



**WATFORD**  
BOROUGH  
COUNCIL



## Strategic Planning Members Group

2pm, 17<sup>th</sup> December 2019  
St Albans City & District Council Offices

### NOTES OF MEETING

#### Attendees

Cllr Chris White	St Albans City & District Council (Chair)
Cllr Jamie Day	St Albans City & District Council
Cllr Harvey Cohen	Hertsmere Borough Council
Cllr Iain Sharpe	Watford Borough Council
Cllr Graham Sutton	Dacorum Borough Council
Chris Outtersides (CO)	South West Herts JSP Programme
James Doe (JD)	Dacorum Borough Council
Laura Wood (LW)	Hertsmere Borough Council
Claire May (CM)	Three Rivers DC
Tracy Harvey (TH)	St Albans City & District Council
Claire Wainwright (CW)	St Albans City & District Council *
Jon Tiley (JT)	Hertfordshire County Council
Philippa Curran (PC)	Iceni Projects *
Charlotte Hunter (CH)	Iceni Projects *

\* Agenda item 3 only

Item	Notes & Actions	Action Owner
1	<p><b>Welcome, introductions and apologies</b></p> <p>Apologies were noted from Cllr Sara Bedford (Three Rivers District Council), Cllr Derek Ashley (Hertfordshire County Council) and Ian Dunsford (Watford Borough Council).</p>	
2	<p><b>Notes from the previous meeting and actions arising</b></p> <p>CO confirmed that all actions had either been completed, or were covered under other agenda items.</p> <p>CO also noted that the agreed minutes from the SPMG meetings would be uploaded to the respective partner authority's websites</p>	

	<p>from now on.</p> <p><b>ACTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The minutes and actions from the SPMG meeting held on the 4 November 2019 were agreed as a true and accurate record of that meeting.</b></li> </ul>	
3	<p><b>Draft JSP Engagement Strategy Proposal</b></p> <p>CO introduced the engagement proposal, outlining that this follows the request from Members at the last meeting in November, and the desire to engage before the results of the SGLS and MMS are known. CO explained that the engagement proposal had been discussed by the partner authority's comms and planning teams before being presented to Members at the meeting.</p> <p>PC and CH set out the key points of the proposal, emphasising the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That the strategy would run from January until March;</li> <li>• That the strategy would primarily be aimed at the under 25's;</li> <li>• It would move away from planning and would not involve reference to the JSP or housing numbers;</li> <li>• That the strategy would involve polled questions and short videos, uploaded to an online platform that would allow under 25's to engage easily with the strategy; and</li> <li>• It was anticipated that the strategy would reach between 1,000 and 1,500 under 25's.</li> </ul> <p>CH introduced a proposed logo for the engagement. This was designed to be focussed on '<i>SWH – Your Future</i>' and would use colours from each of the partner authority's own logos. The idea was that the logo would be used as part of the engagement, but could be transitioned to a JSP logo in due course.</p> <p>CO also outlined that the engagement would involve all Member briefings on the JSP for each of the partner authorities but that this could happen concurrently to the wider engagement as proposed.</p> <p>Cllr Cohen queried whether the results of the engagement could be translated on a district by district basis.</p> <p>Following discussion, Members confirmed that they were happy with the engagement strategy, associated costs and the engagement logo as proposed (including working with Iceni and Built ID), subject to the following actions:</p> <p><b>ACTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The polling questions and 'pre-amble' to the strategy to be circulated electronically to the SPMG for approval prior to commencement of the engagement;</b></li> <li>• <b>All Member briefings to be scheduled across each of the partner authorities in January;</b></li> <li>• <b>The all Member briefings will be led by the SPMG Members, supported by CO and the respective SPOG team member;</b></li> </ul>	<p>CO</p> <p>CO/SPOG</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>CO to confirm with Iceni that the results of the engagement can be translated on a district by district basis;</b></li> <li>• <b>Iceni and CO will brief 3-Fox to ensure that any messaging around the engagement fitted into the HGB branding exercise; and</b></li> <li>• <b>CO to work with procurement at DBC to ensure that Iceni and Built ID can be procured efficiently.</b></li> </ul>	<p>All</p> <p>CO</p> <p>CO</p> <p>CO/JD</p>
4	<p><b>Governance</b></p> <p>CO introduced the governance proposal, explaining that he had evolved and streamlined the proposed structure as set out in the 2018 MoU.</p> <p>Cllr White requested that the regularity of SPMG meetings be updated to reflect that the group should meet 'at least every 12 weeks, and as required'.</p> <p>Following discussion, the governance proposal was agreed, subject to the above amendment and the following actions:</p> <p><b>ACTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>That the agreed governance structure would be presented to the HGB for information; and</b></li> <li>• <b>That CO would issue the agreed governance structure to the SPOG team for uploading to the partner authority's websites for information.</b></li> </ul>	<p>JT/CO</p> <p>CO/SPOG</p>
5	<p><b>JSP Budget</b></p> <p>CO introduced the budget confirming that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The budget assumes a £40k contribution from each of the partner authorities moving forward; and</li> <li>• The budget does not include any additional capacity funding from MHCLG.</li> </ul> <p>Following discussion, the budget and evidence base was noted, subject to the following actions:</p> <p><b>ACTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>That a narrative for each of the pieces of evidence be prepared setting out what the evidence would address (for the post 2036 period) along with when it would be needed.</b></li> <li>• <b>That the budget be regularly reviewed by the SPMG moving forward.</b></li> <li>• <b>That the budget clearly highlights the current funding gap.</b></li> </ul>	<p>CO</p> <p>CO/All</p> <p>CO</p>
6	<p><b>JSP Risk Register</b></p> <p>CO introduced the Risk Register, confirming that it was currently a standing item on the SPOG meeting agendas.</p> <p>Following discussion, the Risk Register was noted, subject to the following actions:</p>	

	<p><b>ACTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That a double RAG column be included; setting out the RAG status before and after any mitigation measures; and</li> <li>• That the revised JSP Risk Register be presented to the HGB, highlighting the current 'red' risks around resourcing and budget.</li> </ul>	<p>CO CO/JT</p>
<p>7</p>	<p><b>AOB</b></p> <p>CO confirmed that the next meeting of the SPMG was scheduled for the 28<sup>th</sup> January. That meeting will focus on the outcomes of Stage 1 of the SGLS and MMS and the methodology for Stage 2 of that work. It would also be useful to feedback any results from the engagement.</p>	