

## MINUTES

### STRATEGIC PLANNING & ENVIRONMENT OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY

28 JULY 2020

#### Present

**Councillors:** Barrett  
Beauchamp  
Birnie (Chairman)  
P Hearn  
Hobson  
McDowell  
Ransley  
Riddick  
Rogers  
Silwal (Vice-Chairman)  
Taylor  
Timmis

<b>Officers:</b>	Rebecca Connolly	Environmental Health Lead Officer (Food Health and Safety)
	James Doe	Assistant Director - Planning, Development and Regeneration
	Stephen Mendham	Strategic Planning and Regeneration Officer
	Neil Polden	Environmental Health Officer
	Alex Robinson	Strategic Planning Manager
	Philip Stanley	Development Management Team Leader
	Sara Whelan	Group Manager - Development Management and Planning

#### Also Attending:

##### Portfolio Holders:

Councillor Banks (Community & Regulatory)  
Councillor Sutton (Planning & Infrastructure)  
Sarah Turner PA to Corporate Directors (Minutes)

##### Others:

Councillor Terry Douris  
Councillor Andrew Williams (Leader of the Council)  
J Rook (Public Participation)

The meeting began at 6.30 pm

The draft minutes from the previous meeting had not been circulated for comments and it was agreed that they would be sent out and signed at the next meeting.

**104                    APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were given on behalf of Councillor Stevens.

**105                    DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

**106                    PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

J Rook enquired when the new Air Quality Action Plan will be published. Cllr Banks advised that due to the impact of Covid 19, the Steering Group had to be cancelled and an interim report would be published at the end of September.

**107                    CONSIDERATION OF ANY MATTER REFERRED TO THE COMMITTEE IN RELATION TO CALL-IN**

None.

**108                    FOOD SERVICE PLAN**

R Connolly presented the Food Service Plan report and asked Committee for any questions.

Cllr Timmis asked three questions; 1) what happens when infectious disease carriers are discovered in the food industry, 2) what is the risk of Covid 19 in food preparation and 3) we are not currently doing food sampling due to a shortage of staff, so can we start recruiting now. R Connolly confirmed that; 1) the person should go to the Doctors and then Public Health England will notify us, there will be an exclusion policy in place and they can return to work for 48 hours after the symptoms have gone, 2) there is no evidence to suggest that Covid 19 is a risk in the preparation of food, and 3) we currently have two adverts going out in August, plus one other Establishment Management Form (EMF) in process. It has been very difficult to employ people who are interested and have the required degree or qualifications so we have been trying to train up our own staff.

Cllr Ransley asked if we check school kitchens. R Connolly advised that we do, we have to inspect all food premises, but generally school kitchens have a high standard.

Cllr Beauchamp enquired how often inspections were undertaken. R Connolly confirmed that it differed depending on the risk rating; the higher the risk the more often we visited. The highest risk rating is A where we would visit every six months and the lowest risk rating would be every three years: this would be for a pharmacy or similar type business. If the A risk rated business had any contraventions we would visit more often and make sure they correct any problems.

Cllr Riddick mentioned that there had been a lot of confusion over the procedures with businesses opening and queried if we have been invited to provide advice. Cllr Riddick also commented that we were in a good position to recruit staff in all areas of the Council due to Covid 19. R Connolly shared the positivity on the recruitment and we are hoping that this time there will be more applicants as the employment climate is changing. R Connolly agreed that the information provided can seem confusing but the Food Standards Agency had produced some good information which is in layman's terms, plus we are changing our inspection proforma to take account of Covid 19 changes, for

example social distancing has been included. Where we have been asked for advice we have been referring people back to the guidance produced by the government to ensure the information given is consistent.

Cllr Hearn asked about the possibility of us getting involved in track and tracing. E Walker advised that it's being dealt with nationally but we are increasingly taking on more complex track and trace at the moment but we are working with lots of different Government agencies.

Cllr Beauchamp queried how often the market traders tests are undertaken. E Walker confirmed that we are not managing the testing, it's being done by the NHS and it's only asymptomatic testing, so you only get a test if you have symptoms. Cllr Beauchamp clarified that he meant food testing of market traders. E Walker advised there is random sampling for salmonella etc, but don't test for everything for Covid and market traders are not in that cohort.

The Chairman mentioned that the report was for Members information but felt that it was important for the public to understand the Food Hygiene Rating System (FHRS). R Connolly confirmed that an explanation of the system is on the Council's website and includes an app where the owner can check the premises against the FHRS.

