

Cabinet Planning and Parking Panel
17 August 2023

WELWYN HATFIELD COUNCIL

* Reporting to Cabinet

Minutes of a meeting of the WELWYN HATFIELD COUNCIL CABINET PLANNING AND PARKING PANEL held on Thursday 17 August 2023 at 7.30 pm in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, The Campus, Welwyn Garden City, Herts, AL8 6AE.

PRESENT: Councillors K.Thorpe (Chairman)
R.Platt (Vice-Chairman)

S.Bonfante, J.Boulton, S.Goldwater, T.Kingsbury,
G.Michaelides, L.Musk, A.Hellyer, C.Stanbury,
S.Thusu, P.Zukowskyj and J.Weston

ALSO Councillors
PRESENT:

OFFICIALS C Carter, Assistant Director (Planning)
PRESENT: C Hyland, Principal Planner
M.Wilson, Planning & Policy Implementation Manager
M. Pyecroft, Senior Planner
R. Misir, Democratic Services Officer

-----51:-----SUBSTITUTIONS-----

The following substitution of Members had been made in accordance with Council Procedure Rules:
Cllr Jill Weston for Cllr Rose Grewal.

52. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Rose Grewal.

53. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 22 June 2023 were approved as a correct record.

54. NOTIFICATION OR URGENT BUSINESS TO BE CONSIDERED UNDER ITEM 7

There were no items of urgent business.

55. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS BY MEMBERS

Cabinet Planning and Parking Panel
17 August 2023

Cllr Kingsbury declared a non-pecuniary interest as a Hertfordshire County Councillor. He also advised he had been part of the Cabinet that had agreed the Active Travel strategy (item 11 on the agenda) go out to consultation; this was a non-pecuniary interest.

Cllr Weston declared a non-pecuniary interest as she had been on the BGS steering group.

Cllrs Thusu and Zukowskyj declared a non-pecuniary interest as Hertfordshire County Councillors.

56. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME AND PETITIONS

The question set out below was received from a member of the public.

“My name is Howard Dawson. I am a resident of Welham Green. I am also a Chartered Surveyor and a Regulation 19 party at the Welwyn Hatfield Local Plan Examination.

The Liberal Democrats and the Labour Members of this Council have been staunch opponents against the allocation of High Harm housing sites in the Green Belt. Equally, the Conservatives, despite being the party which originally advanced the three High Harm sites for allocation in the Local Plan, have also committed themselves unequivocally to the removal of High Harm sites from the Local Plan. In a letter written by the Cabinet of this Council to the Prime Minister on 21 September 2022, it stated;

“A key point for us was that this allocation removed three sites classed as ‘high harm’ to the Green Belt, following a review instigated by the Inspector.”

Two of the three High Harm sites are in Cuffley where, Mr Jonathan Shack, a resident in that village has recently mounted a successful Judicial Review against this Council for trying to grant planning permission for 14 dwellings on one of those High Harm sites. Well done Mr Shack. The third of the High Harm sites is in the Welham Green Ward. It is known as BrP4 (HS22).

In January 2020, the full Council resolved unequivocally to remove all three High Harm sites from the Local Plan. This received cross-party support without any dissention.

At the full Council meeting in January 2020, the now Leader of the Council, Paul Zukowskyj, made crystal clear that the Liberal Democrats would not, under any circumstances, support the allocation of High Harm Green Belt sites in the Local Plan. Now is the opportunity to fulfil that promise.

The Labour and Liberal Democrat coalition is now in a position to deliver its direct promises to the communities of Cuffley, Welham Green and Water End. The three High Harm Green Belt sites must be deleted from the draft Local Plan.

The Labour and Liberal Democrats members must now take ownership of the Local Plan. You cannot duck that responsibility and then hope to blame the Conservatives for their past mistakes. The Conservatives have made clear that High Harm sites in the Green Belt must be deleted from the Local Plan. Their letter to the Prime Minister in September 2022 was unequivocal;

“We have made a decision to remove these sites and we will not reverse that decision.”

There are solid lawful grounds to delete the High Harm sites from the Local Plan. In fact, the Council has itself identified suitable housing sites for over 1,000 dwellings on sites that were found to be Moderate or Moderate-High Harm, none of which have been allocated. The Inspector has made clear that he would be willing to see those sites of less harm to the Green Belt allocated, which the Council should now present to him as an alternative to the High Harm sites.

