

First Supplementary Agenda

Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee



Date and Time

Thursday
5 December 2024
10.00 am

Place

Council Chamber
Woodhatch Place
11 Cockshot Hill
Woodhatch
Reigate
RH2 8EF

Contact

Dilip Agarwal
Scrutiny Officer
dilip.agarwal1@surreycc.gov.uk

Web:

[Council and
democracy
Surreycc.gov.uk](https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/council-and-democracy)

Twitter:

@SCCdemocracy



Committee/Board Members:

Catherine Baart (Earlswood & Reigate South), John Beckett (Ewell), Luke Bennett (Banstead, Woodmansterne & Chipstead), Liz Bowes (Woking South East), Stephen Cooksey (Dorking South & the Holmwoods), Andy MacLeod (Farnham Central), Jan Mason (West Ewell), Cameron McIntosh (Oxted), Lance Spencer (Goldsworth East & Horsell Village) (Vice-Chairman), Richard Tear (Bagshot, Windlesham and Chobham), Buddhi Weerasinghe (Lower Sunbury & Halliford), Keith Witham (Worplesdon) (Chairman) and Mark Sugden (Hinchley Wood, Claygate and Oxshott) (Vice-Chairman)

If you would like a copy of this agenda or the attached papers in another format, e.g. large print or braille, or another language, please email Dilip Agarwal, Scrutiny Officer on dilip.agarwal1@surreycc.gov.uk.

This meeting will be held in public at the venue mentioned above and may be webcast live. Generally the public seating areas are not filmed. However, by entering the meeting room and using the public seating area or attending online, you are consenting to being filmed and recorded, and to the possible use of those images and sound recordings for webcasting and/or training purposes. If webcast, a recording will be available on the Council's website post-meeting. The live webcast and recording can be accessed via the Council's website: <https://surreycc.public-i.tv/core/portal/home>

If you would like to attend and you have any special requirements, please email Dilip Agarwal, Scrutiny Officer on dilip.agarwal1@surreycc.gov.uk. Please note that public seating is limited and will be allocated on a first come first served basis.

AGENDA

2 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS

(Pages
5 - 10)

To agree the minutes of previous meetings of the Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee as a true and accurate record of proceedings.

4 QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

(Pages
11 - 12)

To receive any questions or petitions.

The public retain their right to submit questions for a written response, with such answers recorded in the minutes of the meeting; questioners may participate in meetings to ask a supplementary question. Petitioners may address the Committee on their petition for up to three minutes. Guidance will be made available to any member of the public wishing to speak at a meeting.

NOTES:

- a. The deadline for Member's questions is 12.00pm four working days before the meeting (Friday, 29 November 2024).
- b. The deadline for public questions is seven days before the meeting (Thursday, 28 November 2024).
- c. The deadline for petitions was 14 days before the meeting, and no petitions have been received.

Terence Herbert
Chief Executive

Published: Tuesday, 26 November 2024

MOBILE TECHNOLOGY AND FILMING – ACCEPTABLE USE

Members of the public and the press may use social media or mobile devices in silent mode during meetings. Public Wi-Fi is available; please ask the committee manager for details.

Anyone is permitted to film, record or take photographs at Council meetings. Please liaise with the committee manager prior to the start of the meeting so that the meeting can be made aware of any filming taking place.

The use of mobile devices, including for the purpose of recording or filming a meeting, is subject to no interruptions, distractions or interference being caused to any Council equipment or any general disturbance to proceedings. The Chairman may ask for mobile devices to be switched off in these circumstances.

Thank you for your co-operation.

QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

Cabinet and most committees will consider questions by elected Surrey County Council Members and questions and petitions from members of the public who are electors in the Surrey County Council area.

