

MINUTES

CABINET

15 DECEMBER 2015

Present:

Members:

Councillors: Graeme Elliot Portfolio Holder for Finance & Resources
Margaret Griffiths Portfolio Holder for Housing
Janice Marshall Portfolio Holder for Environmental, Sustainability
& Regulatory Services
Graham Sutton Portfolio Holder for Planning & Regeneration
Andrew Williams Leader of the Council
(Chairman)

Officers: Sally Marshall Chief Executive
Mark Gaynor Corporate Director Housing and Regeneration
James Deane Corporate Director Finance & Operations
James Doe Assistant Director Planning, Development &
Regeneration
Steve Baker Assistant Director Chief Executive's Unit
Jim Doyle Group Manager Democratic Services
Richard Baker Group Manager Financial Services
Laura Wood Strategic Planning & Regeneration Team
Leader
Francis Whittaker Strategic Planning & Regeneration Officer
Michelle Anderson Corporate Support Team Leader-Democracy

The meeting began at 7.30 pm.

CA/112/15 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 24 November 2015 were agreed by the members present and signed by the Chairman.

CA/113/15 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

An apology was received on behalf of Councillor Harden.

CA/114/15 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None received.

CA/115/15 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

There was no public participation.

CA/116/15 REFERRALS TO CABINET

There were no referrals to Cabinet.

Chairman

CA/117/15 CABINET FORWARD PLAN

Decision

That the Cabinet Forward Plan be noted, subject to the following amendments:

That the Asset Management Strategy and the Corporate Plan be added to the February agenda.

The Assistant Director for Planning & Regeneration would confirm what date the 'Hemel Hempstead Town Centre Parking Access and Movement Strategy' would be reported to committee.

CA/118/15 TREASURY MANAGEMENT MID-YEAR PERFORMANCE REPORT

Decision

That the half-year report on targets and performance, in Sections 4-7 of the Cabinet report be approved.

Reason for Decision

To provide Members with mid-year information on Treasury Management performance.

Implications

Financial

A summary of performance against the Council's budgeted investment income is included in Section 5 of the report.

Value for Money

The Council is required to invest surplus funds to ensure that it maximises the benefit of cash flows.

Risk Implications

Failures in the banking sector have increased the risk of investment being lost. A prudent approach to investment is required to minimise the risk to the Council of investment losses. Currently all DBC investments are in prime UK banks or in UK Government bodies; such as the DMO and other local authorities.

Community Impact Assessment

There are no community impact implications

Health And Safety Implications

There are no health and safety implications.

Corporate Objectives

Dacorum Delivers – Optimising investment income for General Fund and Housing Revenue budgets whilst managing investment risk is fundamental to achieving the corporate objectives.

Advice

The Portfolio Holder for Finance & Resources said the report is brought to Cabinet in accordance with CIPFA best practice guidelines, and provides Members with an update on the Council's current treasury position.

In terms of investment, interest rates remain low which has proved beneficial for the borrowing rates available to the Council, but has limited the return on the Council's investment. The current low rates are not expected to change materially until late 2016 at the earliest.

The market expectation is that the US Federal Reserve will start to increase rates shortly and usually the UK does follow this lead.

The prudential indicators within the report demonstrate that the Council's borrowing is sustainable and compliant with regulatory guidelines.

Consultation

Consultation took place with:

- Capita Asset Services

Voting

None.

