

Public Document Pack

THREE RIVERS DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES

Of a meeting of the Full Council held in the Penn Chamber, Three Rivers House, Rickmansworth, on Tuesday, 11 July 2023 from 7.30 - 10.00 pm

Present:

Councillors Councillor Phil Williams (Chair), Councillor Raj Khuroya (Vice-Chair), Matthew Bedford, Sara Bedford, Ruth Clark, Oliver Cooper, Stephen Cox, Andrea Fraser, Stephen Giles-Medhurst, Rue Grewal, Philip Hearn, Lisa Hudson, Tony Humphreys, Khalid Hussain, Joan King, Stephen King, Chris Lloyd, David Major, Keith Martin, Abbas Merali, Chris Mitchell, Debbie Morris, Sarah Nemes, Louise Price, Kevin Raeburn, Paul Rainbow, Reena Ranger, David Raw, Ciaran Reed, Andrew Scarth, Roger Seabourne, Narinder Sian, Jonathan Solomons, Jon Tankard, Chris Whately-Smith and Anne Winter

CL29/23 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors David Coltman, Steve Drury and Ian Morris.

CL30/23 MINUTES

The Minutes of the Annual Council meeting held on 23 May 2023 were confirmed as a correct record subject to the following amendment.

Councillor Narinder Sian replacing Councillor Chris Mitchell as the appointed Member on the Climate Change, Leisure and Community Committee

The Minutes of the Annual Council meeting held on 23 May 2023 were signed by the Chair.

CL31/23 CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chair announced that they had attended various events with details provided in the Members' Information Bulletin.

The Chair that they were looking to organise a footgolf competition and quiz night next year in aid in their two charities which are Watford Football Club Community Trust and Sustainable Three Rivers. A trek to Mount Olympus in Greece was also to be organised.

CL32/23 RECEIVE ANY PETITIONS UNDER PROCEDURE RULE 18 - NONE RECEIVED

None received.

CL33/23 QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC UNDER PROCEDURE RULE 15

The Chair advised they would allow the two members of the public who had submitted questions to submit a supplementary question by email.

The written questions and written answers provided were included in the summons and could be viewed using the link below:

[Agenda for Full Council on Tuesday, 11th July, 2023, 7.30 pm - Modern Council \(threerivers.gov.uk\)](https://www.threerivers.gov.uk)

CL34/23

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE INDEPENDENT REMUNERATION PANEL ON GROUP LEADER ALLOWANCE FOR THE NEW GROUP ON THE COUNCIL

Councillor Sarah Nelmes moved, seconded by Councillor Stephen Giles-Medhurst, the recommendation from the Panel as set out in the report.

On being put to the Council the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair of Council, the voting being by general assent.

RESOLVED:

That the Green Group Leader receive an allowance of £1,640 in line with the other Opposition Group Leader allowance.

CL35/23

TO RECEIVE THE RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE MEETING ON 12 JUNE 2023

7a) Health & Safety Policy Statement 2023

Councillor Sarah Nelmes, seconded by Councillor Stephen Giles-Medhurst moved the recommendation.

On being put to Council the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair of Council having been agreed by general assent.

RESOLVED:

That the Health & Safety Policy statement be agreed.

7b) Customer Service Strategy

Councillor Sarah Nelmes, seconded by Councillor Stephen Giles-Medhurst moved the recommendation.

Councillor Oliver Cooper, seconded by Councillor Philip Hearn proposed an amendment to the recommendation that the third bullet of page 11 of the strategy, be replaced with *“Providing a telephone option for those who do not have access or are unable to use the internet”* with *“Providing a telephone option with an aim of answering calls within 5 rings.”*

The Monitoring Officer advised that the proposed amendment could not be moved or debated as it would be contrary to Rule 11(6) due to the likely cost exceeding £10k.

On being put to Council the substantive motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair of Council the voting being 26 For, 10 Against and 0 Abstentions.

RESOLVED:

Approved the adoption of Customer Experience Strategy 2023-2026

7c) CIL Application – Mill End Community Centre

Councillors Sarah Nelmes and Roger Seabourne declared non-prejudicial interests in this item as they were a member of the Mill End Community Centre. They would not vote would remain in the room for the debate.

Councillor Stephen Giles-Medhurst moved, seconded by Councillor Chris Lloyd, the recommendations as set out in the report.

On being put to the Council the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair of Council, the voting being by general assent.

(Councillors Sarah Nelmes and Roger Seabourne did not vote)

RESOLVED:

Approved CIL funding for the following schemes detailed in Table 1 of this report and summarised in the table below:
Table 1.

Applicant & Project Name	Infrastructure	Total Cost	CIL Amount	Year funds required
Mill End & District Community Association	Replacement Roof	£20,000.	£5,000.	2023
		£4,000.	£4,000.	2023
	Electrical Works		TOTAL: £9,000	

And any changes to the scheme proposals or variation of the financial requirements by up to 25% of the agreed commitment to be delegated to the Associate Director to determine in consultation with the Lead Member.

7d) Pedestrian Bridge, Aquadrome, Rickmansworth

Councillor Stephen Giles-Medhurst moved, seconded by Councillor Chris Lloyd, the recommendations as set out in the report.

