

## Notes of Key Decisions/Actions

Meeting: Council

Date: Wednesday, 24 February 2021

Agenda Item	Decision
1 Minutes	The minutes of the meeting held on 13 January 2021 were agreed by the members present and will be signed by the Mayor at the next available opportunity.
2 Declarations of Interest	There were no declarations of interest.
3 Public Participation	<p><b>Question 1 from Graham Bright (Grove Fields Residents Association) to Councillor G Sutton;</b></p> <p>The Grove Fields Residents Association is a member of the <b>One Voice</b> alliance of organisations, united to oppose the Local Plan. I'd like to read out a joint statement from the One Voice alliance.</p> <p><i>We the Chiltern Society, Chiltern Countryside Group, Grove Fields Residents Association (GFRA), Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG), Kings Langley &amp; District Residents Association (KL&amp;DRA), Berkhamsted Citizens and Tring in Transition as the 'One Voice' alliance, oppose the 'Dacorum Local Plan - Emerging Strategy for Growth' because:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Whilst the policy on biodiversity is clear, the emerging plan is not explicit enough in terms of <b>how</b> Dacorum Council will work with developers and other stakeholders to mitigate Green Belt loss, increase biodiversity and meet National and Hertfordshire's goals for climate change and carbon reduction</i></li> <li>2. <i>The proposed number of houses to be built should be significantly lower than the target to reflect <b>actual demonstrable need</b> for housing and the high proportion of Green Belt and AONB land in Dacorum, with a primary focus on affordable starter homes</i></li> <li>3. <i>A higher proportion of the houses should be built on brownfield land, or established through conversions, in the existing urban areas of Hemel Hempstead, Tring, Berkhamsted and Kings Langley, and <b>away from areas located in the Green Belt</b> (which should only be used in exceptional circumstances) and the Chilterns AONB and its setting.</i></li> </ol> <p><i>While not members of the alliance, the Chilterns Conservation Board and CPRE Hertfordshire are working closely as advisors to the One Voice alliance."</i></p> <p>Each member organisation of the alliance will respond individually to the</p>

Agenda Item	Decision
	<p>public consultation, however, we are united to oppose the Local Plan during and after the consultation.</p> <p>We are very concerned by the robustness of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Sustainable Transport Strategy for Tring because these key documents appear to have been rushed in their development and propose solutions that will not work. Our reasons for this concern are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Due to COVID-19 lockdown restrictions, on-site observations have not been possible and have been replaced by desktop checks.</li> <li>2. It was stated that it is not feasible or cost effective to address sustainable strategy issues identified because of the historic and physically constrained network of roads in Tring</li> <li>3. It was stated that the locations of the 1,800 houses to the east of Tring will make it a significant challenge to encourage sustainable travel behaviour</li> <li>4. The solution puts forward zero large-scale, expensive and complex infrastructure such as new road links and junctions, and major new public transport routes</li> <li>5. If the Local Plan was proposing a 5% increase in houses, people and cars then we would be more accepting that changing behaviours by moving people out of their car and on to bicycles and walking was a reasonable strategy, however, with a 55% proposed increase in houses, people and cars I do not see how this will lead to anything other than gridlock in Tring</li> </ol> <p>We believe the Local Plan should be redeveloped to deliver a 9% growth in housing in Dacorum and focused on brownfield sites and settlements where the infrastructure can support population growth.</p> <p>However, if DBC won't halt the consultation and redevelop the local plan then would it be possible to extend the consultation by 10 weeks so the GFRA can commission a transport consultant to carry out an independent assessment of the robustness of the road infrastructure plans and the sustainable transport strategy?</p> <p><b>Councillor G Sutton response:</b> Publishing a detailed emerging Infrastructure Delivery Plan to support a Regulation 18 consultation is not a legal requirement but the Council felt it important to publish this work to provide as much information for residents as possible to inform representations.</p> <p>The IDP was produced following extensive consultation with key organisations, including the County Council and utility providers. Through this work the Council has identified £76m of new infrastructure for Tring to support growth, including new schools, open spaces and transport.</p>