CA/119/15 COUNCIL TAX BASE

Decision

1. That the Collection Fund surplus estimate of £392,423.62 as at 31 March 2016 be approved
2. That the calculation of the Council's tax base for the year 2016/17 incorporating an estimated collection rate of 99.4% be approved
3. That, in accordance with the Local Authorities (Calculation of Tax Base) Regulations 1992, the amount calculated by the Council as its tax base for the year 2016/17 shall be 55,282.0 and its constituent elements shall be:

Part of Area - Parished and Non Parished	100% Tax base	99.4% Tax base
Hemel Hempstead	29,099.8	28,925.2
Aldbury	456.7	454.0
Berkhamsted	8,328.8	8,278.8
Bovingdon	2,056.2	2,043.9
Chipperfield	846.2	841.1
Flamstead	617.1	613.4
Flaunden	178.1	177.0
Great Gaddesden	439.7	437.1
Kings Langley	2,293.0	2,279.2

Chairman

Little Gaddesden	640.9	637.1
Markyate	1,316.7	1,308.8
Nash Mills	1,040.1	1,033.9
Nettleden with Potten End	796.1	791.3
Northchurch	1,273.4	1,265.8
Tring Rural	617.7	614.0
Tring Town	4,941.0	4,911.4
Wigginton	674.0	670.0
Total	55,615.5	55,282.0

Reason for Decision

1. To agree the estimated Collection Fund surplus as at 31/03/2016
2. To determine the Council Tax Base for 2016/17

Implications

Financial

Providing details of the Collection Fund surplus estimated as at 31 March 2016 assists the Council and other precepting authorities in the setting of their Council Tax for 2016/17.

The recommended Council Tax Base shows a 644.3 increase on the previous year which is due to additional Band D equivalent dwellings in the Borough.

Legal

Cabinet has delegated authority to set the Council Tax Base by virtue of Section 67 Local Government Finance Act 1992 (as amended) and the resolution of Council dated 19 January 2005.

Value for money

Not applicable

Risk Implications

Not applicable

Corporate Objectives

Not applicable

Advice

The Portfolio Holder for Finance & Resources said the Council is required to formally set its tax base for the purpose of approving the Council Tax for Budget 2016/17.

There has been growth in the base of over 1% since 15/16, equating to around 650 Band D properties, which is the prime reason for the surplus on the Collection Fund. This growth has also resulted in an additional £850k of New Homes Bonus for next year.

Chairman

Consultation

Not applicable

Voting

None.

CA/120/15 CONSIDERATION OF RESPONSES TO PRE-SUBMISSION FOCUSED CHANGES AND SUBMISSION OF SITE ALLOCATIONS DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT (DPD)

Decision

1. RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND COUNCIL:

- a) that the changes set out in Table 4 of the Report of Representations are made to the Pre-Submission Site Allocations DPD as a result of representations received; and
 - b) that the Site Allocations DPD incorporating Focused Change, together with other appropriate supporting documents is submitted to the Planning Inspectorate.
2. That the issues arising from representations received to the Focused Changes to the Pre-Submission Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) and the impact of new advice be noted.
 3. That authority is delegated to the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regeneration to approve any further minor wording changes to the Site Allocations document prior to consideration by Full Council.
 4. That authority is delegated to the Assistant Director (Planning, Development and Regeneration) to:
 - (a) Finalise the Report of Representations and other Submission documents; and
 - (b) Agree any further minor changes arising during the course of the Examination.

Reason for Decision

To consider the significant new issues raised through representations on the Focused Changes to the Pre-Submission Site Allocations DPD; and Agree the process for submitting the Site Allocations DPD to the Planning Inspectorate.

Implications

Financial

Budget provision for the next stages of the statutory process i.e. Submission and Examination are made in the 2015/16 and 2016/17 LDF budget.

Having an up-to-date planning framework helps reduce the incidence of planning appeals (and hence costs associated with these). It will be the most effective way of ensuring the optimum level of developer contributions to infrastructure and in mitigation of development impacts can be achieved. This process will be further improved and simplified through the implementation of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

Chairman

Value for money

Where possible, technical work that supports the Site Allocations has been jointly commissioned with adjoining authorities to ensure value for money.

Legal

Jameson and Hill have been retained to provide external legal support for the Site Allocations. The same advisers acted for the Council through the Core Strategy Examination process and subsequent (unsuccessful) legal challenge to this document. They will provide the Council with any advice required regarding the implication of new Government advice; assist with responding to key representations; advise on the production of any additional evidence and support Officers through the Examination process itself.