Please note the following regarding questions from the public:

1. Members of the public can submit one written question to a meeting by the deadline stated in the agenda. Questions should relate to general policy and not to detail. Questions are asked and answered in public and cannot relate to “confidential” or “exempt” matters (for example, personal or financial details of an individual); for further advice please contact the committee manager listed on the front page of an agenda.
2. The number of public questions which can be asked at a meeting may not exceed six. Questions which are received after the first six will be held over to the following meeting or dealt with in writing at the Chairman’s discretion.
3. Questions will be taken in the order in which they are received.
4. Questions will be asked and answered without discussion. The Chairman or Cabinet members may decline to answer a question, provide a written reply or nominate another Member to answer the question.
5. Following the initial reply, one supplementary question may be asked by the questioner. The Chairman or Cabinet members may decline to answer a supplementary question.

This page is intentionally left blank

MINUTES of the meeting of the **COMMUNITIES, ENVIRONMENT AND HIGHWAYS SELECT COMMITTEE** held at 2.00 pm on 19 November 2024 at Council Chamber, Woodhatch Place, 11 Cockshot Hill, Woodhatch, Reigate RH2 8EF.

These minutes are subject to confirmation by the Committee at its meeting on Thursday, 5 December 2024.

Elected Members:

- * Catherine Baart
- * John Beckett
- Luke Bennet
- Liz Bowes
- * Stephen Cooksey
- * Andy MacLeod
- Jan Mason
- Cameron McIntosh
- * John O'Reilly
- Lance Spencer (Vice-Chairman)
- Mark Sugden (Vice-Chairman)
- * Richard Tear
- * Jeremy Webster
- * Buddhi Weerasinghe
- * Keith Witham (Chairman)

- * *present*

43/24 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Cllr Luke Bennett (substitute Cllr Jeremy Webster), Cllr Jan Mason (substitute Cllr Steven McCormick), Cllr Cameron McIntosh (substitute Cllr John O'Reilly), Cllr Lance Spencer (substitute Paul Follows), Cllr Mark Sugden (substitute by Trefor Hogg), and Cllr Liz Bowes.

44/24 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 2]

Councillor Catherine Baart declared that her son lived very close to London Road, and that he cycles to work, but he does not cycle on Section 1 of the road.

45/24 QUESTIONS [Item 3]

46/24 MEMBERS' QUESTIONS [Item 3a]

There were no Members' Questions.

47/24 PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 3b]

There were 11 written questions submitted, in writing, before the Committee meeting. According to the Council's Standing Orders, only six questions could be addressed during the meeting. The first six questions and their answers were included in the supplementary agenda circulated prior to the meeting.

Five members of the public who submitted questions were present and asked supplementary questions.

1. Sam Neatrou asked a supplementary question seeking confirmation whether bus passengers will disembark into a pedestrian-only area, ensuring that the bus stop is not shared with cyclists. Matt Furniss, the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Economic Growth, said all floating bus stops were removed after consulting with the Surrey Coalition of Disabled People. The scheme was designed so that pedestrians can step into a pedestrian-only zone when getting off the bus, while cyclists would be encouraged to go behind the bus stop so that pedestrians would walk out into a pedestrian-only zone.
2. Pat Daffarn asked a supplementary question seeking confirmation that Members had reviewed both the officers' report and the Burford-to-Guildford submission, including the safety improvements detailed in the annex of the Burford-to-Guildford submission. Matt Furniss, the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Economic Growth, said that the Cabinet had considered both written and verbal evidence. He committed to reviewing the route, revisiting the referenced report, and exploring minor amendments, particularly regarding drain covers and other issues raised.
3. Terry Newman asked a supplementary question about whether Surrey County Council believes it can adequately justify and defend a decision to overlook its mandated safety and design standards if the scheme proceeds. Matt Furniss, the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Economic Growth, said that while Surrey's Healthy Streets framework guides new developments, retrofitting all existing infrastructure to modern standards is unfeasible due to spatial constraints. However, incremental betterment, such as enabling safe walking and cycling routes, is still valuable and worth pursuing.
4. Doug Clare asked a supplementary question about whether the Cabinet considered that 94% of the proposed scheme would be significantly safer when making their decision. Matt Furniss, the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Economic Growth, said that all evidence was presented in the report. He expressed greater concern about cycling on pavements, citing a recent coroner's case. The Cabinet Member concluded that the decision is political, with Cabinet Members making their judgments based on the evidence presented.
5. Oliver Greaves asked a supplementary question about whether all relevant safety concerns have been adequately presented and if those involved have been fully informed of these concerns. The Chairman confirmed that they had been.

