

Notice of Meeting

Environment & Transport Select Committee



SURREY
COUNTY COUNCIL

Date & time
Monday, 27
October 2014
at 10.30 am

Place
Ashcombe Suite,
County Hall, Kingston
upon Thames, Surrey
KT1 2DN

Contact
Tom Pooley or Huma
Younis
Room 122, County Hall
Tel 020 8541 9122 or 020
8213 2725

Chief Executive
David McNulty

thomas.pooley@surreycc.gov.uk
or huma.younis@surreycc.gov.uk

If you would like a copy of this agenda or the attached papers in another format, eg large print or braille, or another language please either call 020 8541 9122, write to Democratic Services, Room 122, County Hall, Penrhyn Road, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 2DN, Minicom 020 8541 8914, fax 020 8541 9009, or email thomas.pooley@surreycc.gov.uk or huma.younis@surreycc.gov.uk.

This meeting will be held in public. If you would like to attend and you have any special requirements, please contact Tom Pooley or Huma Younis on 020 8541 9122 or 020 8213 2725.

Members

Mr David Harmer (Chairman), Mr Mike Bennison (Vice-Chairman), Mrs Nikki Barton, 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 and Mrs Victoria Young

Ex Officio Members:

Mr David Munro (Chairman of the County Council) and Mrs Sally Ann B Marks (Vice Chairman of the County Council)

TERMS OF REFERENCE

The Select Committee is responsible for the following areas:

Environment

- Strategic Planning
- Countryside
- Waste
- Economic Development & the Rural Economy
- Housing
- Minerals
- Flood Prevention

Transport

- Transport Service Infrastructure
- Aviation
- Highway Maintenance
- Community Transport
- Local Transport Plan
- Road Safety
- Concessionary Travel

PART 1 IN PUBLIC

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS

2 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING: 10 SEPTEMBER 2014

(Pages 1
- 10)

To agree the minutes as a true record of the meeting.

3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

To receive any declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests from Members in respect of any item to be considered at the meeting.

Notes:

- In line with the Relevant Authorities (Disclosable Pecuniary Interests) Regulations 2012, declarations may relate to the interest of the member, or the member's spouse or civil partner, or a person with whom the member is living as husband or wife, or a person with whom the member is living as if they were civil partners and the member is aware they have the interest.
- Members need only disclose interests not currently listed on the Register of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests.
- Members must notify the Monitoring Officer of any interests disclosed at the meeting so they may be added to the Register.
- Members are reminded that they must not participate in any item where they have a disclosable pecuniary interest.

4 QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

To receive any questions or petitions.

Notes:

1. The deadline for Member's questions is 12.00pm four working days before the meeting (*21 October 2014*).
2. The deadline for public questions is seven days before the meeting (*20 October 2014*).
3. The deadline for petitions was 14 days before the meeting, and no petitions have been received.

5 RESPONSES FROM THE CABINET TO ISSUES REFERRED BY THE SELECT COMMITTEE

There are no responses to report.

6 RECOMMENDATION TRACKER AND FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME

(Pages
11 - 20)

The Committee is asked to monitor progress on the implementation of recommendations from previous meetings, and to review its Forward Work Programme.

7 SURREY CYCLING STRATEGY UPDATE

(Pages
21 - 26)

Purpose of the report: Scrutiny of Services and Budgets

This report provides the Select Committee with an update on progress to date with the implementation of the Surrey Cycling Strategy.

8 REPORT OF THE FLOODING TASK GROUP

(Pages
27 - 44)

Purpose of the report: Policy Development and Review

This report contains the findings and recommendations of the Flooding Task Group, which was commissioned by the Environment & Transport Select Committee to investigate the impacts of the recent flood events that affected Surrey in December 2013 and early 2014.

9 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Committee will be held at 10.30am on Monday 15 December 2014.

David McNulty
Chief Executive

Published: Monday 20 October 2014

MOBILE TECHNOLOGY AND FILMING – ACCEPTABLE USE

Those attending for the purpose of reporting on the meeting may use social media or mobile devices in silent mode to send electronic messages about the progress of the public parts of the meeting. To support this, County Hall has wifi available for visitors – please ask at reception for details.

Anyone is permitted to film, record or take photographs at council meetings with the Chairman's consent. Please liaise with the council officer listed in the agenda prior to the start of the meeting so that the Chairman can grant permission and those attending the meeting can be made aware of any filming taking place.

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 the PA or Induction Loop systems, or any general disturbance to proceedings. The Chairman may ask for mobile devices to be switched off in these circumstances.

It is requested that if you are not using your mobile device for any of the activities outlined above, it be switched off or placed in silent mode during the meeting to prevent interruptions and interference with PA and Induction Loop systems.

Thank you for your co-operation

This page is intentionally left blank

MINUTES of the meeting of the **ENVIRONMENT & TRANSPORT SELECT COMMITTEE** held at 10.30 am on 10 September 2014 at Ashcombe Suite, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 2DN.

These minutes are subject to confirmation by the Committee at its meeting on Monday 27 October 2014.

Elected Members:

- * Mr David Harmer (Chairman)
- * Mr Mike Bennison (Vice-Chairman)
- * Mrs Nikki Barton
- * 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

In attendance

Mike Goodman, Cabinet Member For Environment and Planning
John Furey, Cabinet Member For Highways, Transport and Flooding

57/14 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies had been received from Ken Gulati, Pat Frost and Victoria Young.

Chris Pitt substituted for Ken Gulati.

58/14 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING: 17 JULY 2014 [Item 2]

These were agreed as a true record of the previous meeting.

59/14 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

There were none.

60/14 QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS [Item 4]

There were none.

61/14 RESPONSES FROM THE CABINET TO ISSUES REFERRED BY THE SELECT COMMITTEE [Item 5]

- A response to the interim report on the flooding task group was included in the agenda pack. The Chairman explained that the final

report of the flooding task group would be brought back to the next Select Committee meeting in October.

62/14 RECOMMENDATION TRACKER AND FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME [Item 6]

- The Chairman explained that the Select Committee had been instructed by COSC to set up a finance sub group to look at the budget for the coming year. The sub group would focus on how the overall revenue budget for E&I could be met.
- The sub group would need to be politically balanced; current members of the group included the Chairman, Vice Chairman, Richard Wilson, Michael Sydney and Stephen Cooksey. The sub group still required another member from another of the political groups. This would be discussed at the end of the meeting.

63/14 SURREY HIGHWAYS - PROJECT HORIZON YEAR 1 REVIEW [Item 7]

Witnesses:

Mark Borland (Works Delivery Group Manager)

Jason Russell (Assistant Director, Environment & Infrastructure)

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Works Delivery Group Manager gave a brief overview of the report highlighting that in year one of Project Horizon targets had been met, totalling savings of £4.4 million. The savings made in year 1 would be put back into year two of the project.
2. Members commented on the positive feedback they had received from residents in relation to the work being carried out.
3. A member of the committee queried why Reigate and Banstead had not had much resurfacing work done in comparison to some of the other District and Boroughs. The member went onto further explain that residents had also complained about the condition of Redstone Hill in Redhill and asked what would be done to address these concerns. The Works Delivery Group Manager stated that Reigate and Banstead had the second largest resurfacing programme in place. The first years of the programme would focus on roads in the main strategic network with local roads being a focus in the latter years of the programme. The project had a resource constraint which meant that only certain roads could be resurfaced at certain times.
4. The Works Delivery Group Manager clarified that Reigate and Banstead BC had agreed to years 1 and years 2 of the programme. With reference to Redstone Hill, it was explained that all roads resurfaced in the programme had a ten year guarantee which was covered by the contractor.
5. Some members commented on the need for road closure signs to be removed straight after work had been completed.