With power also comes responsibility. The Council must stand by its cross-party conviction and insist to the Inspector that the three High Harm Green Belt sites be deleted from the draft Local Plan. If you fail to do this, you will lose the trust of those people who voted you into office based on your Green Belt convictions.

Would the Chair please confirm that the Council will take a fresh look at the housing sites that are of less harm to the Green Belt and offer some or all of these sites to the Inspector in replacement for the three High Harm Green Belt sites? Thank you.”

The response below was provided to the question:

“Thank you for your question. The position in relation to the draft Local Plan has evolved considerably since the full Council meeting in January 2020. Most recently, in December 2022, full Council agreed to carry out the main modifications consultation, as requested by the Planning Inspector. This was after consideration of over two years of engagement with the Inspector on some of the matters you have referred to, as well as a request to government by Cabinet for intervention. The Inspector subsequently decided to carry out another consultation, on further main modifications, which focussed on a much narrower range of changes; this followed his consideration of the consultation responses from earlier this year. The Council anticipate receiving the Inspector’s report in the coming weeks. There will then be a decision for full Council in relation to whether or not to adopt the plan, based on current planning policy, the merits and risks of proceeding, and any other options available, following recommendation from CPPP and Cabinet in the usual way. In relation to the sites that you have specifically referred to, these are sites which have been in the plan since the beginning and the Inspector has found sound, and the Council does not have the power to remove them.”

Cabinet Planning and Parking Panel
17 August 2023

The Panel received the report of the Assistant Director (Planning) and a presentation on the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Guidance Note.

Members raised a number of issues which are summarised below:

- Reservations were expressed about the recommendation that delegated powers be given to the Assistant Director (Planning) in consultation with the Executive Member for Planning to update the Guidance Note as required; it was felt that if there was substantial material change to the guidance then it should be considered by CPPP or another panel. An amendment to the second recommendation was proposed so it would read: 'That Cabinet gives delegated powers to the Assistant Director (Planning) in consultation with the Executive Member for Planning, to update the Guidance Note as required *with a further report detailing subsequent changes to come back to CPPP before 1 March 2024.*'
- A Member suggested that the need for materiality needed to be balanced with giving officers sufficient delegation to progress matters and therefore it was proposed that a decision be deferred to the next meeting when the exact wording was known, so a more robust discussion could take place. Officers commented that the document would be 'live' for a while and so it would be appropriate for substantive changes to be considered at a future meeting, while day to day changes of wording as information was updated by government could be managed under delegated authority. The Member still recommended the item should be deferred.
- A Member commented on the requirement that BNG should be maintained for a minimum of 30 years, noted the 10% net gain was small given the biodiversity crisis, and asked whether these could be amended. Officers advised both the 30 years and 10% net gain were specified in the Environment Act and so could not be changed. In response to a further query, officers explained more than 10% could only be required if it could be evidenced through the Local Plan.
- Officers noted the BNG requirement for major sites took effect from November 2023 and proposed that if the guidance was adopted at the meeting, a further report could come to Committee then. In the meantime it was beneficial to have the current guidance in the public domain as requirements would be clear to developers.
- Members asked about the relationship between the guidance and the draft Local Plan. Officers advised that if the Local Plan was adopted before the guidance took effect, all applications had to be determined in accordance with the development plan, so 10% BNG would be required if the Local Plan was adopted.
- In response to a query about monitoring and enforcement, officers explained that responsibility lay with the developer who would have to submit a habitat management and monitoring plan; failure to do so would trigger an alert with the Council. BNG monitoring and enforcement had substantial resource implications for all local authorities.
- Responding to a question, officers advised that Development Management Committee would start to see applications including a BNG plan.

RESOLVED:
(unanimous)

- 1) Cabinet Planning and Parking Panel recommended to Cabinet that the Biodiversity Net Gain Guidance Note be endorsed, and
- 2) Cabinet Planning and Parking Panel recommended to Cabinet that it delegated powers to the Assistant Director (Planning), in consultation with the Executive Member for Planning, to update the Guidance Note as required with a further report detailing subsequent changes to come back to CPPP before 1 March 2024.

58. RESPONSE TO ST ALBANS DISTRICT AND CITY COUNCIL - NEW LOCAL PLAN CONSULTATION

The Panel received the report of the Assistant Director (Planning).

