

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 WEDNESDAY, 4 DECEMBER 2019

ATTENDANCE

MEMBERS OF THE PANEL

J Hale (substituting for S Bedford), S J Boulton, S J Featherstone, S K Jarvis, A K Khan, R H Smith (substituting for P V Mason), G McAndrew, A J S Mitchell (Vice-Chairman), S J Taylor, A S B Walkington, A Stevenson (substituting for J A West).

OTHER MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE

D Andrews, A P Brewster

Upon consideration of the agenda for the Growth, Infrastructure, Planning and the Economy meeting on 4 December 2019 as circulated, copy annexed, conclusions were reached and are recorded below:

Vice Chairman's announcements:

In the absence of the chairman the vice chairman presided for this meeting only.

Declarations of Interest:

*J S Hale declared an interest as recorded at item 3;
S J Taylor declared an interest as recorded at item 5;
S K Jarvis declared an interest as recorded at item 5;
S J Taylor declared an interest as recorded at item 6.*

PART I ('OPEN') BUSINESS

1. MINUTES

- 1.1 The Minutes of the Growth, Infrastructure, Planning & the Economy Cabinet Panel meeting held on 22 October 2019 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

CHAIRMAN'S INITIALS

.....

2 PUBLIC PETITIONS

2.1 There were no public petitions.

3. LONDON LUTON AIRPORT LIMITED PROPOSAL TO GROW LONDON LUTON AIRPORT TO 32 MILLION PASSENGERS PER ANNUM – A NATIONALLY SIGNIFICANT INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECT

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

J S Hale declared a declarable interest as he is the Chairman of the St Albans Quieter Skies Group; he remained in the room and participated in the debate.

3.1 The Panel received an update report on the County Council’s situation in regard of the statutory consultation by London Luton Airport Limited (LLAL) on its proposal to grow London Luton Airport (LLA) to 32 million passengers per annum (mppa), and Member’s endorsement was sought for the Panel to be consulted on a draft County Council response prepared by the Director of Environment and Infrastructure in consultation with the Executive Member for Growth Infrastructure Planning and the Economy.

3.2 Members learned that the Consultation was still at high level and consultants WSP were undertaking a technical review of the applicant’s preferred option on behalf of the core ‘host’ authorities (Luton Borough Council, Central Bedfordshire Council, North Hertfordshire District Council and Hertfordshire Council Council) who would potentially make a collective and individual technical response to it. The draft response(s) would be circulated for Panel members comment, which would be considered by the Director of Environment and Infrastructure in consultation with the Executive Member for Growth Infrastructure Planning and the Economy in the final response drafting process.

3.3 Members were updated that:

- Since writing of the officer report LLAL’s statutory consultation on the scheme had been extended to 24 December 2019;
- The terms of the planning performance agreement with the developer had been agreed and signed;
- **The following motion, which applied to the County Council’s response to the consultation, had been passed at County Council on 26 November 2019:**

That the Council notes that: -

1. On 24 September 2019, the chair of the Committee on

P Donovan,
T A Baker

CHAIRMAN’S INITIALS

.....

Climate Change (CCC), Lord Deben, wrote to the Secretary of State for Transport about net-zero and the approach to international aviation and shipping (IAS) emissions. The letter responded to the Government's request on how to bring IAS emissions formally within the UK's net-zero target, setting out the rationale and the implications for the UK's climate strategy.

- 2. In that letter the CCC stated that "Aviation emissions could be reduced by around 20% from today to 2050 through improvements to fuel efficiency, some use of sustainable biofuels, and by limiting demand growth to at most 25% above current levels. This is likely to be cost-saving. There is potential to reduce emissions further with lower levels of demand."*
- 3. That the Council has already expressed its serious concerns about the environmental impacts of the proposed expansion of London Luton Airport from 18 million passengers per annum (mppa) to 32 mppa.*
- 4. As per Appendix E paragraph 5.3 of the Executive Report to County Council, **a full draft response to the proposal to expand London Luton Airport will be considered by the Growth, Infrastructure, Planning and Economy Cabinet Panel on 4 December.***