Agenda Item	Decision
	<p>Although the consultation ends on the 28<sup>th</sup> February (following 13 weeks) the GRFA are at liberty to produce any further technical work it feels necessary to support its case and to submit this to the Council for consideration.</p> <p>The IDP is only an emerging document and the Council will continue to develop this as the Local Plan develops.</p> <p>The Government has made it clear that local authorities should follow the standard methodology for housing when preparing their Local Plans, and on that basis the growth levels contained in the draft Plan are based on this approach.</p> <p><b>Question 2 from Graham Bright to Councillor G Sutton:</b> On the question of the £76m identified for new infrastructure, I saw that in the report and welcome that but my only concern about that is that it represents not what it would cost to implement the infrastructure but rather what is being made available from developers towards the infrastructure which are two different things. Can Councillor Sutton confirm that is the case?</p> <p><b>Response from Councillor G Sutton:</b> I will come back to you on that so I can confirm the correct breakdown with the responsible officers.</p>
<p><b>4</b> Announcements</p>	<p><b>4.1 By the Mayor:</b></p> <p>The Mayor highlighted that 2020 was the year of Culture across Hertfordshire. There were various items planned in the various districts and boroughs but unfortunately most had to be cancelled due to the pandemic. A short video was presented of some of the events that did go ahead and the Mayor said he hoped it offered some joy from what was a very difficult year.</p> <p><b>4.2 By the Chief Executive:</b></p> <p>C Hamilton advised that the following elections will take place on 6<sup>th</sup> May 2021:</p> <p>The Hertfordshire County Council Election The Hertfordshire Police &amp; Crime Commissioner Election The Tring Central Ward, Dacorum Borough Council Election &amp; The Tring Town Council, Bunstrux Ward Election</p> <p><b>4.3 By the Group Leaders:~</b></p> <p>Councillor Williams gave apologies on behalf of Councillor Oguchi.</p> <p><b>4.4 Council Leader and Members of the Cabinet:</b></p>

Agenda Item	Decision
	(Full details are in the minutes under Announcements of the Leader and Cabinet).
<p><b>5</b> Motion</p>	<p>The following motion was proposed by Councillor Pringle and seconded by Councillor Taylor:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This council recognises the significant changes of circumstances following the launch of the consultation on the Local Plan in November 2020, namely that Dacorum escalated quickly to tier 4 and then national lockdown meaning that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. residents have been severely impeded from engaging in the consultation process, or comprehending the implications of the proposals, due to distractions caused by the dramatic rise in coronavirus cases, hospitalisations and bereavements across Dacorum that was unforeseen at the time this Council voted to proceed with the consultation in November 2020</li> <li>b. opportunities to publicise the local plan through volunteer leafleting, public meetings and question and answer sessions that would normally be an essential element of any such consultation have not been available</li> <li>c, due to the national lockdown, those who cannot access the consultation documents through the DBC portal, because of lack of an appropriate device or skills, have effectively been excluded in any meaningful way from participating in the consultation</li> <li>d. that this excluded cohort of residents is likely to contain a high proportion of elderly and vulnerable people and that encouraging such residents to travel to public libraries, in breach of the government’s guidance on essential journeys to view the consultation documents presents a risk to public health during the current emergency,</li> <li>e. making a journey to a public library in order to view consultation documents on the local plan is not an essential journey according to government guidelines, it is unlawful — and therefore irrational — for Dacorum Borough Council to have encouraged residents to travel to public libraries during lockdown to view documents as an element of the consultation process</li> <li>f. that there is evidence of a high proportion of residents who have not been informed of the local plan though official DBC communications whatsoever and many residents remain unaware of the consultation</li> <li>g. that the published communications that have managed to reach a proportion of the public, suggest that only responses by email or via the portal are acceptable, meaning that those who can only respond by post have effectively been excluded</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. In addition some weeks into the public consultation, on 16th December 2020, the government published its response to the local housing need proposals on the consultation on changes to the current planning system, setting out important changes to the standard method, which clearly stated, amongst other things, that meeting housing needs is never a reason to</li> </ol>

Agenda Item	Decision
	<p>cause unacceptable harm to protected landscapes and the Green Belt. The council acknowledges that the publication of the new guidelines:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. has confused many residents, some of whom believed on hearing these government proposals, that the consultation would be suspended and will have decided not to respond</li> <li>b. has altered the method of calculation and therefore the fundamental premise upon which the consultation was originally based, effectively changing the goal posts such that responses submitted at the beginning of the process are now based on an out-of- date premise</li> <li>c. there is such confusion around the process that it is unreasonable to expect residents to now understand the basis of the formula and therefore evaluate the proposal or to be able to meaningfully respond</li> </ol> <p>3. This council recognises that in view of these material changes of circumstances since the consultation was launched in November 2020, it would not be advisable to proceed with this consultation as it will leave any Local Plan based on such a consultation vulnerable to legal challenge and will lead to a loss of public confidence in the outcome of the consultation and undermine public confidence in Dacorum Borough Council should it choose to proceed under all of these circumstances</p> <p>Therefore this council resolves to withdraw the consultation, revise the proposals and consult the public at a time and in a manner when the consultation can be fully inclusive, accessible and fair to all of our residents.</p> <p><b>A recorded vote was held:</b></p> <p><b>For: 19</b> (Allen, Arslan, Barry, Claughton, England, Freedman, Hobson, Hollinghurst, Link, McDowell, Pringle, Ransley, Stevens, Symington, Taylor, Tindall, Townsend, Uttley and Woolner)</p> <p><b>Against: 28</b> (Adeleke, Anderson, Banks, Barrett, Bassadone, Beauchamp, Bhinder, Birnie, Chapman, Durrant, Elliot, Griffiths, Guest, Hearn, Imarni, Johnson, Sobaan Mahmood, Suqlain Mahmood, Peter, Riddick, Rogers, Silwal, Sinha, G Sutton, R Sutton, Timmis, Williams and Wyatt-Lowe)</p> <p><b>Abstain: 2</b> (Mayor and Maddern)</p> <p>Therefore the motion failed.</p>
<p><b>6</b> Questions</p>	<p><b>Question 1 from Councillor Allen to Councillor G Sutton:</b></p> <p>The Council has the responsibility for consulting with Gypsy and Traveller communities and representatives about access arrangements and the setting up of new sites, a responsibility passed to district authorities several years ago. Will the portfolio holder please confirm that;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The Gypsy and Traveller community has been consulted with on the location and access arrangements for the site included in LA3 and share that consultation with the Council?’</li> <li>b) The County Council has also been consulted</li> </ol>