St Albans District and City Council (SADC) was in the process of producing its new Local Plan. Once adopted, the new Local Plan would guide the future spatial development over a 15-year period from 2024 to 2041. The consultation period will end on 25 September 2023. The draft Plan identified a preferred level of growth and set out a preferred spatial strategy and policies for accommodating that growth. A local housing need figure of 888 dwellings per annum had been calculated, based on the Government's Standard Method, which equated to a minimum of just over 15,000 homes up to 2041. However the draft Plan stated there might be significant changes in the government's evidence and approach to housing need between this consultation and the next iteration of the Plan to be consulted on in 2024.

In terms of spatial strategy, 81% of SADC is designated Green Belt land, and there is insufficient land available to meet housing need without releasing land from the Green Belt.

The spatial strategy gave priority to the development of larger urban centres which can provide a greater range of services and facilities, and supported the re-use of land within the urban areas, which could reduce the need to travel. The spatial strategy resulted in most site allocations being within and adjacent to the larger and most sustainable urban centres, specifically St Albans and the edge of Hemel Hempstead, but also development in Harpenden and London Colney. A series of Broad Locations for development were identified in the Plan; the most significant were the four comprising Hemel Garden Communities, which were planned to the east and north of Hemel Hempstead on Green Belt land and would provide a large contribution to meeting the district's growth requirements. Other Broad Locations were north of St Albans, west of St Albans, west of London Colney, North East Harpenden, North West Harpenden, West Redbourn, Glinwell Nursery in St Albans, and Harper Lane near Radlett.

The site with the strongest locational relationship to Welwyn Hatfield was Glinwell. It was identified as a Broad Location for growth, with a site area of approximately 20 hectares, potentially providing a mixed-used development of

Cabinet Planning and Parking Panel
17 August 2023

436 dwellings, a possible primary school, green infrastructure, transport infrastructure and other community infrastructure. The site was currently in use as a nursery with glasshouses, together with a farm shop and associated car parking. As such, the site was identified as Previously Developed Land.

A draft consultation response was attached to the report at Appendix A. The key issues were the potential impact on the purposes of the Green Belt and the need for development to be supported by infrastructure. The Welwyn Hatfield Green Belt Review noted that the gap between St Albans and Hatfield was narrow to the west of Hatfield. The gap was considered to be fragile as the site was just under 1km away from the nearest point to the boundary with Welwyn Hatfield, and there were concerns development of this site might reduce the already “fragile gap.” However, the site was extensively built-up, with glasshouses and buildings on the site, which reduced the contribution it made to the sense of openness of the wider countryside. In addition to the site-specific considerations already identified, WHBC was suggesting there should be appropriate landscaping and edge treatment of the site to reduce the visual impact of the development on the Green Belt. The draft response also noted a traffic impact assessment would be needed to ensure necessary infrastructure was in place to cope with additional traffic on the A1057 and surrounding roads resulting from the proposed development. Site specific considerations including proposed improvements to the A1057 and to the Alban Way were welcomed.

Following conclusion of the consultation SADC would consider the comments received and use them to help inform its decision making on the next stage of the Plan preparation process.

Members raised issues identified below:

- It was noted that the 15,096 additional new homes was slightly less than what the Inspector had asked for Welwyn Hatfield, despite SADC having a larger population and being slightly bigger physically. Officers responded that SADC generated its housing numbers differently using the government’s current standard method for calculating housing need, whereas WHBC’s Local Plan was progressing on the basis of transitional arrangements under the NPPF from 2012.
- There was an issue of horizontal connectivity between Hatfield and St Albans and the report did not comment on improving public cross-connectivity such as improved railway or bus links. Officers agreed this would be considered in the consultation response.
- A motorway connected the two areas. Any housing close to WHBC would have an impact on the local roads transport network. Officers replied that they would need to consider the strategic transport network as a whole and the impact of any proposed development in relation to the St Albans Local Plan, which would be examined both by the County Council and the examination process. With regard to the site closest to the WHBC boundary, the proposed response already included reference to ensuring the impact on that road network were carefully considered before a decision was made. Officers drew a distinction between the response to a specific site close to the WHBC boundary and the broader Local Plan

processes SADC was embarking on which would require them to look at issues strategically as well as taking committed development and proposed future growth into account.