48/24 CALL-IN: LONDON ROAD GUILDFORD ACTIVE TRAVEL SCHEME - INDEPENDENT TECHNICAL ASSESSMENT OF SECTION 1 FOR CONSIDERATION TO PROCEED [Item 4]

Witnesses:

- Cllr Matt Furniss – Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Economic Growth
- Cllr Denise Turner Stewart – Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Customer and Communities
- Cllr David Lewis – Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources

- Owen Jenkins – Interim Executive Director Highways, Infrastructure and Planning
- Lucy Monie – Director, Highways and Transport
- Roger Williams – Active Travel Programme Manager

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. A Member said that the Cabinet's decision to refuse the scheme should be reconsidered. He argued there was not enough evidence to support the refusal and that it did not address safety improvements, secondary effects, or policy and funding impacts. He also stressed the need for decisions based on evidence. The Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Economic Growth said that Active Travel England (ATE) confirmed funds could be reallocated without loss. The project remains a scheme available for future Council implementation. The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Customer and Communities said that the evidence suggested that introducing a potential risk in a scheme meant to improve safety would not be considered a safety improvement. She stated that the Council's role is to consider safety and risk and the decision made was due to safety concerns that could not be overlooked. The Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources clarified that the decision was based on a technical report from ARUP, not on a non-technical opinion, and emphasised that his concerns were about the evidence provided, not the principle of shared spaces.
2. A Member asked whether the Cabinet Members agree that, overall, the benefits to pedestrians and cyclists outweigh the 5% of the area where the scheme is not perfect. The Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Economic Growth said that he does agree that any improvement is better than none, but concerns were raised that prohibiting shared space due to safety issues could hinder walking and cycling projects, considering many areas lack the space—particularly the width of 1.8 metres—to make improvements. It was suggested that a review of Local Transport Plan (LTP4) might be necessary, depending on the decision. The Deputy Leader said that the report notes that 25% of shared paths in Surrey are 1.8 metres wide, without factoring in the reduced road lane width, presenting complex concerns for not only the narrow path but also the risk of vehicle wing mirrors encroaching on the path, weather, and other factors.
3. A Member asked what was the alternative if the scheme did not proceed and how would existing safety concerns for pedestrians, cyclists, and local school children be addressed. The Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Economic Growth said that there were three sections to be upgraded, safety defects were to be reviewed, and further improvements were to be considered.
4. A Member asked the officers to comment and confirm that, given all the considerations, they regarded the scheme as being as safe as possible and that the ARUP report reflected the same conclusion. The Interim Executive Director Highways, Infrastructure and Planning said that the officer's report to Cabinet reflected the best possible scheme given the site's constraints, as confirmed by the ARUP report, and met the requirements of local transport note (LTN) 1/20.

