believed it was a good example of a scheme coming forward with local support to make Hertford a part of a sustainable travel plan.

### **Conclusion**

2.6 That the Cabinet Panel noted the petition and recommend that officers explore the potential of securing funding to undertake a feasibility study of the proposals as outlined in the petition.

### **3. PRESENTATION BY LONDON LUTON AIRPORT LIMITED REGARDING RECENT, ONGOING AND PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT/GROWTH AT LONDON LUTON AIRPORT** [Officer Contact: Paul Donovan, Team Leader Strategic Land Use Tel: (01992 556289)]

3.1 The Panel received an update on the work of London Luton Airport (LLAL). A presentation was also received from Luton Borough Council on recent, ongoing and proposed development and growth at London Luton Airport. It was noted the report and presentation did not deal with live issues such as noise impacts and flightpaths,

3.2 Members were informed of the Luton Dart air-rail transit services that was hoped to be in place in the Spring of 2020/21. It was envisaged that the air-rail transit would move passengers more quickly and free up road congestion on the A505.

3.3 The Panel were informed of two sites which had been purchased and noted planning applications were being submitted. The first site, Bartlett Square would provide commercial space and a 4\* hotel. The second site, New Century Park already had planning

**CHAIRMAN'S  
INITIALS**

.....

permission for commercial development and would also have a 3\* hotel. Members raised concern in relation to the new jobs that would be created and how it was envisaged to manage the traffic movement. Members were informed that LLAL had submitted a proposal with Thameslink for further links to be available from May 2018, work had been carried out to link DART with the existing train operators.

3.4 Member questioned how the access to the Airport would be addressed when LLAL was the fastest growing Airport in the Country and 18 million passengers were expected to move through the Airport by 2020/21. Members were informed of the steps that were being taken to improve access and transport issues and of the vision of LLAL for the next 32 years, these are detailed below:

- To make the best use of the existing runway at Luton to provide the maximum benefit to the local and regional economy
- To deliver food levels of service
- To actively manage environmental impacts at the local and wider levels in line with their commitment to responsible and sustainable development

3.5 Members also raised concern on the noise impact levels and air quality of the Aircrafts with the Airports expansion which would increase freight movement which would have an impact through the night on local residents of Hertfordshire. LLAL advised the Panel that all these issues would be considered prior to any expansion to make sure it met the infrastructure requirements. It was noted there was a report going to the LLAL Board within the next couple of months in relation to night flights and freight.

3.6 LLAL also stated that they were actively looking at the commitments it could be make to be a better neighbour to Hertfordshire.

3.7 A Member invited LLAL to donate £2m to the infrastructure of Hertfordshire that would benefit the transport infrastructure. LLAL responded by saying that if it was a requirement on Hertfordshire's list then it could be considered.

3.8 LLAL also advised of their vision launch which is a statutory consultation starting in June 2018 for eight weeks and asked for Hertfordshire County Council to be pro-active in responding to the consultation.

**Conclusion:**

3.9 The Cabinet Panel noted the report and the content of the presentation from Luton Borough Council.

**CHAIRMAN'S  
INITIALS**

.....

**4. INTEGRATED PLAN 2018/19 - 2021/22**

[Officer Contact: Mike Collier, Assistant Director Strategic Finance & Performance Tel: (01992) 555792, Lindsey McLeod, Head of Corporate Finance Tel: (01992) 556431]

- 4.1 The Panel was invited to comment and identify any issues on the areas of the Integrated plan which related to Environment, Planning and Transport.
- 4.2 Members were informed that following on from the Public Engagement on the Integrated Plan (IP) that 56% of responses said they would rather see an increase to council tax and 32% a reduction in services. The percentage of respondents that supported a reduction in expenditure on Environment and Planning was 42% lower than in previous years, whilst 21% supported a reduction in Highways and Transportation a slight increase on last year, but lower than the previous two.
- 4.3 Members noted that pressures added £325 in 2018/19 rising to £700,000 in 2021/22. This was mainly the 'Responding to Growth' item. Members' attention was drawn to the item of £3.491m on page 185 of the IP pack under the heading for Infrastructure and Investment, a substantial part of which was for the development of major infrastructure and sustainable transport schemes. It was further noted that savings of £515,000 had been identified for 2018/19 rising to £726,000 in 2021/22.
- 4.4 A concern was raised in relation to the merging of the Countryside Management Service (CMS) and the Rights of Way teams and the impact on the service when the team are reconvened. Members agreed that the work of both teams were valued and both provided a good service. Members were informed the £150k savings would be over the course of 2 years, it was noted that teams did have overlapping functions. The savings would be generated through a natural reduction of one person, thinning of the management structure and by taking over diversion orders from the district and borough councils which would generate income. The aim was that the merging of the two teams would be an improvement to the service. Members hoped that improvements to bridle ways could also be included.
- 4.5 A member questioned whether some of the infrastructure fund could be used to support a passing loop on the Abbey Line. It was noted that the rules for accessing the funds had not yet been agreed and that a bid to support an Abbey Line passing loop would need to be considered against the criteria once set.
- 4.6 Following a question from a Member in relation to the Savercard, the Chairman clarified that the proposal to raise the price of the

