



# **Minutes**

of the  
Meeting of the  
**Growth, Infrastructure, Planning and the Economy  
Cabinet Panel**  
on  
**Monday, 1 July 2019**

1. **AGENDA**
2. **Supplemental Document for Item 3-Arriva in Hertfordshire Presentation**
3. **Supplemental Report for Item 4 - Govia Thameslink Railway Presentation**
4. **MINUTES**

# Minutes



To: All Members of the Growth Infrastructure, Planning and the Economy Cabinet Panel, Chief Executive, Chief Officers, All officers named for 'actions'

From: Legal, Democratic & Statutory Services  
Ask for: Theresa Baker  
Ext: 26545

---

## **GROWTH, INFRASTRUCTURE, PLANNING AND THE ECONOMY CABINET PANEL MONDAY, 1 JULY 2019**

### **ATTENDANCE**

#### **MEMBERS OF THE PANEL**

D A Ashley (Chairman), D J Barnard, T Williams (substituted for S Bedford), S J Boulton, S J Featherstone, S K Jarvis, A K Khan, P V Mason, G McAndrew, A J S Mitchell (Vice-Chairman), S J Taylor, A S B Walkington, J A West.

#### **OTHER MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE**

D Andrews, R H Smith, W J Wyatt-Lowe

Upon consideration of the agenda for the Growth, Infrastructure, Planning and the Economy meeting on 1 July 2019 as circulated, copy annexed, conclusions were reached and are recorded below:

#### **Chairman's Announcements:**

For this meeting only the usual order of business was varied such that item 4 was taken before item 3 to accommodate the Govia Thameslink representative's commitments

*Note: S J Taylor declared an interest as recorded at minute 3.*

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

#### **1. MINUTES**

1.1 The Minutes of the Growth, Infrastructure, Planning & The Economy Cabinet Panel meeting held on 15 May 2019 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

#### **2 PUBLIC PETITIONS**

2.1 There were no public petitions.

**CHAIRMAN'S  
INITIALS**

.....

### 3. ARRIVA BUSES PRESENTATION

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

*S J Taylor declared an interest in this item, as Stevenage Borough Council were trying to assist Arriva in their search for an alternative bus garage. She remained in the room and participated in the debate.*

- 3.1 The Panel received a presentation from Arriva Buses which can be viewed at: [Supplementary Document for Item 3- Arriva in Hertfordshire Presentation](#). Gavin Hunter, Area Managing Director, Arriva Bus (UK) and Dennis Yau, Regional Head of Commercial, Arriva Group spoke to the presentation.
- 3.2 Noting the negative feedback circle in which Arriva was caught, (i.e. congestion impacting bus reliability and causing poor public perception of bus transportation, leading to lower passenger numbers and higher fares to remain viable, which again impacted passenger numbers and business viability), the Panel welcomed Arriva's foray into smaller vehicle transport via ArrivaClick, a door to door on demand response transport solution using minibuses; Members were offered a tour on this service in an area where it had already been rolled out.
- 3.3 The Panel learned that ArrivaClick journeys started at £1 and fares were based on distance travelled, the time at which travel occurred plus other factors and that the Arriva app enabled customers to identify the exact fare before they travelled. Arriva welcomed the comment that since Hertfordshire's rail customers paid £8-10 per day for parking this service could prove a significant business opportunity for Arriva, but highlighted that to achieve this better communication with railway stations was required to resolve timetable connectivity issues. Arriva would not be moving into taxi style transport as it came under a different regulatory system.
- 3.4 Arriva welcomed the suggestion of giving park and ride a new lease of life by making it flexible enough to accommodate people doing the school run and then going to work, those travelling to airports and cycle schemes, which could reduce congestion and assist core buses to keep to timetable.
- 3.5 In light of Arriva's current priority to extend services into airports Members highlighted that 5.00am and 10.00pm were the peak times for public use of Luton and Stanstead airports however public transport at these times was not available.

**CHAIRMAN'S  
INITIALS**

.....