6. A member queried whether minor roads with busy traffic periods were covered as part of the project. The Works Delivery Group Manager explained that the project would work on a range of roads which would also include D roads. Members were asked to let the Works Delivery Group Manager know if there were any roads they thought should be included as part of the project.
7. In a recent audit report it was stated that the first year of Project Horizon had operated at a cost of 170%. The Works Delivery Group Manager explained that the bad weather which had affected the county had meant that an additional £10 million had been included in year 1 of the project spend. This money was part of the total budget for the programme and had been bought forward due to safety reasons.
8. It was explained that tar was found on some of the roads included in the project. This would need to be taken to landfill but was very costly. Until a cheaper alternative for disposing of the tar is found, these roads would be moved further back in the project. The Assistant Director, Environment & Infrastructure anticipated that savings would increase as the programme developed.
9. Concerns were raised around the damage to roads and utilities as a result of the work being done. It was explained that ground radars were now being used to get a better idea of the location of utilities when resurfacing a road. For residents affected by the resurfacing work, measures were put in place to ensure access was achievable. Vulnerable residents were given controlled access to and from their properties whilst other residents were sent a letter explaining alternative routes whilst the work was ongoing.
10. It was recognised that some residents were unhappy with the lack of communications around resurfacing work and road closures. The Works Delivery Group Manager explained that in some specific cases resurfacing work had not been done for 40-50 years, this in turn made the resurfacing work complex especially as some utilities infrastructure and communication was lacking.
11. It was clarified that the vibrations being used on the roads met UK standards and would not harm buildings.
12. Schemes where project horizon could support cycling provision had been identified and would be developed going forward.
13. It was explained that if a utility company had done work on a road and had subsequently dug it up, it was the responsibility of the utility company to return the road to the state they found it in. The services relationship with utility companies had improved greatly especially with the introduction of the permit scheme. It was recognised that more work had to be done with utility companies going forward.

Recommendations:

The Select Committee noted and commented on the first year delivery of Project Horizon and the update on the Year 2 programme.

Actions/Further information to be provided:

For the Assistant Director to send the Chairman a note considering how legislation in relation to utility companies could be changed for the benefit of the local authority.

Committee Next Steps:

None.

64/14 GULLEY CLEANING UPDATE [Item 8]**Witnesses:**

Lucy Monie (Network & Asset Planning Group Manager)
Jason Russell (Assistant Director, Environment & Infrastructure)

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The report was introduced by the Network & Asset Planning Group Manager who gave an update on the highway gulley cleaning programme to date.
2. Some of the members commented on how gulleys in their division had not been cleaned or emptied for years. This had led to many complaints from residents and local councils.
3. Some members recognised that the figures included as part of the targeted cleaning programme would seem unacceptable to residents.
4. The Network & Asset Planning Group Manager explained that 129,000 gulley's were planned to be cleaned as part of the 2014/15 programme. If gulley's had not been cleaned this could be due to a number of reasons including parked cars blocking gulley's and gulley's being incorrectly mapped.
5. It was explained that the contractor Conway had been undertaking gulley cleaning work for a year now and relied on Surrey's data to complete this work correctly.
6. District and Boroughs had been approached with regards to gulley cleaning. It was recognised that each district and borough operated differently.
7. Members queried whether a map of all the gulleys in Surrey was available. The Network & Asset Planning Group Manager explained that this data was mapped and available but work was being done to ensure a stable ICT solution was in place so mapping was available to the public.
8. Members recognised that schedules and maps for gulley cleaning were not easily accessible on the public website. It was explained that this information was available on the public website but conversations

could take place after the meeting to find out what specific details members were after.

9. It was queried whether roads could be booked for gulley cleaning. The Network & Asset Planning Group Manager stated that gulleys were cleaned road by road and conversations were ongoing with district and boughs around how best to deal with parked cars.
10. The Chairman asked for the Network & Asset Planning Group Manager to provide a one page summary on what information is available to members around gulley cleaning. Members can then include their input on what other information they think should be made available.
11. The Assistant Director, Environment & Infrastructure explained that gulley's were part of the wider highway network and had been affected by recent flooding.
12. It was recognised that the reporting system in place for public who wanted to report a gulley was inadequate. It was stated that work was being done with local area teams to look for ways to deal with the communication issues at hand.
13. The Chairman asked that the Network & Asset Planning Group Manager report back to local committees on what was happening to the flow of gulley related information held in the reporting system.

Recommendations:

The Select Committee noted and commented on the progress of the gulley cleaning programme.

Actions/Further information to be provided:

The Chairman asked for the Network & Asset Planning Group Manager to provide a one page summary on what information was currently available to members around gulley cleaning.

Committee Next Steps:

None.

65/14 ANNUAL REPORT OF THE WINTER MAINTENANCE TASK GROUP [Item 9]

Witnesses:

Simon Mitchell (Maintenance Plan Team Leader)
Jason Russell (Assistant Director, Environment & Infrastructure)

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. It was explained that the Task Group had reported to Cabinet in September 2013 with various recommendations which were approved, however there had been no snow in 2013.

2. The Maintenance Plan Team Leader explained that the county had one of the most modern gritting fleets in the country which spread salt in targeted locations at efficient rates.
3. Although Elmbridge BC had not signed up to the snow clearing statement of understanding, it was recognised that they were very helpful in assisting with snow clearing operations.
4. The footways given priority for snow clearance were chosen as a result of the Surrey Priority Network prioritisation review - this had been done in partnership with districts and boroughs.

Recommendations:

The Environment and Transport Select Committee agreed the following recommendations;

- a) The 2013/14 Gritting Route Network be maintained for the 2014/15 winter season while also incorporating minor amendments resulting from member, resident and officer feedback.
- b) Beare Green Depot remains available as a key resource for use during severe weather events.
- c) Communities are permitted to purchase additional grit bins at a total cost of £1,009 for a 4 year period while Parish Councils and other statutory bodies may be licensed to install grit bins on the public highway.
- d) At the end of the initial 4 year period those additional grit bins that meet with the appropriate criteria score (100 points plus) be transferred to the core winter service. Those grit bins that do not meet that criteria score but are serviceable, be offered extended agreements at a total cost of £709 per bin for a further 4 year period.
- e) A Business Case be prepared to support the capital replacement of 7 existing weather stations for installation by 2019 at an estimated cost of £154,000.
- f) The Highways Cold Weather Plan 2014/15, included at Annex 1, be approved.
- g) Approval of any future amendments to the Highways Cold Weather Plan be delegated to the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding and the Assistant Director.