5. A Member asked whether professional technical evidence should outweigh non-technical opinions in decision-making, and whether the ARUP report's conclusion on safety should be considered valid. The Deputy Leader noted that the report's findings were not acceptable to the Cabinet due to the risks. These limitations, tied to the route's location, were referenced but unchangeable, and it was up to the Cabinet to interpret and decide whether to proceed.
6. A Member asked why ARUP conducted a desktop-only exercise and did not require an actual site visit for the report; where were the business requirements given to ARUP; if the scheme was reassessed using the 2024 ATE Route Check User Manual, and if not, why not; and why the ARUP report overlooked key aspects of the ATE Route Check policies, as noted on page 114 of the Cabinet report. The Engineering Project Manager explained that it was standard practice for professional organisations to review drawing designs and perform a technical review based on guidance, including LTN 1/20 and HGV width principles. Regarding the business requirements, the points provided to ARUP were based on the issues concerning HGV width, user safety on the footway, and shared-use path. Concerning the Route Check Manual, the scheme was not reassessed using the 2024 ATE Route Check User Manual because it had already been reviewed. Finally, regarding page 114 of the Cabinet report, it was clarified that the ARUP report did not overlook key aspects of the ATE Route Check policies, as ATE had already signed-off on the design, confirming its adherence to their standards.
7. A Member, after reviewing the scheme and cabinet meeting, believed there were no grounds to refer the decision back and would have opposed the scheme in the first instance. He raised concerns about potential safety risks if traffic exceeds the projected 300 movements per hour and questioned whether prioritising cyclists might discourage pedestrian use, especially for disabled individuals. The Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Economic Growth said that if the scheme had been successful, it would have encouraged more cycling, reduced car usage, and prompted further evaluation of the road's suitability for the highest estimated use volumes.
8. A Member, after hearing the discussion, believed there might be grounds to refer the decision back to Cabinet. He questioned whether the scheme would improve pedestrian safety and asked whether this project should move forward or is there too much uncertainty to make a decision. The Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Economic Growth highlighted the increased number of crossings, continuous pavements, and reduced vehicle speeds, and while recognising the strong opposition to the initial road closure announcement, emphasised that after two years of consultation, a far better design had emerged, even though he was ultimately in the minority. The Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources said that the decision to oppose the proposal was influenced not only by concerns about the shared space and comments in the ARUP report but also by the narrow width of the road and the risks to both pedestrians and vehicles. Additionally, the opposition of key organizations representing disabled and disadvantaged people in the county played a significant role in the

decision-making process. The Deputy Leader responded to concerns about pedestrian safety, referencing road limits and lack of alternatives.

9. A Member asked the Cabinet Members if anything they heard had made them believe that they had not properly considered the safety and technical issues when making their decision, and whether the Committee's debate had influenced any change in their views. The Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources said that after considering all comments, he believed that the correct process was followed and key issues were addressed, and while he supported the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Economic Growth's suggestion to explore small safety improvements, it did not change his decision. The Deputy Leader noted that the Committee acknowledged the qualifications of those producing the reports, and that their decision remained unchanged in light of the important, transparent, due process undertaken.

At the conclusion of the debate, the Chair invited the Committee to proceed with voting on the question: "Does the committee wish to refer the decision not to proceed with the scheme back to the Cabinet for reconsideration?" A roll call vote was taken. Voting was as follows:

Votes in Favour: Baart, Cooksey, Follows, Hogg, O'Reilly, Tear and Weerasinghe (7)

Votes Against: Beckett, Macleod, McCormick and Webster (4)

Not Voting: Witham (1)

The Chair declared the question **PASSED**.

Recommendations:

RESOLVED, the Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee recommends:

1. That the Select Committee refers the decision of Cabinet made on 29 October 2024 not to proceed with the London Road Guildford Active Travel Scheme, back to the Cabinet for reconsideration on the grounds that:
 - a. The conclusions of the previous report to the cabinet and its technical assessment support the scheme as constituting a significant safety improvement for all road users.
 - b. Technical evidence, equivalent in professional competence to the ARUP report, has yet to be assessed regarding Cabinet's main reasons for not approving the scheme.
 - c. Alternative options to alleviate and address safety concerns have yet to be assessed or presented to the cabinet, including options such as a cyclist dismount sign for the section of the proposed scheme which concerns were expressed about.
 - d. Active travel contributes to improved health and well-being, cleaner air, and the Council's ambition to hit net zero by 2050 as well as adopted transport policies, such as the Local Transport Plan (LTP4).

49/24 DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING [Item 5]

The Committee **NOTED** its next meeting would be held on 3 December 2024.