Agenda Item	Decision
	<p data-bbox="432 264 1398 331">Will the Portfolio Holder inform the Council what was discussed at (A) and (B), and the agreed outcomes?</p> <p data-bbox="432 376 1414 640"><b>Response from Councillor G Sutton:</b> Firstly, the Borough Council's responsibility as Local Planning Authority is to plan for sufficient Gypsy and Traveller accommodation within its Local Plan, based on both an assessment of need and in accordance with Government Policy on location, design and layout of sites. The Borough Council does not have a statutory duty over the delivery and management of Gypsy and Traveller sites.</p> <p data-bbox="432 685 1406 875">The Council has always sought to engage with those who have an interest in the travelling community throughout the preparation of our Local Plans and other supporting documents. Indeed, the Statement of Community Involvement commits the Council to engaging with a variety of organisations that represent a wide range of community interests.</p> <p data-bbox="432 920 1402 1144">As members will know, there are two sites confirmed in the statutory development plan for Dacorum and these are LA1 Marchmont Farm HH and LA3 West HH. The County Council's Gypsy and Traveller unit was engaged in the process, and we also specifically consulted with the Gypsy Council, Berkhamsted and District Gypsy Support Group and the Bucks and West Herts Gypsy Advocacy.</p> <p data-bbox="432 1189 1418 1335">Both sites have been confirmed as suitable and appropriate through the statutory development plan process after scrutiny by Planning Inspectors at Public Examinations for both the Core Strategy and the Site Allocations Development Plan Document.</p> <p data-bbox="432 1379 1406 1603">Regarding LA3, the hybrid planning application for its development was considered by the Development Management Committee in November 2019. I can confirm that the County's Gypsy and Traveller Officer was consulted on the application and support was expressed, and I would refer Members to the Committee report for this application where the issue of the proposed site was considered.</p> <p data-bbox="432 1648 1414 1872">The County's Gypsy and Traveller Officer submitted responses on two occasions. The second response, which recommended further consultation with Herts GATE (Gypsy and Traveller Empowerment) came just a few days before the Committee meeting. Further consultation was not possible given the time constraints. The advice from HCC on the suitability of the proposed Gypsy and Traveller site at LA3 was clear.</p> <p data-bbox="432 1917 1390 2063">The final consent for LA3 has not yet been issued as Officers are working with the applicants and HCC on the final version of the s106 agreement that will accompany the grant of planning permission for the whole development. The scope of the permission agreed by the DM Committee</p>

Agenda Item	Decision
	<p>does however require details of the proposed site to be submitted to and approved by the Council as Local Planning Authority as this part of the application has been made in outline form only. There will, therefore, be scope for engagement both with HCC and representative groups of the Gypsy and Traveller community over the details when they are submitted.</p> <p><b>Question 2 from Councillor Allen to Councillor G Sutton:</b> Can you confirm that there is no written, formal or concrete evidence of Gypsy and Traveller opinion relating to LA3 Gypsy and Traveller site?</p> <p><b>Councillor G Sutton response:</b> I will come back to you with a written answer for clarification on that point.</p> <p><b>Question 3 from Councillor Allen to Councillor G Sutton:</b> This process has been going on since 2015 and in the absence of any formal written and concrete evidence on Gypsy and Traveller opinion, how does the Portfolio Holder justify the decision-making on LA3 when Government advice in Planning Policy for Travellers Sites 2015 says <i>local planning authorities should pay particular attention to early and effective community engagement, cooperation with travellers, their representative bodies and local support groups?</i> All I can hear so far is hearsay.</p> <p><b>Councillor G Sutton response:</b> I won't be commenting any further. I think we've met the statutory requirements and I can't say any more than that. If the Gypsy and Traveller community wont engage then what can we do.</p> <hr/> <p><b>Question 1 from Councillor England to Councillor G Sutton:</b> What identified online sources are generating the visits to the consultation documents on the DBC website and on the "Virtual Exhibition AECOM website, and when?</p> <p>Is it social media (which posts, which days, how many), third party website articles (which articles, which days, how many), or direct searches (which days have been the top 10 and how many on each day)</p> <p>The Council uses Google Analytics to know which of its web-pages and social media posts are effective and what channels are best capable of reaching the Borough population.</p> <p>Please could the following keys metrics be provided for either site, quantifying the number of unique user views, which sources produced traffic and the most popular pages over time?</p> <p><b>Response from Councillor G Sutton:</b> As previously confirmed, we will provide a full post-campaign report, which will include data from google analytics (with unique visitors) and data from several other platforms we</p>