Actions/Further information to be provided:

None

Committee Next Steps:

None

Witnesses:

Paul Millin (Travel and Transport Group Manager)
Peter Wylde (Programme and Commissioning Project Manager)
Mike Goodman (Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning)

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The report was introduced by the Travel and Transport Group Manager who explained that the review would look at a number of elements including back office changes, renegotiating bus contracts and local support for concessionary travel. The review would also consider local bus withdrawals as part of the consultation.
2. Members agreed that the communication plan should explain to the public what the consultation was about and the main reasons for it. The Cabinet Member explained that the directorate was under pressure to make a saving of £2 million and would ensure this message was made clear during the consultation.
3. The Travel and Transport Group Manager explained that £10,000 had been set aside to deliver the consultation and the communications strategy that would go along with it. The only other costs related to officer time.
4. The Committee was informed that there was a strand in the review to look at investment, which could potentially include the installation of real time information at more bus stops.
5. A number of key partners including SALC (representing parish councils) and bus operators had been approached before the consultation. It was explained that during the last bus review concessionary fares were not looked at in detail.
6. The local transport review member reference group was vital to shaping the proposals that would go to Cabinet in spring 2015. Social media would also be used to inform residents of the consultation.
7. The Programme and Commissioning Project Manager explained that private workshops were scheduled with local committees to discuss possible changes to buses in each local area.
8. The Chairman stated that officers should ensure the consultation was accessible and understandable to members of the public. It was important that only information that was relevant to the public was included as part of the consultation.
9. Members asked that officers ensure that rural areas were given serious consideration during the consultation process, especially with the lack of public transport these areas faced.
10. The Chairman asked for members of the committee to speak to local members in their division and make them aware of the local transport

review and encourage them to attend any parish/local committee meetings where this issue would be discussed.

Recommendations:

- a) Authorise officers to carry out wide-ranging consultation on proposed transport changes with partners, stakeholders and the wider public during the period October 2014 to January 2015.
- b) At a further meeting in spring 2015, Cabinet consider proposals for change which take into account views expressed in the consultation.

Actions/Further information to be provided:

None

Committee Next Steps:

For the final report on the Local Transport Review to come back to the Environment and Transport Select Committee in April 2015.

67/14 SURREY WILDLIFE TRUST [Item 11]

Witnesses:

Mike Goodman (Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning)

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning updated the committee on the ongoing situation with Surrey Wildlife Trust. It was stated that the Countryside Management Member Reference Group had an overview of the ongoing issues with Surrey Wildlife Trust (SWT). Members of the committee would be sent previous Countryside Management Member Reference Group reports to renew their knowledge on the issues at hand.
2. The Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning agreed to organise a seminar for the committee to discuss the ongoing situation with SWT.
3. A member of the committee raised concerns around timber issues on landholdings held by SWT and questioned the possibility of having a wood fuel house. The Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning explained that details for a wood hub were currently being worked on through the Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEP's). Any other specific issues would be answered by officers at the seminar.

Recommendations:

None

Actions/Further information to be provided:

- For the Scrutiny Officer to send the Committee previous Countryside Management Member Reference Group reports
- For the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning to organise a seminar for the committee to discuss the ongoing situation with SWT.

Committee Next Steps:

None

68/14 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 12]

The next meeting of the Select Committee will be on 27 October 2014.

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

Environment and Transport Select Committee Work Programme

27 October 2014

Item	Purpose	Contact Officer	Comments
Cycling Strategy - update	To inform the Committee of progress towards implementation of the SCC Cycling Strategy, following consideration at Select Committee in November 2014.	Lesley Harding	Report
Final Report of the Flooding Task Group	To consider the final recommendations of the Select Committee's Flooding Task Group.	Thomas Pooley	Report

15 December 2014

Item	Purpose	Contact Officer	Comments
Basingstoke Canal	To inform the Committee of progress regarding the asset management plan for the Basingstoke Canal.	Lisa Creaye-Griffin	Report
CIL Governance Models	To review the implementation of CIL and the governance processes	Paul Druce	Report
Highways Safety Defects	To review the first 12 months of the Highways Service's new approach to managing highways safety defects.	Mark Borland	Report
Highways & Transport Member Reference Group Report	To consider the recommendation of the MRG on whether or not to extend the contract between SCC and Kier	Geraldine Mateu	Report

22 January 2015

Item	Purpose	Contact Officer	Comments
Cycling Strategy – annual report	To scrutinise the Council's progress towards delivering the cycling strategy.	Lesley Harding	Report
Local Growth Deal	To consider funding from Local Growth deals, and the projects on which this will be spent.	Jason Russell	Report
Revised Joint Waste Strategy	To scrutinise the final version of the joint waste strategy for Surrey, prior to approval by Cabinet	Matt Smyth	Report
Utilities Task Group: officer update	To review progress towards implementation of the Task Group's recommendations, and to consider the success to date of the SEPS permit scheme.	Matthew Jezzard	Report

Items to be scheduled:

Aviation (TBC December)
CIL Transport Strategy update (autumn 2014)
Electric Vehicle Strategy (Spring 2015)
Kier contract update (April/May 2015)
Local Transport Review – final report (April 2015)
Rail Strategy update (Spring 2015)

Environment and Transport Select Committee Work Programme



Transport Infrastructure Programme (TBC)

Task and Member Reference Groups:

<p>Countryside Management Member Reference Group</p>	<p>Bill Barker Mark Brett-Warburton Stephen Cooksey Pat Frost David Harmer (Spokesperson)</p>	<p>To report to Environment & Transport Select Committee with recommendations to advise the Cabinet Member on the changes required to the Surrey Wildlife Trust (SWT)/Surrey County Council (SCC) Agreement and its governance, to ensure that it is fit for purpose for the remainder of its term.</p> <p>To include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • determining the terms of the Agreement between the County Council and SWT • determining the powers of SCC under the Agreement • advising on how the agricultural portfolio should be managed • advising on how the forestry portfolio should be managed • advising on how the rest of the property portfolio should be managed • advising on Governance to ensure that SCC fulfils its stewardship duty (to include also the co-ordination of the activities of Surrey representatives on Boards and Management Groups related to the SWT Agreement, and the establishment of an appropriate method of reporting back to the Select Committee and its Task Group) • advising on the SCC makeup of the Partnership Committee and to ensure a clear remit for those Members • advising on the draft strategy and business plan for the SCC Estate • advising on the future of the Sawmill and Workshop. 	<p>The Group's amended terms of reference were agreed at Select Committee on 23 October 2013.</p> <p>The Group met on 3 February 2014, and will reconvene once further work has been completed on the SWT Business Plan.</p>
<p>Customer Service Excellence Member Reference Group</p>	<p>John Beckett Stephen Cooksey George Johnson Richard Wilson (Spokesperson) Victoria Young</p>	<p>To support the Highways Service's journey to achieve the Customer Service Excellence (CSE) Standard, by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sharing the perspective of users and the general public on customer service within Highways 	<p>The work of the Group is currently underway and its most recent meeting took place on 29 September.</p> <p>The next meeting of the</p>

Environment and Transport Select Committee Work Programme

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Challenging and validating the project's objectives • Providing advice on how to approach wider engagement with the public and stakeholders • Putting forward recommendations on the action plan • Acting as advocates for CSE with Member colleagues and customers • Providing a Member perspective on future performance criteria, the levels of service and priorities, which may include the most effective use of IT supporting systems for the benefit of both the public and the highways department. • Helping maintain CSE as a priority once the award has been achieved. 	<p>Group will take place on 21 November 2014.</p>
<p>Finance Sub-Group</p>	<p>Mike Bennison Stephen Cooksey David Harmer (Spokesperson) George Johnson Michael Sydney Richard Wilson</p>	<p>To carry out robust scrutiny of major budgets, performance and costs of the services within the remit of the Environment & Transport Select Committee, and review existing and potential options for budget savings and performance improvement including testing of the evidence base for these options. Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To work with E&I Directorate management and Finance officers to develop a good understanding of the budgets within the committee's remit and identify any further information which might be required. • To carry out scrutiny of revenue spend of Environment & Infrastructure for the Medium Term Financial Plan (including fees and charges) period 2015/16 to 2018/19, with a broad focus on highways and environment issues. • To test the evidence base for existing and potential options for reducing costs of service delivery, generating income and improving performance. • To suggest additional areas for achieving significant savings based on views of individual members of the finance sub group • To lead the discussion when the issues are discussed by the full Committee at a workshop session, ensuring that other Members have a good understanding and can make informed decisions. 	<p>The Group will meet on four occasions between October and November 2014.</p>

