

# 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 FRIDAY, 7 FEBRUARY 2020**

### **ATTENDANCE**

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

D A Ashley (Chairman), T C Heritage (substitution for D Barnard), S J Boulton, S J Featherstone, S K Jarvis, M A Eames-Petersen (substitution for A K Khan), P V Mason, G McAndrew, A J S Mitchell (Vice-Chairman), E M Gordon (substitution for S J Taylor), A S B Walkington, R H Smith (substitution for J A West).

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

A P Brewster, C B Wyatt-Lowe, W J Wyatt-Lowe

Upon consideration of the agenda for the Growth, Infrastructure, Planning and the Economy meeting on 7 February 2020 as circulated, copy annexed, conclusions were reached and are recorded below:

#### **Chairman's announcements:**

To accommodate officer commitments item 8 was considered before item 7.

#### **Declarations of Interest:**

-

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

#### **1. MINUTES**

- 1.1 The Minutes of the Growth, Infrastructure, Planning & the Economy Cabinet Panel meeting held on 4 December 2019 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

#### **2 PUBLIC PETITIONS**

#### **CHAIRMAN'S INITIALS**

.....

2.1 There were no public petitions.

### 3. SOUTH WEST HERTFORDSHIRE JOINT STRATEGIC PLAN

[Contact: Chris Outtaside, Director South West Hertfordshire Joint Strategic Plan]

3.1 The Panel received a presentation from Chris Outtaside on the South West Hertfordshire Joint Strategic Plan (SWJSP) which can be viewed at: [Supplementary Document-Item 3-Presentation-SW Herts Joint Strategic Plan](#)

3.2 Members learned that the Plan was proposed to be a joined-up, post 2036 to 2050 shared vision of a cross boundary strategic approach to infrastructure delivery, economic opportunities and housing challenges. The JSP would facilitate sustainable growth decisions across the SW of the county as a whole and without such collaboration Hertfordshire would likely be overlooked for government investment. The Plan adoption target was end of 2023 in order to have the necessary infrastructure by 2035.

3.3 During discussion C Outtsides clarified that:

- The JSP would not replace Local and District Plans but would guide the next Local Plan review.
- None of the 6 authorities involved would lose their planning committee sovereignty.
- Engagement was vital to building trust, the latter being essential before proposing ideas/solutions.
- As the time frame for maturation of the vision was post 2036, engagement with the under 25s would include schools in order to hear that mattered to young people, including what would make them stay in SW Hertfordshire and their priorities for improving it.
- Engagement also included the larger towns and trying to identify the SW Hertfordshire identity.
- In view of the sensitivities around Local Plans and the need for transparency a SWHertsJSP website would be set up, once the JSP had been committed to. Currently, the JSP meeting minutes were published on the websites of each of the authorities involved.
- So that potential parochialism from the authorities involved did not cause the JSP to fail before reaching fruition, it would not be adopted unless it was adopted at each stage by each authority, which required keeping the authorities fully briefed including planning committees.
- As sustainable transport did not stop at county borders talks were ongoing with towns such as Aylesbury, and London.

3.4 The chairman thanked C. Outtsides for the presentation.

**CHAIRMAN'S  
INITIALS**

.....

**CONCLUSION:**

3.5 The Panel noted the presentation

**4 INTEGRATED PLAN 2020/21 - 2023/24 GROWTH, INFRASTRUCTURE, PLANNING AND THE ECONOMY**

[Officer Contact: Faisal Mir (Assistant Director Finance and Business Support, Environment and Infrastructure (Tel: 01992 555692)]

*All Members who have a disclosable pecuniary interest arising from an allowance from the County Council, another local authority in Hertfordshire, or a body to whom they have been appointed by the County Council, have received a dispensation to allow them to participate in debate and vote on the Integrated Plan.*

*All Members have been granted a dispensation to participate in debate and vote in any business of the County Council relating to setting the council tax or precept when they would otherwise be prevented from doing so in consequence of having a beneficial interest in land which is within the administrative area of Hertfordshire or a licence (alone or jointly) to occupy such land.*

4.1 The Panel considered a report which provided a high-level overview of the County Council’s financial position (the Integrated Plan (IP)) in order to consider those issues relating to the Growth, Infrastructure, Planning and The Economy (GRIPE) portfolio.

4.2 Officers highlighted the positive nature of this budget review for the (GRIPE) portfolio. In revenue terms this comprised no new policy choices, growth resourcing of £200k per annum for consultancy and Public Inquiry costs, alongside £270k per annum for strategic planning in Hertfordshire. New capital monies included an extra £9m for bus priorities and measures, and £150k in relation to the Integrated Transport Unit (ITU) systems which brought together the Council’s delivery of transport, to make better, more efficient use of routes and fleets.