Staff

It is critical that the Strategic Planning and Regeneration team is fully staffed to enable the agreed LPF timetable to be delivered. A Programme Officer will need to be appointed by the Council to provide administrative support to the Inspector and act as a single, independent point of contact for all parties throughout the Examination process.

Land

The Site Allocations supports delivery of the Council's adopted Core Strategy which will play an important role in decisions regarding future land uses within the Borough. The Council has specific land ownership interest in two of the Local Allocations - LA1 (Marchmont Farm) and LA2 (Old Town).

Risk Implications

Key risks are identified in the Local Development Scheme and reviewed annually within the Annual Monitoring Report. They include failure of external agencies or consultants to deliver on time, changes in Government policy and team capacity. A separate risk assessment prepared for the Core Strategy Pre-Submission identifies a number of risks relating to the Examination process and particularly the soundness tests with which the Site Allocations must comply.

Equalities Implications

An Equality Impact Assessment has been carried out for the Core Strategy. Equalities issues are also picked up as part of the Sustainability Appraisal Report that accompanies the Site Allocations document.

Health And Safety Implications

Implications are included in the planning issues covered by the Core Strategy and Site Allocations DPDs.

Corporate Objectives

The Site Allocations forms part of the Council's Local Planning Framework, which as a whole helps support all 5 corporate objectives:

- *Safe and clean environment:* e.g. contains policies relating to the design and layout of new development that promote security and safe access;
- *Community Capacity:* e.g. provide a framework for local communities to prepare area-specific guidance such as Neighbourhood Plans, Town / Village Plans etc;

- *Affordable housing*: e.g. sets the Borough's overall housing target and the proportion of new homes that must be affordable;
- *Dacorum delivers*: e.g. provides a clear framework upon which planning decisions can be made; and

Regeneration: e.g. sets the planning framework for key regeneration projects, such as Hemel Hempstead town centre and the Maylands Business Park.

Advice

The Strategic Planning & Regeneration Team Leader gave the following introduction to the report

'The role of this report is to summarise the issues raised through representations on the limited 'Focused Changes consultation on the Council's Site Allocations' document, and to agree processes for submitting this Site Allocations DPD to the Planning Inspectorate for Examination. This submission requires the agreement of Full Council.

Subject to this agreement being achieved at the next Full Council in January, the Site Allocations would be submitted in early February, with the examination hearing sessions pencilled in for May 2016.

As Cabinet has previously been advised, the Site Allocations DPD is in effect the 'delivery' document or the adopted Core Strategy.

It is not an opportunity to re-open debates on issues that the Core Strategy covers – but to show how these policies and designations will be delivered on the ground.

It is a very important document in helping the Council to demonstrate that it has an up to- date plan, as required by Government and can also ensure delivery of the critical 5 year land supply.

To delay its submission and implementation therefore weakens the Council's ability to fend off speculative applications on sites it does not wish to see developed – especially those in the Green Belt.

Not unexpectedly, the most sensitive issue in the Site Allocations DPD relates to the inclusion of 3 Gypsy and Traveller sites within the largest of the six 'Local Allocations' – at LA1 (Marchmont Farm), LA3, (West Hemel), and at LA5, (Tring).

Members will also have received a letter from a local resident who is also a planning barrister regarding the LA5 site. I can respond to all his points in turn if you wish, but I have provided Councillor Sutton with a briefing note on this matter prior to the meeting and will ask him whether he wishes me to outline our response to the issues Mr Standen raises.

In summary, we do not feel that there is any need from either a technical or legal perspective to delay the Site Allocations submission until after the Housing and Planning Bill is enacted. The coverage of Gypsy and Traveller issues within this Bill is extremely limited and doesn't change the Council's obligations to assess the needs of this group or demonstrate through planning designations and polices how these needs will be met.