On being put to Council the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair of Council the voting being by general assent.

RESOLVED:

The recommendation is that Members approve CIL funding for the following schemes detailed in Table 1 of this report and summarised in the table below for 2023/2024:

Applicant & Project Name	Infrastructure
Three Rivers District Council <u>Rickmansworth Aquadrome Pedestrian Bridge replacement</u>	Replacement of existing pedestrian bridge from Riverside Drive

Any request for additional monies for this specific project is delegated to the Director of Finance, in consultation with the Lead Member, to determine having regard to the economic context and timescales for implementation, and who would consider an increase of up to 15% of the total CIL monies agreed.

7e) Substitutes on Licensing Committee

Councillor Stephen Giles-Medhurst moved, seconded by Councillor Sarah Nelmes moved the recommendation to rescind the decision at Annual Council in accordance with Rule 22.

On being put to Council the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair of Council, the voting being by general assent.

RESOLVED:

To rescind the decision made at the Annual Council meeting on 23 May 2023 which permitted substitutes to sit on Licensing Committee.

7f) Summary of the Financial Year End Position 2022/23

Councillor Keith Martin moved, seconded by Councillor Stephen Giles-Medhurst the recommendations.

On being put to Council the recommendation was declared CARRIED the voting being 26 For, 0 Against and 10 Abstentions.

RESOLVED:

That the favourable revenue year end variance after carry forwards of £138,356 to be noted.

That the capital year end position as summarised in paragraph 2.6 and Appendix 3 be noted.

To approve to carry forward the unspent service budgets from 2022/23 to 2023/24 which total £490,772 to enable completion of projects as detailed at Appendix 2.

To approve the rephasing of capital projects from 2022/23 to 2023/24 which total £10,885,484 as detailed at Appendix 4.

To approve the creation of a new Commercial Risk earmarked reserve to manage financial risk associated with commercial ventures.

CL36/23

CHANGE TO THE MEMBERSHIP TO THE LICENSING COMMITTEE, REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE AND ENVIRONMENTAL FORUM

Noted that Councillor Sarah Nelmes will replace Councillor David Major on the Licensing and Regulatory Services Committee.

Noted the resignation of Councillor Phil Williams on the Environmental Forum.

CL37/23

QUESTIONS TO THE LEADER, LEAD MEMBERS, CHAIRS OF COMMITTEES AND REPORTS FROM THE CHAIRS OF THE COMMITTEES AND QUESTIONS ON THE CHAIRS REPORTS

Written questions provided to the Leader and Lead Member were taken as read along with the written responses provided. To view the written questions and written responses (item 9 on the summons -please see the link below

[Agenda for Full Council on Tuesday, 11th July, 2023, 7.30 pm - Modern Council \(threerivers.gov.uk\)](https://www.threerivers.gov.uk/agenda-for-full-council-on-tuesday-11th-july-2023-7.30-pm-modern-council)

At the meeting the Leader and Lead Members were asked some supplementary questions on the written response provided with the responses provided at the meeting and after the meeting indicated below.

Councillor Sarah Nelmes, Leader of the Council, from Councillor Sara Bedford

9a No supplementary question.

9b. **Supplementary question:**

What other providers of training were considered? How was the choice made? A number of errors were made at the session I attended with the trainers getting confused on pre-determination and also brought up the 6 tests for conditions wrongly and did not cover costs.

Supplementary response provided after the meeting:

Following one of the previously leading providers of planning training closing business following the Covid Pandemic, there are very few providers of planning training with a specific focus on public sector or councillor training. Prior to 2021, training for Members had been given by Planning Officers. However, a combination of resourcing and capacity limitations, along with the benefit of external delivery bringing with it an increased breadth of experience, resulted in training being procured externally since 2021. This was procured via the Planning Advisory Service (PAS - part of the Local Government Association - LGA) although more recently the trainers were procured directly rather than through PAS. Given the limited availability for other external providers, and that PAS are part of the LGA, Officers did not consider other providers for this training.

There has been limited feedback given regarding the planning training, and whilst it is acknowledged that some comments in the training session may not have been clearly communicated, Officers were in attendance and had no concerns that the sessions were giving inaccurate or misleading advice that would prejudice Members ability to make decisions.

In respect of the breadth of the training, this is designed to give people with no knowledge about the planning system a basic introduction to ensure they are able to make well informed decisions. It is not possible (or appropriate) to cover all circumstances or elements of the planning system in a short introductory session. Officers request from Members details of further matters they require training on during the year but also expect Members to approach them should they have specific questions and queries.

9c. **Supplementary question:**

What updated information was supplied to Members, what decisions were examined from the previous year and is it not a concern that the training assumed that Members of the Planning Committee who sat on the Committee in April did not know what a material consideration was?

Supplementary response provided after the meeting:

The training is primarily aimed at Members with limited experience of the planning system, but Officers consider there is value in all Members receiving annual training to ensure they are apprised of any major updates or changes to the planning system, and to give a helpful reminder of matters that may not come up frequently. In the past year there have been few major changes to the planning system and thus the content of the training but planning is constantly in the news with 'emerging' changes which may be announced and take effect – for example the Levelling Up and Regeneration Bill or amendments to the NPPF, as well as particular appeals or court cases of note, and the annual opportunity to provide updates. There is no suggestion that Members who sat on Committee in April do not know what a material consideration is, but equally there are occasions throughout the year where matters are raised that are not material to planning which suggests a reminder is better than none.