4.3 To Member challenge at the location of Sustainable Herts within the GRIPE portfolio, since the environmental areas could not make the greatest contribution to it and the issue should be visible across the Authority, officers clarified that its current placement was pragmatic.

**CHAIRMAN’S INITIALS**

.....

- 4.4 Members welcomed the wider package of measures for buses the government had announced on 6 February, particularly as it was the first element of growth in Local Government since for a number of years. Officers highlighted that the funding came with different timescales, criteria and processes for bidding, some of which excluded Hertfordshire. From a preliminary assessment one of the criteria was towns/cities with poor quality air; in Hertfordshire this applied only to Broxbourne and a bid would be considered. Funding was also available for new fleet of electric buses; the winning town would be used as model by the government. In relation to the grant for bus services operators, for a trial of demand responsive transport for rural areas where bus services were less frequent, a £400k bid was being prepared for next year.
- 4.5 Responding to a Member challenge officers clarified that the £9m for the Intalink Enhanced Partnership Highways Scheme would involve improvements to bus infrastructure and the highways network, e.g. bus lanes and gates to prioritise bus movements over other traffic, particularly in congested areas. This would enable buses to become a more reliable and attractive option thus reducing congestion. However, the cooperation of the Local Planning Authorities on parking which often impeded the passage of buses would be required.
- 4.6 A Member challenged the modest expenditure on the ITU systems, bearing in mind the expectation that with these tools the ITU was expected to find savings in the Council's transport delivery. Officers highlighted that savings should be possible from the £30m transport budget and to progress this a Head of Transport Unit was being recruited. The results would be reported back to the GriPE cabinet panel.
- 4.7 With Members' agreement to suggestions from the chairman the recommendations were changed to those in paragraph 4.8.

S Aries

**CONCLUSION**

- 4.8 The Panel:
1. Recommended to Cabinet that the Integrated Plan 2020/21-2023/24 for Growth, Infrastructure, Planning and the Economy is agreed.
  2. Welcomed the £9m investment in the Intalink Enhanced Bus Partnership, thanking the bus companies and the Department for Transport for their work in supporting the Council to bring this forward, and welcomed the investment in the Integrated Transport Unit.
  3. Welcomed the ongoing investment in growth, enabling the Council to continue to support the delivery of good growth and engage in proactive place leadership in Hertfordshire.

**CHAIRMAN'S  
INITIALS**

.....

The panel agreed unanimously to recommendations 2 and 3, but voted as follows on recommendation 1:  
8 in favour : 4 abstentions – all 4 opposition members present abstained

**5. INTALINK ENHANCED PARTNERSHIP**

[Officer Contact: Matt Lale, Passenger Transport Manager (Tel: 01992 588633); Jacob Wing, Network and Travel Planning Deputy Team Leader (Tel: 01992 588617)]

- 5.1 The Panel considered a report which proposed that the County Council adopts a combined “Intalink Bus Strategy” which brought together and revised the existing Bus Strategy and Intalink Strategy.
- 5.2 Members learned that an Enhanced Partnership would prioritise modal change in line Local Transport Plan 4 and extend the Intalink Quality Partnership. Via new powers conferred in the amended Transport Act 2000 the Council would be able to take on bus service registration powers, the expectation being of close working with the operators to improve poor performance, the registration powers acting to deter non-compliance.
- 5.3 The Panel noted that operator feedback had identified traffic congestion as the biggest obstacle to providing reliable, punctual and profitable commercial bus services and that, as Highway Authority, the Council could implement bus priority measures to reduce the impact of this. Resultant reduction of bus journey times would increase ridership and act as an incentive to operators to offset the additional costs to them of meeting standards for meaningful improvement.
- 5.4 Members heard that an Intalink Enhanced Partnership comprised an Enhanced Partnership Plan and an Enhanced Partnership Scheme. Further to this it was a statutory requirement for both parties to comply with all elements of the Plan and Scheme, the Partnership being legally binding. If adopted the Council would be the first in the country to adopt the Enhanced Partnership.
- 5.5 During discussion of the joint County Council and bus operator established objectives, Members highlighted that as part of improving the image of buses, a necessary and quick win to show the direction of travel of the partnership was to ensure that the Intalink Enhanced Partnership branding was bold since operators would be keeping their own livery.

**CHAIRMAN’S  
INITIALS**

.....