The Chairman mentioned there was a discrepancy on paragraph 4.1 and the risk rating. R Connolly confirmed she would look into this and advise the outcome.

**Action: R Connolly**

The report was noted by Committee.

## **109                    PLANNING PERFORMANCE AGREEMENT SERVICE**

The Planning Performance Agreement (PPA) Service was introduced by J Doe and then S Whelan presented the report and asked Committee if they had any questions.

Cllr Riddick queried the figures for the income. S Whelan advised these were two slightly different points and one figure related to sites promoted through the local plan.

Cllr Riddick raised concerns about the income being £250k, we would hope that would become a standing base to increasing income. S Whelan confirmed that this was already included.

Cllr Timmis said that PPA works well for Planning Department and the developer but not so well for local communities, there is no meaningful consultation as the decision has already been made. S Whelan advised that it's very helpful for developers to engage with Parish and Town Councils, which we would encourage and if there is early consultation you can steer the designs. Cllr Timmis felt that it was a fait accompli by the time the customer sees it, plus such bodies as environmental groups are not included as consultees..

Cllr Ransley shared Cllr Timmis' worries about consultation, the Town and Parish Council's are side lined out of the decision making process. Cllr Ransley also asked how big a development had to be to have a PPA. S Whelan confirmed that environmental concerns is a massive part of the PPA, plus one of the key aspects of the signed PPA includes the community engagement via the Community Review Panel.

The Chairman said that we continuously have concerns raised that the Towns and Parish Councils are not involved and asked if they could have a representative on the Community Review Panel. S Whelan advised that was not possible as it's for the community and separate to the Council. There are routes for the Town and Parish Councils already and advised we can look at the way we engage

with them so that they feel included. J Doe confirmed this was about enhancing the community engagement and if we don't have this we will be bound by more formal statutory requirements.

Cllr Rogers endorsed that the consultation had no regards for Parish Councillors. They know the areas better, so would welcome a review of options for engaging better. Cllr Rogers asked how much weight was given to the Parish Council on applications. S Whelan replied that if the Parish Council comments on something that's not a material planning matter we are unable to put any weight on it, but if it's a material consideration we can put more weight on it.

Cllr Hobson said that Hemel Hempstead did not have Town or Parish Councillors and asked if Ward Councillors could be consulted. S Whelan replied that Ward Members are encouraged to comment.

Cllr Beauchamp asked what the costs were to the developer for a PPA and queried the cost per session for the Community Review Panel which is £3,300. S Whelan confirmed that the fee for the developer is a bespoke fee for each scheme and that the cost of the Community Review Panel is for an external facilitator and the developer bears the cost for this.

The Chairman asked if the charges for the PPA and Pre-app were lumped together. S Whelan advised they were lumped together as income that we received, but there are set charges for a pre-app and bespoke prices for a PPA.

Cllr McDowell mentioned that in the report it states 'where appropriate' Councillors will be consulted and asked if this could be expanded upon. S Whelan said this is exactly what we are working towards, having Members involved as early as possible, being able to manage expectations from developers in terms of how complex the site is and if it needs a briefing and making sure in terms of Development Management Committee there is no concern about pre-determination. J Doe highlighted that he held a weekly briefing with Cllr Sutton to go through all the schemes.

Cllr Silwal enquired how many people were on the Community Review Panel and if they've already met. S Whelan confirmed there were 19 residents on the Panel and yes they've already met virtually.

Cllr Sutton explained that he very much welcomed the policy which formalises the process, he wanted to assure Members that it's not about running roughshod over Members or Parish Councils, or that the decision has already been made, it's not a fait accompli and the Development Control Committee is very democratic. Cllr Sutton mentioned the LA5 and LA3 sites had great scrutiny and we also use Task and Finish Groups to shape the future of new developments. Cllr Sutton added that there had always been a strong Member/Officer relationship and hopes that the new policy will strengthen this.

The report was noted.

## **110**                      **LOCAL ENFORCEMENT PLAN PROGRESS**

P Stanley introduced the report and asked Members for any questions.

Cllr Silwal mentioned that since 2006 there are 546 live cases, but only 53 live cases where formal action has been taken. P Stanley advised that we use a range of tools at our disposal and dealing with them formally with a Notice is not always appropriate. Firstly it may not be a breach and if it is a breach it may not be harmful and it wouldn't be expedient to take action. Also, we have to make sure we are able to defend a Notice.