9d. **Supplementary question:**

Only two working days' notice was given of the meeting to agents, did you know that one vote that was originally classed as spoiled was allocated to the incorrect candidate when added back and are you aware that one result was only saved from

being declared for two losing candidates when party representatives noticed just prior to declaration? Do you think this is appropriate.

Supplementary response provided after the meeting:

The above statements will be taken into account in the planning of future elections.

9e **Supplementary question:**

The Parish Candidates, Party representatives were not advised they were responsible for communicating with any party candidates and are you aware that the incorrect date for the submission of Parish election expenses was circulated post-election which could of led to the Parish candidates who received it submitting their expenses incorrectly later.

Supplementary response provided after the meeting:

Under Procedure Rule 14(4) it will take a little longer to draft a reply as that officer has left the Council so will need to access emails.

9f **Supplementary question:**

What material was the screen made out of which only allowed sound to move in one direction?

Supplementary response provided after the meeting:

The screens are made of acrylic, and the sound does not travel in one direction.

Leader of the Council, Councillor Sarah Nelmes, from Councillor Oliver Cooper

9g **Supplementary question:**

Would you please reconsider restoring the former website of which 13,000 pages could then be seen in future to hold us to account.

Supplementary response provided after the meeting:

All statutory and current relevant information has been transferred to the new website and is available to residents and customers. One of the objectives of the new website was to provide greater clarity, accuracy, and consistency of information to customers when they search for information or services, which is in alignment with the Customer Experience Strategy 2023-26 objectives. Maintaining out of date data on the website increases the risk of causing confusion by providing incorrect and misleading information to customers. I refer to my previous answer confirming that old archive content will be able to be provided on request.

Leader of the Council, Councillor Sarah Nelmes from Councillor Sara Bedford (allowed under Rule 14(3))

9gi **Supplementary question:**

What can be done on learn lessons from this to ensure that residents get a better response in future.

Supplementary response provided after the meeting:

As with any unauthorised encampment, the Officer Work Group will meet to review 'what went well' and 'what could be better next time'. As part of this review, Officers will look at the communications and reporting of such incidences to see if any improvements can be made.

Lead Member for Public Services, Councillor Paul Rainbow, from Councillor Narinder Sian

9h **Supplementary question:**

Can you indicate which forum the feasibility study is likely to be presented at.

Supplementary response

Details would go through the General Public Services and Economic Development Committee. We are in discussions with Watford BC.

Question to the Lead Member for Public Services, Councillor Paul Rainbow, from Councillor Chris Mitchell

9i Supplementary question

For the Community Way car park in Croxley Green is there potential for solar panels and could we set up a meeting with officers to see if the car park could be used a pilot.

Supplementary response

Would be interested in an exploratory meeting at this time just to hear what the proposals are.

9j No supplementary question.

Lead Member for Public Services, Councillor Paul Rainbow, from Councillor Oliver Cooper

9k Supplementary question

What will be the impact on people going to Mount Vernon and the access road which is included in ULEZ and thought we had not fed back on those people being excluded or was it fed back in another way.

Supplementary response provided by Councillor Stephen Giles-Medhurst

Both the roads to the hospital are excluded from ULEZ and it was included in the original letter which went to the mayor. The access roads are excluded.

Lead Member for Public Services, Councillor Paul Rainbow, from Councillor David Raw

9l Supplementary question

On the parking and PCNs should the administration not take more responsibility and check the service being implemented for us.

Supplementary response:

There are constant checks and if you are to take the area as a whole or Uxbridge Road in isolation Hertsmere are visiting one to three times a day. From the data up to end of June we have had 351 visits to the area and to adjacent roads. We are not able to put CEOs there around the clock as we do not have that level of resource. In 2014 when the laws were changed, in order to remove things like spy cars, local councils were required to physically put the PCN on the windscreen of the offending vehicle. As things stand that is still the case so we are reliant on CEOs being there. People do park in the area for a very short time which makes it very difficult for the CEOs to be able to place a ticket on the offending vehicle. On CCTV if the Council was minded to write to the Government to move on this that may a potential avenue.

Lead Member for Public Services, Councillor Paul Rainbow, from Councillor Philip Hearn

9m Supplementary question

The map and survey for the LCWIP consultation was put forward by TRDC officers to align with the Councils future vision for consultations so would the Lead Member apologise for the misleading answer to the question.

Supplementary response

The response was provided in consultation with HCC.

9n Supplementary question

Can the residents be assured that any who will be impacted will have a letter through their door informing them of any changes before they are implemented.

Supplementary response

The stage we are at the moment is very much a draft stage. There has been some misinformation put round. Filters can disrupt traffic, but people have been referring to them as road closures. They referred to the Governments gear change on their new vision for cycling and walking document from 2020 and which does refer to filters as being a way of reducing through traffic. Please do not refer to them as road closures because some vehicles can get through such as cycles and motorcycles.