Agenda Item	Decision
	<p>use to monitor and evaluate large scale mixed media campaigns.</p> <p>I have also provided all Councillors with a high-level overview of all channels and activities, which provides relevant statistics regarding audience numbers, our website and virtual exhibition. The cumulative effect of the comprehensive mixed media communications campaign is validated by the positive numbers in reach and levels of engagement.</p> <p>In advance to the full post-campaign report, I am happy to share a summary of source data traffic to the Local Plan webpage, as a result of online and offline communications during 27 November to 19 February 2021:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Search engine (e.g. Google) – 42%</li> <li>• Dacorum.gov.uk referral – 24%</li> <li>• Direct access (e.g. URL typed directly into browser, summary video, Link in PDF's or hardcopies etc.) – 20%</li> <li>• Social Media referral – 7%</li> <li>• Other – 7% (60+ sources less than 1% each)</li> </ul> <p>I am fully satisfied with the approach from both the Strategic Planning and Communications team for delivering a comprehensive, professional and engaging programme of works, and look forward to sharing the full post-campaign report in due course.</p> <p><b>Question 2 from Councillor England to Councillor G Sutton:</b> Can the Portfolio Holder please explain or perhaps give one or two examples of the specific plans which were put into the communications plan to ensure hard to reach residents would be engaged?</p> <p><b>Councillor G Sutton response:</b> I think we did all we could and most certainly under the very difficult circumstances. We've already discussed this at length during the motion of what has occurred with the pandemic and the lockdown situation and I think that we've engaged well with the public. In fact, I think to a certain extent some of the public may have had a little bit more time because they've been at home on their computers. We've seen many people who have not been computer literate in the past suddenly become very computer literate over the past year and I think the response that we've had online is possibly slightly better than those who have attended exhibitions in the past.</p> <p><b>Question 3 from Councillor England to Councillor G Sutton:</b> What are the Portfolio Holders top criteria and key targets for this important consultation being judged successful? What numbers were you expecting?</p> <p><b>Councillor G Sutton response:</b> In the past we've probably finished up with only two or three percent of the population having responded so I think if we achieve more than that then we've done fairly well.</p>



Agenda Item	Decision
	<p><b>Question 4 from Councillor England to Councillor G Sutton:</b> How different would the Portfolio Holder expect engagement numbers to be if there was not currently a pandemic?</p> <p><b>Councillor G Sutton response:</b> I think that's an extremely difficult question to answer actually because if there wasn't a pandemic how could we guarantee that we're going to get people to exhibitions like I already said. I think that people sitting at home in front of the computer screen probably have more time than if people were engaged in full time work and other activities. To be honest I don't think there would have been a huge amount of difference in the numbers engaging.</p> <hr/> <p><b>Question 1 from Councillor Pringle to Councillor Williams:</b> Does the leader of the council agree with the advice of the Mayor of Dacorum* that elderly residents should not be encouraged to travel to libraries to view the hard copies of the Local Plan, as to do so would not class as an essential journey?</p> <p><i>*Minutes of Northchurch Parish Council 11 January 2021: (b) Cllr Pringle asked Cllr Douris whether he would advise elderly people in Northchurch to travel to a library, to which Cllr Douris suggested he would advise residents of Northchurch to stay home and stay safe, residents should not travel to a library as this does not class as "essential journey".</i></p> <p><b>Councillor Williams' response:</b> I would say not necessarily. I think its academic because I understand that the library has not been open to view this but my view would be that if the libraries were open to view this and individuals felt that they were in their own personal circumstances were happy to go to the library and use the ICT there I would say that was an acceptable thing to do.</p> <p><b>Question 2 from Councillor Pringle to Councillor Williams:</b> I'm not criticising the staff but it's quite clear that the written information from Strategic Planning to Northchurch Parish Council said (when it was sent on 14<sup>th</sup> December 2020) amongst other things that the libraries are currently open in the borough. I am simply pointing out that what you have just told the Council is contradicted by an official response to Northchurch Parish Council. How can that be? Was the response from Strategic Planning to Northchurch Parish Council a mistake or are you mistake?</p> <p><b>Councillor Williams' response:</b> My understanding is that if they wrote that letter they obviously wrote it in good faith when the library may have been open. My understanding is that for at least the last couple of weeks the libraries have not been open for browsing, I'm not a regular user of the library but my understanding is that in the latest lockdown libraries weren't</p>