Cllr Silwal asked why there was still a live case from 2006. P Stanley confirmed there are about 8 or so approaching 10 years old. If we have served an Enforcement Notice, unfortunately after 10 years it's too late to take action. It can take a long time to go to court, or an amended planning application may have been submitted.

Cllr Riddick said that the numbers show 550 cases per year with 380 solved, leaving 170 unresolved and asked if that increasing gap gets carried forward and queried whether the service is unable to cope with demand with the resources available. P Stanley said that the difference is actually a minus, so it's actually a positive difference in recent years where we've been increasing our live case load, which, to a degree, is linked to resources. We have made a lot of changes in the team which means we are more efficient in dealing with additional caseload, with one less officer.

Cllr Timmis commended the department, highlighting that they do a great job. Cllr Timmis asked about the provision of the service over the weekend. P Stanley confirmed there was no on call service out of hours. However, we sometimes do a pre-emptive service, for example with Bovingdon Market where residents had raised concerns. If we are aware in advance we can go out and deal with it but we don't have an on call service.

Cllr Hearn also said what excellent work the team does and suggested that perhaps this team could do with an additional member of staff. The Chairman said he had already noted this and was himself going to put forward this suggestion this evening.

Cllr Riddick thanked the team for their good work, including dealing with Bovingdon Market at 5am in the morning.

J Doe noted the number of questions about resources would report back to Committee with a view.

**Action: J Doe**

The Chairman mentioned this was a vital service for the Council and that there is not much point in having conditions on planning applications if they can't be enforced. The Council needs to find the resources. The Chairman asked the Cabinet Members present tonight to convey the message to the next Cabinet meeting.

The report was noted.

## **111**

### **DRAFT CAR PARKING SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT**

The Chairman raised concerns about this lengthy document being published at the last moment when much the content is the same as the report that had been presented approximately a year ago. Members were very concerned with this matter and should have had more time to consider the report. The Chairman also thanked Members who had already sent comments before this meeting and said that he will forward them to the Portfolio Holder.

J Doe advised that the report has come back to Committee following additional work and A Robinson and S Mendham would go through the changes and would be happy to take any comments.

The Chairman mentioned he was not happy because the introduction to this item states that if the SPD is not approved, the current standards will continue to apply. But what if we approve it in a modified form? In addition, point 1.5 implies that it would not become immediate policy. J Doe confirmed that if the Council did not approve this policy the fall-back position will be to continue to use the current standards. If they approve it, the policy will become valid. In terms of point 1.5, any policy has to be embedded within statutory basis of the Local Plan 2004 which would mean the current one, where national standards were about maximum standards. We are now looking at minimum standards, so this means that we can adopt this as an interim form of guidance, which doesn't fully comply with the policies of the 2004 Local Plan but will be an effective way to require local developers to do so on a non-statutory basis. We are preparing our new Local Plan with the intention of that being adopted by the end of 2022 and this policy could be adopted in the new Local

Plan. We have bought this forward now at the request of Members because an urgent review of parking was needed.

The Chairman accepted those points and agreed that Members were dissatisfied with the maximum standard and wanted a more sensible policy that could be applied in planning, but he was concerned that this standard won't be implemented immediately as a policy. J Doe confirmed it would be enacted as a policy, but Officers were trying to be clear with Members that supplementary planning policy has to have its basis in adopted Plan policy. If Council does approve this policy we will be taking it forward to Developers as a requirement. When the new Local Plan comes out it will have a full statutory basis.

A Robinson summarised the report.

Cllr Silwal asked about point 4.2 car ownership levels. A Robinson confirmed that point 4.2 was seeking to illustrate that there hasn't been much of an increase in ownership levels between those two periods and the evidence base is largely derived from the Census between 2001 and 2011. We do rely on evidence that is collected at a national level and that's what has informed in part the report before Members tonight.

The Chairman was concerned that the information used to make decisions was from some time ago in a period of recession that would obviously affect ownership.

Cllr Timmis wanted to reinforce the concerns that the 2011 Census is an out of date evidence base. Also, it was unrealistic to ask people to use alternatives to car use when we don't have any viable forms of public transport. A Robinson highlighted that the Car Parking SPD is one of a number of tools that we would use, alongside the Local Plan and a big part of that toolkit is the Sustainable Transport Plan, which will include a number of interventions like passenger transport initiatives, cycling and pedestrian improvements. The Parking Standards are part of the wider toolkit that we hope will help provide more options for people when trying to move around our towns.