Lead Member for Public Services, Councillor Paul Rainbow, from Councillor Oliver Cooper

9o Supplementary question

What has been done different here compared to other Districts and what factors have been applied in Three Rivers which has meant we have not bid for funding for Three Rivers and installed electric charging points here which did not apply to other Councils.

Supplementary response provided after the meeting:

Recent funding available, including the On Street Residential Chargepoint Scheme (ORCS), is only for on street EV charging point (EVCP) installations aimed at residential use. The approach that has been pursued by Three Rivers DC to date has been for off street EVCP in its car parks and for rapid chargers which are aimed at enhancing our town centres and for visitors rather than residents. Different approaches have been pursued elsewhere across the County. As explained above Officers are currently considering alternative opportunities including how funding can be accessed.

Lead Member for Public Services, Councillor Paul Rainbow, from Councillor Reena Ranger

9p Supplementary question

If displacement is a known problem will the Lead Member review the boundary roads and will they write to neighbouring authorities to ask for notification of schemes to be implemented with potential overspill consequences for our residents.

Supplementary response

We are working through a programme with reduced resources. All the schemes brought to our attention recently have been noted but we have to work to the plan.

Lead Member for Public Services, Councillor Paul Rainbow, from Councillor Ciaran Reed

9q 20 days is a huge amount of time to go without a functional brown bin so does this Council provide compensation for the time people don't have their bin which they have paid for and would the Lead Member consider bringing this in.

Supplementary response:

If you can provide details of anyone waiting longer than 20 days, we can get responses arranged. We have been aiming for 20 days but we have issues at the moment with the supply chain and there is only a certain number of bins we can store. We were one of the earliest to introduce this level of recycling and a lot of the bins we had are coming to the end of their life.

9r No supplementary question

Lead Member for Public Services, Councillor Paul Rainbow, from Councillor Andrea Fraser

9s **Supplementary question**

Can the Lead Member confirm that parking charges will not go up in Rickmansworth in the next 12 months.

Supplementary response:

Not in the budget to increase.

Lead Member for Public Services, Councillor Paul Rainbow, from Councillor Joan King

9t **Supplementary question**

Is the Lead Member aware that officers were already aware of this but were reminded by myself of the HCC funding for double yellow lines and should officers have been aware.

Supplementary response:

Was only brought to my attention recently and officers have been working hard to expedite this. I thank them for their time in doing this and they are trying to get this moved on speedily.

Lead Member for Public Services, Councillor Paul Rainbow, from Councillor Stephen Cox

9u **Supplementary question:**

When is the Lead Member to be advised or was advised of the results of the statutory consultation as the answer only refers to when Ward Members would be advised.

Supplementary response provided after the meeting:

The Lead Member is still to be advised. Officers are still awaiting final feedback on the statutory notice consultation from their consultants (Hertsmere BC). Once received it will be discussed with the Lead Member and the Ward Members advised soon after.

9v **Supplementary question:**

Can the Lead Member advise, given that the Gosforth Lane scheme is only set to be implemented in part, when the next consultation dealing with the limited weight proposals which had been identified and the double yellow lines in Otley Way will be held?

Supplementary response provided after the meeting:

Officers have not yet confirmed a date, but I am aware there was a recent site visit to discuss the situation and proposals with Ward Councillors and Officers. Hertsmere BC Officers are currently reviewing the outcomes of this meeting and will be preparing further plans to share with Ward Councillors. I would expect a public consultation on further proposals in the Autumn.

Lead Member for Public Services, Councillor Paul Rainbow, from Councillor Stephen King

9w **Supplementary question:**

Can the Lead Member confirm that the answer to Point 3 is no, 4 none and 5 no and does the Lead Member accept that regular meetings are all very well but are you keeping on top of things and what is needed is a solution.

Supplementary response provided after the meeting:

As has been previously explained in the original response in relation to question 3 the bins at this location have been assessed as appropriate in size should they be used properly. As such, at this time, further bins will not be provided. In regard to question 4 again as previously responded on my instruction officers of this council have repeatedly made additional and special collections to clear and cleanse this area, they continue to work in partnerships with Thrive to seek to work with the local community to address the underlying behavioural issues which are causing the problems. Officers have met, both off and on site, on a number of occasions to discuss ways forward but of course I would be happy to meet with interested parties if it is felt that this will add value. As Lead Member I am regularly briefed on this matter and agree that a longer-term solution is required as this situation as well as being unacceptable for those residents who are subject to the impacts of thoughtless behaviour of others misusing this bin area is additional pressure on our Council waste service.

9x **Supplementary question:**

If the School Mead parking proposals are unfortunately on hold and are not able to be progressed this financial year, what is the plan and what are the next two locations to be investigated on the priority list for car parking bays.

Supplementary response provided after the meeting:

A further Work Programme is required to determine the next schemes to be progressed, there are currently no further schemes identified. In the absence of a Transport Planner this further review of priority schemes has not progressed at the current time.

Lead Member for Economic Development and Planning Policy, Councillor Stephen Giles-Medhurst, from Councillor Sara Bedford

9y **Supplementary question**

What is your view of the leaflets that have been circulated across the district over the past 6 months claiming these decisions are already made and the Council has approved sites for development.