Given the CCC's call for demand growth to be limited to at most 25% above current levels it is proposed that in responding to the current consultation for the expansion of London Luton Airport that the Council: -

- 1. Objects to the proposed expansion plans on the grounds that expansion of London Luton Airport to 32 mppa would result in unacceptable harm to the environment; and***
- 2. That given the letter from the CCC any plans to expand the airport should be deferred until the Government's response to the CCC's letter is published."***

3.4 In relation to point 4 of paragraph 3.2 above, the Panel received a WSP presentation on its technical review draft findings of the LLAL preferred option for LLA Expansion, which can be viewed at: Supplementary Document – [Supplemental Document-WSP Presentation](#). Officers advised that when finalised, that findings of the technical review would be circulated to Panel.

P Donovan
T A Baker;
P Donovan
T A Baker

3.5 In view of the 2014 noise contour planning permission conditions to allow growth to 18 mppa Members emphasised that:

- exceedance of the night time spatial noise contour since 2017 gave little assurance of adherence to future limits;
- any assumption based on the introduction over time of new, quieter, re-engineered aircraft should be challenged as this had not been achieved to date;
- FASI South noise reduction could not be relied on as FASI

**CHAIRMAN'S
INITIALS**

.....

South itself would not be determined until 2025.

3.6

During discussion Members variously highlighted:

- That in view of climate change and comments on the negative impacts some people would experience without direct benefit, LLAL's proposed £1 per additional passenger above the current permitted cap of 18 mppa to a 'Future LuToN Impact Reduction Scheme for the Three Counties' (FIRST) fund as impact mitigation was derisory;
- That the projected £14m LLAL would contribute to the FIRST fund should be enhanced to support a levy on travellers to deter air travel or mitigate further impact;
- That as LLAL's consultation events had been largely located in venues linked to small residents' associations rather than those which would have attracted town wide interest, the consultation period should be extended beyond 24 December;
- The weak case for employment / economic benefits to wider Hertfordshire from any LLA expansion, as employment opportunities would be shared with Bedfordshire and Buckinghamshire, and accrue particularly to people in the immediate vicinity of LLA;
- The current climatic trend for easterly winds, when the runway was aligned to take advantage of westerlies, necessitated aircraft take off against the prevailing wind, thus more flights would impact a greater number of properties in Luton;
- LLAL's claim that no building would take place east of the airport, however a planning application was already in waiting.

3.7

In terms of surface access to an expanded LLA, congestion reduction and modal shift, Members drew attention to the:

- Rail capacity issues at St Albans as indicated by the County Council's Draft Rail Strategy;
- The lack of improvement to access to an expanded airport e.g. via the B653 Lower Luton Rd;
- Lack of evidence of public transport to the proposed bus station;
- Lack of East - West public transport in Hertfordshire;
- Need for offsite car parking and measures to prevent damage to cars whilst parked there;
- LLAL's need to aspire to support modal shift and the climate emergency by increasing public transport to LL through engagement with bus operators to use environmentally friendly technology and provision of e-bikes/e-taxis for workers from further afield.

3.8

The Panel requested that the chairman write to LLAL to ask for the deadline to be extended in view of the technical information outstanding and the need to consider climate change.

D Ashley,
P Donovan

**CHAIRMAN'S
INITIALS**

.....