Agenda Item	Decision
	<p>open. I'm sure when the advice was given by the officers that was their understanding of the situation and what I have said his evening is my understanding of the situation.</p> <p><b>Question 3 from Councillor Pringle to Councillor Williams:</b> I can tell you in good faith that I witnessed the Portfolio Holder for Education and Libraries at that meeting tell us that libraries were open at that meeting in January and that it was dangerous for people to travel there. I think it is really important when public health is at risk and when elderly people are distressed that they can't access these documents to be consistent and so I ask, would you agree that there is a lack of consistency?</p> <p><b>Councillor Williams' response:</b> I would say that the advice that you got from the officers is correct and my understanding that the libraries are not open may be incorrect. Going back to your original question, if people feel able and competent to use the ICT at the library then I would say that's a reason to go.</p> <hr/> <p><b>Question 1 from Councillor Pringle to Councillor G Sutton:</b> Does Councillor Sutton agree that the distribution of the brochure summarising the local plan (Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation) has been a failure that has undermined public confidence in the consultation process, with many residents across the Borough, including those bordering the development sites in Northchurch, not having received the summary document at all?</p> <p><b>Response from Councillor G Sutton:</b> Following the extension of the consultation from 10 weeks to 13 weeks, we took the additional opportunity to distribute 61,000 hardcopies of the Local Plan summary guide, which has been available to residents and members since the start of the consultation on 27 November 2020.</p> <p>We received anecdotal evidence from Councillors that some properties or streets did not receive a hardcopy of the summary document, and any missed delivery requests we received, have been posted a copy.</p> <p>With leafleting on this scale it is understandable that there may be factors such as property access, voids and delivery delays due to weather conditions. To mitigate against these factors, we also procured an additional 1,000 copies which were made available to members on request.</p> <p>I would like to thank Councillors who have actively requested additional copies of the summary guide to share with residents who are offline, and for sign-posting the vast majority of residents who contact them online, to the online documents, online summary guide, video and consultation portal. We have had an overwhelmingly positive response and high levels</p>

Agenda Item	Decision
	<p>of engagement across the board.</p> <p>I should remind Members that all residents were sent a copy of Dacorum Digest in November 2020 which drew the draft Local Plan to their attention including how to respond and access the very extensive amount of documents and information we put on the DBC website, including the virtual exhibition and an electronic copy of the summary document that Cllr Pringle refers to.</p> <p>I would stress to Council again that this is a draft Local Plan. It is important we test public opinion at this stage before developing the plan further, and officers will be bringing a report back to Cabinet and SPEOSC once the results of the consultation have been collated and analysed.</p> <p><b>Question 2 from Councillor Pringle to Councillor G Sutton:</b> Does Councillor Sutton agree that it is wrong for wealthy developers to use a well-funded PR campaign to distort the consultation process on the Local Plan in their favour by encouraging residents to respond by taking a photograph of their marketing material?</p> <p><b>Response from Councillor G Sutton:</b> The Council is not responsible for the actions of private developers. Our residents can choose for themselves whether to respond to any lobbying or publicity they may receive.</p> <p><b>Question 3 from Councillor Pringle to Councillor G Sutton:</b> Will this be given equal weight to the response of someone who, for example, has taken 9 hours to wade through the consultation process?</p> <p><b>Response from Councillor G Sutton:</b> This is the actions of a broad, private developer and I've already said that we have no control over what private developers do. All submissions will be given equal status and value.</p> <hr/> <p><b>Question 1 from Councillor Symington to Councillor G Sutton:</b> Along with other councillors, I am receiving many emails regarding the failure of the Dacorum Local Plan 2020 to 2038 Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation to address climate emergency issues and demonstrate a pathway to local carbon reductions.</p> <p>It is noted that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This is a requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework and the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act.</li> <li>2. The UK Government set a target for net zero emissions of greenhouse gas by 2050 for the UK in June 2019.</li> <li>3. Dacorum Borough Council passed a Climate Emergency Motion in July 2019 including committing to the production of a strategy and action plan to make the activities of Dacorum Borough Council carbon neutral by 2030. In</li> </ol>

Agenda Item	Decision
	<p>particular, clause B5 states the Council resolved to: Ensure the new Local Plan and associated regulations when adopted contains all available measures to cut carbon emissions and reduce the impact on the environment.</p> <p>Please can you detail the actions the Council is taking in the plan-making process to comply with the obligations set by (1), (2), and (3) above?</p> <p><b>Response from Councillor G Sutton:</b> Mitigating and adapting to climate change is an overarching strategic objective of the Plan and underpins the sustainable development strategy.</p> <p>In particular the Plan sets out a pathway to net zero carbon which exceeds the UK government expectations. All new development is expected to be net zero by 2030 and leading up until 2030, all new major development is expected to reduce carbon emissions by at least 19% below Part L of the Building Regulations (2013) requirements and contribute towards a further 20% reduction in residual carbon emissions by either generating renewable energy on-site or by connecting to low carbon energy sources. Prior to 2030 new build non-residential buildings will be expected to achieve a BREEAM standard of Excellent for buildings, after which they will also be expected to be net zero carbon.</p> <p>The draft plan addresses the need for providing for biodiversity, which itself has a key role to play in helping with the Climate Change agenda. We will be developing policy in line with the proposed Environment Act as matters develop.</p> <p>The Council will also be preparing a new Supplementary Planning Document to support implementation and provide guidance for developers.</p> <p>The Council is undertaking feasibility studies to establish the Dacorum carbon offset fund.</p> <p><b>Question 2 from Councillor Symington to Councillor G Sutton:</b> Does the Portfolio Holder agree that it would have been appropriate to consider the role of agriculture and carbon capturing soils, trees and woods in the local plan, given that 85% of the borough is rural land?</p> <p><b>Response from Councillor G Sutton:</b> Biodiversity is a passion of mine and most certainly for as long as I have some sort of responsibility for this I will be pushing for this. Most certainly some of the officers know that I'm extremely keen on items such as urban farms and obviously using any available green space in-between developments for agricultural biodiversity. I think that any area can be a very pleasant place to be if it's developed, landscaped and used correctly.</p> <p><b>Question 3 from Councillor Symington to Councillor G Sutton:</b></p>

