



**WATFORD**  
BOROUGH  
COUNCIL



## South West Hertfordshire Joint Strategic Plan Strategic Planning Members Group

1.30pm, 10<sup>th</sup> July 2020  
Meeting held via Microsoft Teams

### NOTES OF MEETING

#### Attendees

Cllr Chris White	St Albans City & District Council (Chair)
Cllr Jamie Day	St Albans City & District Council
Cllr Iain Sharpe	Watford Borough Council
Cllr Graham Sutton	Dacorum Borough Council
Cllr Sarah Nelmes	Three Rivers District Council
Chris Outtersides (CO)	South West Herts JSP Programme
James Doe (JD)	Dacorum Borough Council
Ross Whear (RW)	Hertsmere Borough Council
Laura Wood (LW)	Hertsmere Borough Council
Claire May (CM)	Three Rivers District Council
Tracy Harvey (TH)	St Albans City & District Council
Jack Green (JG)	Watford Borough Council
Jon Tiley (JT)	Hertfordshire County Council

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) and Cllr Harvey Cohen (Hertsmere 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><b>ACTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No actions</li> </ul>	

<p><b>3</b></p>	<p><b>Strategic Planning Update</b></p> <p>CO noted that the £540k of capacity funding from MHCLG to support the JSP had now been received and was being held by Dacorum on behalf of the JSP partnership. CO advised that the award of the funding reflects the profile of the JSP within MHCLG.</p> <p>CO also explained that he had met with MHCLG (along with TH) to update them on the progress of the South West Herts JSP. The meeting was also attended by representatives of the Oxfordshire JSSP as well as South Essex who are also considering a statutory joint plan. As well as updating MHCLG on the JSP, the meeting focussed on the current Local Plan inspection process with discussion focussing on the changes that are needed in relation to the consideration of joint strategic plans as opposed to Local Plans. MHCLG advised that changes to the strategic planning process may be included in the upcoming Planning White Paper which is expected by the end of July.</p> <p>A follow up meeting with MHCLG was in the process of being arranged.</p> <p>CO noted that it may be appropriate for the JSP programme to respond to the White Paper, depending on what it says about strategic plans. CO went on to explain that any submission would need to be approved by the SPMG first</p> <p><b>ACTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>CO to keep SPMG updated on any discussions with MHCLG</b></li> </ul>	
<p><b>4</b></p>	<p><b>JSP Engagement Summary</b></p> <p>CO introduced the engagement summary prepared by Icen Projects noting that the online engagement had now been completed. In summary, the engagement reached over 10,000 people with over 3,000 people answering the polls. In addition, over 700 people provided their contact details and were interested in further discussions about the future of SW Herts. CO noted that the response rate to the engagement was twice what was expected and represented an excellent outcome. CO also noted that the age spread of respondents was roughly equal across the board.</p> <p>CO confirmed that the draft report had been considered by Council comms and planning officers and had been well received.</p> <p>Cllr White queried why the number of respondents from Dacorum appeared to be higher than other areas of SW Hers. CO and JD confirmed that there had been a strong social media 'push' from Dacorum, but that this should be investigated further. In addition, JD noted that the number of Dacorum respondents had been higher in the early weeks of the engagement, but this had levelled off after a couple of weeks.</p> <p>Cllr White noted that parks and open spaces and proximity to London were the two clear favourite things that respondents like about SW Herts.</p>	