- 3.6 Responding to comment that reliability, communication of bus delays/cancellations and a lack of service provision after 7.30pm were major factors in the reduction in number of people using its buses, Arriva clarified that as it did not control the information boards at bus stops it used crowd control information to Twitter/facebook bus users. Members heard that real time information systems were located at bus/railway stations and on major bus corridors, however officers could only input information on the boards if they were told about it. Arriva clarified that a bus was categorised as 'late' when it was delayed by 10 minutes.
- 3.7 The Panel heard that Arriva buses purchased in 2019 were those rated as the best bus product, were eco-friendly and would meet the air quality requirements scheduled for 2020. Members suggested that Arriva consult with the airports on the electric chargers for electric buses so that the cost was shared. To reduce air pollution from diesel powered buses Arriva was rolling out a new campaign to stop idling when stopped for periods of more than 2 minutes.
- 3.8 To the suggestion of cherry picking routes, Arriva highlighted that the reduction in bus user numbers and funding/support was reflected in the service contraction and acknowledged that continuing commercially unviable routes had to be balanced against undermining the whole service.
- 3.9 Arriva acknowledged that due to the county's proximity to London (i.e. the quality of bus engineering facilities there and pay rates) retention of staff was its greatest challenge. Currently it was 18 drivers short but had 20 agency drivers. The company had a good pipeline of candidates to join the business and, to encourage retention, new wage scales were being considered, part time working was being improved, flexible working practices were being trialled (e.g. split rota shifts) and women were encouraged to become bus drivers; 10% of Arriva's bus drivers were women however security when lone working was a concern.

**CONCLUSION:**

- 3.10 The panel noted the presentation.

**4 GOVIA THAMESLINK RAILWAY PRESENTATION**

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

**CHAIRMAN'S  
INITIALS**

.....

- 4.1 The Panel received a verbal commentary on a presentation from Govia Thameslink Railway (GTR) which was subsequently circulated to the Members and can be viewed at: Supplementary Document for Item 4 - Govia Thameslink Railway Presentation. Patrick Ladbury, Stakeholder Manager for Great Northern and Thamelink provided a performance update since the introduction of the new time table in May 2019.
- 4.2 The Panel learned the GTR franchise had been divided into two The Panel learned the GTR franchise had been divided into two with a managing director for Thameslink / Great Northern and another for Southern / Gatwick Express. Furthermore 400 more trains were now in operation each day than at this time last year and during 26 May to 22 June 2019, 75.1% of all services arrived on time at every station and cancellations were at 4%. P Ladbury acknowledged that there was room for improvement notwithstanding the increase in train reliability and consistency since May 2019 (due the introduction of Nine 6-car class 717 trains (the remainder of the 21 to have replaced the 3-car class 313 units by early autumn) and the impact of driver training). Members heard that the timetabling intention for the Great Northern Line was for weekday services to move to 4 trains per hour and to fill the morning and afternoon service gaps.
- 4.3 Whilst acknowledging that performance had improved over that in 2018 (and highlighting that this was not difficult to achieve due to the low performance bar set in 2018) Members expressed concern that delays and cancelled trains continued, particularly at weekends and that their experience over the past 2 months did not match Govia Thameslink's picture of improvements. The Panel emphasised that:
1. As the new 717 units had greater capacity than the 313s, passengers would likely be content with 50% of the currently scheduled weekend trains providing they ran reliably;
  2. The majority of the extra weekday trains were outside peak hours;
  3. The considerable demand for light night trains did not match provision;
- 4.4 P Ladbury emphasised that GTR's contract franchise with the DfT was to deliver greater capacity on the route to accommodate housing growth. He also clarified that although week day performance had improved, at weekends it was impacted by contractual reliance on drivers working rest days (although not all drivers working at weekends were working on rest days), but was unable to confirm whether the new drivers were on the same contract as the current ones. To Member comment that the resources should match the service, P Ladbury highlighted that another 50 drivers were anticipated to be qualified by late November.

- 4.5 When Members emphasised the need to communicate to passengers that (a) they could legitimately use LNER trains if their scheduled train had been cancelled; and (b) trains would be stopping at intermediate stations to aid those whose trains had been cancelled, P Ladbury highlighted that there was a project with Network Rail to improve communications, however, due to issues with live data transfer during disruptions, publication of only those trains that would run during disruptions was being considered.
- 4.6 During discussion Members heard that the deadline for ideas for the Passenger Benefit Fund was 31 July 2019 Local Members of affected stations had already been contacted and district and borough councils would be contacted on 10 July. On hearing that the DfT had advised that the funds could be used for capital expenditure but not for committed obligations e.g. structural issues. lift maintenance, Members observed that the Rail Regulators needed to allow regular benefits for disrupted services. P Ladbury agreed that the £80k awarded per station whose passengers were heavily impacted in summer 2018 by the timetable changes was a limited amount of funding with which to provide tangible benefits to improve passengers' journeys, however it was on top of additional compensation paid direct to passengers.
- 4.7 The chairman emphasised that realism and reliability were required and the level of service should match the level of demand. In view of this, until such a time as a better driver contract was in place, GTR needed to change the weekend schedule.
- 4.8 P Ladbury was thanked for attending and the chairman made a request for the new managing director to attend the next meeting.