Supplementary response

Total disgrace and is not true. It is clear the lead opposition is running a campaign of lies to hide the fact that the Government want Green Belt housing built but are refusing to allow local decision to be made by Councils hence the appeal decision in Surrey last week where the Government Inspector overruled the Council on a Green Belt site. No effort is being made to get the NPPF changed at this time. We will be putting forward a Local Plan which will not meet the Government targets but will protect Green Belt.

Lead Member for Economic Development and Planning Policy, Councillor Stephen Giles-Medhurst, from Councillor Sara Bedford

9z **Supplementary question**

Why do you think opposition Councillors are saying the Council refused to consult until the Council forced them but clearly from the minutes this is not the case.

Supplementary response

I can only suspect it is confuse residents. It was the case at the Policy and Resources Committee the lead opposition refused on 5 December to back the consultation and only when we came to Council did, they change their mind. We have always supported consultation and continue to do so.

Lead Member for Economic Development and Planning Policy, Councillor Stephen Giles-Medhurst, from Councillor Sara Bedford

9aa **Supplementary question**

The Council are not seeking to build £1,100 houses in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty is that not, correct?

Supplementary response

That is correct and despite the member of parliament being written to when the leaflet became apparent, they have not responded on the incorrect information. The planning applications referred to in the leaflet in Chorleywood were both refused planning permission in March 2023. I hope the Government Inspector will support the Council in turning down these applications.

Lead Member for Economic Development and Planning Policy, Councillor Stephen Giles-Medhurst, from Councillor Matthew Bedford

9bb **Supplementary question**

Can you comment further on the results from the recent Regulation 18 additional sites consultation and the additional call for brownfield land.

Supplementary response

Unfortunately, no more brownfield sites have been put forward by the site owners or promoters but a couple of small additional sites have been proposed and will be coming back to the sub-committee as part of the process for reviewing what we bring forward to the public. We are looking to progress to a final Regulation 18 consultation, with a lower housing number, based on what the Council thinks is right and protects much more of the Green Belt but allows for some growth for social and affordable housing and new infrastructure over the next 18 years. Our target is likely to be 50% less than the Government target. Council should be proud of its consultation as evidenced by the 20,000 comments received to the two Regulation 18 consultations. No decisions have been made on potential sites and had already ruled out over 250 potential sites that had been suggested by site promoters.

Lead Member for Economic Development and Planning Policy, Councillor Stephen Giles-Medhurst, from Councillor Andrea Fraser

9cc **Supplementary question**

On the save the High Street consultation I was wondering why the Council had not actioned some of the suggestions that were made

Supplementary response

They were not suggestions they were options for the council to look at in conjunction with the Chamber of Commerce and some of the suggestions are outside the scope of this council. In relation to the charges the £1 charge for 2 hours in Rickmansworth with the first hour free is the cheapest in the entire country where charges are made and has not been increased since it was first introduced 5 years ago.

Lead Member for Economic Development and Planning Policy, Councillor Stephen Giles-Medhurst, from Councillor Andrea Fraser

9dd **Supplementary question**

Will the Leader of the GPZ call an extraordinary meeting to consider the recommendations on the different opening times requested by the retailers to help them out as they struggle with the current opening times presented to the Board recently.

Supplementary response:

The Board is a joint board set up by HCC and I am one of the representatives from TRDC along with the HCC member for the area and BCC. Meetings are called on ad hoc basis and I am yet to see any minutes or proposals from the recent meeting. I understand HCC are keen to complete the trial exercise to see what the results are

and as you aware at the public meeting the initial figures were showing an increase in footfall in the high street and a much longer dwell time than in previous years. We need to receive the data and review that along with the responses and the different views of everyone. It will be for the Highways Authority, the County Council to make their decision jointly.

Lead Member for Economic Development and Planning Policy, Councillor Stephen Giles-Medhurst, from Councillor Andrea Fraser

9ee **Supplementary question**

Should the Chair of the planning committee not have made statement on affordable housing, considering their interest in the planning training.

Supplementary response

I would want to check and verify the information you have provided. This council is clear on local planning policies we wish to secure 45% of all new housing as affordable housing but the Government allows developers to have get out clauses on affordability as a means of not providing affordable housing.

9ff No supplementary question

9gg No supplementary question

9hh No supplementary question

9ii No supplementary question

9jj No supplementary question

9kk No supplementary question

Lead Member for Resources, Councillor Keith Martin, from Councillor Chris Mitchell

9ll **Supplementary question**

Will the meeting be as described in my original question?

Supplementary response

It will and we have agreed the agenda.

Lead Member for Resources, Councillor Keith Martin, from Councillor Paul Rainbow

9mm **Supplementary question**

Does the Lead Member believe that the use of terminology such as “so dilapidated” is unfair on the tenant who is responsible for maintenance?

Supplementary response

It is not helpful because if the building was in that state and I am assured it is not a notice would have been served on the leaseholder to repair the building.

9nn **Supplementary question**

Does the Lead Member believe that it is misleading to put out such information.

Supplementary response:

If I received an email from an authoritative force and it had something which I believed to be accurate then it has the potential to mislead. One of the reasons for having the

meeting on Friday is to make sure we have authoritative information provided to residents so they can be clear on what is happening.