Environment and Transport Select Committee Work Programme



Page 14

<p>Flooding Task Group</p>	<p>Mark Brett-Warburton Stephen Cooksey David Harmer (Spokesperson) Peter Hickman Chris Norman Denise Saliagopoulos Nick Skellett</p>	<p>To review the recent flood events that took place in Surrey and help the Council be as well prepared as possible for future instances of flooding, by addressing the following questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the key lessons to be learnt from the County Council's response to recent flood events? • With the benefit of hindsight, what could the County Council do better should future flood events take place? • How were local communities affected by flooding and what did they see as the key issues on the ground? • What 'business as usual' activities can be carried out more effectively to help prevent flooding? • What schemes for Surrey are being included as part of the River Thames Scheme, how are they being funded and do they represent the best possible protection for the County? • To monitor findings of key Section 19 reports and consider how the Council can best invest in infrastructure to mitigate against future rain and storm events. 	<p>The Group has concluded its investigation and will be submitting its final report to the Select Committee meeting on 27 October.</p> <p>The report and any additional comments from the Select Committee will be submitted to Cabinet on 25 November.</p>
<p>Highways for the Future Member Reference Group</p>	<p>Mike Bennison (Spokesperson) Stephen Cooksey Peter Hickman Richard Wilson</p>	<p>To allow Member input into the Highways Service's plans for the future long-term management of Surrey's highways, by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing a member perspective on future performance criteria, the levels of service and priorities. • Providing a member perspective on the alignment between maintenance and improvement of the highway. I.e. bringing together activities currently separated into 'highways' and 'transport'. • Providing insight and challenge to the reviews of the current delivery strategies, including Horizon, safety defects, asset management strategies etc. Also help consideration of member roles in future delivery strategies. • Providing insight and challenge to current contract performance, and to consideration of the extension of the 	<p>The work of the Group is currently underway and it is meeting on a regular basis.</p>

Environment and Transport Select Committee Work Programme

		<p>Kier contract.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing insight and challenge to the development of future procurement strategies. • Providing a member perspective on capability issues for the 'Client' organisation. 	
Local Transport Review Member Reference Group	<p>Pat Frost (Spokesperson) David Goodwin Peter Hickman Michael Sydney</p>	<p>To assist the E&I Directorate in its Local Transport Review project, by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Giving officers the perspective of users and the general public on the various transport services under review • Advising on proposed levels of savings and the balance between savings and unavoidable impacts on users and the public • Challenging and validating the project's Equalities Impact Assessments • Advising on the balance of savings between different service types and areas • Advising on how to approach wider engagement with the public and stakeholders and own the agreed plan • Acting as advocates for the agreed plan with Member colleagues and community organisations • Following a briefing on consultation responses, advising on the proposals to be taken before E&T Select Committee and Cabinet. 	<p>The work of the Group is currently underway and its most recent meeting took place on 17 October 2014.</p> <p>The next meeting of the Group will take place in February 2015.</p>
Winter Maintenance Task Group	<p>Stephen Cooksey (Spokesperson) David Goodwin David Harmer</p>	<p>To provide scrutiny and oversight of Surrey's annual Winter Maintenance policy.</p>	<p>The Task Group met on 14 July 2014 to consider the Winter Maintenance policy for 2013/14 following consultation with Local Committees. This was then approved by the Select Committee on 17 July 2014.</p>

This page is intentionally left blank

**ENVIRONMENT & TRANSPORT SELECT COMMITTEE
ACTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKER**

The recommendations tracker allows Committee Members to monitor responses, actions and outcomes against their recommendations or requests for further actions. The tracker is updated following each Committee. Once an action has been completed and reported to the Committee, it will be removed from the tracker.

Date of meeting	Item	Recommendations/ Actions	Achieved or still outstanding?	Responsible Officer:
23 January 2014	CIL Update Report [Item 11]	The Transport Policy Team Manager to report back to the Committee on updated timescales for the 4 year transport strategies adoption programme, as shown on page 81 of the report.	Outstanding Officers contacted – awaiting response.	Lyndon Mendes/Paul Sanderson
23 January 2014	Utilities Task Group: Update Report [item 12]	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.	Outstanding Officers contacted – awaiting response.	Matt Jezzard

12 June 2014	Utilities Task Group Recommendations And South East Permit Scheme (Seps): Update Report [Item 9]	That the Utilities Task Group reconvenes to review the progress to date against outstanding recommendations, and consider how the Task Group can move forward with the recommendations and concerns raised by the Committee.	Outstanding- Chairman has agreed to review this action once the work of the flooding task group has been completed.	Tom Pooley
17 July 2014	Freight Initiatives Update [Item 8]	That officers provide Members with a briefing as to the viability of a Low Emissions Zone for Surrey.	Outstanding	Peter Hitchings
10 Sept 2014	Surrey Highways – Project Horizon Year 1 Review [Item 7]	For the Assistant Director to send the Chairman a note considering how legislation in relation to utility companies could be changed for the benefit of the local authority.	Outstanding	Jason Russell
10 Sept 2014	Gully Cleaning Update [Item 8]	The Chairman asked for the Network & Asset Planning Group Manager to provide a one page summary on what information was currently available to members around gully cleaning.	Outstanding	Lucy Monie

10 Sept 2014	Surrey Wildlife Trust [Item 11]	For the Scrutiny Officer to send the Committee the report of the Countryside Management Member Reference Group.	Achieved An email with reports from the Countryside Management Member Reference Group were sent to the committee on 10/09/14.	Tom Pooley
10 Sept 2014	Surrey Wildlife Trust [Item 11]	For the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning to organise a seminar for the committee to discuss the ongoing situation with SWT.	Achieved A seminar was organised with members of the Select Committee on 3 October 2014.	Mike Goodman

This page is intentionally left blank



Environment and Transport Select Committee
27th October 2014

Surrey Cycling Strategy Update

Purpose of the report: Scrutiny of Services and Budgets

This report provides the Select Committee with an update on progress to date with the implementation of the Surrey Cycling Strategy.

Introduction:

1. The Surrey Cycling Strategy was approved by Cabinet in December 2013. It sets out the County Council's commitment to work in partnership to encourage more people in Surrey to cycle more safely. It seeks to encourage cycling as a means of transport and for leisure and health whilst addressing some of the negative impacts including the sharp increase in cycle casualties and the impact of the increased popularity of sports cycling on some rural communities.

Strategy Context

2. The Surrey Cycling Strategy was developed to address a number of issues facing the county:
 - 2.1 To promote cycling as a means of sustainable transport which is healthy and affordable, contributes to improved local air quality and reduced carbon emissions
 - 2.2 To capture the wider economic benefits from cycling including tackling congestion, improving journey time reliability, reducing absenteeism and providing local economic opportunities.
 - 2.3 To address the sharp increase in cycling casualties in Surrey in the last six years.
 - 2.4 To address the challenge of increased popularity of sports cycling and sportive events in rural Surrey with resultant high volumes of cyclists in narrow rural roads and communities.