Agenda Item	Decision
	<p>Does the Portfolio Holder think the policy of densification would be a more viable way to mitigate the impacts of transport related carbon emissions rather than replacing over 200 hectares of land North of Hemel in HH01 for just 1,550 houses?</p> <p><b>Response from Councillor G Sutton:</b> I think we have to look at all options of how we address this. There has got to be mixed housing, high density housing and apartments, and the success is actually creating the right mix. Also one has to take into consideration affordability amongst other things.</p> <p><b>Question 4 from Councillor Symington to Councillor G Sutton:</b> Could the Portfolio Holder update members and the public on the progress being made by the Council through working with the Association of Public Service Excellence and their specialist energy consultancy to guide their approach?</p> <p><b>Response from Councillor G Sutton:</b> I will certainly take it up with the officers to see where we stand and I will let you know.</p> <hr/> <p><b>Question 1 from Councillor Stevens to Councillor Griffiths:</b></p> <p>Climate Emergency – and the Green New Deal;</p> <p>Funding is being closed, of which £500m had been allocated for Local Authorities for improvements to Housing heating systems.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Has the Borough applied for any funding?</li> <li>2) If so, how much and how many properties would that have applied to?</li> <li>3) In light of the difficulties the contractors have had with non-payment by the American consulting firm ICF, has the Borough actually received the Funding?</li> </ol> <p><b>Councillor Griffiths' response:</b> Firstly I need to make it clear that the Green Homes Grant Voucher Scheme budget has been greatly reduced but not ended. This is completely separate from the Green Homes Grant Local Authority Delivery Scheme which the question refers to. We did apply but were unsuccessful for the grant funding in round one, but the fund was heavily oversubscribed with conditions that were very restrictive in that the money had to be spent in a very short period and would have applied to a tiny proportion of our stock. The details of the Green Homes Grant Local Authority Delivery Scheme phase two is in the process of being finalised and will be rolled out in 2021/22. We intend to apply again.</p>
<p><b>7</b> Business from the last council meeting</p>	<p>None.</p>

Agenda Item	Decision
<p><b>8</b> Cabinet referrals</p>	<p><b><u>Resolved:</u></b></p> <p>That the following be approved:</p> <p><b><u>19 January 2021</u></b></p> <p><b><u>8.1 CA/008/21 DACORUM STRATEGIC SITES DESIGN GUIDE</u></b></p> <p><b>Decision</b></p> <p>That the draft SPD be adopted.</p> <p><b><u>09 February 2021</u></b></p> <p><b><u>8.2 CA/017/21 BUDGET 2021/22</u></b></p> <p><b>A recorded vote was held:</b></p> <p><b>For: 29</b> (Allen, Anderson, Banks, Barrett, Bassadone, Beauchamp, Bhinder, Birnie, Chapman, Durrant, Elliot, Griffiths, Guest, Hearn, Hobson, Johnson, Maddern, Suqlain Mahmood, Riddick, Rogers, Silwal, Sinha, G Sutton, R Sutton, Timmis, Townsend, Williams, Woolner and Wyatt-Lowe).</p> <p><b>Against: 0</b></p> <p><b>Abstain: 15</b> (Barry, Cloughton, Mayor, England, Freedman, Hollinghurst, Link, McDowell, Pringle, Ransley, Stevens, Symington, Taylor, Tindall and Uttley)</p> <p><b>Absent for vote: 5</b> (Adeleke, Arslan, Imarni, Sobaan Mahmood and Peter)</p> <p>Therefore it was resolved that the following be approved;</p> <p><b>Decision</b></p> <p><b>General Fund Revenue Estimate</b></p> <p>a) set a Dacorum Borough Council General Fund Council Tax requirement of £12.406m, and a provisional amount of £13.405m for the combined Borough Council and Parish Councils' requirement for 2021/22;</p> <p>b) approve a Band D Council Tax increase of £5 (2.42%) for Dacorum Borough Council;</p> <p>c) approve the base estimates for 2021/22, as shown in Appendix A1, and the indicative budget forecasts for 2021/22 – 2024/25, as shown in Appendix A2;</p> <p>d) approve the forecast balances of Revenue Reserves as shown in Appendix J, and approve section 11 of this report as the updated Reserves Strategy;</p> <p>e) approve increases in Fees and Charges for 2021/22 as set out in Appendices C3, D3, and E3;</p>

