

MINUTES of the meeting of the **ENVIRONMENT & TRANSPORT SELECT COMMITTEE** held at 10.30 am on 23 April 2015 at Ashcombe Suite, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 2DN.

These minutes are subject to confirmation by the Committee at its next meeting.

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

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

21/15 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Natalie Bramhall and Adrian Page. David Ivison substituted for Adrian Page.

22/15 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING: 12 MARCH 2015 [Item 2]

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

23/15 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

There were none.

24/15 QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS [Item 4]

There were none.

25/15 RESPONSES FROM THE CABINET TO ISSUES REFERRED BY THE SELECT COMMITTEE [Item 5]

There were no responses from the Cabinet.

**26/15 RECOMMENDATION TRACKER AND FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME
[Item 6]**

Witnesses:

None.

Key points raised during the discussion:

The Chairman drew the Committees attention to the Forward Work Programme on page 7 of the Agenda and informed Members that the Select Committee scheduled for the 14 May 2015 would no longer take place so that the Local Transport Review could go through a second round of consultation.

The item would be coming to the 11 June Select Committee meeting.

Recommendations:

None.

Committee Next steps:

None.

27/15 COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY & S106 UPDATE [Item 7]

Witnesses:

Paul Druce, Infrastructure Agreements & CIL Manager

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Committee discussed paragraph 22-23 on page 17 of the Agenda which highlighted barriers that existed for Local Area Committees in the governance of CIL and voting restrictions that applied to county council Members. One Member stated that voting was open to all Members including those from borough and districts and the county council. It was explained that in some areas only County Members attend meetings but that Local Area Committees had a role to play in the governance of CIL.
2. The Committee asked officers to clarify the relationship between CIL and Local Committees and if there was a requirement for CIL money to be dispersed within the district or borough it originated from. Officers stated that generally CIL monies will be spent in the area that secured it, although it was possible for cross border infrastructure to be funded using CIL. The involvement with Local Committees was challenging as CIL money was district/borough money, but officers assured the Committee that work was being undertaken to involve county councillors in the process and to inform Local Committees of

bids in their area. Officers agreed to report back on progress with Local Committees.

3. The Chairman assured the committee that the Infrastructure Agreements & CIL Manager along with members of his team would work on behalf of SCC to make sure bids were sensibly placed.
4. Members questioned the cost of developing green and brown belt sites. Officers informed the Committee that brown belt sites are typically more expensive as costs often include the demolition and clearing of the previous development and any contamination arising from previous commercial uses.
5. The Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding informed the Committee that it was Members responsibility to involve themselves in CIL bids and ensure that members considered the whole county when making any decisions regarding CIL.

Recommendations:

The Environment and Transport Select Committee agreed the following recommendations;

- a) Officers should continue collaboration with Borough and District colleagues in their preparation of Local Plan policies, Infrastructure Delivery Plans, CIL Charging Schedules and Regulation 123 Lists to ensure the County Council is able to support development in each of the areas by securing and providing strategic infrastructure at the required time,
- b) Officers should continue to seek mitigation of infrastructure impacts from developers, on an application by application basis, in those LPA (Local Planning Authority) areas where CIL is not adopted post 6th April 2015, bearing in mind the restrictions placed on s106 agreements for any given district and borough. Details of any infrastructure mitigation that have not been achieved should be recorded.
- c) Officers should establish a reporting back regime to establish the level of 'infrastructure deficit' arising from new development which is not being mitigated by the allocation of CIL or site specific s106 or s278 agreements,
- d) That officers should continue close working with the planning authorities operating CIL, and where possible negotiate changes to the governance arrangements and the Regulation 123 Lists in an attempt to ensure that any infrastructure deficits are kept to a minimum.
- e) Officers should continue to seek agreement as to how the governance regime for CIL will operate in each of the areas by way of a memorandum of understanding or other suitable agreement, and
- f) That further work required to secure a suitable governance regime in each of the areas should be undertaken, in the light of the possible different models for governance, given that the Woking model is one

that appears to offer the most open and transparent collaborative process for deciding which projects CIL monies should support.

Actions/Further information to be provided:

- For a progress report to come back to committee later this year.
- For the Infrastructure Agreements & CIL Manager to produce an update on the Judicial Review once further information on this was available.

Committee Next steps:

None

28/15 THE AGREEMENT WITH SURREY WILDLIFE TRUST FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL'S COUNTRYSIDE ESTATE [Item 8]

Witnesses:

Lisa Creaye-Griffin, Countryside Group Manager

Rod Edbrooke, Countryside Partnerships Team Leader

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Countryside Group Manager outlined the report and informed the Committee of the aim to reduce Surrey County Council (SCC) contribution to the Surrey Wildlife Trust (SWT) to zero by 2021. The Committee were informed that an annual report on the SWT agreement would come to this Committee for review. The final agreement would be signed off by April 2016.
2. The Committee discussed the need for detail in the annual report and facts and figures around SCC assets run by the SWT. Officers informed the Committee that a first draft would be ready for the task group and more detail by June.
3. There was a discussion around repairs that need to be done to SCC owned buildings that are run by the SWT and officers informed the Committee that a schedule of repairs had been drawn up that needed to be finalised as part of the agreement. Members highlighted paragraph 6 on page 34 of the Agenda and questioned why the terms of the lease had not been updated following the Cabinet Agreement to the supplemental lease in 2010.
4. One Member asked if SCC could back out of the agreement should they wish. Officers informed the Committee that the agreement allows SCC to back out should SWT default on their KPI's, or SWT are able to serve one year's notice if they can no longer afford to manage the Countryside Estate.

5. It was explained that a strategic woodland management plan would be ready by December 2015. By this date officers should be able to tell how much income could be generated from the woodland.
6. Members questioned whether SCCs estate managers had financially assessed the SWT ran estate. Officers informed the Committee that there had not been a full internal assessment of the SWT estate.
7. One Member expressed concerns about the agreement with regards to financial return on investment and the need for qualified staff.
8. The Committee discussed the monitoring of Key Performance Indicators and questioned when these would begin. Officers informed the Committee that they begun in 2002.
9. The Committee discussed the level of detail in the report and agreed there was a need to scrutinise the SWT agreement equipped with greater detail before Cabinet on 23 June 2015. Officers agreed to liaise with the Chairman of the Committee as to when would be the best time for the SWT agreement to come back and to inform Members accordingly; this was put to vote with all Members in agreement.

Recommendations:

None

Actions/Further information to be provided:

- For the Chairman of the Committee to liaise with the Cabinet Member for Environment as to the best time for the item on the SWT agreement, contract variation to come back to Select Committee.
- For the Scrutiny Officer to inform Members of the Committee as to when the SWT agreement will come back to the Committee for discussion.

Note:

- With regards to paragraph 6 of this item it has since come to light that the Built property and farms were valued in 2012 along with an assessment of the rental value.

**29/15 SELECT COMMITTEE TASK AND FINISH GROUP SCOPING DOCUMENT:
FUTURE GOVERNANCE OF THE BASINGSTOKE CANAL [Item 9]**

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Chairman informed the Committee that Michael Sydney, George Johnson and himself had offered their services to the proposed task group. No further comments were made.

Recommendations:

The committee noted the task group scoping document.

30/15 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 10]

The next meeting of the Committee will be held at 10.30am on 11 June 2015 in the Ashcombe Suite, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames.

Chairman