

## Notice of Meeting

# Economic Prosperity, Environment and Highways Board

**Date & time**

Thursday, 10 March  
2016 at 10.30 am

**Place**

Ashcombe, County  
Hall, Penrhyn Road,  
Kingston upon  
Thames, KT1 2DN

**Contact**

Huma Younis or Rianna  
Hanford, Room 122,  
County Hall, Kingston upon  
Thames  
Room 122, County Hall  
Tel 0208 213 2725, 0208  
213 2662  
huma.younis@surreycc.gov.uk,  
rianna.hanford@surreycc.gov.uk

**Chief Executive**

David McNulty

**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 [huma.younis@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:huma.younis@surreycc.gov.uk), [rianna.hanford@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:rianna.hanford@surreycc.gov.uk).**

**This meeting will be held in public. If you would like to attend and you have any special requirements, please contact Huma Younis or Rianna Hanford, Room 122, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames on 0208 213 2725, 0208 213 2662.**

### Elected Members

Mr David Harmer (Chairman), Mr Bob Gardner (Vice-Chairman), Mrs Nikki Barton, Mr Mike Bennison, Mrs Natalie Bramhall, Mr Stephen Cooksey, Mrs Pat Frost, Mr David Goodwin, Dr Zully Grant-Duff, Mr Ken Gulati, Mr Peter Hickman, Mr George Johnson, Mr Richard Wilson and Mrs Victoria Young

### TERMS OF REFERENCE

The Committee is responsible for the following areas,

Performance, Finance and Risk Monitoring for the E&I Directorate	Road Safety	Community Transport
Strategic Planning	Concessionary Travel	Economic Development and the Rural Economy
Economic Prosperity	Minerals	Housing
Countryside	Parking Regulation and Enforcement	Local Transport Plan
Waste and recycling	Climate Change and Carbon Energy	Biodiversity and Wildlife
Transport Service Infrastructure	Rights of Way	Planning Services
Aviation	Cycle Routes	Street Lighting
Highway Maintenance	Gypsy and Traveller Sites	Flood Prevention and Infrastructure

## **AGENDA**

### **1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS**

### **2 MINUTES FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING: 26 JANUARY 2016**

(Pages 1  
- 10)

To agree the previous 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:**

- The deadline for Member's questions is 12.00pm four working days before the meeting (4 March 2016).
- The deadline for public questions is seven days before the meeting (3 March 2016).
- 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 BOARD**

(Pages  
11 - 12)

A response is included following recommendations made to Cabinet on 2 February 2016.

**6 RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKER AND FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME**

(Pages  
13 - 18)

The board is asked to monitor progress on the implementation of recommendations from previous meetings and to review its forward work programme.

**7 UPDATES FROM MEMBER REFERENCE GROUPS AND TASK GROUPS**

To receive a verbal update from the Board's Task and Member Reference Groups.

**8 PROJECT HORIZON**

To receive an update on Project Horizon.

*Report to follow.*

**9 SURREY INFRASTRUCTURE STUDY**

(Pages  
19 - 22)

**Purpose of the report:** Policy Development and Review

The Surrey Infrastructure Study provides an evidence base of infrastructure requirements across the County for the period to 2030. The Study will inform future work to develop an Infrastructure Strategy to ensure effective delivery of strategic infrastructure requirements to support sustainable economic growth.

**10 DATE OF NEXT MEETING: 21 APRIL 2016**

The next meeting of the Economic Prosperity, Environment and Highways Board will be held on Thursday 21 April 2016 at 10.30am in the Ashcombe Suite, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames.

**David McNulty  
Chief Executive**

Published: Wednesday 2 March 2016

## **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*

**MINUTES** of the meeting of the **ECONOMIC PROSPERITY, ENVIRONMENT AND HIGHWAYS BOARD** held at 10.30 am on 26 January 2016 at Ashcombe, County Hall, Penrhyn Road, Kingston upon Thames, KT1 2DN.

These minutes are subject to confirmation by the Board at its meeting on Thursday, 10 March 2016.

**Elected Members:**

- \* Mr David Harmer (Chairman)
- \* Mr Bob Gardner (Vice-Chairman)
- \* Mrs Nikki Barton
- \* Mr Mike Bennison
- \* Mrs Natalie Bramhall
- \* Mr Stephen Cooksey
- A Mrs Pat Frost, Substituted by Mr Michael Sydney
- \* Mr David Goodwin
- A Dr Zully Grant-Duff, Substituted by Mrs Margaret Hicks
- \* Mr Ken Gulati
- \* Mr Peter Hickman
- \* Mr George Johnson
- \* Mr Richard Wilson
- \* Mrs Victoria Young

**Substitute Members:**

Mrs Pat Frost, Substituted by Mr Michael Sydney  
Dr Zully Grant-Duff, Substituted by Mrs Margaret Hicks

**In attendance**

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

**1/16 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]**

Apologies were received from Dr Zully Grant-Duff and Mrs Pat Frost. Mrs Margaret Hicks substituted for Zully Grant-Duff and Mr Michael Sydney substituted for Mrs Pat Frost.