9pp **Lead Member for Resources, Councillor Keith Martin Councillor Sara Bedford (allowed under Rule 14(3))**

Supplementary question:

What could have been done to protect the car park and make it more difficult for the travellers to get in, such as what was done with the tree trunks at the Aquadrome car park.

Wished to put on record that the Head of Property and Major Projects had been superb in the support they had provided to the South Oxhey Jets.

Supplementary response provided after the meeting:

As part of the post removal review, the Officer Work Group will also consider if any proactive deterrents or measures could be put in place to better protect this site and other Council-owned sites. There are some specific user-based challenges with this site. As the Member will be aware the car park is regularly used by the Oxhey Jets Football Club and part of the site is currently occupied by a Contractor who is undertaking an insulation project in the area. The Contractor regularly receives deliveries of materials from larger good vehicles, which might find it difficult to navigate any physical preventative measures – Officers will look at what can be done to act as a deterrent, whilst still enabling reasonable use of the site.

CL38/23 LEADER AND LEAD MEMBER REPORTS AND RECEIVE ANY QUESTIONS

Noted the written reports from the Leader and Lead Members and oral updates provided as appropriate. Some oral questions raised on the written reports were provided with oral responses at the meeting while on other oral questions it was agreed a written response be provided after the meeting. Details of these are provided below.

A link to the reports is provided below under item 10 of the summons [Agenda for Full Council on Tuesday, 11th July, 2023, 7.30 pm - Modern Council \(threerivers.gov.uk\)](https://www.threerivers.gov.uk/Agenda-for-Full-Council-on-Tuesday-11th-July-2023-7.30-pm-Modern-Council)

Councillor Sarah Nelmes, Leader of the Council

Noted report and no questions raised.

Councillor Paul Rainbow, Lead Member for Public Services

Noted the report.

Question from Councillor Philip Hearn

In October 2022 the IHED Committee agreed to go out for consultation on the LCWIP and that any further comments, as appropriate, would be integrated into the consultation. Chorleywood Parish Council and Chorleywood Residents Association put a lot of effort into their response, including some alternative proposals and asked why these proposals did not appear in the consultation document.

Response provided after the meeting:

Whilst comments received were considered, and the Senior Transport Planner spoke with some Ward Councillors following the IHED Committee, it was not considered the consultation draft should be significantly amended. The concerns about specific routes, specifically in Chorleywood, were noted but these were routes derived from a detailed evidence base and it was considered appropriate that the Plan should go out to consultation with these routes detailed so wider resident/public comments on the proposals could be considered.

Question from Councillor Oliver Cooper

Why is there inconsistency between the leaflet that was distributed by the Liberal Democrats at the Chorleywood Village Day on Saturday stating that the Three Rivers and Watford LCWIP was drafted by Herts County Council consultants and owned by the County Council when the first line of the LCWIP states it was developed with TRDC and Watford Borough Council

Response provided after the meeting:

The LCWIP is a document prepared by and on behalf of 3 authorities: Hertfordshire County Council, Watford Borough Council and Three Rivers DC. The original consultants were commissioned by HCC on behalf of all 3 authorities.

Question from Councillor Debbie Morris

Can you provide a date on when the parking consultant's report will be provided with regard to Sandy Lodge Way.

Response provided after the meeting

This report is awaited from our consultants, it is expected by the end of July.

Question from Councillor Reena Ranger

What does the Lead Member feel a reduce parking standard in our local plan for new homes will do to help this District to make it an easier place to walk and cycle when anti-social parking or existing pressures are high.

Response provided after the meeting

Any reduction in parking standards is a tool which can be used to discourage car ownership and private car usage and conversely encourage further sustainable and active travel. However, it is often necessary to consider this as one of a number of measures to encourage more walking and cycling.

Councillor Stephen Giles-Medhurst, Lead Member for Planning Policy and Economic Development

Noted the report.

Thank you for the Head of Planning Policy and Conservation and the team on the work they are doing on the Local Plan.

Question from Councillor Reena Ranger

Electric vehicles are heavier than cars. Could you please tell me if any provision has been made to check what level of EV occupancy there is at our multi storey or raised car parks and are they adequately robust to take the weight and also robust to have solar panels on them.

Response provided after the meeting:

No work has been taken on this to date but given the parking of larger vehicles in the two Council multi storey car parks. The presence of EVs is not considered to raise an issue but this will be considered in work going forward.

Councillor Andrew Scarth, Lead Member for Housing, Public Health and Wellbeing

Noted the report.

Question from Councillor Joan King

There are currently 62 households in temporary accommodation which has been provided by the Council could comparable figures be provided for this time last year.

Response provided after the meeting

Please see the table below for comparison purposes of the number of households in temporary accommodation, data provided is as a snapshot on the last day of the month.

Jul-21	Jul-22	Jul-23
58	53	62

Councillor Chris Lloyd, Lead Member for Leisure

Noted the report. There were no questions.

Councillor Jon Tankard, Lead Member for Sustainability and Climate

Noted the report.