## **CONCLUSION**

- 4.9 The panel noted the presentation.

## **5. FINANCIAL OUTLOOK**

[Officer Contact:  
Steven Pilsworth, Assistant Director Finance (Tel 01992 555143)  
Faisal Mir, Assistant Director Finance and Business Support (Tel: 01992 555737)]

- 5.1 The Panel received a report which brought to their attention the

**CHAIRMAN'S  
INITIALS**

.....

overall financial outlook for the Council over the next three years, and sought their views on areas where further work should be done as part of the forthcoming Integrated Planning round to meet the £45m of savings required over the four years from April 2019.

- 5.2 Members noted the Council's ongoing and increasing financial challenges stemming from service demand outstripping available funding, particularly in Children's Services and Adult Care Services. As a consequence of central government's focus of Brexit, there was also uncertainty around central grant funding and control totals were unlikely to be agreed, a roll forward being suggested via one year settlements perhaps with inflationary uplift and council tax flexibility.
- 5.3 In light of the growth in the county Members highlighted the need to identify ways to maximise developer contributions for costs other than those of physical construction e.g. the cost of setting up expansions and, on the basis that if it wasn't asked for it wouldn't be received, emphasised the need to ask for this from planning authorities. Capturing enhanced land values was also suggested.
- 5.4 Members were reminded of the inherent conflict between considering only the financial aspect of the council's current situation and the need to lead on the development of good towns and place shaping.
- 5.5 The Panel emphasised the need to lobby government even more strongly for proper funding of councils and services for the most vulnerable, without which the current situation would continue.
- 5.6 A Member cautioned the Panel to remember that the strongest case for more funding or transformation was that of better delivery
- 5.7 During discussion officers clarified that it was unclear whether the funds received as a result of the failure of the Metropolitan Line Extension would be available for other Watford projects and that the LEP might call for other bids.

**CONCLUSION**

- 5.8 That Panel considered the questions raised in paragraph 2.4 of the report and provided feedback, as above, to Cabinet on these.

**CHAIRMAN'S  
INITIALS**

.....

6. **INTEGRATED TRANSPORT DELIVERY PROGRAMME UPDATE**

[Officer Contact: Darryl Keen, Director of Community Protection and Chief Fire Officer (Tel: 01992 507500)]

- 6.1 Members considered a report on the work of the Integrated Transport Development Programme (ITDP). Their comments were sought on the outcome of the first stage business case which recommended the establishment of an Integrated Transport Unit (ITU) for specialist transport functions, subject to further assessment and consultation, as a step toward a Future Operating Model (FOM) for transport across Hertfordshire County Council. From the transport delivery structures identified by the Edge review, option C was officer preferred option.
- 6.2 The Panel learned that the Council spent c.£30m per annum on Passenger transport, including Special Education Needs (SEN), Adult Care Services (ACS) and mainstream home to school transport (statutory duties), and public transport; this type of transport also contributed to the Council's environmental strategies. However, management information was not aggregated or easily available to drive service improvement between departments since the transport management/delivery structure was spread across many services and the delivery approach and IT systems used varied between departments. Thus creation of an ITDP would enable focused and managed change and provide resources for innovative ideas;
- 6.3 Members noted that changes to the way in which ACS and SEN services were planned and delivered would have a significant impact on transport, the need for identification of the best FOM for the transport service being evidenced by a predicted significant population increase over the next 15 years, including an aging population with an associated need for transport to support service delivery and support/assistance for older users; a predicted increase in the number of SEN children and children with complex needs, which would subsequently impact ACS when they became adults; increased expectations for transport to be more responsive to individual needs; and rising transport costs and pupil numbers likely to raise local authority transport costs.
- 6.4 During discussion it was clarified that the report examined the concept of developing an ITDP and distinguished policy and demand from effective delivery at any particular demand point; Equality Impact Assessments would be provided if specific proposal were made as part of a future business case. The Chairman clarified that the ACS and CS Financial Outlook reports had not indicated any particular savings, the objective of

**CHAIRMAN'S INITIALS**

.....

an ITDP being to make savings by managing wider transport effectively and efficiently without impacting service users.