**2/16 MINUTES FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING: 10 DECEMBER 2015 [Item 2]**

Victoria Young commented that the minutes of the previous meeting required an amendment on her attendance. Upon this correction, the Board agreed the minutes as an accurate record of the meeting.

**3/16 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

There were no declarations of interest.

**4/16 QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS [Item 4]**

There were no questions or petitions.

**5/16 RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKER AND FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME [Item 5]**

The Board noted the progress made on the Recommendation Tracker and reviewed the Forward Work Programme.

**6/16 UPDATES FROM MEMBER REFERENCE GROUPS AND TASK GROUPS [Item 6]**

**Key points raised during the discussion:**

1. The spokesperson for the Customer Service Excellence Member Reference Group reported that there has been no meeting of the group; however when the next Project Horizon schemes are introduced the group plans to visit local businesses to gauge the impacts on businesses.
2. The spokesperson for the Basingstoke Canal Task Group reported that the group had not met as it was waiting for a business plan from officers.
3. The spokesperson for the Countryside Management Member Reference Group reported that the group had not met, however the content of this meeting covered the remit of the MRG.
4. The spokesperson for the Finance Sub Group informed the Board that the group had scheduled a meeting but this had been cancelled due to the changes in central government funding for the Council budget which meant there was not enough information to hold a finance meeting.
5. The spokesperson for the Highways for the Future Member Reference Group reported that the group was pleased that the Board endorsed the recommendations from its paper from the 10 December 2015

board meeting. The group will reconvene after the Cabinet meeting on 2 February 2016 to review the group's role and assess its priorities going forward.

## **7/16 REFERRAL OF COUNTY COUNCIL MOTION [Item 7]**

### **Declarations of interest:**

None.

### **Main Speakers:**

Cllr Hazel Watson (Mover of the Motion)  
Cllr Stephen Cooksey (Motion Secunder)  
Cllr Tim Hall, County Councillor  
Mr Richard Bolton, Local Highways Services Group Manager

### **Key points raised during the discussion:**

1. The following motion was referred to the Board for consideration.  
  
"Council notes that when roads are surface dressed in order to prolong the life of roads by sealing them and to save money before a full resurfacing, the road surface becomes noisier for residents living nearby.  
  
This Council requests the Cabinet to amend its policy to take into account not just cost but also the quality of life of residents, including noise levels of different road surfaces when deciding on different types of materials and processes for surface dressing or full road resurfacing."
2. Cllr Watson made the following points in support of her motion:
  - Highways laid a new road surface on a major road within her ward. After some years a preventative surface dressing scheme had caused a rise in noise level on the road.
  - That it was wrong to subject local residents to that level of noise.
  - That decisions on road surface treatments should be balanced on quality of life for residents as well as cost.
  - That the Council should adopt a similar policy to Lincolnshire County Council and Surrey County Council should accept that what has happened has had a detrimental effect on the quality of life to residents.
3. The motion was formally seconded by Cllr Cooksey, who reserved his right to speak.
4. Tim Hall, a Member for an adjacent ward was granted permission to speak by the Chairman and made the following points in support of the motion:

- An example of ineffective road surface treatment was given by Mr Hall in relation to the Leatherhead Bypass; this was evidence that something had to be changed to current policy.
  - That criterion was not correctly being followed and that the surface treatment used in Cllr Watson's case was perhaps not the right solution for the area.
5. The Local Highways Services Group Manager made the following points:
- There were a number of prevention strategies in place and that one option was resurfacing.
  - A newly laid road surface has a negative texture surface, whereas following preventative surface dressing a road has a positive texture surface, and a positive texture surface causes more road noise.
  - The Highways industry has developed quieter road surfaces so the effects of road surface treatment makes the noise differential greater.
  - Preventative surface dressing can lengthen the life of an asset considerably.
  - A preventative scheme covers more surface area for cost compared to road resurfacing.
  - There were a number of materials used for surface treatment and decisions were made on geography, traffic flow and the quality of the road. Some materials were unsuitable for certain roads due to traffic volumes or speeds.
  - Engineers make assessments on noise, but decisions rely on officer judgement. There was no national guidance on noise levels for roads.
  - Road surface specification will vary along a road depending on its layout, geography, traffic volume and speed.
6. Members of the Board including Cllr Cooksey made the following points:
- Quality of life can be interpreted differently.
  - There was no national guidance policy on treatment schemes.
  - Highways should consider and implement the best road surfaces in the correct areas.
  - Surrey's roads are among the most heavily used roads in the Country.
  - Inevitably some areas of road will run in the proximity of residents though it is unsuitable to change a road surface because residents live nearby to the detriment of safety.
  - Quality of life is not fully considered and the motion asks for this to be considered alongside cost.
  - Noise pollution can be stressful to residents.
  - Highways engineers are trained professionals and the materials used are subject to extensive scientific testing before use. Engineers choose the best surface for the roads and do consider the noise impacts on residents.
7. The mover of the motion was given an opportunity to comment on the discussions that had taken place and urged the Board to support the motion.



