

HATFIELD HEATH PARISH COUNCIL

Notes on the Meeting of the USAG held at 10.00 on Friday 22 October 2021 at URC Hall, Hatfield Heath

Group Members Present:

Cllr Terry Marsh – HBO [TM]	Cllr Nigel Robley – HH [NR]
Cllr Tessa Pemberton – HBO [TP]	Cllr Neil Jackson – GH [NJ]
Cllr Susan Meyer – LH [SM]	Cllr Alan Thomson – GH [AT]
Cllr Val McKirdy – LH [VM]	Cllr Mark Bissell – HH [MB]

Present by Invitation

Cllr Keith Artus – HBO [KA]	D Cllr Mark Lemon – HH [ML]
Jenny Thomson – Thomson Planning - 10:15	Steve K SJK Planning – from 10:15
	Richard Bowran – Clerk to HH [RB]

Welcome by the Clerk to the meeting.

1. Election of Chairman Cllr Keith Artus was elected as chairman of the group <i>[Pro 6 votes; Con 2 votes]</i>
2. To approve USAG Terms of Engagement Clerk asked if there were any comments on the draft Terms of Engagement, previously circulated. TP sought clarity on the frequency of meetings, and who would set the agenda <i>Frequency: Once a month, added to ToE, "or as necessary determined by the Chair"</i> <i>Agenda: Added to ToE "Generated by the secretariat in consultation with the chair referring to the latest developments"</i> TP sought clarity on the membership of the group <i>As stated in the ToE: Eight, 2 members from each council appointed by that council. Additional councillors or community representatives may be invited to attend as required and determined by the group</i> TP sought clarity on voting rights <i>Added: "each member having an equal vote"</i> TP sought clarity on the distribution of meeting notes, recording of confidential information and reporting to home councils. <i>Secretariat will distribute notes to members of USAG and the clerks of the four parishes. Individual councils have determined how they communicate these to Members and the public. USAG members confirmed they were satisfied as to the integrity of the clerk to the meeting.</i> TP sought clarity on liability for future payments to consultants <i>Agreed that any further expenditure and its apportionment shall be proposed and agreed by each participating council.</i> TP sought clarity on the recording of proceedings <i>Agreed that no audio recordings be made of meetings.</i> There being no other comments the ToE were Agreed They are appended to these notes for future reference.
3 Presentation by SJK Planning and Thompson Planning Consultants has circulated a Local Plan Flow Chart which demonstrated UDC's timeline for preparing the Local Plan, and an alternative view which perhaps represented more realistic timings. Key points made:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are 20 evidence-based studies being commissioned. All need to be signed off by UDC. Updates are on-going. • There will be variations due to Covid considerations, for example the shift in employment patterns. • The evidence base will be published in draft but there is no opportunity to comment unless we spot it. • Use of publicity within parishes, USAG and UALC was commended. • The key response point for USAG is at the Regulation 18 consultation. • Asked if the Issues and Options consultation could be revisited, Jenny Thompson agreed to enquire whether this was possible. • USAG cautioned about consultation fatigue and said that targeted responses were more effective. <p>Consultants were asked to provide a quotation for further proposed work. They then left the meeting at 11:20</p>
4	<p>Response from UDC to the Sustainability Scope There had been no response from UDC, although this was to be expected</p>
5	<p>Further distribution of the USAG document? No consensus here as each council had resolved to treat the information in different ways.</p>
6	<p>USAG Next steps for Hatfield Garden Community proposals (Confidential) Evaluation Site Proforma critique (Confidential) Green Corridor? (Confidential)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revisit Issues and Options consultation if possible • Understand Growth criteria being used • Noted the impact of Stansted airport on noise and health issues. • Response deadline to the technical consultation of published sites is 29 November. Noted that it was factually incorrect in many aspects • Suggested that USAG response should be made by 28 November by our consultants. Comments by each council should be made to KA/RB within 10 days.
7	<p>KA meeting with Kemi Badenoch MP re planning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes in the planning process were noted • Confusion by the Prime Minister at conference over the distinction between Green Field and Green Belt • MP advised of the lack of signposting by UDC before the Issues and Options consultation.
8	<p>Further advice Agreed that the taking of legal advice at this stage would be premature.</p>
9	<p>Review of additional local sites in Call for Sites Response on sites local to each parish apart from the “Hatfield Garden Village” should be addressed by individual councils.</p>
10	<p>Neighbourhood plans and local sites assessment Understood that the criteria for choosing “preferred sites” will be published by mid-November. We need to have knowledge of the scoring matrix that will be employed.</p>
11	<p>Agree further PR and community information It was suggested that currently UDC do not recognise USAG as a representative body and UDC should be formally advised. Suggested that we also use UALC as a conduit as they are recognised by UDC. Agreed to refer to USAG in any local magazine articles. Speculated whether to set up residents’ associations for opinions, and noted that a null response would be taken as acquiescence.</p>

Noted that HBO pc were setting up planning training for their members to better understand the processes involved.

12 Any Other Business

Agreed that the three District Councillors representing the four parishes should be invited to attend future meetings of USAG as appropriate.

Meeting ended at 12:15

Attached: Agreed Terms of Engagement

Circulation to Clerks at:

- *Hatfield Heath HPC*
- *Hatfield Broad Oak PC*
- *Little Hallingbury PC*
- *Great Hallingbury PC*

Unsustainable Sites Action Group

GROUP TERMS OF ENGAGEMENT

NAME OF GROUP

The Unsustainable Sites Action Group (USAG)

PURPOSE OF GROUP

USAG has been formed as a **Working Group** of the four parishes of Hatfield Broad Oak, Hatfield Heath, Little Hallingbury and Great Hallingbury to consider and respond to a proposed development in the immediate surrounding area of the four parishes referred to in the UDC "Call for Sites" in April 2021.

Specifically, to consider matters relating to a proposed development referred as a result of the UDC "Call for Sites" as "Hatfield Garden Village", and to represent the best interests of the parishes and parishioners.

To recommend action to be considered by individual parishes and assist where appropriate

To appoint specialist consultants as necessary to assist the Group in understanding the appropriate responses in terms of content and timing.

To respond to the UDC Local Plan creation process at the appropriate time.

STRUCTURE

Membership:	Eight (8);	Quorum Four (4)
Membership eligibility:	2 members from each council appointed by that council, each member having an equal vote	
	Additional councillors or community representatives may be invited to attend as required and determined by the group	
Chairmanship:	A person approved by a majority of members.	
Secretariat:	A person, not a member, appointed by the Group	
Frequency of meetings:	Once a month, or as necessary determined by the Chair.	
Agenda topics:	Generated by the secretariat in consultation with the chair referring to the latest developments.	

ACCOUNTABILITY

Report to members of the USAG through notes taken at meetings of the Group

Record actions decided at meetings of the Group but

... determine which strategic matters should remain confidential

Parish representatives to report proceedings to members of their sponsoring council

Publish proceedings on the USAG website.

REVIEW

Review Terms of Engagement for relevance every three months.

FINANCE

Initial expenditure approved by the group shall be shared by Hatfield Broad Oak, Hatfield Heath and Little Hallingbury in equal proportions together with a payment of £500 from Great Hallingbury.

Any further expenditure and its apportionment shall be proposed and agreed by each participating council.