

MINUTES of the meeting of the **ENVIRONMENT & TRANSPORT SELECT COMMITTEE** held at 10.00 am on 23 January 2014 at Elmbridge Borough Council, Civic Centre, High Street, Esher, Surrey, KT10 9SD.

These minutes are subject to confirmation by the Committee at its meeting on Monday, 24 February 2014.

Elected Members:

- * Mr David Harmer (Chairman)
Mr Mike Bennison (Vice-Chairman)
- * Mr John Beckett
Mrs Natalie Bramhall
Mr Mark Brett-Warburton
- * Mr Stephen Cooksey
- * Mrs Pat Frost
Mr David Goodwin
- * Mr Ken Gulati
- * Mr Peter Hickman
- * Mr George Johnson
- * Mr Adrian Page
- * Mr Michael Sydney
- * Mr Richard Wilson
Mrs Victoria Young

Ex officio Members:

Mr David Munro, Chairman of the County Council
Mrs Sally Ann B Marks, Vice Chairman of the County Council

Substitute Members:

In attendance

1/14 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Mike Bennison, Adrian Page, David Goodwin, Natalie Bramhall, Victoria Young and Mark Brett-Warburton.

Margaret Hicks, Mary Lewis and Bob Gardener substituted.

2/14 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING: 12 DECEMBER 2013 [Item 2]

The minutes were agreed.

3/14 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

There were none.

4/14 QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS [Item 4]

There were none.

5/14 RESPONSES FROM THE CABINET TO ISSUES REFERRED BY THE SELECT COMMITTEE [Item 5]

There were none.

6/14 RECOMMENDATION TRACKER AND FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME [Item 6]

Declarations of interest: None.

Witnesses: None.

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. On Item 4 of the recommendations tracker, the Chairman explained that parish Councillor Mr Hunter had been invited to a meeting with the Highways Agency. The result of this was that a working group had been established around signage for the Hindhead Tunnel. It was also noted that the Highways Agency would be making a formal response to Mr Denton's question on Hindhead Tunnel closures in due course.
2. Members asked for it to be checked that the final page of the Winter Service report had been circulated to the Committee.

Recommendations: None.

Actions/further information to be provided: None.

Committee Next Steps: None.

7/14 MEMBER REFERENCE GROUPS TERMS OF REFERENCE [Item 7]

Declarations of interest: None.

Witnesses:

Paul Millin, Travel and Transport Group Manager

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Chairman of the Committee listed the proposed membership of each of the Environment and Transport Select Committee Member Reference Groups. The Leader of the Council had suggested that it may be constructive for a flooding Task Group to be set up following the Select Committee's consideration of flood-related items at its March meeting. The Chairman proposed that if necessary, this work be included as part of the Winter Maintenance Task Group.
2. The Travel and Transport Group Manager explained the terms of reference of the Local Transport Review Member Reference Group to Members of the Committee. It was proposed that the group look at

best practice, eligibility criteria and community transport as part of the work programme. Members asked if real time information and marketing could be included as a strand of the group.

3. The Travel and Transport Group Manager explained that real time information would be included as part of a work stream of the Group as this alongside other improvements or enhancements to bus services could generate additional patronage and therefore income to the market.
4. Members agreed for the inclusion of an extra bullet point as part of the Customer Service Excellence Member Reference group terms of reference under 'proposed role of the Member Reference Group', that read 'which may include the most effective use of IT supporting systems for the benefit of both the public and the highways department'.

Recommendations:

That the terms of reference and Membership of the Committee's Member Reference Groups be agreed.

Actions/further information to be provided: None.

Committee Next Steps: None.

8/14 PROPOSALS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF A LONGER-TERM APPROACH TO THE MANAGEMENT OF HIGHWAYS - BRIEFING [Item 8]

Declarations of interest: None.