8. The motion was then put to the vote by the Chairman with five Members voting for and eight Members voting against, though there was one abstention. Therefore the motion was lost.

**Recommendation:**

- a) That the outcome of the motion is reported back to County Council at its next meeting.

**Actions:**

For the Chairman to report back on the outcome of the Motion at the next Council meeting.

**8/16 CUSTOMER SERVICE EXCELLENCE IN HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT [Item 8]**

**Declarations of interest:**

None.

**Witnesses:**

Mike Dawson, Customer Service & Improvement Manager  
Richard Bolton, Local Highways Services Group Manager  
John Furey, Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding

**Key points raised during the discussion:**

1. Officers outlined that Highways began its Customer Service Excellence journey in 2013. At that time Highways had the highest volume of Stage 1 complaints across County's services, and Highways was considered as a major issue for Surrey residents.
2. Officers explained that the Customer Service Excellence accreditation is a mark of year-on-year improvement to customer service, using customer feedback to drive improvements. The Customer Service Excellence work was supported by the Board's Customer Service Excellence Member Reference Group.
3. Highways were independently inspected in 2014 and retained the accreditation in 2015. Officers confirmed that work on improving customer services continues.
4. Officers highlighted that Highways was using customer feedback to help identify trends and future improvements to the service and cited results from a national survey, and results from Highway's Customer Panel.
5. Officers explained that they were open to suggestions for driving improvements to their service for customers and that Officers were working on improvements previously identified at a Resident Experience Board meeting on Highways Customer Service

Excellence.

6. Members queried whether collecting grass cuttings from the side of the highway could contribute positively to customer satisfaction as well as an improvement to recycling statistics.
7. Officers explained that although Highways was responsible for grass cutting, there was no authority that collects the grass. Collection of cuttings would result in substantial additional workforce and logistical costs, making the idea less financially viable.
8. Cabinet Member John Furey commented that current spending on grass verges was quite discretionary as Highways only needed to meet statutory safety requirements.

Cabinet Member Mike Goodman arrived at 11.48am.

9. Members commented that residents were not aware of which authority is responsible for which Highways service and that clarity should be made around this. Members suggested that work should be done with the contact centre to clarify this at the first point of call.
10. Officers reported that Highways was in the process of reviewing its web pages and that the service had no target figure for 'hits' at the time. The Customer Service & Improvement Manager explained that the Community Partnership Team was currently working through the Customer Service Accreditation and both would be working together in the future.
11. Members commended the work of the Works Communication Team and requested an update into the review of the Dorking Project Horizon scheme. Officers confirmed that the Dorking Project Horizon works were discussed at the most recent Member Reference Group meeting, and that the group was awaiting the result of a survey.
12. A member of the Committee suggested that when surveys were put together comparisons should be made with similar sized authorities with similar landscapes, for example Hertfordshire.

**Recommendation:**

- a) The Board noted the report.

**Actions:**

None.

**9/16 SUPERFAST BROADBAND UPDATE [Item 9]**

**Declarations of interest:**

None.

**Witnesses:**

Graham Cook, Programme Manager, Superfast Surrey Broadband Programme.

**Key points raised during the discussion:**

1. The Chairman explained that the Superfast Surrey Broadband Programme would return to the agenda in April rather than March as previously scheduled.
2. The Programme Manager explained that Superfast Surrey Programme had reached the end of the main deployment phase and had provided Superfast Broadband to 86,000 Surrey properties from the intervention area drawn in 2012.
3. It was explained that the final months of the programme focussed on connecting properties that were more challenging; mostly rural homes. It was reported that these works were mostly complete however officers were ensuring completion before finally signing the work off.
4. It was reported that approximately 96% of Surrey had access to download speeds of 15Mb or higher, and expects a rise to 97% around 2018 if there is no further intervention in the market.
5. The Programme Manager and BT were waiting for the terms of the agreement between Broadband UK and the European Union to be renegotiated before further works could be carried out, however the Council was working with BT to identify potential areas for deployment within the original intervention area.
6. Members queried when it would be likely for residents to be included in future broadband programmes. The officer explained that until the EU agreement with Broadband UK had been signed, the OMR process and consultation could not start. It would be very difficult to put a date on timescales but this could potentially be months.