Agenda Item	Decision
	<p>f) approve and adopt the Treasury Management Strategy for 2021/22, attached at appendix K, noting the proposed changes to counter party limits detailed in section 4.6' (amended)</p> <p>g) approve and adopt the Capital Strategy for 2021/22, attached at Appendix L;</p> <p>h) note that this budget paper, if approved by Council, will form part of the Medium Term Financial Strategy.</p> <p><b>Capital Programme</b></p> <p>i) approve the Capital Programme for 2021/22 to 2025/26, as detailed in Appendix I;</p> <p>j) approve the financing proposals in Appendix I subject to an annual review of the financing options by the Corporate Director (Finance &amp; Operations), in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources, during the preparation of the Statement of Accounts.</p> <p><b>Housing Revenue Account (HRA)</b></p> <p>k) set dwelling rents according to the new MHCLG Rent Standard, which provides for a rent increase of CPI+1% (1.5% in total). The average dwelling rents is proposed to increase to £104.96 in 2021/22, from its current level of £103.43 (based on 52 weeks);</p> <p>l) approve the HRA estimate for 2021/22 as shown in Appendix F.</p> <p><b>Employer Terms and Conditions</b></p> <p>m) note that the hourly rate of all Council employees continues to exceed the rate proposed by the rates of the Living Wage Foundation, for 2021/22 (to be reviewed annually thereafter).</p> <p><b>Statement by Chief Finance Officer</b></p> <p>n) approve the statement by the Chief Finance Officer regarding the robustness of the budget estimates and level of reserves as set out in Appendix M.</p> <p>o) approve Dacorum Borough Council entering into a Hertfordshire Business Rates pool as described in paras 4.10 to 4.15</p> <p><b><u>09 February 2021</u></b></p> <p><b><u>8.3 CA/019/21 SENIOR OFFICER PAY POLICY</u></b></p> <p><b>Decision</b></p> <p>To Council that it adopts the Pay Policy for 2021/22 as set out in appendix 1 to this report.</p>
<p><b>9</b> Overview and</p>	<p>None.</p>