- 6.5 Members expressed support for Option C as a transport delivery structure at this stage of the business case i.e. full integration (wide ranging organisational integration of all or most of the transport related functions under a single management structure).

**CONCLUSION:**

- 6.6 The Panel:
- I. Noted the work of the Integrated Transport Development Programme to date;
  - II. Noted the next steps for the Integrated Transport Development Programme and the future decisions which would be brought back to Panel and to Cabinet.

**7. ACCESSIBILITY STRATEGY (LTP SUPPORTING DOCUMENT)**

[Officer Contact: Alexandra Stevens, Senior Transport Planning Policy Officer, Strategic Transport & Rail (Tel: 01992 588132)]

- 7.1 The Panel received a report which provided the findings of the analysis undertaken for the Accessibility Strategy, one of the supporting documents of the Local Transport Plan (LTP).
- 7.2 Members heard that although the strategy was no longer required by government, analysis of accessibility by non-car mode to key services in Hertfordshire against published Department for Transport (DfT) upper and lower time thresholds had revealed that there were no immediate concerns at strategic level in respect of public transport (bus /rail) since 14 out of 16 services were considered accessible by 95% of the population within the upper time thresholds. Improvements however could be achieved at the local level through development and implementation of the other theme specific support documents of the (LTP e.g. the Growth and Transport Plan and Intalink Strategy. The document was an evidence base and the active travel document would address specific issues.
- 7.3 Members welcomed the detailed information provided by the journey time maps and statistics and variously observed:
- That Local Members perceptions were often at odds with the compliance findings based on the DfT metrics;
  - That many Local Plans included urban expansions distant from town centres and could decrease future accessibility compliance;

**CHAIRMAN'S  
INITIALS**

.....

- That to support the LTP focus on modal change, the 30 minutes time frame based on DfT data collected prior to the current LTP should be more ambitious and meet a shorter time threshold;
- That encouraging modal change in parents who drove children to school could potentially raise compliance with the cycling time to school metric;
- That the bus station metric had limited value due to potential skewing from more people using bus stops than stations;
- That the 60 minute metric for travel time to Accident and Emergency would not meet current public expectations.

## CONCLUSIONS

7.4 The Panel endorsed the draft Accessibility Strategy (attached as Appendix A to the report) as a supporting document to the Local Transport Plan (2018).

### 8. WASTE LOCAL PLAN – WAY AHEAD PAPER FOLLOWING INITIAL CONSULTATION AND CALL FOR SITES

[Officer Contact: Trish Lyons, Planning Officer - Policy (Tel: 01992 556254)];

8.1 The Panel received a progress report on the Waste Local Plan (WLP) following the Call for Sites exercise and identification of the preferred option to progress the Draft Waste Local Plan, including the proposed way ahead for identifying sites/areas.

8.2 The Panel noted the detail of the: results of the Call for Sites exercise; re-assessment of the adopted Allocated Sites and existing Safeguarded Strategic Sites; and reassessment of the 60 Employment Land Areas of Search (ELAS) and any new employment land during the emerging site selection process. Members heard that the updated Capacity Gap report concluded that there was a projected significant waste management capacity shortfall in Non-Hazardous and Construction, Demolition and Excavation (CD&E) waste and, as recycling and recovery of the CD&E waste was the most significant gap, the county would require further recycling facilities for this waste stream, a specific policy is being drafted to encourage this at appropriate locations.

8.3 Analysis for the way forward showed that:

- In relation to Existing Strategic Sites:
  - The existing safeguarded Strategic Sites should remain and would continue to be safeguarded;
  - Two additional strategic facilities would be identified in the

**CHAIRMAN'S  
INITIALS**

.....

emerging WLP at Burymead Road Transfer Station and Buntingford Local Authority Collected Waste Bulking Facility/Depot.

- Potential uncertainty and insufficient information to support delivery of an allocation meant that the remaining sites would not continue to be identified in the WLP. They may be suitable for waste uses but not for allocation in the plan.
- Based on the limited potential of the sites put forward in the Call for Site submissions, including those re-submitted and already identified in the adopted WLP, and the non removal of sites in the Green Belt from Local Plans, to offer greater flexibility for future waste capacity to be delivered, the Draft WLP should move away from site specific allocations other than safeguarding of strategic sites;
- In terms of ELAS there is approximately 900ha of suitable employment land (B2/B8) which could provide opportunities for waste management facilities and criteria-based policies would be applied to any applications received on employment land rather than identifying specific employment areas.