Chairman

I would therefore ask members of Cabinet to agree the recommendations set out in the report and enable this important document to progress through the statutory process.'

Councillor Hicks spoke as a ward councillor for Tring West & Rural. He said that when he was elected he promised to oppose the gypsy and traveller site at every opportunity. He felt that the proposal process was wrong. He had not yet seen a detailed plan or an artist impression and how it would affect the gateway to Tring. He explained that they were trying to push Tring as a tourist attraction. He concluded that he believed the whole system to be flawed.

Councillor Conway, ward councillor for Tring West & Rural also wanted to see a plan. She felt that the junction at the entrance to the proposed site would be too dangerous. She wanted more information before a decision could be made as currently, in her opinion, the proposed site was in the wrong place.

The Leader of the council noted that this was not a planning meeting and the committee were making a decision on land use only and the level of detail the councillors were looking for would come later in the process.

The Assistant Director for Planning, Development & Regeneration explained that the intention had always been that the site would be included in the consultation document and that the design and detail would follow.

The Portfolio Holder for Planning & Regeneration noted that he was a member of the land allocation panel a few years ago as was a representative from Tring. All proposed gypsy and traveller sites had representatives on the panel too. He added that this report was to purely agree the settlement for the site and not detailed plans. He said that local residents would have an opportunity to make their views known, further down the line.

The Strategic Planning & Regeneration Team Leader said that all of the objections from councillors and local residents would be passed to the planning inspector. She predicted that a hearing would be held to examine the process and the council's decisions.

The Portfolio Holder for Environmental, Sustainability & Regulatory Services sought clarification on whether or not the powers of the Development Control Committee (DCC) would be limited if this site allocation plan is approved. She also asked what would happen if DCC refused a gypsy and traveller site application.

The Assistant Director for Planning, Development & Regeneration replied that the council's role would be strengthened by a decision at Cabinet and would allow a planned and controlled approach.

The Leader of the council added that the DCC would need to be mindful of this document when considering certain applications.

The Portfolio Holder for Environmental, Sustainability & Regulatory Services asked if DBC would have to find alternative sites if the DCC had overwhelming objections.

The Assistant Director for Planning, Development & Regeneration replied that there had already been extensive searches over the years for gypsy and traveller sites within the borough, therefore the council would be in a difficult position as no other sites had been identified.

The Portfolio Holder for Planning & Regeneration sympathised with the Tring West & Rural ward councillors and requested that they be provided with the background information from past discussions in order to bring them up to date.

The Strategic Planning & Regeneration Team Leader said that the council prepared a consultation document which was published on the website. She added that the minutes from the Task and Finish Group meetings could be circulated, which the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regeneration agreed.

Councillor Conway asked what would happen if the government changed the policy. The Assistant Director for Planning, Development & Regeneration said the council would need to look at the matter again; however they had sought appropriate legal advice.

Councillor Hicks noted that if the gypsy and traveller sites were removed from the plan he didn't think there would be a list of developers wanting to build these sites rather than houses.

The Leader of the Council replied that the council would not fulfil their responsibility within the plan if this were to happen.

The Portfolio Holder for Housing added that this decision would protect the council, for example some travellers had landings in Dacorum and this would stop them developing in other sites.

The Assistant Director for Planning, Development & Regeneration said that developers were not the issue but where the traveller community wished to settle was the issue.

The Leader of the Council said the provision for gypsy and traveller sites was always a challenging process. The government sets out that the council has to provide a site and the sites previously identified were thought to be the best sites.

He noted that the Core Strategy had already been approved and were currently approving subsequent proposals.

The Strategic Planning & Regeneration Team Leader noted that the council could not look at housing numbers etc. but further down the line there could be more discussion. She concluded to note that the planning inspector could not make the decision for the council but he could advise changes to be made. If this was the case there would be further consultation and report back to Full Council.