3. The Strategy underwent extensive consultation, with over 3,600 individuals and organisations submitting their views.

Implementation progress to date

4. The Strategy identified 12 objectives to support delivery of the aim to get more people in Surrey cycling, more safely.

O1. Surrey County Council and its partners will work together to deliver improvements for cycling

O2. Surrey Local Committees will oversee development of Local Cycling Plans that reflect local priorities and issues

O3. We will develop a comprehensive training offer and ensure that cost is not a barrier to learning to ride a bike

O4. We will work with partners to ensure that Surrey's economy benefits from more people cycling for every day journeys and from Surrey's role as a centre for cycling

O5. We will seek funding to improve infrastructure to make cycling a safe, attractive and convenient mode of transport for people of all ages and levels of confidence

O6. We will encourage cycling as an inclusive, healthy and affordable means of travel through the provision of information, promotional activities and practical support

O7. We will work with Surrey Police and other partners to improve cycle safety and encourage respect between different road users through targeted campaigns and initiatives

O8. We will promote and encourage cycling for health and leisure

O9. We will encourage the provision of off road cycle trails and activities while managing the impact on Surrey's countryside

O10. We will take action to minimise the impacts of high levels of sport cycling on some roads and communities in Surrey

O11. We will lobby central government to ensure that regulations governing events on the highway are fit for purpose

O12. We will support major cycling events which inspire participation and bring economic benefit, while minimising impact on affected communities

5. Since the strategy was signed off in December last year, activity has focused on a number of areas. The key areas of progress are outlined below. A full report on progress in the first year against the strategy and action plan will be produced in January 2015.

Local Plan Development

6. The County Council is now working with three local committees on local cycling plan development and in early dialogue with a further three local committees to determine how they want to proceed. The plans are developed by borough and county officers, drawing on evidence relating to current participation rates, casualty data, existing infrastructure provision and results from the strategy consultation.

7. The most advanced Local Cycling Plan is in Mole Valley where the District established a member task group to progress the work, including

representation from the Local Committee. The Local Cycling Plan has been developed and signed off by the Local Committee and is awaiting sign off from the Mole Valley executive. The next stage of the plan is the development of a cycling infrastructure plan which will be led by the Local Committee, through a consultative process.

Cycle Training Provision

8. Schools-based training remains the bedrock of cycle training provision. In the financial year 2013/14, Level 1 training was delivered to 5,071 pupils and Level 2 training to 6,100 pupils. A new course was launched for year 2 pupils, called 'Pedals', and this has proved popular with 1,494 pupils undertaking the training. A further 61 secondary students undertook Level 3 training, this is the main area that we have identified for expansion, and also the most demanding on capacity as it requires one instructor per two trainees.
9. The County Council has also been carefully expanding its 'customised training' offer, available to all ages and at all levels from starter to cycling safely on busy roads. The most popular forms of customised training are complete beginner (both child and adult), family cycle training and returning to cycling, the last being popular with older clients. This financial year a government subsidy has enabled us to widen the offer.
10. Cycle training continues to operate on a cost recovery basis, with costs covered through a combination of course fees and government grants. In the last financial year, a grant of £240,000 was received for the school-based Level 2 and Level 3 training. At the moment, the County Council is offering customised training at £20 for three hours as a result of LSTF funding. This funding is currently in place until March 2016.

Infrastructure Provision

11. Through the Local Sustainable Transport Fund, Surrey County Council is investing in new cycle infrastructure in Guildford, Woking and Redhill. This work, in addition to the Redhill Balanced Network, will be complete by April 2015. For 2015/16, the County Council is bidding to the Local Enterprise Partnerships for Local Growth Funds for further sustainable transport schemes in Egham, the Blackwater Valley and Redhill.
12. The County Council is also investing funds in two schemes targeting two of the worst areas in the county for cyclist casualties: in Leatherhead - Ashted and Walton-upon-Thames – Upper Halliford. The Leatherhead – Ashted is nearing completion with the Walton scheme underway and scheduled to be completed by April 2015.
13. Through the Local Sustainable Transport Fund, a Cycling Improvement Fund has supported Surrey organisations with additional cycle parking and other infrastructure to encourage cycling. In addition, work with South West Trains and Southern Rail is resulting in investment in new Brompton Dock cycle hire facilities at Guildford, Woking, Redhill and Reigate stations.

Cycle promotion

14. The County Council has undertaken a range of activities to promote cycling in 2014. These include cycle festivals in Guildford, Woking, Reigate and Merstham, which were attended by around 7,000 people, as well as the business focused Cycle Challenge. The County Council was successful in bidding for further funds for 2015/16 to support promotional activities.

Cycle Safety

15. The Drive SMART Partnership is currently undergoing a reorganisation as a result of Sussex Police taking responsibility for roads policing for Sussex and Surrey. Once the new arrangements are in place, a new Campaign Plan for cycle safety will be developed.
16. In the interim, work has been underway on a guidance document for police officers 'Improving the Safety of Cyclists' with details of options for advice and interventions relating to a range of behaviours and offences. This will be further developed and disseminated within the police force once the reorganisation is complete.

Sports Cycling and Unregulated Events

17. The County Council has no powers relating to sportive events. The Leader and the Cabinet Member for Community Safety were invited to give evidence at a Parliamentary Enquiry in February 2014 where they highlighted the problem of high volumes of sports cyclists and unregulated events in some parts of the UK, and calling for a change to current regulation to address this issue.
18. Work is also on-going to establish links to events that are unregulated and do not require the organiser to gain approvals or permissions from the statutory partners in Surrey. In addition, the County Council is in early dialogue with the LGA, Sport England and British Cycling to explore how the sport Governing Body can support our work to engage with event organisers and ensure that a voluntary code of conduct for unregulated events is implemented.

Regulated and Major Events

19. Events requiring a 16A road are now being fully administered through the 'Framework for coordinating and approving events on Surrey's Highway', a new Framework which was also approved by Cabinet in December 2013. Events that have been delivered through this framework include cycle events and half marathons.
20. The Prudential RideLondon-Surrey 100 and Classic events were successfully delivered on Sunday 9 August, despite very difficult weather conditions. Changes to the traffic management plan reduced the impact of road closures and research showed that extensive communications activity resulted in the level of awareness being much higher before the events.

- 21. Venues such as pubs and cafes along the route were offered a celebration pack to help them to maximise the opportunities provided by the crowds watching the events and a spectator hub was created in Dorking town centre. Research to assess the impact on businesses has been commissioned and topline results are expected around 13 October with a full report in early November.

Conclusions:

- 22. Work is underway to deliver the Surrey Cycling Strategy, with significant progress being made in the first 9 months since the strategy was finalised.

Recommendations:

- 23. The Select Committee is recommended to:
 - a) Endorse progress to date on delivering the Surrey Cycling Strategy
 - b) Identify priority areas where further consideration is required

Next steps:

An annual report on progress in delivering the strategy will be published in January 2014.

Report contact: Lesley Harding, Place and Sustainability Group Manager, Environment and Infrastructure

Contact details: 020 8541 8091; lesley.harding@surreycc.gov.uk

Sources/background papers:

Surrey Cycling Strategy
Framework for Coordinating and Approving Events on Surrey's Highway

This page is intentionally left blank



Environment & Transport Select Committee
27 October 2014

Report of the Flooding Task Group

Purpose of the report: Policy Development and Review

This report contains the findings and recommendations of the Flooding Task Group, which was commissioned by the Environment & Transport Select Committee to investigate the impacts of the recent flood events that affected Surrey in December 2013 and early 2014.