Cllr Ransley queried the town centre and high street parking provision and mentioned that people go there to shop, they can't carry their shopping on a bus or a bike: they need to go in their cars. A Robinson highlighted that the SPD focusses on new development proposals, it does not comment on existing facilities.

Cllr McDowell asked why there was no mention of loss of on street parking where there is a development which is detrimental in this respect. A Robinson said that the loss of on street parking can be an unfortunate consequence of some development proposals. The Car Parking SPD is seeking to make sure that where developments come forward they are meeting their own parking requirements. He confirmed that we do want to avoid on street parking being lost and the SPD doesn't stop us using other appropriate action to limit that.

The Chairman confirmed he was pleased to hear that each development would meet its parking needs on site.

Cllr McDowell advised that he felt strongly that where on street parking is lost we should be able to do something to push developers to replace what's been lost within the development site.

Cllr McDowell queried the parking stress test where we can apply for higher standards and asked when this can be used on smaller developments. A Robinson said we can look into the provisions in the SPD regarding on site parking. On the second question we are applying a 10 unit threshold for where the parking stress test would apply, with regards to the areas, we have kept it open so that we can take into account the relevant circumstances and it's probably best not to put anything in black

and white as it's open to loopholes. We also use the controlled parking zones to give an indication of where parking stress exists.

Cllr McDowell asked how many parking zones are there in a town like Tring. A Robinson confirmed he would need to get back to him on that. **Action: A. Robinson**

Cllr McDowell advised there were very few and if that's how parking stress is monitored then in somewhere like Tring it doesn't exist. A Robinson said it was a useful proxy but it's not the only criterion.

Cllr Beauchamp raised concerns about the rationale behind the more stringent parking measures being applied to town centres, as people will still need to commute to work etc, and there will be an increase in on street parking. Could there be an increase in parking for residential use only? A Robinson confirmed that accessibility zones are based on the existing transport services provided and generally speaking this is better in town centres. That's the rationale for the lower parking standards in those areas. Increased on street parking was considered in the SPD and the aim was to try and avoid that, ensuring that developments are providing adequate parking within the red line, also this could prove difficult in town centres and may add to parking issues.

Cllr Beauchamp said it was still based on the premise that we do have good transport links but that's not always the case. A Robinson agreed that not every town centre will have good public transport, but the parking stress test is used where we feel that a particular area has a degree of parking stress and we can seek to apply the higher parking standards in the SPD, although developers will ask for that to be evidenced.

The Chairman highlighted there are changes in the town centre that we have no planning control over, for example where offices or shops are turned into residential accommodation - all of which will increase the stress. A Robinson mentioned there are other tools available particularly Article 4 where we can control the amount of units that are converted. The onus is on us to have policies that seek to improve access to public transport.

Cllr Riddick mentioned that he supported and endorsed the opening comments relating to the delay in bringing this report before Committee. He was also concerned about the report being based on a Census from 2011 since which there have been many changes; increased buildings and traffic that should be taken into consideration. Developers should be providing adequate parking, which should be a minimum of one space per bedroom. Cllr Riddick confirmed he was not happy with the report as it stands.

Cllr Barrett raised concerns about Bovingdon being in Zone 3 which reduces the parking provision by 25-30%. Given that all the other places in Zone 3 have better transport links, he asked for the justification for Bovingdon being in Zone 3. A Robinson said that we have grouped the villages together as Zone 3. That reflects that Bovingdon and the villages are not the most sustainable locations, but we don't think it is in Zone 4, which covers all the rural areas. It is a relative assessment based on the whole Borough.

Cllr Barrett asked for clarification on the reduction proposed on Bovingdon. A Robinson confirmed that this is an actual increase, because the current standards are a maximum, so the developer could provide less than we are currently asking. But the new standard is a minimum, so they have to provide this or have justifiable evidence why they can't provide the minimum standard. The developer can currently ask for a reduction but with the new standard they can't.

The Chairman agreed that we need a new standard, what's not clear, especially as the data underpinning this report isn't up to date, is the rationale for deciding on these fixed figures. A Robinson recognises the data deficiencies, but we are relying on the best information we have and to

look at anything else would be very costly and time consuming. He appreciates that it's not a great answer but it's the best data we have available.