Witnesses:

Peter Agent, Asset Planning Group Manager
Simon Mitchell, Maintenance Plan Team Leader

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The 15 year asset management strategy development plan was presented to Members of the Committee. It was explained that this was a 15 year outline programme which would look at around 20 transport and highway assets owned by the Council. Officers explained that they would be looking to create a Member Reference Group to help them with the project. A Member of the Committee asked for an objective around the level of interface officers had with Local Committees to be included as part of the Member Reference Group's discussions.
2. A Member of the Committee raised concerns around the lack of communication and involvement there seemed to be with Local Committees on the proposed plan. Officers agreed that they would look into this.
3. Members of the Committee asked for clarification around the Footway Network Survey. The Maintenance Plan Team Leader explained that

the survey had started 4 years ago with around 8-9,000 km of network being surveyed and analysed. A Member of the Committee asked if it would be possible for officers to brief Local Committee Members on the survey.

4. There were questions around the level of involvement highways engineers had in decision making. It was confirmed that when issues arose, these were discussed with local engineers who were then expected to pass on this information to the local Member.
5. Members of the Committee commented on whether any discussions had taken place with other stakeholders and if the proposals had taken account of other strategies the Council had in place. The Asset Planning Group Manager explained that the plan was still in its early stages and the team was identifying a way forward with the help of the Committee and the Member Reference Group.
6. A Member of the Committee asked officers if it would be possible for each Member to get a grading of the severity of red roads in their local area as part of the mapping system. The Asset Planning Group Manager agreed that the team want to be in a position where they can show Members the full effect of different budgets on roads with pictorial support.
7. The Asset Planning Group Manager clarified that bridal ways and rights of way were not included as part of highways and were therefore part of a separate management plan.
8. There were questions from Members around damage to county property and what the procedure was when dealing with this. The Asset Planning Group Manager explained that the county made best efforts to get back as much money as they could from damages; ensuring public safety was the first consideration. The Maintenance Plan Team Leader explained that there was an immediate response in place from contractors Kier who would retain some commercial value from following up on damages.
9. Comments were made by the Committee on the focus there seemed to be on larger roads rather than smaller roads as part of Project Horizon. Members agreed that there needed to be a balance for present and future provision, and that the positive work that had taken place on the County's larger roads should be better promoted to residents.
10. The Committee expressed its support for the current highways contract and felt it should be recognised that the current structure was better than what had been seen under previous contracts.
11. It was suggested that while interest rates were low the Council should consider investing in capital in a way that reduces costs long-term.

Recommendations: None

Actions/further information to be provided:

Officers to provide the Committee with details around specific targets for the recovery of money for damage to County property.

Committee Next Steps:

The Select Committee will receive a full report on proposals for the development of a longer-term approach to the management of highways at its meeting on 13 March 2014.

9/14 SUPERFAST BROADBAND UPDATE [Item 9]

Declarations of interest: None.

Witnesses:

Lucie Glenday, Programme Director Superfast Broadband
Graham Cook, Programme Assurance Manager

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The report was introduced by the Programme Director who explained that despite all the bad weather, phase 2 of the programme had been achieved. The team was now on track to deliver all 5 phases of the broadband roll out. The take up level for superfast broadband in Surrey has been high in comparison to the national average.
2. A Member of the Committee asked for clarification around what was classified as being connected to superfast broadband. The Programme Director explained that the numbers of premises (buildings) as opposed to individual customers were counted as being connected in the figures.
3. Questions were raised around equality of access and what was being done about residents who were outside the intervention area. The Programme Director explained that the programme was delivering the contractual agreements set and under competition law could not provide services outside the intervention area. It was stated however that negotiations were ongoing to establish a framework whereby hard to reach commercial areas could be accessed.
4. Members of the Committee asked how the phased rollout had been designed. The Programme Director explained that BT had designed the roll out taking account of cost efficiencies. Phase 4 of the project should be completed by the end of June and phase 5 by the end of September. A deployment plan looking at infill areas would be completed by the end of April 2014.
5. A Member of the Committee raised concerns around the amber status against the resource status. The Programme Director stated that the programme team was well resourced and that she was confident in the work being done. As the Programme Director would soon be taking up a new role she would be away from her team for large periods of time, but a main point of contact would be assigned in her absence.