The Select Committee is asked to endorse the recommendations of the Task Group, which seek to assist the County Council and its partners in mitigating against the impact of future flooding on residents, businesses and infrastructure.

Introduction:

1. In April 2014 a Flooding Task Group was set up to examine all matters surrounding the flooding experienced in many parts of Surrey between 23 December 2013 and March 2014. The Task Group was established under the auspices of Surrey County Council's Environment & Transport Select Committee, with a remit to report back by the end of 2014. Membership of the Group was as follows: David Harmer (Chairman), Mark Brett-Warburton, Stephen Cooksey, Peter Hickman, Chris Norman, Denise Saliagopoulos and Nick Skellett.
2. This report is based on witness statements and we have relied on those because further information is becoming available on a regular basis. This report should be treated as a dynamic document which is likely to be further developed.

Methodology:

3. The Task Group began its investigation by meeting with Surrey County Council's (SCC) Emergency Management officers. The first meeting discussed the plans in place prior to the flooding, both for SCC and for its various emergency partners, and then the actual experience during the crisis period. A second meeting discussed the recovery phase, again

comparing plans with actual experience; since this meeting took place during the recovery phase, the experience was on a “so far” basis.

4. The Task Group then consulted the Chairmen of SCC’s eleven Local Committees, to determine which Division in each Borough and District seemed to be the worst affected. A meeting was held with the County Councillor for each of the nominated Divisions, at which the Divisional Member was invited to bring one or more outside parties, for example residents, Borough or District officers or business people, to explain their experiences of what happened on the ground. These meetings were held in the relevant Borough or District or the adjacent one, with the Divisional Member orchestrating the discussion and Task Group Members seeking clarification, in particular on the local geography.
5. At this stage the Task Group submitted an interim report and recommendations to the Environment & Transport Select Committee meeting of 13 July 2014, from where they were passed on to the Cabinet meeting of 22 July 2014. All of the recommendations were accepted (this report is available on the SCC website and/or on request).
6. Next the Task Group met with the Environment Agency, Thames Water (as the drainage authority), the Police and the Fire Service. OfWat, the water regulator, was unfortunately unable to meet with the Task Group because the timing coincided with the period in which they were considering the business plans of all the water companies for the next five years. However, OfWat provided the Task Group with written evidence.
7. Lastly, the Task Group met with Members and other representatives of further Divisions which had been significantly affected on the same basis as above. In all representatives of 16 Divisions were involved in such meetings, and additional written evidence was received from officers of affected Boroughs. A list of all these meetings and witnesses is attached at **Annexe 2**.

Overall findings:

8. There were two separate flooding crises. The first occurred just before and during the Christmas 2013 period, caused by very substantial rainfall along Surrey’s southern border, which in turn caused dramatic rises in the levels of the Wey, the Mole and their tributaries. This was exacerbated by high winds bringing down trees and power lines in some places. The second, much longer crisis occurred, with two peaks, during January and February 2014, caused by substantial rainfall along the Thames basin, well upstream from Surrey, affecting both the Thames itself and its tributaries, resulting in steadily rising river levels and volumes over a longer period.
9. In terms of properties flooded and in terms of people flooded out of their homes, Surrey was substantially the worst affected county in England. Over 1400 properties were confirmed as having been internally flooded, though there was strong evidence of under-reporting. This is believed to have been caused by concern that properties would become uninsurable and/or that their value would be reduced. Since insurance companies nowadays make their judgments essentially on a postcode basis, such

under-reporting has not been helpful. Encouragingly, The Association of British Insurers has now written to Penny Mordaunt, Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State at the Department for Communities and Local Government, saying that “applications for the Repair and Renewal Grant will not directly lead to premiums or excesses being increased.”

10. Over 1200 of the flooded properties were flooded directly by main rivers. By this measure the worst affected areas, according to the Environment Agency, were Egham (339 properties), Staines (339), Guildford (143), Chertsey and Laleham (91), Fetcham (76), Godalming (72), Smallfield (65) and Shepperton (51). The lead agency for main river flooding is the Environment Agency, and they have plans for the protection of most of the areas affected, subject to the availability of resources.
11. Of those properties flooded other than directly by main rivers about half were flooded via fluvial gravel beds from the main rivers, these being in Egham and Staines, a third by unidentified causes and around 40 by sewage. A much greater number of properties were reported as having been seriously affected by sewage in their gardens, in their roads and lapping against house walls. The lead agency for these matters is Thames Water and indirectly the Environment Agency. It is difficult to understand what action is being taken to reduce future risk with regard to sewage, but in any case (regrettably) the County Council has no basis for intervening with resources.
12. The Environment Agency has some limited powers in cases where sewage is endangering the environment, for example where it escapes on to gardens from where there is a clear risk that it may in due course escape into the river network; or where sewage escapes on to roads from which it is likely to reach the river network via the highway drainage system. Sewage intrusion into houses is outside the remit of the Environment Agency, as is the case (which has been widely reported in Surrey) where failures of the sewage network result in residential toilets becoming unflushable. The Environment Agency has requested that all householders affected by sewage should report the matter to the EA so that they can build an accurate picture of the problems.
13. The Environment Agency does intend to propose that Thames Water should ensure that all control equipment should be located above the highest recorded flood levels.
14. The most common criticism of the authorities overall related to communication, both to and from residents and the various authorities. Many residents felt that they were not kept adequately informed of what was happening, what should be expected to happen and what action they should or should not take. At the same time they also felt that their input could have been useful to the authorities in building up a picture of the situation on the ground, if there had been a recognised channel of communication. Some authorities felt that the information flow among authorities could function much better, especially in the early part of each stage of the two crisis periods.

15. However, Borough and District Councils' support for residents was generally very helpful. Some communities and individuals made extraordinary efforts to help vulnerable residents. And the decision process led by SCC's Chief Executive which resulted in the early declaration of an Emergency was a key factor in preventing much greater potential problems.
16. Among other concerns reported by residents were the protection of closed roads, wash entering gardens and homes from cars driving too fast along flooded and even closed roads, and problems of cars blocking roads where emergency services needed vehicular access. Residents believe that the authorities ought to take strong action about these issues during flood emergencies, while the authorities, Police and Councils, point to the level of resource that would be required to enforce the requisite controls.

<p>Options for reducing future risk through capital investment:</p>
--

17. Potential risk reduction through new capital investment falls into three categories. Firstly, a range of protection measures could be implemented along the main rivers. This would fall under the aegis of the Environment Agency, but would require substantial investment, ranging between 50% and 80% of the overall cost, on the part of Local Authorities. The percentage to be locally funded is derived from a Central Government formula based on the cost/benefit in economic terms. These measures range from quite modest schemes costing less than £1 million to the River Thames Scheme for which the Surrey element would cost £240 million at 2015 prices.
18. Secondly, there are a range of measures which could be implemented to reduce the amount and the rate of water getting into the main rivers in the first place. This could range from the reinstatement of former ditches, soakaways and ponds to the creation of new lakes and floodplains. Many of these would also have the effect of reducing floodspots on the highway, thereby improving safety. Most of these measures are likely to require close to 100% funding by the County Council, although some contribution may be sought from riparian owners and/or Boroughs and Districts.
19. Thirdly, there is a clear need for the drainage authority, Thames Water, to make a whole range of improvements to its drainage systems. These measures include the renewal of pipework to prevent surface water getting into the drainage system where it is at risk of creating unsustainable levels of water pressure downstream. They would also include renewal of pipework to prevent foul water and sewage from escaping into the general environment, as well as improvements to a number of control systems which failed under the pressure of the winter's flooding. Since Thames Water is a private company, public money cannot be contributed to the costs of these improvements, and it is not entirely clear what authority is responsible for ensuring that these improvements are made.