Cllr McDowell agreed that the census data is out of date and questioned if it should be reviewed on the basis that this SPD should only last until we can re-evaluate the data. Cllr McDowell also asked for clarification on the EV charging points, on Page 40 chart 1, which in point 8.27 refers to table 1 which requires 20% active charging points and 20% passive where the chart above it is 50% for each. A Robinson confirmed the table is incorrect and we will pick up the error. Also, the report does build in a 5 year review.

Cllr Timmis said that parking is very controversial and she would add that she is not happy to support the report especially where there is a reduction of parking at the station, where parking has increased. A Robinson replied that the standards for new developments that take place near the station have reduced standards because they are in close proximity to public transport, so shouldn't need so much parking. Also, parking for commuters is a separate point.

Cllr Rogers asked if retailers and shoppers will be amenable to the proposals with the current issues we have with everyone shopping online at the moment, this will prove detrimental to traditional retailers. Also, with increasing new properties, this obviously means more cars and with the data evidence used being from 10 years ago, the standards are not sufficient for today and this puts up barriers for people who want to come and live in Dacorum. A Robinson said that with regards to retailing, the parking requirements for shopping in Zone 1 is done on a case by case basis, so the business can make a case for what it needs for parking. If in the planning balance that's acceptable, we can allow it. With regards to the realistic parking standards and if it reflects today's life, the standards are lower, but we have an incredible challenge with the huge building targets of over 1000 properties p.a. that Government has stipulated, while minimising use of the green belt. We will be challenged by developers looking at our assumptions for development, stating that our parking standards won't allow achievement of the target, so we are trying to encourage more development in our town centres and minimise development on green belt. A Robinson added that he realised this wasn't a particularly helpful answer but hopefully shows why we've taken this approach to reduce parking in our towns.

Cllr Hobson asked if everyone working on the many different projects, for example Climate Change, Local Plan, etc, are all working together and said that there is the challenge of free parking elsewhere including free park and ride, so this is a challenge for town centres. The Chairman pointed out that this was a report to discuss car parking and not car parking charges but the query about everyone working together is a good one and this is probably the case.

Cllr Barrett mentioned that the current standards are a maximum which the developer can argue down to a lower figure but the new minimum standards mean that the developer can only go down to that figure, so is this a better position to be in. A Robinson replied that the current standard is a maximum, so under the existing approach the developer can argue that down by saying that 0% or 25%, in the town centre would mean they don't have to provide any parking. But in the new standard, this is fixed at 0.5 as a minimum, and that's why the Government has introduced this approach.

The Chairman advised this isn't true, because in a couple of sections in the report there is provision for the developer to buy himself out of his obligations under s106.

Cllr McDowell wanted to commend the Officers and the Group on the changes brought forward tonight because they are actually a significant improvement and if Council can take into account the comments mentioned, it will be really beneficial.

J Doe mentioned the point made by Cllr Hobson with working together on a range of issues was absolutely right and we are all working together. Also he made it clear to Members that this report is



just about parking in new developments, not existing town centre parking. J Doe added for any planning policy to have credibility, it's got to be based on evidence. Yes the Census is out of date and we are a year away from a new one, but the data won't be available until at least 2022, so 2011 is the best we have and we can't rely on anecdotal evidence. With Climate Change and car use, we are heavily dependent on our cars, but this will be a key point in the Local Plan and if we continue to accommodate increased use of the car we have no prospect of persuading people to use other sustainable methods of transport. J Doe also mentioned the haste with which the report was bought before Members and advised that Members had asked for it as they were concerned with the current maximum standards and environment impact. J Doe confirmed that the new Local Plan will be published in about two years and this will provide another opportunity to review the parking standards. But we will take any comments on amendments to Cabinet.

The Chairman stated that he didn't accept the validity of the evidence from the 2011 Census. Also, insufficient evidence has been attention had been paid to residential amenity. County Council Officers at Highways may have their views on modal shift in transport, but they do not have to face an electorate and if this means more cars and vans lining the streets, that will be anathema to our electorate, severely damaging residential amenity within the Borough. The Chairman put forward a previously circulated proposal as recommendations to Cabinet, which is as follows:

1. All large developments should provide adequate on site parking.
2. Arbitrary residential parking provision figures in the Appendices should be replaced for all Accessibility Zones except Zone 1 with one space per bedroom.
3. For business developments adjacent to or within residential areas, provision of parking should include not only commercial vehicles, but also cars belonging to employees.
4. The proposed standard should be firmly applied and such "wriggle room" offered by Page 19 para 6.11 and Page 38 para 12.1 should be deleted from the policy. Allowing developers to pay money in this way to dodge their obligations to residents is completely unacceptable.

