

HERTFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

MINUTES of the Extraordinary Meeting of the County Council held at County Hall, Hertford, on Tuesday 27 November 2001.

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE

N E Agar	K M Crout	M J Hobday	P A Ruffles
T I Ambrose	A D Dodd	M H T Janes	R Sanderson
J E Anderson	M Downing	S E Jones	H M Saunders
D A Ashley	D J Drake	L R Kercher	D T F Scudder
S A Batson	R J M Ellis	B J Lamb	A M R Searing
M V Bayes	K F Emsall	A Lee	I Simpson
D Beatty	B C Engel	D B Lloyd	E N Singam
D E Billing	F J Escott	D E Lloyd	R H Smith
N K Brook	G D Game	R Mays	R J Smith
P T J Channell	S B A Giles-Medhurst	D R McManus	W A Storey
G R Churchard	J Gipps	J T Metcalf	I E M Tarry
E M Clarke	P V Goggins	R Mills	J Taunton
D Clayton	R I N Gordon	S J Mills	J W A Usher
F W Clayton	A K Gray (Chairman)	J R Morton	G F Wenham
R S Clements	M Green	M H O'Neill	C J White
K J Coleman	F Guest	D A A Peek	B A York
M D Colne	B N W Hammond	J M Pitman	
G M Cook	D W Hills	S Quilty	
R N Copping	J A Hobday	D Royall	

Upon consideration of the agenda for the Extraordinary Meeting of the County Council held on 27 November 2001, as circulated, action was taken or decisions were reached as follows:-

1. STRUCTURE PLAN

1.1 The following motion proposed by **B A York**, and duly seconded, was LOST:-

"(1) That the County Council:-

- (a) welcomes the belated decision of the Cabinet and Executive Committee to make public the consultants' propositions, other information and the extensions of the strands;*
- (b) notes that the Urban Capacity Study has put forward a figure of 62,000 new dwellings; way above the Government's target figure for Hertfordshire;*
- (c) apologies to the District Councils for inadequate consultation before the notorious and acrimonious meeting held with them on 4 October;*

- (d) *apologies to the public for distress caused by failure to release information, especially the consultants' propositions, openly and systematically.*
- (2) *That every attempt be made for the initial public consultation document to be based on a consensus view of the County Council and (at least a majority of) the District Councils.*
- (3) *That the Review of the Structure Plan, whilst following the sequential approach for location of housing, with emphasis on town renaissance and use of previously developed sites in accordance with Government and Regional Planning Guidance, should produce policies which:*
 - (a) *will ensure that all residents of Hertfordshire are able to live in decent homes;*
 - (b) *ensure housing provision is adequate to meet the needs of the whole community, including people unable to afford market priced housing;*
 - (c) *enable key workers to be attracted to, and housed in, the county;*
 - (d) *avoid town cramming and overloading of facilities and infrastructure;*
 - (e) *ensure any strategic allocations of new housing are in the most sustainable locations."*

1.2 The following motion was proposed by **I E M Tarry**, and duly seconded:-

- "(1) *That the County Council takes every opportunity to correct the misleading information being deliberately peddled to the press by the opposition about the status of the first stage of the Housing Capacity Study and the role played by the Consultant's survey.*
- (2) *That the County Council will seek to secure a consensus of views with at least the majority of District Councils in reaching its decision on the housing capacity of the urban areas.*
- (3) *That the Roll-Forward of the Structure Plan will seek to strike the right balance between:-*
 - (a) *avoiding too much development in our towns and over-burdening local services such as schools, transport and health facilities.*

- (b) *making sure that investment continues in towns to make the best use of resources, improve facilities and ensure that our towns remain healthy and prosperous, and*
- (c) *protecting our green fields from development wherever possible as they are essential to the overall quality of life in Hertfordshire.*

1.3 The following amendments proposed by **C J White**, and duly seconded, were ACCEPTED by the proposer and seconder:-

"Add 'Labour' before opposition in line 3 of (1); Add 'town cramming, namely' after 'avoiding' in (3)(a)."

1.4 The following amendment proposed by **B A York**, and duly seconded was CARRIED:-

"Add 'and green areas in towns' after 'fields' in (3)(c)."

1.5 The substantive motion was then CARRIED unanimously as follows:-

"(1) That the County Council takes every opportunity to correct the misleading information being deliberately peddled to the press by the Labour opposition about the status of the first stage of the Housing Capacity Study and the role played by the Consultant's survey.

(2) That the County Council will seek to secure a consensus of views with at least the majority of District Councils in reaching its decision on the housing capacity of the urban areas.

(3) That the Roll-Forward of the Structure Plan will seek to strike the right balance between:-

- (a) avoiding town cramming, namely too much development in our towns and over-burdening local services such as schools, transport and health facilities.*
- (b) making sure that investment continues in towns to make the best use of resources, improve facilities and ensure that our towns remain healthy and prosperous, and*
- (c) protecting our green fields and green areas in towns from development wherever possible, as they are essential to the overall quality of life in Hertfordshire."*

ANDREW LAYCOCK
County Secretary