Meeting ended at: 3.38 pm

Chairman

COMMUNITIES, ENVIRONMENT AND HIGHWAYS SELECT COMMITTEE

THURSDAY, 5 DECEMBER 2024

MEMBER QUESTIONS

M1	<p>Question from Councillor Baart</p> <p><i>“The Housing Affordability and Homes strategy calls for a stronger partnership approach to tackling issues of housing affordability and availability across the County.</i></p> <p><i>How does the county council view the requirement to achieve “best value” for property disposals (interpreted as the value achieved by sale on the open market) against the Housing Affordability and Homes strategy’s aim to achieve more affordable housing and homes for social rent in Surrey?</i></p> <p><i>In practice, what specific processes are in place to support this partnership approach when the county council’s property assets come up for disposal? For example, do borough and district councils, and housing associations receive sufficient notice of property coming up for disposal before the property goes on the open market?”</i></p> <p>Answered by Head of Economic Programmes & Localities</p> <p>SCC is required to achieve best value for the disposal of assets through the open market, under s123 rules. There is currently no specific SCC policy for SCC assets to be first considered for sub-market housing. Bids for SCC assets are, however, considered in the round, with factors such as deliverability also taken into account. There are examples of SCC Cabinet having agreed the sale of an SCC asset to a district authority on this basis.</p> <p>Efforts are also made to make borough and district authorities aware of the proposed sale of SCC assets ahead of the property being launched onto the open market. There is currently an aspiration to strengthen these processes, and a SCC/D&B Collaborative Asset Management Agreement is being proposed by SCC to more formally establish the optimal processes for the management and disposal of public assets, in line with SCC and borough and district priorities and objectives.</p> <p>Where SCC assets are disposed of for residential development, developers also need to comply with the affordable housing policies set within each borough and district Local Plans.</p>
----	---

M2

Submitted by Councillor Baart

“The recent rain has highlighted again there are “disruptive wetspots” across Surrey’s roads and pavements which always flood heavily and disruptively in heavy rain. These wetspots are not solved by routine drain jetting. Residents report the same wetspots over and over again but there is no change. Many of the wetspots near me mean pedestrians (including school pupils) have no choice but to walk through knee high water; also trunk roads such as the A23 at Salfords have to be closed, leading to widespread traffic jams.

Please can a list be shared of persistently disruptive wetspots on main pedestrian/vehicle routes for each division, where there is no reasonable alternative route. This will enable each county councillor to check the list is complete. Can this list then be updated with a date for each wetspot for an investigation of the underlying cause of persistently inadequate drainage, a plan to correct the issue and budget to carry out the necessary work.”

Answered by Assistant Director Highways, Network and Asset Management

Due to Climate Change, the intensity and frequency of severe rainfall events is increasing causing more instances of flooding across the network. Some issues may only occur during high level events and the waters may naturally subside over a short period of time which may not necessarily require any interventions. Some issues can be improved through highway drainage improvements, but others require the input of multiple stakeholders which could include the Environment Agency, districts and boroughs or private landowners.

While Surrey Highways are aware of many locations of flooding and have plans in place to address them over the coming years, either through enhanced cleaning or improved drainage solutions we do not have a full picture of all of the issues.

We will be preparing a list of all current wetspots for each division highlighting the status of the wetspots, its proximity to schools etc. We anticipate this will be complete by the end of January. We will then contact all Councillors and to ask them to review the wetspots in their divisions and will be asking them to highlight any areas that are missing from our map, particularly where they impact routes to schools. The Asset Team will then review all of the sites, taking information from local stakeholders including schools as required. Current wetspots can be found on the interactive map [here](#) if Cllrs wish to familiarise themselves with the known wetspots in their area prior to being contacted.

Once we have the data from Cllrs, we anticipate that it will take approximately 6 months to review all new sites after which a revised wetspot list with revised priorities will be produced.