	<p>RW queried whether parks and open spaces included reference to Green belt and whether this distinction was made in the polls. CO confirmed that Green belt was not specifically referenced in the polls.</p> <p>Cllr Day noted the relatively low response in relation to job opportunities being important to the residents of SW Herts and whether this reflected the current trend for residents of SW Herts to commute into London for work. CO and JD confirmed that this was likely to be the case, but that an important part of the JSP will still be to provide sufficient employment opportunities within SW Herts.</p> <p>Following further discussions, it was agreed that the report (once amended) should be issued to each of the partner authorities for information and dissemination. Once this has happened, the report should then be released, with an accompanying press release.</p> <p>Cllr Sutton noted that contact should be made with those who had provided their contact details, thanking them for responding to the engagement and providing them with a copy of the report. This was agreed, once the report had been socialised with the partner authorities.</p> <p><b>ACTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>CO to work with Iceni to finalise the engagement report;</b></li> <li>• <b>CO to issue the report to the partner authorities for dissemination;</b></li> <li>• <b>ALL to work with CO to ensure that the report is considered by all partner authorities;</b></li> <li>• <b>CO to email those who had expressed an interest in being involved in the process with a copy of the report;</b></li> <li>• <b>CO to coordinate a press release, once the report has been accepted and can be made public.</b></li> </ul>	<p>CO</p> <p>CO</p> <p>CO</p> <p>CO</p> <p>CO</p>
<p><b>5</b></p>	<p><b>Strategic Growth Locations Study / Multi Modal Study Update</b></p> <p>CO explained that the online Member engagement to set the aims for the SGLS and MMS had not produced the anticipated response and that the process had therefore been paused pending an 'in person' workshop which it is hoped could be convened in autumn 2020.</p> <p>CO emphasised that the results of the engagement and workshop will be critical to the robustness of the SGLS and MMS and therefore the JSP. It was therefore important that a proportionate and representative response from the partnership was secured to the engagement, even if this meant a slight delay to the programme.</p> <p>CO also confirmed that DLA and ITP (the consultants contracted to prepare the SGLS and MMS) were working on preparing options for consideration once the outcome of the workshop/engagement were known. This will minimise any delay to the programme.</p> <p>CO questioned whether it was worth a final 'push' requesting Member involvement in the online engagement tool. Following</p>	

	<p>discussion, it was agreed not to do this, and to wait until an ‘in person’ workshop could be held.</p> <p><b>ACTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>CO to send out calendar invites for the SGLS and MMS workshop in autumn 2020.</b></li> </ul>	<b>CO</b>
<b>6</b>	<p><b>JSP Budget</b></p> <p>CO introduced the JSP budget confirming that this now reflected the MHCLG capacity funding.</p> <p>CO also confirmed that he had had discussions with the Dacorum finance officers, and that the JSP budget had carried over approximately £710k from 19/20, with approximately £950k now in the budget following contributions from each of the partner authorities.</p> <p>Moving forward, the budget currently anticipates carrying over at least £500k into 21/22, although this is likely to be higher given the delays to the programme.</p> <p>Following discussion, the budget was noted.</p> <p><b>ACTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>No actions</b></li> </ul>	
<b>7</b>	<p><b>JSP Risk Register</b></p> <p>CO introduced the revised Risk Register, confirming that there had been two material changes to risks 2 and 4. These relate to Government changes necessary to facilitate strategic planning (risk 2) and the reliance of the JSP on the respective district and borough Local Plans with the respective risks now reading as red (2) and amber (4) respectively.</p> <p>Following discussion, the Risk Register was noted.</p> <p><b>ACTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>No actions</b></li> </ul>	
<b>7</b>	<p><b>AOB</b></p> <p>CO queried whether an agenda item should be added to the HGB on the JSP. Cllr White confirmed that this was a good idea.</p> <p>Cllr White provided an update on the work that the HGB is currently doing, confirming that discussions with Government about a Hertfordshire ‘deal’ were still ongoing. Cllr White also confirmed that the minutes of the HGB were also now published on the partner council(s) website(s).</p> <p>Cllr White raised the issue of briefing MP’s. Following discussion, it was agreed that this should happen in tandem with the HGB. CO to discuss with Patsy Dell.</p>	

	<b>ACTIONS:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• CO to liaise with JT and Patsy Dell to add an agenda item to the HGB on the JSP</li><li>• CO to liaise with Patsy Dell regarding briefing MP's.</li></ul>	CO/JT CO
--	---	-------------