Question from Councillor Chris Mitchell

Can you please add Croxley Green to the Fast Followers

Supplementary response provided after the meeting:

Under the Fast Followers programme, TRDC and Grand Union Community Energy (GUCE) are working in partnership to launch the “Transition Streets” programme in Three Rivers over the next two years as a pilot. Transition Streets aims to bring neighbours together on a street-by-street basis to inspire them to make sustainability improvements to their homes and lifestyles, while saving money on their bills. Participating neighbours would meet together over a few months to complete a free programme of 7 short, home-based workshops covering key topics: Energy, Food, Travel, Water, Resource Use, and Biodiversity.

As Fast Followers is seeking to pilot the approach in Three Rivers as an innovative means of inspiring pro-environmental behavioural changes, and GUCE only has one part time officer to deliver the pilot project in our District over the 2-year Fast Followers programme and therefore are only able to facilitate 1-2 streets through the programme at any one time. Direct marketing will be sent to target areas that we believe are best suited to the trial, based on geodemographic data and other factors. Generic marketing will take place on a district wide basis. It is hope that the direct mail campaign will provide more encouragement for the targeted communities to apply, however it does not restrict others from applying and all applicants will be assessed against the criteria.

While anyone can participate in Transition Streets and it is a programme designed with inclusivity at its core, we are keen to use the pilot project to trial the approach with groups that would be representative of the wider community, so that relatable case studies can be created to inspire further engagement beyond the Fast Followers programme.

Using [CACI's Acorn data](#) and stakeholder insights, we have identified Abbots Langley and Bedmond, Leavesden, Penn and Mill End, and Rickmansworth Town wards as wards with the highest proportion of residents in the demographics that Transition Streets aims to engage. The primary demographic target for Transition Streets is “Comfortable Communities” defined as containing “*much of middle-of-the-road Britain, whether in the suburbs, smaller towns or the countryside. They are stable families and empty nesters in suburban or semi-rural areas*”, but other demographic categories of “Rising Prosperity” and “Financially Stretched” can be candidates too.

As Transition Streets emphasises the cost savings of sustainable changes, it is important that residents participating in the pilot project are motivated by the prospect of saving some money (and therefore we discounted wards with the highest proportions of “Affluent Achievers”), yet they should also have the financial means to be able to implement some changes which may have longer pay-back times such as home retrofit. We also recognised that residents facing the greatest socio-economic hardships are less likely to be able to commit their time and energy to a several month-long programme focusing on sustainability when they may be dealing with multiple

deprivations (and therefore discounted wards with the highest proportions of “Urban Adversity”).

We also decided to avoid areas that have already had extensive involvement in past and current retrofit projects such as South Oxhey and Carpenders Park, as the Transition Streets pilot programme has an emphasis on retrofit, which many people in these areas would already have been exposed to.

Though we have initially identified wards to focus our marketing of Transition Streets in, the project is ultimately dependent on the willingness of residents to take part, and we are therefore open to having residents from anywhere in the District express their interest in participating. Following the pilot project, we hope to expand Transition Streets across the District so that more residents from a diverse range of communities can join in.

If you do know of a street (a group of 6-8 households) that may be interested in participating in Transition Streets, then we would welcome any suggestions you have. Residents can also register their interest in the programme here:

<https://forms.gle/YH9zqMYyRSiiKTmB7>

Councillor Steve Drury, Lead Member for Community Partnerships

Not in attendance.

Councillor Keith Martin, Lead Member for Resources

Noted the report and no questions.

CL39/23 WRITTEN REPORTS FROM AND QUESTIONS TO CHAIRS OF AUDIT, PLANNING, LICENSING AND REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEES

Noted the written report from the Chair of Planning Committee.

No questions were raised on the report.

CL40/23 MOTIONS UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 11

Motion 1

Councillor Stephen Giles-Medhurst moved, seconded by Councillor Sarah Nelmes under notice duly given the motion as follows:

Council notes that the Member of Parliament for South West Herts (covering the majority of the Three Rivers Council area) has issued a leaflet at the end of May signed by him making a false claim about this Council.

The MP stated in this leaflet:

"The Liberal Democrat Council in Three Rivers have been pressing on with plans to build over 1,000 new dwellings across two of our green belt sites, which falls within the Chilterns' Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)".

This is false.

In fact, the Council has not proposed or supported any development on any site within the Chilterns' Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

Without exception, every application for development on any site within the AONB has been rejected by Three Rivers Council (including both the current applications in respect of the Green Street site in Chorleywood).

The Council has not consulted about Green Street, Chorleywood or any other site in the AONB as a potential development site in its emerging Local Plan.

Council therefore expects the MP to withdraw the leaflet, issue a retraction and a public apology for misleading residents if he has not already done so as asked of him on 31 May.

Council instructs the Chief Executive to write again to the MP setting out the facts, seek assurances that he will not repeat misleading facts again and request a retraction and a public apology for misleading residents within 5 working days of this motion being passed if so a retraction has not already been received.

Council notes that its officers will, as have they have done so previously, rigorously defend any refusal of planning before the governments planning inspector and will do so re the Green Street, Chorleywood proposals.

