

**MINUTES** of the meeting of the **ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORT SELECT COMMITTEE** held at 10.00am on Thursday 31 May 2012 at County Hall.

These Minutes are subject to confirmation by the Select Committee at its meeting on 19 July 2012.

**Members:**

- \* Steve Renshaw (Chairman)
- \* Mark Brett-Warburton (Vice-Chairman)
- \* Victor Agarwal
- \* Mike Bennison
- \* Stephen Cooksey
- \* Will Forster
- \* Chris Frost
- Pat Frost
- \* David Goodwin
- \* Simon Gimson
- \* Frances King
- A Geoff Marlow
- \* Chris Norman
- \* Tom Phelps-Penry
- \* Michael Sydney
- \* Alan Young

**Ex officio Members:**

Mrs Lavinia Sealy (Chairman of the Council)  
Mr David Munro (Vice-Chairman of the Council)

**In attendance:**

- \* John Furey (Cabinet Member for Transport and the Environment)

A = apologies  
\* = present

**PART 1**  
**IN PUBLIC**

31/12 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]**

Apologies were received from Geoff Marlow. No Members were appointed as substitutes.

32/12 **MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: 1 MARCH 2012 [Item 2]**

The minutes were agreed as an accurate record of the meeting.

33/12 **DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS [Item 3]**

There were no declarations of interests.

34/12 **QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS [Item 4]**

A question was submitted by Mr Will Forster regarding the funding arrangements for a proposed bridge on the Basingstoke Canal by Hermitage Bridge.

The question and response are appended to these minutes as Annexe A.

35/12 **RESPONSE BY THE EXECUTIVE TO ISSUES REFERRED BY THE SELECT COMMITTEE [Item 5]**

There were no responses to be considered.

36/12 **FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME AND RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKING [Item 6]**

The Recommendations Tracker (Item 6a) and Forward Work Programme (Item 6b) were agreed.

37/12 **WATER MANAGEMENT [Item 7]**

**Declarations of interest:**

None.

**Witnesses:**

Ian Boast (Assistant Director, Environment)  
Lesley Harding (Sustainability Group Manager)

Mark Barnett (Environment Agency)  
Doug Hill (Environment Agency)  
Lester Sonden (Surrey & East Surrey Water)  
Thames Water sent their apologies

John Furey (Cabinet Member for Transport & Environment)

**Key points raised during the discussion:**

- The Select Committee invited representatives from the Environment Agency and Water Companies in order to discuss how issues relating to flooding and drought are managed, and whether this takes into account their inherent linkages.
- The Environment Agency advised that the Water Framework Directive (the Directive) had been in place since 2009. This took an holistic

approach towards water catchment areas, and this meant that all water related assessments and information would be collated together.

- Under the Directive, watercourses could be rated as either:  
1) High, 2) Good, 3) Moderate, 4) Poor, 5) Bad.
- Members were advised that most of Surrey's watercourses were rated as Moderate and hence technically in breach of the directive. Most of the problems facing these watercourses related to sewerage discharges and levels of phosphorus across the Thames Catchment area.
- The Environment Agency also advised that enforcement measures against those exceeding permitted water extraction from bore holes under licence and for those who polluted water courses was 'excellent', although members retained some reservations with regards to this.

10:23 - David Goodwin entered the meeting

- It was recognised that there was a lot of work required in order to bring the majority of Surrey's watercourses up to a 'Good' or 'High' status. Consequently, the Environment Agency was working in partnership with all possible bodies in order to improve these watercourses. An important element of this was placing emphasis on close working with residents and businesses in order to meet their needs, rather than focusing only on the requirements of the Directive.
- The Environment Agency advised that is delivering flood alleviation projects in Surrey. Some of these receive Local Levy funding to which Surrey County Council (SCC) contributes around £1 million annually. Other projects receive funding from the Department for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs. SCC, and Surrey's boroughs and district authorities, are entitled to apply for funds for local projects from the regional programme. Waverley District Council was cited as an example of success, which secured £170,000 for property protection measures. It was commented that there was an increasing desire from government to generate local financial contributions to projects.
- Members asked to see a list of flood alleviation projects in Surrey. Officers advised that the Environment Agency and SCC, as part of the local flood risk strategy, are currently mapping flood schemes.
- The Environment Agency advised that they regularly updated maps following the completion of flood defence/alleviation schemes, but that it was up to the insurance industry to make use of the updated information.
- Members felt that it was important to encourage the Government to secure an agreement with the Association of British Insurers on flood insurance.
- The Environment Agency explained the objectives of the Lower Thames Strategy. There is currently approximately £114 million shortfall in funding from Government for this significant infrastructure project. Members felt that SCC and partners should focus on delivery of the Lower Thames Strategy as one of its highest priorities. This should include interim