- A Member expressed concern about the impact on the A414 where it met Junction 3 of the A1M which was already particularly overloaded. It was not just the interchange at Radlett that would impact on the road network there; the west of Colney development was likely to have a direct transport impact on the A414 and it would be helpful to say so in the response. Officers would add comments to reflect this.
- A Member felt it was surprising Glinwell Nursery was proposed as a housing development site as it appeared to be a functioning economic site with significant business there. The land was presumably employment land which would be lost for the purposes of housing delivery and WHBC might wish to comment on this as its draft Local Plan sought to increase housing opportunities. Officers agreed to raise concern at the loss of employment generating use on the existing site.

RESOLVED:

(unanimous)

Cabinet Planning and Parking Panel agreed the consultation response provided in Appendix A, subject to the inclusion of additional comments delegated to the Assistant Director (Planning) reflecting concerns about:

- 1) Impacts on the functioning of the A414/A1(M) at Junction 3 and to highlight that careful consideration should be given to the impact of both committed and planned levels of development on this key junction.
- 2) The potential loss of employment generating activity and use at Glinwell Nursery.
- 3) The need to consider horizontal connectivity between key settlements such as St Albans and Hatfield/Welwyn Garden City.
- 4) Improved and maintained street lighting.
- 5) More focus on bus availability, including evenings and weekends.
- 6) Question where the source evidence is to support the statistics around retail spend.
- 7) Consider implication of the emerging trends for e-scooters and e-bikes.
- 8) Require that active travel interventions demonstrate high quality design and take account of meaningful consultation in the local area where they are proposed. They should also consider safety and longevity of the design.
- 9) Amend paragraph 4 of the letter to remove the specific references to the schemes in WGC.

59. BIRCHALL GARDEN SUBURB MASTERPLAN

The Panel received the report of the Assistant Director (Planning).

Several sites in the Welwyn Hatfield were required to be master-planned. Masterplans sought to provide a long-term strategy and framework that responded to needs and issues affecting an area, providing a clear steer on priorities and principles for new neighbourhoods and setting parameters for

Cabinet Planning and Parking Panel
17 August 2023

design proposals that could inform more detailed masterplans and planning applications. They were a material planning consideration in planning decisions relating to the particular sites for which they were prepared and were a reference tool and steer for the preparation of planning applications and design codes. They sought to ensure development did not take place in isolation and provided a vision for the overall development of a site.

Birchall Garden Suburb was a large strategic site to the southwest of Welwyn Garden City, straddling the boundary between Welwyn Hatfield and East Hertfordshire. The area within East Hertfordshire was removed from the Green Belt and allocated for development in the East Hertfordshire District Plan (adopted in 2018). The area within Welwyn Hatfield was proposed in the draft Local Plan for partial removal from the Green Belt and allocation for development; unlike the land in East Hertfordshire, some parts of the development within Welwyn Hatfield would remain in the Green Belt. All land in Welwyn Hatfield remained Green Belt until the adoption of the draft Local Plan. The Welwyn Hatfield Draft Local Plan and adopted East Hertfordshire District Plan 2018 shared the same policy requirement for the production of a jointly prepared strategic masterplan document for Birchall Garden Suburb. The policy requirement was for 1950 homes to be delivered over the plan period: 600 in Welwyn Hatfield Borough and 1,350 in East Hertfordshire District which would be planned comprehensively to create a new community incorporating Garden City principles. The identified 600 homes in Welwyn Hatfield was a reduction from the 1,200 proposed in the submitted Draft Local Plan (2016) as, through the Examination of the Draft Local Plan, the Inspector concluded that development on the area by the A414 would be unsound.

The policies for both Plans stated that a joint masterplan should be prepared setting out the quantum and distribution of land uses, access and sustainable transport measures, sustainable design and layout principles, the approach to character areas and site density, treatment of ecological and heritage assets including key views, the approach to land remediation, locations of Gypsy and Traveller sites, and phasing and delivery of infrastructure, mineral extraction and built development.

The masterplan for Birchall Garden Suburb was included at Appendix A of the report and had been produced by consultants Allies and Morrison who were jointly commissioned by Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council (WHBC) and East Herts District Council (EHDC). The consultant team had worked closely with officers from both authorities, Hertfordshire County Council (HCC) and a number of other statutory and community stakeholders. A series of technical workshops had been held and a project steering group established which helped shape development of the masterplan. Design options were discussed and tested by the steering group, and development of the green corridor and incorporation of wider urban greening were a key consideration in the design process. Density of development across the site, sustainable design and construction, and addressing the impact of other onsite employment uses had also been explored in detail.