Consultation

Consultation on the Site Allocations DPD has been carried out in accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI), adopted by the Council in June 2006. The detail is set out within the Reports of Consultation that followed the 2006 and 2008 Issues and Options Consultations. A draft report of consultation for the period 2008 and 2014 has also been published.

Advice from key stakeholders, such as the Local Education Authority and Highway Authority, has been sought where appropriate. Feedback on the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan has also been significant in developing a clear understanding of local infrastructure needs. This advice is referred to within the relevant Background Issues paper that form part of the Site Allocations DPD evidence base. The Consultation Reports relating to the Core Strategy (Volumes 1-7) are also relevant.

In terms of internal processes, a Task and Finish Group advised on the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD, There have been reports to Cabinet at key stages in the

preparation of the Local Planning Framework and the Planning and Regeneration Portfolio Holder has been kept apprised of progress.

SPEOSC also considered a progress report, which highlighted key emerging issues, on 27 January 2015.

Voting

None.

CA/121/15 LOCAL PLANNING FRAMEWORK AUTHORITY MONITORING REPORT AND LOCAL DEVELOPMENT SCHEME UPDATE

Decision

1. RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND COUNCIL:

- **The adoption of the new Local Development Scheme as set out in the report to Cabinet.**
2. That the headline results from the forthcoming Authority Monitoring Report 2014/15 with regard to housing, employment and retailing be noted;
 3. That progress on the Local Planning Framework be noted

Reason for Decision

To consider:

- the Authority Monitoring Report for 2014/15;
- progress on the Local Planning Framework; and
- recommend publication of a revised Local Development Scheme to Council.

Implications

Financial

Funding is provided from the LDF reserve. A budget has been agreed for 2015/16. The 2016/17 budget is currently being reviewed as part of the annual budget cycle.

Value for Money

Every effort has been made to secure external funding – most recently through the New Homes Bonus, to reduce the impact on the Council's budget. Where possible, evidence base work is undertaken jointly with other authorities to ensure cost is optimised (through economies of scale). Collaborative working with landowner consultants will continue to help extend the resources available to the Council and avoid the duplication of site specific technical information.

Risk Implications

A risk assessment has been carried out as part of the PID / CORVU monitoring process. The Local Development Scheme also contains its own risk assessment. The key concern is that the (new) development plan must be sound, and delivers what is

needed expeditiously. Risk is reduced by ensuring processes and the evidence base is robust. Sufficient financial resources are essential to achieve that: this includes maintaining a team of appropriately skilled and qualified staff. Certain elements of the plan-making process have explicit statutory requirements such as consultation, publication, examination and presentation of the adopted Development Plan Document. The Authority Monitoring Report reviews the risks inherent in preparing the Local Planning Framework. Monitoring of development is a source of information which, properly used, can assist risk reduction – i.e. it checks whether progress and control of development has been successful and can indicate where change (in policy or process) may be beneficial.

Community Impact Assessment

An Equality Impact Assessment has been carried out for the Core Strategy. This is currently being converted and updated into a broader Community Impact Assessment. An independent Sustainability Appraisal Report which accompanies the Core Strategy also considers equalities issues separately. It concludes that the Core Strategy avoids any discrimination on the basis of disability, gender or ethnic minority.

Health And Safety Implications

None

Corporate Objectives

The Authority Monitoring Report looks at the effectiveness of current planning policies – for example the achievement of the overall housing target and protection of green space/wildlife sites – and progress towards planning policy review (i.e. targets set out in the Local Development Scheme). It therefore provides a good summary of how the Council's planning policies are supporting delivery of corporate objectives – especially those relating to affordable housing; safe and clean environment and regeneration. As the policies within the Core Strategy and other planning documents are aimed at enabling growth, it also provides an indication of how the 'Dacorum Delivers' objective is being supported.