Non capital investment:

20. At every meeting with Divisional Members and residents, it was stressed that the greatest concern was communications. Residents felt that they had very limited information as to what was happening and what they should expect to happen. Flood alerts proliferate to such an extent that they have become less helpful. Both alerts and flood warnings are expressed in such a broad geographical way as to be of limited help in each specific area. Residents and Councillors believe that they could be very helpful to all the authorities by giving them locality-specific information if there was a clear channel of communication. This would enable the authorities to harness their resources more accurately, as well as enabling them to pass on more accurate information to other residents in nearby locations.
21. Flood fora would assist in providing a clear channel at the resident end, and SCC are keen to encourage their development. However, there is concern that such fora may be difficult to sustain after a few years (hopefully) without serious flooding.
22. The Environment Agency has argued that dredging the Thames would be counter-productive as it is a self-cleaning river, and this is becoming generally accepted. However, there are a number of areas on the Thames where residents have clear evidence of a build-up of silt and/or other material, particularly downstream of bends in the river and upstream of constructions within the river confines. Cumulatively these areas would appear to amount to a potential loss of river capacity. Dredging these areas on a trial basis could be considered.
23. Following the 2013/14 floods a large number of obstructions, including many substantial trees, were left blocking the free flow of water in the main rivers. The Environment Agency has received additional income from Central Government specifically to address this issue, and work is under way to that effect.

Risks and costs:

24. The risks may be categorised as follows:
 - a) A similar scenario might occur, repeating the 2013/14 experience, with similar results;
 - b) An 1894 level flood might occur, short but much more severe, resulting in tens of billion pounds' worth of damage and subsequent economic loss;
 - c) A storm of a different pattern, but of similar severity, might result in a quite different pattern of damage.
25. Common sense surely dictates that it would be desirable to set out to protect Surrey from a known pattern of damage, recognising alternative risk scenarios.

26. The capital costs of the work that should be done can be estimated (at 2014 prices). These are outlined below and are broken down in to further detail and specific schemes in **Annexe 1**.

Scheme:	Cost:
The River Thames Scheme (Surrey section)	£240m, of which £120m from SCC
Costed schemes to 2021 on other main rivers	£30m, of which £23m from SCC
Prepared schemes beyond 2021 (excl. RTS)	£29m, all from SCC
Other schemes not yet prepared	£25m, all from SCC
Surface water capture (ditches, ponds etc.)	£25m, mostly from SCC

(Note that Borough and District Councils may contribute to the SCC element).

27. Current plans are scheduled for around 75% of this work, to be largely completed by 2025. History tells us that the completion date will slip, and in any case 2025 is too long a delay in providing the protection. A better plan must be found.

Recommendations:

The Select Committee is asked to endorse the following recommendations:

- a) Surrey County Council should lobby Central Government to change the powers of the Water Company regulators, such that proper investment in the drainage networks of the water companies can be directed, until such time as the Secretary of State is satisfied that those drainage networks fully comply with current standards.
- b) The Environment Agency should be pressed to give strong consideration to a programme of selective, tactical dredging of specified areas of the Thames.
- c) Surrey County Council should work with partner organisations to make significant improvements to the arrangements for communications in emergencies, and in particular to provide for communication structures between residents and the relevant authorities. Particular attention should be made for special arrangements in holiday periods.
- d) Surrey County Council should work with all the Boroughs and Districts and with residents in the relevant areas to establish flood fora.

Next steps:

The Task Group's report and recommendations will be submitted to the Cabinet meeting on 25 November.

The Task Group will continue in a monitoring role as and when required.

Report contacts:

David Harmer, Task Group Chairman

Tel: 01428 609792

Email: david.harmer@surreycc.gov.uk

Thomas Pooley, Scrutiny Officer

Tel: 020 8541 9902

Email: thomas.pooley@surreycc.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Annexe 1

Flood locations 2013/14 and proposed solutions

Because further information is becoming available on a regular basis, this table should be treated as a dynamic document which is likely to be further developed.

(Note that Borough and District Councils may contribute to the SCC element)

Acronyms: EA – Environment Agency
 FAS – Flood Alleviation Scheme
 GBC – Guildford Borough Council
 SCC – Surrey County Council

Location	Number of properties flooded	Flood source	Proposed solution(s)	Cost (£m)	Bearer of cost
a) Staines	339	Main river (Thames), incl. fluvial gravels	River Thames Scheme	120.0 120.0	EA SCC
b) Egham	333	Main river (Thames), incl. Fluvial gravels	River Thames Scheme Medlake Ditch EA Bell Weir “A” gate replacement Review Minerals Plan Thames Water	As a) above Unknown As a) above	
	6	Sewage			
c) Guildford	142	Main river (Wey)	EA Guildford FAS	1.05	EA
	1	Sewage	Thames Water	2.05	SCC
d) Chertsey &	90	Main river (Thames)	River Thames Scheme	As a) above	

Annexe 1

Laleham		Main river (Bourne)	River Thames Scheme	As a) above	
e) Fetcham	76	Main river (Mole)	Middle Mole FAS	0.65 1.95	EA SCC
			Rye Brooke	Unknown	
			Reservoir at Gatwick	Unknown	
f) Godalming	69	Main river (Wey)	EA Godalming FAS	1.05 2.05	EA SCC
	1	Non main river	Clearance of concrete obstruction etc.		
	2	Sewage	Thames Water		
g) Smallfield	47	Main river (Burstow)	SCC Smallfield FAS	0.33 0.79	EA SCC
	16	Sewage	Thames Water		
	2	Surface Water	Unknown		
h) Shepperton	51	Main river (Thames)	River Thames Scheme	As a) above	
i) Sunbury & Halliford	47	Main river (Thames)	River Thames Scheme	As a) above	
			Local Tactical Dredging (esp. Ferry Lane)		
			Sheepwall ditches		
			Sunbury Weir refurb		
j) Caterham Bourne	40+ (prov)	Main river (Bourne)	Various, some revenue, substantial capex	Unknown	
k) Weybridge	37	Main river (Thames)	River Thames Scheme	As a) above	

Annexe 1

			Dredging Thames Improving river banks EA Wey Road FAS	0.25 0.45	EA SCC
l) Byfleet	26	Main river (Wey)	Redesign Mill Lane sluice gates EA Byfleet FAS	Unknown 0.25 10.5	EA SCC
m) Dorking	20	Main river (Wey and Pipp Brook)	Unknown		
n) Horley	16	Main river (Burstow Brook)	EA Horley FAS Motorway drainage Balcombe Road drainage Reservoir at Gatwick	0.18 0.4	EA SCC
	4	Sewage	Thames Water		
o) Old Woking	18	Main river (Wey)	SCC Old Woking FAS	0.2 0.8	EA SCC
p) East Molesey	12	Main river (Mole)	EA Dead River FAS	0.11 0.25	EA SCC
q) Lingfield	5	Sewage	Thames Water		
	3	Main river	Unknown	As g) above	
	1	Non-main river	Unknown		