Cabinet Planning and Parking Panel
17 August 2023

In January 2023, the draft masterplan was presented and tested at the Hertfordshire Design Review Panel (an impartial, independent process) which provided constructive criticism that led to further design refinements.

EHDC would consider endorsing the masterplan at its Executive meeting on 5 September 2023, the same date that WHBC Cabinet would consider it. Endorsement by both authorities would enable the document to be used for development management purposes to help shape the future delivery of the site.

Tarmac, the landowner, had submitted an outline planning application for development at Birchall Garden Suburb in June 2022. The submitted application was a proposal for an extension to Welwyn Garden City that extended into land that would remain in the Green Belt post adoption of the Welwyn Hatfield Local Plan. The masterplan which was the subject of this report reflected the policy position of Welwyn Hatfield following the conclusion of the hearing sessions. Tarmac had consistently raised concerns about the approach of the Inspector and the Council during the course of the examination and through the preparation of the masterplan. However a masterplan was not a prescriptive blueprint for development. It had always been intended that masterplans for strategic sites would be developer/landowner led, working in conjunction with others. However in this instance there had been disagreement between the two councils and Tarmac about the area of land to be master-planned, with the landowner wanting the inclusion of all of the area now subject to the planning application. Therefore the two councils funded the masterplan, reflecting the area of land already allocated in EHDC and proposed for allocation in WHBC.

Members commented as below:

- A Member noted that in 2017, the Environmental Health team had concluded that inclusion of the site would require contaminated land risk assessments and a robust mitigation strategy; he asked if that had taken place. Officers responded that through the Local Plan, the Inspector had robustly considered the site and was satisfied there were no major issues preventing development at Birchall Garden Suburb. At the planning application stage, further technical work would be required by the landowner to consider and identify any suitable mitigation works. The Member asked what would happen if the land was not suitable. Officers replied that a proportionate approach was needed at each stage of the process; the Planning Inspector was sufficiently satisfied the allocation was sound and could be included in the Local Plan. The next stage would involve more detailed work around contamination and other factors through a planning application process.
- A Member asked whether, if the masterplan was to be adopted, it would carry substantial weight at Development Management Committee (DMC) and allow pushback, whether a Local Plan was in place or not. Officers replied that if the draft Local Plan was to fall away, the land would remain in the Green Belt; if it was adopted, it would identify and allocate an area of land for 600 homes and associated infrastructure. The Birchall Garden Suburb masterplan would be an important tool which would be a material consideration and the planning application would be assessed against it.

Cabinet Planning and Parking Panel
17 August 2023

The weight to be afforded to the masterplan would depend on whether the site was an adopted allocation or would remain in the Green Belt. The Inspector had identified concerns about development in the location due to the impact on the wider Green Belt, so one of the main modifications had been to reduce the boundary and just have 600 homes within the Local Plan. The landowner's planning application still advocated the full Birchall Garden suburb area.

- Clarity was sought about whether everything in the smaller area of land would remain in the Green Belt. Officers advised that unlike in EHDC, the Local Plan Inspector had been adamant that WHBC's Green Belt boundaries were tightly drawn around the built form of the development.
- A Member noted concerns raised by the Central Herts Green Corridor group which had been sent to committee members and further noted concerns relating to the differing width of the green corridor in both authorities, biodiversity issues and the presence of barn owls, a protected species, as well as rare species. The Member asked whether there could be a risk assessment, costed mitigation strategy and viability assessment of the 600 homes. Officers said it was a challenge to strike a balance between competing factors; one of the roles of the masterplan was to consider the issues and strike an appropriate balance. The green corridor that ran through the garden suburb varied in width and came to a narrow point within WHBC; if it was to be wider as it was within EHDC, then only two thirds of the number of homes in the WHBC area could be achieved. The consultants had looked at this closely as part of the masterplan preparation. These issues had been discussed at length through the local planning examination and the Local Plan Inspector's conclusion was that development of this scale subject to the width of the buffer was sound. Detailed considerations of ecology, contamination and other matters would be considered via the planning application process; they had been considered through the plan-making process by the Inspector.
- A Member commented on the impact of dumped clutter on and around the Commons nature reserve as a result of the housing development and urged councillors and officers to walk round the area and see the impact of the development before saying a wider green corridor in the area was not feasible.
- Responding to a question about what would happen if either EHDC or WHBC did not endorse the masterplan, officers said another way of looking at it was to think about what would happen if the masterplan went away; the Council would lack work that had agreed a series of principles on good place-making that should inform the next stage of development and would be unable to use it as a tool to assess a planning application. A Member asked what this would mean in terms of potential additional homes in the WHBC area and officers replied that the landowner already had an application in for 1,200 homes. There was a policy requirement in the emerging Local Plan for a masterplan to be prepared for the site.
- A Member sought clarity as to whether if the masterplan was approved but the Local Plan was to fall away, it would be a consideration at DMC. Officers said it would remain a material consideration but the weight