### **Conclusion**

8.4 The Cabinet Panel supported the proposed way ahead as the most appropriate for the identification of sufficient opportunities to meet capacity requirements (strategic sites, areas and criteria-based policies) to be taken forward to the Draft Plan stage for the Waste Local Plan review.

### **9. DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS GUIDANCE: A REPLACEMENT FOR THE HERTFORDSHIRE TOOLKIT**

[Officers: Sarah McLaughlin, Head of Growth and Infrastructure Unit (Tel: 01992 588110); Rupert Thacker, Head of Highways Implementation and Strategy (Tel: 01992 658176); Kulbir Lalli, Head of Integrated Accommodation ACS (Tel: 01438 843217));

9.1 The Panel received a report which updated them on matters raised in relation to 'Developer Contributions Guidance: A Replacement for the Hertfordshire Toolkit' report presented to the panel on 15 May 2019, the Guide being an up to date view of S106 and integration with Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

9.2 As requested at the previous panel the Guide now included indicative contributions on a per unit type basis for calculations of the costs of delivery of school expansions.

- 9.3 Members noted officers' intention to use a two strand approach methodology for seeking strategic transport infrastructure contributions; strand one being site specific mitigations directed by a Transport Assessment and delivered by the developer or via CIL/ S106 funding; strand two being the funding of the wider impacts on transport infrastructure, most appropriately via CIL when the authorities concerned had a CIL charging mechanism, however S106 contributions were the only mechanism for non-CIL charging authorities and was complicated by legislative restrictions. In light of this officers were procuring advice and guidance to recommend an appropriate solution to meet strategic transport requirements.
- 9.4 Members noted that although Adult Care Services' (ACS) had an established programme to model future care provision, the difficulties in modelling the requirements of disabled adults aged 64 and under necessitated a two phase approach to modelling the S106 tools for seeking developer contribution, phase 1 being a methodology to calculate a per dwelling social care impact and requirement for older persons age 65 and over, and phase 2 a per dwelling social care impact and requirement methodology for disabled adults aged 64 and under. As future versions of the guide would include this information the current Guide provided a flexible approach and S106 obligations could be assessed on a case by case basis.
- 9.5 A Member emphasised the need for officers to seek sufficient contributions for transport.
- 9.6 Officers clarified that low sample sizes, census data and an element of rounding had resulted in the costs for education facilities being lower per 4 bedroom flat than per 3 bedroom flat.

**Conclusion**

- 9.7 The Growth, Infrastructure, Planning & the Economy Cabinet Panel endorsed a public consultation on the Developer Contributions Guidance (Appendix 1) for an eight week period.

**10. LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN DELIVERY PROGRAMME AND INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT AND SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT FUND UPDATE**

[Officer Contact: Rupert Thacker, Head of Highways Strategy and Implementation (Tel: 01992 658176)]

- 10.1 The Panel received an update on and noted the progress made on development of the ten priority Highways Authority projects

identified for delivery in and adjacent to Hertfordshire and the bids made to or in development associated with the Infrastructure Investment and Sustainable Transport Fund (IISRF).

- 10.2 To concern that lack of an easily demonstrable clear viable business case for the Abbey Line (passing loop) could mean a move from heavy to light rail, Members heard that the County Council and district councils needed to consider whether the local rail user report on options for the loop accurately considered the extent of planned new housing development in the Local Plan (e.g. development south of Park Street) and options such as new stations on the line.
- 10.3 Members welcomed the consideration given to sustainability in many of the projects and the use of existing infrastructure to deliver some of the sustainability e.g. the cycle network.
- 10.4 Members suggested that the s.106 reserve be reviewed to see if there are potential contributions for improvements associated with key bus routes and the quality bus partnership. The chairman observed that easier movement of buses around the county could lead to reduced travel times, where even a 2 minute reduction would save bus companies £millions and make them more viable.

R Thacker

**Conclusion**

- 10.5 Members:
  - 1 Noted the progress made on the development of the priority schemes;
  - 2 Noted the funding award from the IISTF and likely future bids.

**11. OTHER PART I BUSINESS**

- 11.1 There was no other Part I business.

**QUENTIN BAKER**  
**CHIEF LEGAL OFFICER**

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

**CHAIRMAN'S  
INITIALS**

.....