3.9	Officers agreed to email the County Council’s response, when it became available, to the Panel and all interested Members for their individual responses.	P Donovan T A Baker
3.10	During discussion of the possibility of bringing the County Council’s response to the consultation back to Panel, officers clarified the Development Consent Order process generally had deadlines for which local authorities were expected to have sufficient delegation arrangements in place. Whilst the deadline for this consultation was less stringent, LLAL had already granted the host authorities an extension and it was highly unlikely any calls for a further extension would be supported. However, in recognition of Members’ concerns the vice chairman agreed to consult with the chairman on how to proceed.	A Mitchell D Ashley P Donovan
CONCLUSION:		
3.11	<p>The Panel:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted the County Council’s engagement in the proposed scheme to date, the next steps in the Development Consent Order process and the ongoing technical work in relation to enabling the County Council to respond to the statutory consultation. 2. Would be consulted on the draft County Council response prepared by the Director of Environment and Infrastructure in consultation with the Executive Member for Growth Infrastructure Planning and the Economy, when available. 	P Donovan. M Kemp D Ashley
4	DRAFT RAIL STRATEGY	
[Officer Contact: Val Male, Principal Rail Officer (Tel: 01992 556251)]		
4.1	The Panel considered a new draft Rail Strategy setting out the County Council’s aspirations for developing the rail network in Hertfordshire, prior to public consultation on it in early 2020.	
4.2	Members heard that the chairman had proposed a seminar to bring the Panel and other Members who wished to attend up to date on the many current rail issues.	T Mason V Male
4.3	Members learned that the strategy had been revised to reflect rail industry changes since 2016 and to ensure it was in line with LTP4. It had been rewritten to provide clarity on the County Council’s aspirations, for ease of understanding and, although a high-level strategy, also included issues such as station access.	

CHAIRMAN’S INITIALS

.....

- 4.4 The Panel was reminded that the Council had no powers over how rail services were delivered (i.e. it could not engineer solutions), however publication of its aspirations would give greater weight to its views in franchise consultations, Network Rail route studies and other rail industry processes.
- 4.5 The Panel welcomed the aspiration for a rail line between Stevenage and Luton and suggested that it could stop at towns such as Hitchin.
- 4.6 During discussion Members commented:
- that Elstree station needed to be reconsidered as the redevelopment had not accounted for the new Sky Studios;
 - That there should be an aspiration for a heavy rail (i.e. rapid transit systems and heavier regional rail/intercity rail) between Hertfordshire and Heathrow;
 - That although the idea of a new service from London to Edinburgh calling at Stevenage had been already been around for a while implementation was not imminent as train operator licences were many years in production.
- 4.7 During discussion officers clarified that the rail industry considered Digswell Viaduct a bottleneck and additional signalling was expected which would increase capacity. However, in view of the strength of Member feeling, the strategy could be clearer on the need to maintain capacity at Digswell Viaduct with an aspiration for capacity increase since the bottle neck also impacted aspirations linked to it.
- 4.8 Responding to Member challenge officers clarified that:
- The district/ borough councils had been consulted on the aspiration of a new station at Napsbury to reduce the pressure on other lines and this might be in the final strategy;
 - Dialogue was ongoing with train operators to increase the currently inadequate amount of car parking for rail commuters, with the district / borough councils to allow access to the car parks which were often on railway land and exploration of other ways to get people to the stations.
- 4.9 Officers agreed to consider how to build into the work of the Hertfordshire Growth Board the priority order for work on Hertfordshire railway stations.
- CONCLUSION**
- 4.10 The Panel endorsed the draft Rail Strategy for public consultation.
- D J Barnard left the meeting*

V Male
T Mason

M Kemp

**CHAIRMAN'S
INITIALS**

.....

5. HERTFORDSHIRE GROWTH BOARD MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

[Officer Contact: Patsy Dell, Assistant Director Strategic Planning, Infrastructure & Economy (Tel: 01992 556836); Charles Thompson, Graduate Management Trainee (Tel: 01992 556407)]

S K Jarvis declared an interest as he is a member of North. Herts District Council; he remained in the room and participated in the debate;

S J Taylor declared an interest as she is a member of the LEP Board; she remained in the room and participated in the debate.

5.1 The Panel considered the Hertfordshire Growth Board Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) which set out the objectives, principles, and scope of the collaborative work being and to be undertaken through the Hertfordshire Growth Board.

5.2 Members learned that the Board, established in September 2018 and comprising the Leaders and Chief Executives of the 11 Hertfordshire Councils and the Local Enterprise Partnership, had developed a Place Leadership model for Hertfordshire. It had explored how housing, infrastructure and funding could be jointly addressed in the future and to implement this a forward work programme had been approved. The Leaders had also agreed to develop a MoU to signal their intent to work together collaboratively on place-based issues to central government, partner and Hertfordshire residents, without being legally tied. To date two District Councils had signed the MOU.

CONCLUSION

5.3 That the Panel recommended to Cabinet that Cabinet agree to the Memorandum of Understanding set out in Appendix 1 to the report.

6. PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON THE DRAFT A1(M) GROWTH AND TRANSPORT PLANS (NORTH AND SOUTH CENTRAL)

[Officer Contact: Sue Jackson, Highways - Group Manager for South West Herts and Strategy (Tel: 01992 588615)]

6.1 The Panel considered the Draft A1(M) Growth and Transport Plans (North and South Central) and conclusions of the supporting Strategic Environmental Assessment and Equality Impact Assessment.

6.2 Members learned that the A1(M) Growth and Transport Plans (GTPs) (North and South Central) were part of a suite of spatial

CHAIRMAN'S INITIALS

.....

transport strategies being developed for areas in Hertfordshire; they proposed objectives and packages of transport interventions to support economic growth, housing and jobs whilst promoting quality of life and environmental objectives, in this instance for key towns and smaller settlements along the A1(M) corridor. The draft Plans were ready for a 12-week public consultation from early January to late March 2020.

6.3 The Panel heard that the GTPs were strategic, aligned with Local Transport Plan 4 (LTP4) by focusing on ways to improve access by sustainable transport and once adopted would supersede the relevant Urban Transport Plans (UTPs) and Area Transport Plans. GTPs would work alongside the district councils' Local Plans to establish transport infrastructure improvements at key locations and corridors and were a tool to support bids for external funding and guide interactions with transport partners i.e. Highways England and Network Rail to enable delivery of some of the proposed schemes.

6.4 The Panel welcomed the GTPs and commented that:

- It was not clear how the measures proposed in the GTPs would address population changes;
- They seemed to focus more on addressing current problems;
- A different layout to the GTP documentation might better showcase the focus on sustainable transport;
- Good public engagement would identify weaknesses and ensure sufficient interconnectivity between the transport modes to enable whole journeys to be made from one location to another and not just part way;
- The GTPs could be more ambitious and promote shared space schemes and pavement widening which would improve town centres by blurring traffic and pedestrian distinctions;
- As a suggestion, Transport for London's improvements for pedestrian crossings could be adopted (i.e. where traffic signals show a green signal for pedestrians continuously until vehicular traffic is detected, at which time the pedestrians are stopped on a red signal and vehicles are given a green light to proceed), which would show a focus on pedestrians;
- Horse riders as well as cyclists and pedestrians needed to be catered for;
- It was important to involve the parish councils;
- The GTPs needed to influence provision of joined up cycleways and interurban connections.

**CHAIRMAN'S
INITIALS**

.....

- 6.5 During discussion officers clarified that:
- To encourage wider engagement during the consultation an interactive website would be launched, and the public would be able to click on the maps to see details of the individual proposals in specific areas; there would also be press releases, distribution of posters and leaflets to libraries and direct emails to stakeholders;
 - The Sustainable Transport Corridors in some packages included bus priority measures;
 - Pegasus crossings for horse riders were being considered where appropriate e.g. near London Colney;
 - All the GTPs recognised key corridor connections with one another; work was underway on a cycle connectivity study and Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans (LCWIPs) would also look at interurban cycle connections.
 - Stevenage Borough Council's Local Cycling & Walking Infrastructure Plan (2019) (LCWIP) would enable a more seamless approach to a multi modal corridor between Stevenage and Hitchin.

6.6 A Member highlighted that Colney Heath Parish Council, which bordered the A1, was missing from the list of consultees and officers agreed that the consultation events arranged with the district councils should include the parish councils.

A Vettivelu
S Jackson

CONCLUSION

- 6.7 The Cabinet Panel:
1. Considered and noted the draft A1(M) Growth and Transport Plans (North and South Central) Prospectuses and Intervention papers (Appendix A, B C and D), the draft Consultation Communication Strategy (Appendix E), the draft Strategic Environmental Assessments (Appendix F, G) and Equality Impact Assessments (Appendix H and I).
 2. The Cabinet Panel noted the proposed twelve-week public consultation on the draft A1(M) Growth and Transport Plan (North and South Central) from early January to late March 2020.