Councillor Oliver Cooper moved, seconded by Councillor Philip Hearn the following amendments to the motion:

- Before the first original paragraph, add four paragraphs reading:
- “Council notes its desire for better-informed public debate on the most important issues affecting local residents.
- “Council notes a number of misleading communications, including a recent leaflet distributed by the district councillors for Chorleywood South & Maple Cross, which claimed that the Local Cycling & Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) was developed and proposed by “consultants for Hertfordshire County Council”.
- “This is false, as the first line of the LCWIP states, “This document is the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan for Watford Borough Council (WBC) and Three Rivers District Council (TRDC), developed with these two local authorities and in partnership with Hertfordshire County Council (HCC) as the Highway Authority.”
- “TRDC’s leading role in proposing the plan has also been made clear in multiple statements issued by the Lead Member through official communications and in the officers’ report to IHED in October 2022.”
- In the first original paragraph, before “Council”, add “In addition, this”.
- In the fifth original paragraph, after “(AONB)”, add “and the applications in question were unanimously rejected by members of all parties at the Planning Committee. It would only have been correct if he had referred to the Green Belt, not AONB.”
- Add a new paragraph after the fifth original paragraph, reading: “This Council reminds all officeholders of the importance of releasing factually accurate information to our residents.”
- Delete all after.

It was advised by the Monitoring Officer that the proposed amendments were contrary to Rule 16(6d) as they had the effect of negating the motion and could not be considered.

On being put to Council the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair of Council the voting being 26 For, 0 Against and 9 Abstentions (one Councillor was not present in the room for the vote).

RESOLVED:

The council notes that the Member of Parliament for Southwest Herts (covering the majority of the Three Rivers Council area) has issued a leaflet at the end of May signed by him making a false claim about this Council.

The MP stated in this leaflet:

"The Liberal Democrat Council in Three Rivers have been pressing on with plans to build over 1,000 new dwellings across two of our green belt sites, which falls within the Chilterns' Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)".

This is false.

In fact, the Council has not proposed or supported any development on any site within the Chilterns' Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

Without exception, every application for development on any site within the AONB has been rejected by Three Rivers Council (including both the current applications in respect of the Green Street site in Chorleywood).

The Council has not consulted about Green Street, Chorleywood or any other site in the AONB as a potential development site in its emerging Local Plan. Council therefore expects the MP to withdraw the leaflet, issue a retraction and a public apology for misleading residents if he has not already done so as asked of him on 31 May.

Council instructs the Chief Executive to write again to the MP setting out the facts, seek assurances that he will not repeat misleading facts again and request a retraction and a public apology for misleading residents within 5 working days of this motion being passed if so a retraction has not already been received.

Council notes that its officers will, as have they have done so previously, rigorously defend any refusal of planning before the governments planning inspector and will do so re the Green Street, Chorleywood proposals.

Motion 2

Councillor Stephen Giles-Medhurst moved, seconded by Councillor Sara Bedford under notice duly given the motion as follows with additional point 4:

Green Belt and Local Plan

Council notes various pronouncements made by Michael Gove as Secretary of State for Levelling Up & Communities and other prominent Conservative MPs that the standard methodology for calculating housing numbers is not going to be compulsory and that councils need not build on the Green Belt, although such changes have not yet been applied to local authorities. Councils are required to follow.

Council believes that our towns and villages are important to communities and that the green space within and around them is precious.

Council therefore requests that officers continue to work on:

1. Conducting further search for brownfield land, with publicity to landowners and the public.
2. Preparing a draft Local Plan with an evidence-based approach to safeguard undeveloped Green Belt land.
3. Ensure there is an evidence-based response to support the approach outlined in 2 above in any submission we are required to make to the planning inspectorate.
- 4. That in light of misleading and inaccurate information being circulated across the District about the Local Plan and planning decisions, the Council should use all facilities at its disposal to correctly inform residents of the factually correct information concerning the Local Plan and other matters.**

Councillor Ciaran Reed, seconded by Councillor Oliver Cooper proposed an amendment to the motion as follows, which was rejected by the proposer of the motion.

- In numbered list 2, after "land", add:

- “and that does not allocate any sites in the Green Belt for development unless the site is both:
- (i) substantially developed; and
- (ii) where the harm to the Green Belt from development is either low or moderate

On being put to Council the substantive motion with the addition of point 4 was declared CARRIED by the Chair of Council the voting being by general assent.

RESOLVED:

Green Belt and Local Plan

Council notes various pronouncements made by Michael Gove as Secretary of State for Levelling Up & Communities and other prominent Conservative MPs that the standard methodology for calculating housing numbers is not going to be compulsory and that councils need not build on the Green Belt, although such changes have not yet been applied to legalisation councils are required to follow.

Council believes that our towns and villages are important to communities and that the green space within and around them is precious.

Council therefore requests that officers continue to work on:

1. Conducting further search for brownfield land, with publicity to landowners and the public.
2. Preparing a draft Local Plan with an evidence-based approach to safeguard undeveloped Green Belt land.
3. Ensure there is an evidence-based response to support the approach outlined in 2 above in any submission we are required to make to the planning inspectorate.
4. That in light of misleading and inaccurate information being circulated across the District about the Local Plan and planning decisions, the Council should use all facilities at its disposal to correctly inform residents of the factually correct information concerning the Local Plan and other matters.

Motions 3 and 4 fell under Rule 11(4)

CHAIR

This page is intentionally left blank