6. Questions around how Members would learn about local infill areas were raised. The Programme Director stated that BT would be delivering on this information and the project team would ensure this would be provided to Members and residents.
7. Officers agreed that lessons had been learnt when placing Cabinets around the county. Although it was not possible to engage with every resident on this matter, the team ensured that the local planning authority was made aware of Cabinets being placed so as to avoid locating them in inappropriate areas (such as National Trust land). It was commented that the governance structure associated with placing Cabinets was complex and the team was not in direct contact with those who planned where Cabinets were located.
8. Members asked how the team would ensure that broadband speeds contractually set were being met. The Programme Director explained that ISPs could dock speeds which made it difficult to measure the real broadband speed. The Programme Director further explained that BDUK would be undertaking speed line checks in due course, and that the Council were considering borrowing BDUK's equipment to check line speeds themselves, but a downside to this was that its use was expensive.

Recommendations: None

Actions/further information to be provided: None.

Committee Next Steps: None.

10/14 ROAD SAFETY REVIEW [Item 10]

Declarations of interest: None.

Witnesses:

Duncan Knox, Road Safety Team Manager
Lesley Harding, Sustainability Group Manager
Paul Millin, Group Manager Travel and Transport

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The report was introduced by the Road Safety Team Manager who explained that the county's road safety policy had been reviewed to take into account the latest national policy and improve on Surrey's existing policy and procedures. Members were asked for their comments before the policy went out to consultation and Cabinet.
2. A Member of the Committee asked what the procedure would be if a road did not meet its existing speed limit under the new criteria. The Road Safety Team Manager explained that if there was a speeding problem the Local Committee may wish to tackle this, but it was not compulsory for them to retrospectively change a speed limit.
3. Concerns were raised around the cost of traffic measures introduced outside of schools. The Road Safety Team Manager explained that a

working group looking into this had been established and would consider costs of traffic measures in conjunction with school place planning.

4. A Member asked for clarification around the term 'most needed' when considering school crossing patrols. The Sustainability Group Manager explained that the term referred to risk associated with the site. Where there seems to be a high risk the service looks to give priority funding to that site. It was confirmed that this policy is set centrally, with individual officers responsible for implementation in local areas.
5. Officers informed the Committee that the approximate annual cost of a school crossing patrol was £2,700.
6. A question around police involvement with setting speed limits was asked by a Member of the Committee. The Road Safety Team Manager explained that the Police were consulted on their views in speeding matters especially in areas where signs alone were not successful, because the police are responsible for enforcement and it is important for speed limits to be effective and manageable.
7. A Member of the Committee raised concerns around dangerous speeding levels near Royal Alexandra House, Reigate but stated that the Police felt that changing speed limits was not required. It was agreed that this issue should be taken up with the Local Committee, which could allocate funding for traffic calming measures if it saw fit.
8. Members raised concerns around the consultation timetable and asked for Local Committees to be involved in the consultation process going forward. The Road Safety Team Manager stated that if the policy went to Local Committees the timetable would be extended.
9. A Member of the Committee commented that while the report gave an overview of road safety as a whole in the county; it would be helpful to dedicate a page to each of the districts and boroughs for the benefit of Members.
10. It was suggested that in planning applications for school expansions, it be a requirement that highway improvements/traffic calming measures are included as part of the proposals, so that it is not primarily the responsibility of the highways service to plan for.
11. Members were happy to approve the report on the assurance that Local Committees would be covered as part of the consultation process.

Recommendations:

That the setting local speed limits, road safety outside schools and school crossing patrol policies be approved, subject to consultation with Local Committees.

Actions/further information to be provided:

Officers to consult with Local Committees on the updated setting local speed limits, road safety outside schools and school crossing patrols policies.

Committee Next Steps:

None.

11/14 CIL UPDATE REPORT [Item 11]

Declarations of interest: None.

Witnesses:

Paul Sanderson, Minerals & Waste Policy Team Manager
Paul Druce, Infrastructure Agreements Manager