The committee agreed with these recommendations, except for Cllr Taylor, who wanted more opportunity to consider the implications of the proposals.

The Chairman asked for those who want to add to these recommendations to Cabinet to email their proposals and he will add them to the papers that Members have already sent in and provide them all to the Portfolio Holder.

## **112                    ANNUAL AIR QUALITY UPDATE**

N Polden presented the Annual Air Quality Update and asked Members for any questions.

Cllr Hobson asked why it is taking so long dealing with air quality, especially in Apsley, and asked why we can't do more and what's being done about cycling options. N Polden responded that it was frustrating and we do need to come up with solutions. Regarding trying to set emissions standards, we have put bids in to Defra for funding. Also it's difficult to stop people driving and we have to put in the infrastructure for people to cycle safely, so it's not a quick fix.

Cllr Silwal asked if we could add tree planting to the priorities for 20/21. N Polden advised that he was aware that we were planting trees under climate change policies, but this was neither a proven or unproven solution for air quality and would continue to be looked at through climate change.

Cllr McDowell said that one accurate nitrous oxygen measurement in Northchurch had been mentioned and to downgrade all our other measurements due to one discrepancy, doesn't make sense scientifically. N Polden said that when we carry out diffusion tube monitoring there is plus or minus 20% of the actual mean, to overcome this we have a continuous analyser located in the district,

with which we compare the performance of the diffusion tube and then it's corrected for that bias. This technique is recognised in the national guidance by Defra and they see the results to check they are accurate.

Cllr McDowell asked whether additional real time monitoring would be of benefit or improve accuracy, plus there is quite a lot of mention of PM2.5 in the report, and asked if this was something we need to look at. N Polden advised that we only need one analyser. They are expensive to run and maintain, so we need to have some plans to replace when they need renewing. N Polden added that with PM2.5 it is included the annual report that we have limited PM2.5 monitoring across Hertfordshire and again it's a very expensive pollutant to monitor, what we've found is that where we have monitoring in place, it aligns quite well with the national monitoring undertaken by Defra.

Cllr McDowell said that there is a reference in the report to High Street and New Road but there is only one monitoring piece of equipment in Northchurch. N Polden advised that High Street Northchurch was the continuous analyser and New Road was the diffusion tube.

Cllr Beauchamp said the report mentioned the interlink and improving bus services and queried how we will be doing this. N Polden advised that it wasn't the services that will be improved, it was the air quality through emission standards.

Cllr Taylor highlighted that most of the problems have been caused by vehicles but there are not suitable options for electric vehicles and asked what can be done to support this. N Polden replied that low emissions vehicles were part of the action plan. It was also included in climate change policy and we will be looking at the EV charging infrastructure strategy for Dacorum.

Cllr Taylor said that many of the challenges are in Berkhamsted where there is a lot of on street parking, also the current provider is very expensive.

Cllr Timmis enquired why there was no monitoring equipment in Flamstead, as it's close to the M1 and is overflowed by aircraft from Luton Airport. There is monitoring equipment in Markyate where planes fly over, but nothing in Flamstead. N Polden confirmed that the proximity to the M1, which Flamstead is quite separated from so there wouldn't be concerns over air quality, in terms of aircraft and receptors, it needs to be within 1km and Flamstead is not within that area.

The Chairman noticed that London Road Health Centre in the report appears to have no results. He has also asked on earlier occasions exactly where the monitoring equipment is on London Road, Lawn Lane 1a and Lawn Lane 3a. He said that responding by email is fine. N Polden agreed to email The Chairman.

**Action: N Polden**

The report was noted

## **113**                      **WORK PROGRAMME**

The Chairman asked for items that need to be added to the Forward Plan.

Cllr Hobson requested that we consider a report towards the end of next year, giving her sufficient time to research, on the use of plastics and plastic recyclables and their disposal. The Chairman said timeframes are not required at the moment, just proposals for inclusion.

J Doe mentioned that the Draft Local Plan is on the agenda for the September meeting, along with other items. The Local Plan discussion will be quite detailed and is likely to require a lot of Committee time and may evoke a lot of community interest, so J Doe requested that Member Support should seek to find an alternative date for a meeting just to deal with the other items planned for the

September meeting, such as the Performance Reports and Public Space Protection Order The Chairman asked J Doe to email him on the proposal.

**Action: J Doe**

The Meeting ended at Time Not Specified