Agenda Item	Decision																																																												
Scrutiny referrals																																																													
<b>10</b> Changes to committee membership	None.																																																												
<b>11</b> Change to committee dates	<p>The following changes to committee dates were agreed:</p> <p><b>Additional SPAE meetings;</b></p> <p>Add additional meeting to the 2020/21 timetable; Tuesday 27<sup>th</sup> April  Add additional meeting to the 2021/22 timetable; Wednesday 30<sup>th</sup> June (re. Local Plan)</p> <p><b>Change to DMC dates;</b></p> <p>To change the frequency of meetings (currently scheduled to take place every 3 weeks), as set out below;</p> <p><b><u>2020/21 timetable;</u></b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="432 976 1334 1155"> <thead> <tr> <th>Current timetabled date</th> <th>Proposed revised date</th> <th>Frequency</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1<sup>st</sup> April 2021</td> <td>1<sup>st</sup> April 2021</td> <td>4 weeks</td> </tr> <tr> <td>22<sup>nd</sup> April 2021</td> <td>29<sup>th</sup> April 2021</td> <td>4 weeks</td> </tr> <tr> <td>20<sup>th</sup> May 2021</td> <td>27<sup>th</sup> May 2021</td> <td>4 weeks</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b><u>2021/22 timetable;</u></b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="432 1261 1369 2078"> <thead> <tr> <th>Current timetabled date</th> <th>Proposed revised date</th> <th>Frequency</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>10<sup>th</sup> June 2021</td> <td></td> <td>3 weeks</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1<sup>st</sup> July 2021</td> <td>8<sup>th</sup> July 2021</td> <td>4 weeks</td> </tr> <tr> <td>22<sup>nd</sup> July 2021</td> <td>6<sup>th</sup> August 2021</td> <td>4 weeks</td> </tr> <tr> <td>12<sup>th</sup> August 2021</td> <td>Cancel</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2<sup>nd</sup> September 2021</td> <td></td> <td>4 weeks</td> </tr> <tr> <td>23<sup>rd</sup> September 2021</td> <td></td> <td>3 weeks</td> </tr> <tr> <td>14<sup>th</sup> October 2021</td> <td>21<sup>st</sup> October 2021</td> <td>4 weeks</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4<sup>th</sup> November 2021</td> <td>11<sup>th</sup> November 2021</td> <td>3 weeks</td> </tr> <tr> <td>26<sup>th</sup> November 2021</td> <td>Cancel</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>16<sup>th</sup> December 2021</td> <td></td> <td>5 weeks</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6<sup>th</sup> January 2022</td> <td>13<sup>th</sup> January 2022</td> <td>4 weeks</td> </tr> <tr> <td>27<sup>th</sup> January 2022</td> <td>10<sup>th</sup> February 2022</td> <td>4 weeks</td> </tr> <tr> <td>17<sup>th</sup> February 2022</td> <td>Cancel</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>10<sup>th</sup> March 2022</td> <td></td> <td>4 weeks</td> </tr> <tr> <td>31<sup>st</sup> March 2022</td> <td></td> <td>3 weeks</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Current timetabled date	Proposed revised date	Frequency	1 <sup>st</sup> April 2021	1 <sup>st</sup> April 2021	4 weeks	22 <sup>nd</sup> April 2021	29 <sup>th</sup> April 2021	4 weeks	20 <sup>th</sup> May 2021	27 <sup>th</sup> May 2021	4 weeks	Current timetabled date	Proposed revised date	Frequency	10 <sup>th</sup> June 2021		3 weeks	1 <sup>st</sup> July 2021	8 <sup>th</sup> July 2021	4 weeks	22 <sup>nd</sup> July 2021	6 <sup>th</sup> August 2021	4 weeks	12 <sup>th</sup> August 2021	Cancel		2 <sup>nd</sup> September 2021		4 weeks	23 <sup>rd</sup> September 2021		3 weeks	14 <sup>th</sup> October 2021	21 <sup>st</sup> October 2021	4 weeks	4 <sup>th</sup> November 2021	11 <sup>th</sup> November 2021	3 weeks	26 <sup>th</sup> November 2021	Cancel		16 <sup>th</sup> December 2021		5 weeks	6 <sup>th</sup> January 2022	13 <sup>th</sup> January 2022	4 weeks	27 <sup>th</sup> January 2022	10 <sup>th</sup> February 2022	4 weeks	17 <sup>th</sup> February 2022	Cancel		10 <sup>th</sup> March 2022		4 weeks	31 <sup>st</sup> March 2022		3 weeks
Current timetabled date	Proposed revised date	Frequency																																																											
1 <sup>st</sup> April 2021	1 <sup>st</sup> April 2021	4 weeks																																																											
22 <sup>nd</sup> April 2021	29 <sup>th</sup> April 2021	4 weeks																																																											
20 <sup>th</sup> May 2021	27 <sup>th</sup> May 2021	4 weeks																																																											
Current timetabled date	Proposed revised date	Frequency																																																											
10 <sup>th</sup> June 2021		3 weeks																																																											
1 <sup>st</sup> July 2021	8 <sup>th</sup> July 2021	4 weeks																																																											
22 <sup>nd</sup> July 2021	6 <sup>th</sup> August 2021	4 weeks																																																											
12 <sup>th</sup> August 2021	Cancel																																																												
2 <sup>nd</sup> September 2021		4 weeks																																																											
23 <sup>rd</sup> September 2021		3 weeks																																																											
14 <sup>th</sup> October 2021	21 <sup>st</sup> October 2021	4 weeks																																																											
4 <sup>th</sup> November 2021	11 <sup>th</sup> November 2021	3 weeks																																																											
26 <sup>th</sup> November 2021	Cancel																																																												
16 <sup>th</sup> December 2021		5 weeks																																																											
6 <sup>th</sup> January 2022	13 <sup>th</sup> January 2022	4 weeks																																																											
27 <sup>th</sup> January 2022	10 <sup>th</sup> February 2022	4 weeks																																																											
17 <sup>th</sup> February 2022	Cancel																																																												
10 <sup>th</sup> March 2022		4 weeks																																																											
31 <sup>st</sup> March 2022		3 weeks																																																											



Agenda Item	Decision		
	21st April 2022	28 <sup>th</sup> April 2022	4 weeks
	18 <sup>th</sup> May 2022	26 <sup>th</sup> May 2022	4 weeks
<b>12</b> Council Tax Declaration 2021/22	<p><b>A recorded vote was held:</b></p> <p><b>For: 46</b> (Adeleke, Allen, Anderson, Banks, Barrett, Barry, Bassadone, Beauchamp, Bhinder, Birnie, Chapman, Cloughton, Durrant, Elliot, England, Freedman, Griffiths, Guest, Hearn, Hobson, Hollinghurst, Imarni, Johnson, Link, Maddern, Sobaan Mahmood, Suqlain Mahmood, McDowell, Pringle, Ransley, Riddick, Rogers, Silwal, Sinha, Stevens, G Sutton, R Sutton, Symington, Taylor, Timmis, Tindall, Townsend, Uttley, Williams, Woolner and Wyatt Lowe)</p> <p><b>Against: 0</b></p> <p><b>Abstain: 1</b> (Mayor)</p> <p><b>Absent for vote: 2</b> (Arslan and Peter)</p> <p>Therefore the Council Tax Declaration for 2021/22 was agreed.</p>		

The meeting ended at 10.57 pm