measures that can be taken as part of the overall strategy, in the absence of the required funding for the complete project.

- Sutton and East Surrey Water informed the Committee that they used statistics from the Office of National Statistics and local authorities in order to project future usage needs for water. Members were advised that currently, Sutton and East Surrey Water had sufficient supply to meet average demand levels within a dry year, but had a supply deficit in meeting peak demand.
- At present, due to the relatively dry winter period, several boreholes in Surrey were at their lowest ever recorded level. Sutton and East Surrey Water advised that they had a long term programme to increase their water supply capacity.
- In addition to the planned increase in supply, the company was aiming to manage demand by reducing leakages in the system and changing consumer behaviour. Members were advised that around 50% of leakages came from customers' pipes, which included both residential and industrial supplies. In order to meet future demand, it was commented that consumer behaviour would need to change, and education and metering were important parts of this.
- It was suggested that SCC could contribute to Sutton and East Surrey Water's Customer Challenge Group. Its support for water meters would help to identify leakages on properties, for which property owners are responsible.
- It was also noted that neither the Environment Agency, nor the water utility companies, were statutory consultees on planned developments that may either be on a flood plain, or could overstress the existing supply, or sewerage infrastructure.
- Surrey County Council Officers introduced and closed the discussion, and provided a summary of what they felt were key issues. This included integrated risk management in particular. It was felt that an approach was necessary which would tackle the risks associated with water supply, drought, and flooding on an integrated basis. This would need to define the respective roles of the organisations involved, and clearly set out how Surrey County Council would engage with them as the lead organisation.

**Actions/further information to be provided:**

None.

**Recommendations (to Cabinet):**

That a policy be drafted on integrated water management, which sets out what Surrey County Council can and will do, in working with partners to address the challenges and risks facing Surrey in this regard.

**Select Committee next steps:**

The Committee will await the response of the Cabinet and depending on the response may contribute to the development of a Water Management Policy.

38/12 **INTERIM REPORT OF THE COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL) TASK GROUP [Item 8]**

**Declarations of interest:**

None.

**Witnesses:**

Guy Davies (Reigate & Banstead Borough Council)

Paul Druce (Infrastructure Agreements Manager)

Jan Haunton (Strategy Group Manager)

Paul Sanderson (Planning Policy Manager, CIL)

John Furey (Cabinet Member for Transport & Environment)

**Key points raised during the discussion:**

- The Select Committee considered the interim report of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Task Group. This Task Group arose out of the Section 106 / CIL Task Group, which provided an interim report to the Environment and Transport Select Committee on the 30th June 2011.

**Role of Districts/Boroughs and Local Committees**

- Members discussed the governance arrangements for CIL and considered the role of Local Committees. Some Members felt that Local Committees should have a prominent role in decision making for CIL.
- Officers advised that CIL will be led by the Local Planning Authorities (*in Surrey, the District and Borough Authorities*) as they would be responsible for setting the CIL charge, collecting the revenues, and deciding upon their allocation.
- Further to this discussion, the Chairman advised that the Task Group had considered this issue in detail and had highlighted its conclusions as part of its Findings.
- The Chairman drew attention to Finding 2, which stated that Local Committees, as currently constituted are not suitable as joint decision-making bodies for CIL, but should be engaged within the CIL process from an early stage, and could play a key consultative role in terms of considering infrastructure schedules.”