**CHAIRMAN'S  
INITIALS**

.....

Savercard ticket was not linked or contingent in any way on the efficiency savings expected from the wider concessionary fare scheme.

4.7 The Executive Member noted that the additional income from increasing the price of Savercards was relatively small and suggested the Panel recommended to Cabinet that, if further savings had been identified through the budget process, that Cabinet defer the increase to the Savercard. The Panel supported the Chairman's suggestion to Cabinet.

4.8 A Member queried what would happen to the budgeted £72m Capital money over the next three years if it was not used for the Metropolitan Line Extension. In response the Panel noted that the money was not predominately the County Council's money and it was money that would have been received through the LEP and third party contributions. The Panel were informed that a certain amount of Capital money had already been committed. Members agreed the infrastructure fund for sustainable planning and the new team were welcome and there was an opportunity for Members to put forward schemes for consideration.

#### **Conclusions:**

4.9 That the Panel:

1. supported the Integrated Plan Proposals in relation to Environment, Planning & Transport
2. recommended to Cabinet that Cabinet consider deferring the increase in the price of the Savercard if other efficiencies have been identified through the budget process
3. also identified any issues that it felt that the Cabinet should consider in finalising the Integrated Plan proposals. These are outlined in the preceding text'

#### **5. RAIL UPDATE**

[Officer Contact: Trevor Mason, Team Leader Strategic Transport & Rail Tel: (01992) 556117]

5.1 The Panel received a report in relation to recent and upcoming issues concerning the rail services for Hertfordshire and the East Coast Route Study provided an opportunity for the County Council to set out its infrastructure aspirations for this route. Members noted the deadline for responses was 16 March 2018.

5.2 In response to a query on the Digital signalling proposal as the solution to capacity constraints on the two-track section through the Welwyn area and what the benefits were, officer's agreed to prepare a briefing note to clarify the benefits of digital signalling and circulate

Action  
Trevor  
Mason

**CHAIRMAN'S  
INITIALS**

.....

to the Panel.

5.3 A concern was raised in relation to the changing of stopping patterns at intermediate stations such as Welwyn North and it was asked that it be clarified that this was not a reduction or cessation of service to Welwyn North. It was believed that Welwyn North was used more than other nearby stations due to the parking availability, therefore a change to the service would impact passengers. Further concerns were raised in relation to services not stopping at Watford junction. Members requested these concerns be included in the response to the Network Rail East Coast Route Study

Action  
Trevor  
Mason

5.4 A Member sought clarification on the bus substitution of train services due to the postponement of the fifth platform scheme at Stevenage and the assumption that the completion of the scheme was assumed to be 2021, officers informed the Panel that this was the earliest date for completion. In relation to the substitute bus service GTR have stated they cannot deliver a half hourly service between Watton-at-Stone and Stevenage. this would be reduced to an hourly service. Members agreed there would be an impact on residents and commuters that used this service and stated this was unacceptable.

**Conclusion:**

5.5 The Panel:

1. noted the issues arising, and in particular the key events highlighted in Appendix 1.
2. commented on the draft response to the Network Rail East Coast Route Study, as set out in Appendix 3 to the report and requested the concerns in relation to Welwyn North station be incorporated in the response to the Network Rail East Coast Route Study.