7. LOCAL AGGREGATES ASSESSMENT AND ANNUAL MONITORING REPORT

[Officer Contact: Emma Chapman, Planning Assistant
(Tel: 01992 556275)]

- 7.1 The Panel considered the statutory Minerals and Waste Planning Authority's annual monitoring reports i.e. Hertfordshire Authority's Monitoring Report (AMR) which monitored the

**CHAIRMAN'S
INITIALS**

.....

implementation of the adopted Minerals and Waste Local Plan documents and progress of the plan production over the period 1 April 2018 to 31 March 2019, and Hertfordshire's Local Aggregate Assessment (LAA) for the calendar year 2018 which monitored the level of permitted reserves and landbank level of sand and gravel on an annual basis.

7.2 Members heard that, based on the 1 April 2018 to 31 March 2019 AMR, Hertfordshire's Minerals and Waste Local Plan documents remained a sound basis upon which to determine minerals and waste planning applications. The LAA, which formed part of the evidence basis of the Mineral Local Plan, would also continue to take into account national and local legislative requirements and would continue to monitor sand and gravel supply and demand in Hertfordshire.

7.3 Attention was drawn to paragraph 6.21 of the LAA, Section 6 Future Aggregate Supply and Demand which required completion before publication.

E Chapman

7.4 Members heard that as Cllr. M Eames-Petersen's email to the Panel chairman/vice chairman, entitled 'Response to the Hertfordshire Mineral Local Plan consultation', was not applicable to the statutory reports under consideration and as the issue was due to be considered at Development Control Committee on 18 December 2019, the chairman/vice chairman had agreed to provide her with a written response which would also be emailed to the Panel.

D Ashley,
A Mitchell,
T A Baker

7.5 During discussion officers clarified that:

- the delay to the timelines for the Minerals Local Plan review had resulted from the need for trial trenches to be dug at the Briggens Estate as part of further technical work required. Some archaeological hot spots have been identified;
- In terms of risk to forecast reserves of sand and gravel, if the BAE Hatfield Aerodrome site did not come forward due to the Bromate Plume other sites would need to be considered the Minerals Local Plan.

CONCLUSION

7.6 The Cabinet Panel:

- i) Considered and noted both the AMR and the LAA as outlined in this report and attached at Appendix 1 (AMR) and Appendix 2 (LAA);
- ii) Acknowledged that both documents would be placed on the County Council's website.

**CHAIRMAN'S
INITIALS**

.....

8. GROWTH, INFRASTRUCTURE, PLANNING & THE ECONOMY PERFORMANCE MONITOR

[Officer Contact: Simon Aries, Assistant Director Transport, Waste & Environmental Management (Tel: 01992 555255); Patsy Dell, Assistant Director Strategic Planning, Infrastructure & Economy (Tel: 01992 556836)].

8.1 The Panel reviewed the performance of Growth, Infrastructure, Planning & the Economy for July-September 2019, Q2, against the Environment and Infrastructure Department Service Plan 2020-2024.

8.2 Members heard that subsequent to writing of the report verified data for October 2019 for the monitor 'All Young People who are Not in Education, Employment or Training (NEET)' had become available; this was 2.4% and an improvement on Q1.

8.3 Following a Member request for monitoring of 'Employment Space Reduction' officers agreed to find out if this was feasible.

S Aries
P Dell

8.4 During discussion of the drop to 15% in the 'Percentage of Affordable Housing Achieved through the Planning System', despite the rise in 'Net Additional Homes Provided', officers clarified that developers were disputing the viability of affordable housing on housing developments and pushing market dwellings whilst the economy was stable to maximise return, none the less lobbying for affordable housing would continue via the Growth Board. A Member suggested that the target for 'Percentage of Affordable Housing Achieved through the Planning System' should be increased to allow for the backlog in building of affordable housing.

S Aries
P Dell

CONCLUSION:

8.5 The Cabinet Panel noted the report and commented as above on the performance monitor for Quarter 2 2019-20.

9. OTHER PART I BUSINESS

9.1 There was no other Part I business.

**QUENTIN BAKER
CHIEF LEGAL OFFICER**

CHAIRMAN _____

**CHAIRMAN'S
INITIALS**

.....