Advice

The Strategic Planning & Regeneration Officer said that the report was to seek member's views and to recommend to Council the adoption of the new Local Development Scheme as set out in the report to Cabinet. He added that a letter had been received earlier in the day from Savills who represented GUI. They had raised concerns around the timetable for the term ending 2017/18, which they had interpreted as being the end of December 2017. However the council had intended that this would actually end March 2018. The timetable fully reflected this position.

The Portfolio Holder for Environmental, Sustainability & Regulatory Services felt that it was appropriate to clarify the wording.

The Strategic Planning & Regeneration Team Leader said they could cross reference in the Local Development Scheme and explain the timetable would go to the end of the financial year 2017/18.

Consultation

Consultation took place with:

Chairman

- Assistant Director Planning, Development and Regeneration.
- Group Manager, Strategic Planning and Regeneration.
Corporate Management Team.

Voting

None.

CA/122/15 CONSIDERATION OF NEW STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT (SCI) TO GUIDE CONSULTATION ON PLANNING MATTERS.

Decision

1. That the draft of a new Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) for consultation as set out in the report to Cabinet be approved;
2. That further technical information on consulting on planning applications is added to the SCI and that authority is delegated to the Assistant Director (Planning, Development and Regeneration)
3. That authority for the arrangements for targeted consultation is delegated to the Assistant Director (Planning, Development and Regeneration) on the basis as set out in the report to Cabinet.

Reason for Decision

That Cabinet consider a draft of a new Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) and agree arrangements for seeking feedback on this.

Implications

Financial

There are no direct financial implications relating to the preparation of a new SCI. However, there are implications for the consultation arrangements set out within it: and the need to balance public expectations regarding the types of consultation techniques with the costs involved.

Value for money

The SCI sets out the range of consultation techniques that will be used within the planning process and the need to ensure that these are fit for purpose and proportionate in terms of the scale and nature of the planning issue(s) involved.

Legal

The production on an SCI is a legal requirement. Compliance with an up to date SCI assist the Council in defending objections and appeals against its planning decisions. Conversely, failure to comply with the standards and processes set out within the SCI could result in legal action against the Council.

Staff

No direct implications for staffing. However, all staff and elected Members need to be aware of the content of the SCI and follow processes and procedures within it.

Land

No direct implications, although the planning documents and proposals that will be subject to consultation will have implications for the future use of land.

Risk Implications

Key challenges relating to consultation are set out within the SCI itself. Key risks relate to non-compliance with the SCI – resulting in legal challenges - and the need to balance public aspirations regarding consultation and involvement in planning decisions, with the limited budgets available.

Equalities implications

Equalities issues are considered through the Sustainability Appraisal process that all planning policy documents are subject to. The SCI itself also considers the most appropriate consultation techniques to reach different types of consultees. There may also be indirect implications for the SCI i.e. relating to the choice of venues for public consultation events and the need to ensure these are DDA compliant.

Health And Safety Implications

No direct implications. There may be indirect implications relating to different types of consultation techniques and the choice of event venues.

Corporate Objectives

The SCI sets out how the Council will consult on its planning policy document and on planning applications. It therefore directly supports the 'Community Capacity' and 'Dacorum Delivers,' and indirectly supports all other objectives via the plans and developments that arise through the planning process.

Advice

The Strategic Planning & Regeneration Team Leader gave the following introduction to the report.

'The Statement of Community Involvement, or SCI for short, is the document that the Council is required to produce, that sets out how we will consult on planning policy documents and planning applications.

Our current SCI was adopted in 2006 and so does not fully reflect changes that have occurred since then in terms of:

1. Government regulations
2. Changes in the Council's own processes and procedures
3. And the increased use of electronic communication, websites and social media.

This report therefore asks for Cabinet's approval to seek informal feedback on a new SCI. Whilst there is no Government requirement to gain such feedback.