In response to questions officers clarified that:

- Although it had not responded to the consultation St Albans City & District Council supported the Partnership;
- Although the number of responses to the consultation had been small, at 2460 it was the highest response rate to any of the council's policies;
- At 21% of the responses received, the response from the disabled community reflected that a greater percentage of this population used buses than formed part of the population as a whole and this data set would feed into future approaches;
- There was a process to revise the partnership to reflect altered travel landscapes before the partnership end date;
- The first schemes to be implemented through the feasibility studies are those towns that operators had identified as a priority e.g. Stevenage, St Albans and Watford;
- Members could forward relevant congestion issues in their towns to officers for consideration in 2021 and onwards;
- To aid in prioritising schemes bus operators were expected to identify the most congested corridors in towns and report this via the Partnership;
- Localised meetings would be undertaken for the various schemes.

- 5.6 During discussion of seeking Community Infrastructure Levy contributions for bus schemes from developers, the chairman observed that this could be done undertaken where it was legally unchallengeable, and the District Planning Authorities should be leveraging the system to enable this.

## **CONCLUSION**

- 5.7 The Growth, Infrastructure, Planning and the Economy Cabinet Panel recommended to Cabinet that Cabinet adopt The Intalink Bus Strategy and Enhanced Partnership proposal in Appendix A and Appendix B to the report.

## **6. ADOPTION OF THE PLACE & MOVEMENT APPROACH**

[Officer Contact: Sue Jackson Group Manager Highways Operations & Strategy (Tel: 01992 588 615)]

- 6.1 The Panel considered a report on the technical Place and Movement approach to recognising the needs of different road users, managing the interfaces between them and the implications for adopting the approach, with a view to recommending that Cabinet agree its adoption and embedding as a concept in Local Transport Plan 4 (LTP4).

**CHAIRMAN'S  
INITIALS**

.....

- 6.2 Members welcomed the approach and highlighted that it would aid in planning for delivery of good growth, by making developers aware of LTP objectives and what mitigation measures for future housing and employment developments Highways might support. It would also enable the development of safer streets where people could cycle / walk safely.
- 6.3 Members learned that the approach classified the highway network into 9 categories based on relative place and vehicle movement function, considering land use, road type and rural or urban location. In line with LTP4 the approach would aid in making the highway more attractive, where appropriate, to sustainable modes of transport, i.e. pedestrians, cyclists and passenger transport, over private car use.

### **CONCLUSION**

- 6.4
1. The Cabinet Panel recommended to Cabinet that Cabinet adopt the Place and Movement approach and endorse the use of its principles in the following LTP4 supporting documents:
    - (i) Speed Management Strategy
    - (ii) The next generation of Roads in Herts (Hertfordshire Design Guide)
    - (iii) Active Travel Strategy
  2. The Cabinet Panel recognised its use as part of the toolkit for supporting the following strategies:
    - (i) Maintenance of Active Travel Strategy
    - (ii) Network Management Strategy
    - (iii) Road Safety Strategy.

### **7. EAST MIDLANDS RAILWAY DECEMBER 2020 TIMETABLE CONSULTATION**

[Officer Contact: Trevor Mason, Team Leader Strategic Transport & Rail (Tel: 01992 55611)]

- 7.1 The Panel considered a report on the County Council's response to the consultation being undertaken by East Midlands Railway on the proposed timetable to be introduced in December 2020.
- 7.2 Members heard that the East Midlands Railway (EMR) was consulting on the proposed December 2020 timetable which encompassed the Department for Transport (DfT) franchise specification to speed up journey times between London and East Midlands' cities. The timetable changes would remove

**CHAIRMAN'S  
INITIALS**

.....

EMRs long-distance rail connectivity to Hertfordshire, i.e. (i) removal of intermediate long-distance stops south of Kettering i.e. Luton Airport Parkway / Luton; (ii) conversion of the Corby service from long-distance to commuting

7.3 Officers highlighted the overall negative impact on connectivity between Hertfordshire and the East Midlands; although the journey time between St Albans and Leicester would increase by 6 minutes the frequency would possibly increase from hourly to every 30 minutes, however, additional changes of train would be required. The Corby commuter service would call at Luton Airport Parkway and Luton but would not service any station in Hertfordshire.