Annexe 1

r) Enton	8	Unknown			
s) Betchworth	7	Main river (Mole)	Unknown		
t) Alford	6	Main river (Cranleigh Waters)	SCC Alford Crossways FAS	0.22 0.88	EA SCC
u) Thames Ditton	6	Main river (Thames)	River Thames Scheme	As a) above	
v) Leatherhead	5	Main river (Mole)	EA Middle Mole FAS Unknown – Rye Brook Reservoir at Gatwick	As e) above	
w) Brockham	4	Main river (Mole)	SCC Brockham & Strood Green FAS	0.09 0.25	EA SCC
	1	Sewage	Thames Water		
x) Other Waverley	-	Main river (Cranleigh Waters)	SCC Cranleigh FAS	0.7 1.8	EA SCC
	8	Unknown	Duplicate culvert under old railway at Bramley	Unknown	
	1	Non-main river	Unknown		
y) Other Mole Valley	7	Main river (Mole)	EA Lower Mole FAS etc.	0.2 1.1	EA SCC
		Main river (Rythe)	EA culvert intake refurb SCC Bookham FAS	0.3 0.7	EA SCC
z) Other Reigate & Banstead	8	Main river (Burstow)	SCC River Burstow FAS	0.25 0.58	EA SCC
		?	EA Redhill FAS	Unknown	
aa) Other	4	Main river (Bourne)	EA Addlestone FAS	0.13	EA

Annexe 1

Runnymede		Main river (Wey)	EA Wey Meadows FAS	1.22 0.09 0.22	SCC EA SCC
			EA New Haw FAS	Unknown	
bb) Other Elmbridge	3	Main river (Thames)	River Thames Scheme	As a) above	
cc) Other Surrey Heath	1	Sewage	Thames Water		
- Camberley		Main river (Blackwater)	SCC Camberley FAS	0.7 1.8	EA SCC
- Chobham		Main river (Bourne)	SCC Middle Bourne FAS	0.3 0.7	EA SCC
- Chobham South		Main river (Bourne)	EA Chobham South FAS	0.03 0.72	EA SCC
- West End		Main river (Mill Brook)	SCC West End South FAS	0.16 0.84	EA SCC
- Frimley		Main river (Blackwater)	EA Frimley FAS	0.09 0.23	EA SCC
- Bagshot		Unknown	EA Bagshot FAS	Unknown	
- Windlesham		Unknown	EA Windlesham FAS	Unknown 0.26	EA SCC
dd) Other Guildford					

Annexe 1

- Albury		Main river (Tillingbourne)	SCC Albury FAS	0.04 0.25	EA SCC
- Eashing		Main river (Weybridge)	SCC Eashing FAS	0 0.28	EA SCC
- East Horsley		Surface water	GBC East Horsley FAS	Unknown 0.23	GBC SCC
- Send		Main river (Wey)	SCC Send FAS	0.03 0.26	EA SCC
- Shere		Main river (Tillingbourne)	SCC Shere FAS	0.03 0.26	EA SCC
- Ripley		Main river (Wey)	EA Ripley Springs FAS	0.03 0.26	EA SCC
- Ash		Surface Water	GBC Ash FAS	Unknown	
- Ashenden Road		Surface Water	GBC Ashenden Road surface water system	Unknown	

Annexe 2

List of witnesses the Task Group has consulted:

Elmbridge:

24/06/14:

- Christian Mahne (County Councillor for Weybridge)
- Ray Lee (Strategic Director)
- Local residents

Environment Agency:

09.07.14:

- Doug Hill (Partnerships & Strategic Overview for Surrey)
- Ian Tomes (Flood & Coastal Risk Manager for West Thames)

Fire Service:

22/09/14:

- Russell Pearson (Chief Fire Officer, SCC)

Guildford:

24/06/14:

- David Goodwin (County Councillor for Guildford South-West)
- Caroline Reeves (Borough Councillor for Friary & St. Nicolas)
- Matt Furniss (Executive Member for Environment)
- Tim Pilsbury (Engineering Manager)

Mole Valley:

02/06/14:

- Tim Hall (County Councillor for Leatherhead & Fetcham East)
- Graeme Kane (Strategic Leadership Manager)
- Local residents

17/09/14:

- Helyn Clack (County Councillor for Dorking Rural)
- Roger Hurst (District Councillor for Mickleham, Westhumble & Pixham)
- Hazel Watson (County Councillor for Dorking Hills)

Annexe 2

Police:

09/09/14:

- Paul Morrison (Chief Superintendent, Sussex Police and Gold Command for Flood Response in Surrey)

Reigate and Banstead:

18/06/14:

- Dorothy Ross-Tomlin (County Councillor for Horley East)
- Allen Kay (Deputy Leader)

Runnymede:

27/05/14:

- Yvonna Lay (County Councillor for Egham)

07/08/14:

- Hilary Cantor (Local Resident, Eastworth Road)
- Derek Cotty (Borough Councillor for Chertsey Meads)
- Deborah Dunn-Walters (Local Resident and Co-ordinator of Volunteer Response)
- Malcolm Loveday (The Chertsey Society)
- Chris Norman (County Councillor for Chertsey)
- Peter Sims (Assistant Chief Executive, Runnymede Borough Council)

Spelthorne:

27/05/14:

- Denise Saliagopoulos (County Councillor for Staines upon Thames)
- Nick Moon (Risk and Resilience Manager)

12/08/14:

- Tim Evans (Member for Lower Sunbury and Haliford)
- Vivienne Leighton (Borough Councillor for Shepperton Town)
- Chris Murdoch (Managing Director for Nauticalia)
- Richard Walsh (Member for Laleham and Shepperton)

Surrey County Council:

21/05/14:

- Ian Good (Head of Emergency Management)
- Susie Kemp (Assistant Chief Executive)

Annexe 2

- Owen Lee (Drainage Asset Team Leader)
- James Painter (Community Partnership Manager)
- Ben Skipp (Programme Manager)
- Jason Russell (Assistant Director, Highways)
- Mark Twomey (Deputy Head of Emergency Management)

Tandridge:

18/06/14:

- Sally Marks (County Councillor for Caterham Valley)

09/10/14:

- Local Residents
- Liz Cutter (Chairman, Burstow Parish Council)
- Michael Sydney (County Councillor for Lingfield)
- Peter Joseph Tebbutt (Parish Councillor for Dormansland)

Thames Water:

23/07/14:

- Jason Eccles (Process Manager for Ashford Common)
- Jenny Elliot (Customer and Continuous Improvement Manager)
- Hilary Murgatroyd (Local Regional Government Liaison)

Waverley:

16/06/14:

- Steve Cosser (County Councillor for Godalming)
- Nick Williams (Borough Councillor for Godalming, Farncombe and Catteshall)
- Donal O'Neill (Borough Councillor for Farnham Upper Hale)
- Peter Voisey (Local Residents Association)
- Andy Jeffrey (Operations Manager, Godalming Town Council)

26/09/14:

- Elizabeth Cable (Borough Councillor for Witley & Hambledon)
- Tony Clothey (Water Environment Consultant)
- David Morley (Ex-Parish Clerk Bramley Parish Council)
- Stewart Stennett (Borough Councillor for Cranleigh East)
- Kathy Victor (Parish Clerk at Bramley Parish Council)
- Beverly Weddle (Clerk at Waverley Borough Council)
- Alan Young (County Councillor for Cranleigh & Ewhurst)
- Victoria Young (County Councillor for Waverley Eastern Villages)

Annexe 2

Woking:

26/06/14:

- Richard Wilson (County Councillor for The Byfleets)
- Geoff McManus (Neighbourhood Services, Woking Borough Council)
- Local residents