Once this consultation has taken place, Cabinet and full Council would be asked to consider the responses received and any changes required to the document as a result, before adopting the new document and its requirements coming into effect.

It is very important that we have an up to date SCI to govern consultation on our new Local Plan, which begins next year and also to ensure we have a clear approach to seeking feedback on planning applications and other DM processes.

Chairman

I would therefore ask Cabinet to agree the recommendations set out in this report.'

The Portfolio Holder for Housing said this was an excellent idea and asked what the estimated timescales were for completion.

The Strategic Planning & Regeneration Team Leader said they would like to consult in January 2016 and would allow 4-6 weeks for responses. The level of response would then impact on when the report returns to Cabinet, which was hoped to be in the spring.

The Portfolio Holder for Environmental, Sustainability & Regulatory Services asked what the definition was for a minimum major development.

The Assistant Director for Planning, Development & Regeneration said it was more than 10 dwellings.

The Portfolio Holder for Environmental, Sustainability & Regulatory Services explained that residents regularly complain as they are unaware of applications. She felt that neighbourhood notices should also include a site notice and this should be put in place for 10 dwellings and below.

The Assistant Director for Planning, Development & Regeneration noted the valid points raised and highlighted that arrangements for targeted consultation would be delegated to the Assistant Director (Planning, Development and Regeneration). He suggested that the council look into circumstances where these notices would be in use and a sensible judgement should be taken to allow those affected an opportunity to comment. He added that the neighbourhood notifications worked very well but they could look at using them in conjunction with site notices.

The Leader noted the points raised and suggested that the chart on page 403 of the agenda 'Statutory Publicity requirements for Planning and Heritage applications' be amended. A tick should be included for site notices for major developments and the title of the second column should read 'site notice and neighbour notification letter'.

The Assistant Director for Planning, Development & Regeneration recommended including a criteria in the document to provide sensible judgement/advice.

The Portfolio Holder for Planning & Regeneration concluded to note that this was a much needed review as the borough was not standing still and therefore needed a framework to base on for the future.

Consultation

The draft revised SCI has been discussed internally with the following teams:

- Communications
- Strategic Planning and Regeneration
- Development Management
- Legal

The intention of this report is to gain permission from Cabinet to extend this consultation to relevant external groups, including developers and agents, community groups and Town and Parish Councils.

Voting

None.

Chairman

CA/123/15 COMMITTEE TIMETABLE 2016/17

Decision

RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND COUNCIL:

The Committee Meeting Timetable for 2016/17 as set out in Annex A to the Cabinet report.

Reason for Decision

To seek approval of the Meeting Timetable for 2016/17.

Risk Implications

Approval of the Meeting Timetable enables Members and Officers to manage forward decision making planning.

Community Impact Assessment

Not applicable

Health And Safety Implications

None

Corporate Objectives

The various meetings of the Council, Cabinet and Committees support the achievement of the Council's Corporate Objectives.

Advice

None.

Consultation

Consultation took place with:

- The Leader of the Council
- Corporate Management Team.

Voting

None.

CA/124/15 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

Decision

That, under s.100A (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 Schedule 12A Part 1 as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006 the public be excluded during the item in Part 2 of the Agenda for this meeting, because it is likely, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted, that, if members of the public were present during this item, there would be disclosure to them of exempt

Chairman

information relating to the financial and business affairs of the Council and third party companies/organisations. (Minute CA/125/15)

Local Government Act 1972, Schedule 12A, Part 1, paragraph 3

**CA/125/15 VARIATION OF SALE CONTRACT FOR STATIONERS PLACE,
APSLEY, HEMEL HEMPSTEAD.**

Decision

That the recommendation as detailed in the report be approved.

Full details are in the Part II minute.

Reason for Decision

Full details are in the Part II minute.

Implications

Full details are in the Part II minute.

Advice

Full details are in the Part II minute.

Voting

Full details are in the Part II minute.

The meeting ended at 8.20pm.