7.4 Members variously:

- Welcomed the line being taken in the Council's draft response to the consultation.
- Observed that the proposed changes could evolve into gradual reduction of rail travel options in Hertfordshire and negatively impact its economy;
- welcomed the call for the addition of St Albans to the Corby service;
- expressed concern that although completion of electrification etc. to the Midland Main Line would allow restoration to Harpenden of the peak Thameslink services removed in May 2018, but promised under the Thameslink programme, this might be reversed by prioritisation of trains for Luton;
- observed that a review was required of the DfT's London centric attitude to rail transport and the need for connections,

7.5 The Panel supported the draft response set out in appendix 2 to the report and, in view of Members comments, officers agreed to make further additions to it to strengthen it further.

7.6 A Member highlighted that attendance by many Members at the Rail Seminar on 24 February would emphasise to the attending rail operators the Council's strength of feeling on these issues.

## **CONCLUSION**

7.7 The Panel supported the draft responses set out in Appendix 2 to the report with further additions to strength it further.

## **8. A414 CORRIDOR STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION PLAN**

[Officer Contact: Sue Jackson, Group Manager Highways Strategy -(Tel: 01992 588 615)].

**CHAIRMAN'S  
INITIALS**

.....

- 8.1 The Panel received an update report on the A414 Corridor Implementation plan, including the Mass Rapid Transit (MRT) scheme and the live implementation plan as at January 2020.
- 8.2 A compressed version of the plan displaying only the MRT supporting schemes was tabled and welcomed by the Panel:- [Supplementary Document-Item 8-MRT supporting schemes on A414 Implementation Plan](#)
- 8.3 The Panel heard that the Hertfordshire Growth Board (HGB) was developing a long term, shared strategy for place-base growth across the county, centred on design and delivery of two nationally significant strategic East-West growth corridors. The HGB Steering Group was developing programmes to support development in the county to 2050 and intended to submit an investment proposal to Central Government in early 2020. The HGB was initially focusing on the East West-South corridor, which the A414 Strategy aligned with and A414 Implementation Plan fed into.
- 8.4 The Panel were reminded that the A414 Strategy's purpose was to identify the role, function and investment priorities for the A414 corridor. This would include identification of key infrastructure requirements to support strategic sites and support the requirements of funding from developments and bids. The corridor included parallel and connecting routes for all journey types and transport modes. Members observed that the MRT would create great opportunities for East West travel and retail and would act as a 'policy hook' for the Local Plan. Members heard that an MRT workshops were being held and portfolio holders and senior officers were invited to the event on the on 13 February.
- 8.5 Members noted that MRT development work also fed into South West Herts Joint Strategic Plan (cf. item 3 of this agenda) which was examining where growth could be accommodated following the current local plan period (2036) including a Multi Modal Transport Strategy.
- 8.6 The Panel noted the work being done to achieve consensus on what an East-West MRT system was trying to achieve, including a stakeholder and communications and engagement plan and engagement with the Local Planning Authorities.
- 8.7 The Strategic Outline Business Case was scheduled for early summer 2020. Other scheme packages would be progressed and included in the Implementation Plan; smaller scale short term measures with no dependencies would be he taken forward in the Highways Integrated Transport Programme along with development work already in train for the committed scheme at

**CHAIRMAN'S  
INITIALS**

.....

Colney Heath Longabout and the concept development for the A414 London Colney Junction. Those dependent on developments would be integrated in the local plan policies in South West Herts currently under review, and in master planning and discussion with developers.

- 8.8 Officers clarified that at the most heavily trafficked Pedestrian Crossings waiting times were being considered.
- 8.9 During discussion Members were asked to inform officers of any planned discussions with Highways England to ensure that mixed messages were not given.
- 8.10 The chairman suggested and the Panel agreed the following amendment to recommendation 3.1 and an additional recommendation i.e. recommendation 3.5;
- 3.1. That the Cabinet Panel *notes* the updated Implementation Plan along with the proposed list of schemes and potential timescales and dependencies for implementation.
- 3.5 *Panel to be updated periodically with progress on the scheme*

Members

**CONCLUSION:**

- 8.11 3.1 The Cabinet Panel noted the updated Implementation Plan along with the proposed list of schemes and potential timescales and dependencies for implementation and noted the progress to date.
- 3.2 The Panel noted the progress made so far on the development of the Mass Rapid Transit project.
- 3.3 The Panel noted the links with other key areas of work including the South West Herts Joint Strategic Plan and the Growth Board.
- 3.4 The Panel recognised the need for significant ongoing investment to bring forward the package of schemes.
- 3.5 The Panel to be updated periodically with progress on the scheme

**9. OTHER PART I BUSINESS**

- 9.1 There was no other Part I business.

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

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

**CHAIRMAN'S  
INITIALS**

.....