**6. CONSULTATION BY THE MAYOR OF LONDON ON A DRAFT LONDON PLAN**

[Officer Contact: Paul Donovan, Team Leader Strategic Land Use  
Tel: (01992) 556289, Tel: 01992 555255]

6.1 Members received a report in relation to the consultation by the Mayor of London on a Draft London Plan and were invited to consider the issues as set out in section 6 of the report and come to a view on those and any others it recommended that should be included in the County Council's response to the London Plan consultation. It was noted that the Chief Executive and Director of Environment would prepare and submit a response in consultation

**CHAIRMAN'S  
INITIALS**

.....

with the Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport taking into account the views of the Panel.

- 6.2 Members noted the plan was a plan for London and the Mayor did not have any planning powers that extended outside the Capital. The plan needed to do a fundamental review of future economic growth and housing. It was noted that the plan identified a housing need of 66,000 dwellings per annum and a housing target of 65,000 per annum which members noted was 1,000 houses less. Growth was to be achieved without encroaching onto the Green Belt.
- 6.3 The Panel agreed that Policy GG2 'surplus public sector land' element needed to be quantified.
- 6.4 Observations were that it was not realistic that this number of houses that were expected to be built as there was not the number of contractors available to build these properties, especially in the light of Brexit.
- 6.5 The panel agreed there needed to be a joint arrangement across the boundaries.
- 6.6 It was noted that the Mayor was interested in working with 'Willing Partners' the Panel needed clarification on whether this was short, medium or long term.

**Conclusions:**

- 6.7 The Panel considered the issues in section 6 of the report and came to a view on these and recommended these should be incorporated into a County Council response to the London Plan consultation. The Chief Executive and Director of Environment would prepare and submit a response, in consultation with the Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport, taking into account the views of Panel.

**7. REVISED WASTE LOCAL PLAN TARGETS AND INDICATORS**

[Officer Contact: Emma Chapman, Apprentice Planner, Spatial Planning and Economy Tel: (01992) 556275]

- 7.1 The Panel received a report on some revisions to the targets and indicators contained within the Waste Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document which formed part of the Waste Local Plan.
- 7.2 Target 3 reported on any New Waste Management Facilities that had been permitted (within Areas of Search A-E which are broad areas set out in the Hertfordshire Waste Local Plan) to treat the

**CHAIRMAN'S  
INITIALS**

.....

identified Local Authority Collected Waste Arising. It was noted this target needed to be revised in light of the findings set out in the Local Authority Collected Waste Spatial Strategy and therefore as a result of the findings the Waste Planning Authority no longer needed to report on new facilities to treat the LAC Organic waste arising's.

- 7.3 Target 8 reported on the percentage of untreated waste that is imported from London into Hertfordshire after 2015, with the aim of this percentage being 0%. Members noted that obtaining this data had proved difficult for the Waste Planning Authority to obtain and subsequently there was an inability to report it accurately. It was noted that the definition of 'untreated waste' was something that had not been treated in its original state, i.e. construction and demolition waste.
- 7.4 In relation to Target 17 the panel were given amended wording to that detailed in 5.2 of the report. It was noted that Target 17 reported on the number of yearly breaches of planning control and complaints received relating to operational waste management facilities in the county. It had been difficult for the Waste Planning Authority to obtain the information to report on as the current system for monitoring enforcement cases was being considered as part of an enforcement review.
- 7.5 There was a concern that Target 17 would not be reported on but officers confirmed that the outcomes of the overall Enforcement Review would be presented to a future meeting and the administration systems that were currently being procured would allow officers to monitor breaches more efficiently.

**Conclusion:**

- 7.6 The Panel supported the revisions to the targets and indicators which were used to assess the implementation of the Waste Local Plan policies, within the AMR.

**8. ENVIRONMENT, PLANNING & TRANSPORT PERFORMANCE MONITOR Q3**

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

- 8.1 The Panel received a report to review the performance of Environment, Planning and Transport for the Q3 October 2017 to December 2017 against the Environment Department Service Plan 2016-2020. The report included key performance indicators, major projects, contracts and identified risks.
- 8.2

**CHAIRMAN'S  
INITIALS**

.....



**Conclusion:**

8.3 The Cabinet Panel noted the report and commented on the performance monitor for Quarter 3 2017-18.

**9. OTHER PART I BUSINESS**

9.1 There was no other part I business.



**KATHRYN PETTITT  
CHIEF LEGAL OFFICER**

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

**CHAIRMAN'S  
INITIALS**

.....