Cabinet Planning and Parking Panel
17 August 2023

afforded to it would be commensurately less as the site would not have been allocated through the Local Plan process; the principle of how a planning application would be considered would be different as the site would remain in the Green Belt.

- A Member reflected that the masterplan gave both councils an additional policy hook to hold the developer to a maximum housing level and therefore supported the masterplan although he caveated that with the expectation that issues that biodiversity, contamination etc would be considered in much more detail during the planning process.
- A Member asked about WHBC's position on affordability given the developer had suggested the reduced number of homes would have an impact on the delivery of social housing, and asked whether calculations of affordability should be done across the site. While he was aware affordability would be impacted by contamination, it needed to be very significant before it became unmitigable. Officers said infrastructure did not really acknowledge administrative boundaries and what was being considered was the garden suburb as a whole.
- A Member asked whether the masterplan needed to evolve to produce a southern branch of the green corridor to the River Lea area in order to link blue and green infrastructure to make a coherent network. Officers said the masterplan flagged a series of principles and was limited to the boundary of where the development would take place; looking at widening the corridor would probably form part of the Local Plan.
- A question was asked about whether the developer could be required to do work on the width of the green corridor, contamination etc. Thames Water was concerned that the existing foul water network infrastructure might not be able to accommodate the proposed development and there were concerns about sewage potentially flooding homes or rivers. Officers responded that Thames Water would need to know what the detail was in order to consider necessary mitigation; the masterplan was not a prescriptive exercise and sought to establish good urban design principles that could be worked up in detail. Thames Water would form part of the statutory consultees when looking at details of planning applications.

RESOLVED:

(unanimous)

Cabinet Planning and Parking Panel (CPPP) recommended to Cabinet that the Birchall Garden Suburb Masterplan, as detailed in Appendix A, be agreed as a material consideration for Development Management purposes.

60. HERTFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL ACTIVE TRAVEL STRATEGY RESPONSE

The Panel received the report of the Assistant Director for Planning.

The report set out the proposed response to Hertfordshire County Council's Active Travel Strategy. Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council worked with Hertfordshire County Council to produce a Local Cycling and Walking

Cabinet Planning and Parking Panel
17 August 2023

Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) which was considered by the Climate Change Sub Group in January 2023. Further to this, the County Council had undertaken significant works in Welwyn Garden City town centre in recent years to improve active travel provision.

Concerns were raised about whether the Council's recommendations had been approved by Development Management Committee, and that the consultation could have included a larger amount of Welwyn Hatfield residents. Officers confirmed that the County Council was the body which produced the Strategy and asked the Panel to consider the Strategy rather than the consultation process.

It was felt that there was a need for an Integrated Transport Strategy to support people getting out of their cars and reducing carbon emissions. Several bus routes had been reduced or stopped recently which stopped people using buses. There was a need for better street lighting to encourage residents to use public transport after dark.

It was agreed that it was important to include high quality design for any infrastructure which would be in line with the borough.

It was agreed that additional comments would be added to reflect the need for improved and maintained street lighting; more focus on bus availability, including evenings and weekends; question where the source evidence was to support the statistics around retail spend; consider implication of the emerging trends for e-scooters and e-bikes; require that active travel interventions demonstrated high quality design and took account of meaningful consultation in the local area where they are proposed - they should also consider safety and longevity of the design; and to amend paragraph 4 of the letter to remove the specific references to the schemes in Welwyn Garden City.

RESOLVED:

That authority be delegated to the Assistant Director (Planning) in consultation with the Executive Member for Planning to respond to the Hertfordshire Active Travel Strategy Consultation.

Meeting ended at 9.55 pm