### **Strategic Decision Making**

- Officers, and Members of the Task Group, advised that from the County Council's perspective, it is necessary to take decisions about infrastructure at a strategic level.
- The County Council's role is of a strategic infrastructure provider. It will be necessary to work with the District and Borough Authorities in order to agree on which key pieces of infrastructure would be provided by the County and how they would be funded.
- Whilst CIL is an important element of infrastructure funding, its anticipated revenues of £20m per annum, were felt to be small when considered alongside the overall requirements for infrastructure, and also other key sources of infrastructure funding.
- It was commented that SCC will therefore need to coordinate and combine CIL with various sources of infrastructure funding in order to successfully meet the future demand for essential infrastructure.
- The Chairman drew attention to Finding 8 of the report, which made specific reference to this concern.

### **Complexity and Leadership**

- The Task Group recognised that CIL will be challenging to implement in Surrey, with its 11 District and Borough authorities, each of which would be a different charging and collection authority. SCC would need to ensure that it engages effectively with each authority in order to provide key strategic infrastructure across Surrey.
- Owing to this complexity, the Chairman felt that it was crucial that SCC should:
  - i) Provide a strategic overview with regards to the implementation of CIL, the provision of strategic infrastructure, and infrastructure which crosses District/Borough boundaries.
  - ii) Commit to providing strong political leadership in order to coordinate the implementation of CIL across Surrey's authorities, in order to ensure that CIL is not only successfully implemented, but also administered in an effective and efficient manner across Surrey.

### **Continuation of the Task Group**

- The Chairman acknowledged that the Task Group had undertaken a lot of work and had produced a detailed and thorough report. However, there were still many aspects of CIL which would require ongoing Member engagement and further Scrutiny, and the Committee therefore agreed that the Task Group should continue its work in relation to CIL and report back to the Select Committee in due course.

**Actions/further information to be provided:**

None.

**Recommendations:**

- i) That the Cabinet considers and notes the 12 Key Findings of the Task Group, as outlined in Section 51 of the attached report.
- ii) To continue to work with districts and boroughs in order to consider how we might make decisions about infrastructure priorities in a two tier area.
- iii) To consider how to engage with the Development industry to enable discussions at member and officer level around issues of mutual concern and interest. This could include hosting events open to developers and all districts and boroughs.
- iv) To recognise the Task Group's concern about the potential impact of Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) on CIL receipts, as it relates to the available funding for essential infrastructure and investigate and quantify this risk and report back to the Select Committee.
- v) To endorse and oversee the joint work on viability across Surrey, now being supported by the County Council to provide a consistent approach to assessing viability in different parts of the County. This is in order to reduce public sector costs, make CIL charging levels easier to defend at examination and to ensure that development remains viable.
- vi) The Task Group praised the work of the Joint Officer Working Group and asks the Cabinet to recognise the importance of effective joint working on CIL, and continue the work of the group.

**Select Committee next steps:**

- The Select Committee will await the response of the Cabinet and the Task Group will continue its work in line with its terms of reference.

39/12 **DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 10]**

It was noted that the next meeting of the Committee would be on 19 September 2012.

---

**Chairman**

**ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORT SELECT COMMITTEE – 31 MAY 2012**

**ITEM 4 – QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS**

The following question has been submitted by Will Forster:

“As part of the Cycle Woking programme, a cycle and pedestrian bridge was proposed to be built on the Basingstoke Canal (Saturn Trail) by Hermitage Bridge.

The total cost of the bridge was estimated to be £450,000 and around £344,000 of Section 106 money was earmarked to fund the construction of the bridge from 2011.

Please could the Council confirm if the £344,000 of Section 106 money still ring fenced for Hermitage Bridge, and when can residents expect the bridge to be built?”

**Response:**

The initial design, consultation, planning application and ecological survey works have already been undertaken for the proposed Hermitage Bridge pedestrian/cycle route.

Following the closure of the 2011/12 accounts, £308,123 of s106 funding remains within the 'Cycle Woking Project match funding' local contributions budget and is ring fenced for this project.

A progress meeting of scheme specific County Council officers and Sustran's is planned for the 31st May next.

Following this meeting Paul Fishwick, the LSTF Project Manager, will update Cllr Forster as to the availability of additional funding and whether a prospective construction start date of March 2013 is still achievable.

Steve Renshaw  
Committee Chairman