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The report was presented to the Committee by the Minerals & Waste Policy Team Manager who gave an update on progress being made with the implementation of CIL across the county. Each district and borough has a regulation 123 list which identifies which infrastructure the money from CIL can be used on.
2. A Member of the Committee raised concerns that Members were not being advised on what the money from CIL would be spent on and who the key decision makers in this process were. The Minerals & Waste Policy Team Manager explained that Local Committees would have a key role in deciding county council priorities and advising districts and boroughs. District and boroughs will make the final decision regarding CIL spending..
3. It was suggested that Membership of the joint Member/Officer working group (as outlined in paragraph 7e) include representation for Local Committee Chairmen.
4. Members went on to ask what explanation they could give to residents who were concerned over when major schemes would start. It was clarified that none of the major schemes listed in the transport strategies currently had funding and some were unlikely to receive funding for the foreseeable future. The Cabinet Member for Transport & Environment explained that a bid had been placed to the Local Economic Partnerships (LEPs) for funding of some schemes but confirmation of funding and when work would commence had not yet been received.
5. The Cabinet Member for Transport, Highways & Environment asked that the Transport Policy Team Manager report back to the Committee with amended dates for the 4 year transport strategies adoption programme, as shown on page 81 of the report.
6. Members raised concern that some district and boroughs were not progressing with implementing CIL. The Cabinet Member for Transport & Environment explained that district and boroughs were ultimately in control of implementing CIL and would take final decisions on how money from CIL would be spent.

7. Officers agreed to provide an update to Members on the Transport Strategy programme.

Recommendations:

That the Committee:

- a) Supports the mainstreaming of the CIL project workstreams
- b) Supports the ongoing production of local transport strategies through Local Committees with final endorsement by Cabinet
- c) Supports the work of officers in working more closely with Districts and Boroughs

Actions/further information to be provided:

1. The Transport Policy Team Manager to report back to the Committee on updated timescales for transport strategies adoption programme, as shown on page 81 of the report.
2. Officers to also provide an update to Local Committee Members on the transport strategy programme, which they can forward to residents.

Committee Next Steps:

Progress on the adoption of transport strategies will be reported to the Select Committee in autumn 2014.

12/14 UTILITIES TASK GROUP: UPDATE REPORT [Item 12]

Declarations of interest: None.

Witnesses:

Matt Jezzard, Traffic and Streetworks Manager

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. An update report on the Utilities Task Group was presented to the Select Committee. The Traffic and Streetworks Manager commented on the success of the work carried out by the Streetworks team following the recommendations of the Utilities Task Group.
2. The Traffic and Streetworks Manager asked Members to consider the removal of recommendation 4f as officers were finding it difficult to locate a possible central store for specialist surfacing material. The Traffic and Streetworks Manager strongly believed the delivery of the permit scheme would inhibit the necessity for recommendation 4f to come into play.
3. Members expressed concern that the removal of recommendation 4f would not safeguard against utilities companies using inappropriate materials in conservation areas. Officers responded that although this

had previously been an issue, an increase in staff resource and conditions set out in the permit scheme gave the Council much greater power to enforce rules. The Chairman asked for recommendation 4f to be suspended while the quality of work is monitored under the permit scheme. It was requested that an update report be submitted to the Select Committee in 6 month's time detailing the impact of the suspension of the recommendation. Depending on the findings the Committee would then decide whether to remove or reinstate recommendation 4f.

4. The Traffic and Streetworks Manager explained that paragraphs 22-25 of the report were not active at present owing to changes to the governance structure of HAUC.
5. The Traffic and Streetworks Manager explained that the Streetworks team were performing very well, with particular successes being that the 'rent a jointer' scheme had good take up numbers, and that officers were making effective use of new technologies such as handheld tablet devices.
6. The Committee congratulated officers and the Task Group for the positive work that had taken place as a result of the recommendations. It was requested that Local Committees be provided with the Utilities Task Group performance data so that positive performance news could be shared with Members and residents.
7. It was agreed that an update on the permit scheme would come to Select Committee in June 2014 and an update on the wider recommendations of the Task Group would come back to Select Committee in twelve month's time.

Recommendations:

That recommendation 4f be suspended, pending further review.

Actions/further information to be provided:

1. An update report (including the impact of the suspension of recommendation 4f) to come back to Select Committee in June 2014.
2. An update on the permit scheme to come back to Select Committee in June 2014.
3. An update on the wider recommendations of the Task Group to come back to Select Committee in twelve month's time.
4. Officers to provide a briefing note for Local Committees detailing the positive work taking place following implementation of the Task Group's recommendations and the permit scheme.

Committee Next Steps: None.

13/14 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 13]

The next meeting of the Select Committee will take place on 13 March 2014.

Meeting ended at: 1.00 pm

Chairman