**Recommendation:**

- a) That the Board receives a progress report at its April 2016 board meeting.

**Actions:**

For the Scrutiny Officer to include this item on the forward work programme.

**10/16 THE AGREEMENT BETWEEN SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL AND SURREY WILDLIFE TRUST TO MANAGE THE COUNTRYSIDE ESTATE [Item 10]**

**Declarations of interest:**

None.

**Witnesses:**

Lisa Creaye-Griffin, Countryside Group Manager  
Ian Boast, Assistant Director for Environment  
Nigel Davenport, Chief Executive, Surrey Wildlife Trust  
Roger Wild, Director of Finance, Surrey Wildlife Trust  
Mark Pearson, Director of Countryside Management, Surrey Wildlife Trust  
Mike Goodman, Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning.

**Key points raised during the discussion:**

1. The Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning commented that Surrey Wildlife Trust were willing to engage and make amendments to their contract with Surrey County Council. He also commented that both parties had been on a long and difficult journey to reach an agreement but believed that both parties agreed on the same direction of travel.
2. Officers reported that a number of plans had been drawn up, with the key to success being the main business plan, monitoring progress via agreed key performance indicators, and applying the correct investment opportunities. It was also reported that Surrey Wildlife Trust were looking to create efficiencies from their own resources.
3. The Chief Executive of Surrey Wildlife Trust commented that the Trust and Surrey County Council had been working well together and that the relationship between them had improved, and that there was an understanding of the importance of making the countryside estate self-financing.
4. It was reported that the risks to the Trust, should the plans fail, were significant and that therefore it was in the Trust's interest to succeed. It was reported that the Trustees would be discussing the Memorandum of Understanding, their formal commitment to the Council, at a meeting on 8 February 2016.
5. Members queried some of the figures around the woodland plan citing; 1,150 hectares generating £116,500 net income. The Director of Countryside Management explained that the Trust had commissioned an assessment of all nineteen woodlands on the countryside estate, and that they had been surveyed; however, at the time of writing the business plan they focussed on the four most productive woodlands, though assessments were still coming in for woodlands across the rest of the estate. The assessments have been completed, DWT are now working on the management plans for each woodland.
6. Members commented that a 0.1% per annum return was not a good prospect, however the Director of Countryside Management explained that the figures were based on wood prices and that opportunities would increase year on year, and that the low return on woodlands would be investigated.
7. Members commented that there were many income generating ventures that could be achieved in woodlands that did not require cutting down the wood. Officers agreed that recreational and amenity based activities were potentially viable in Surrey's woodland estate.

The Director of Countryside Management explained that discussions were taking place with contacts in the wood fuel industry around income generating opportunities. Some members raised concerns around levels of return.

8. The Chairman of the board agreed for the item to be taken into Part 2, by virtue of paragraph(s) 3, Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person including the authority holding that information). The Chairman invited the Director of Finance from Surrey Wildlife Trust to stay for the first part of this section of the meeting to which he agreed.
9. Members further discussed the agreement between Surrey County Council and Surrey Wildlife Trust and outlined their concerns regarding the agreement. The Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning assured members of the Board their comments would be taken on board.

**Recommendation:**

- a) For the Board to send a recommendation to Cabinet outlining concerns around the agreement between Surrey County Council and Surrey Wildlife Trust to manage the Countryside Estate.

**Actions:**

For a recommendation outlining the Boards concerns to be sent to Cabinet for consideration.

**11/16 SURREY INFRASTRUCTURE STUDY [Item 11]**

This item was withdrawn from the agenda.

**12/16 DATE OF NEXT MEETING: 10 MARCH 2016 [Item 12]**

The next meeting of the Economic Prosperity, Environment and Highways Board will be held on Thursday 10 March at 10.30am in the Ashcombe Suite, County Hall, Kingston-upon-Thames.

Meeting ended at: 2.55 pm

---

**Chairman**

**CABINET RESPONSE TO ECONOMIC PROSPERITY, ENVIRONMENT AND HIGHWAYS BOARD**

**HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT MEMBER REFERENCE GROUP'S REPORT ON THE KIER CONTRACT EXTENSION**

**(considered by Economic Prosperity, Environment and Highways Board on 10 December 2015)**

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS:**

That Cabinet approve the extension to the Kier contract until 2021, subject to the conditions outlined in paragraph 20 of the Member Reference Group report.

These conditions were:

In order to ensure that Kier continue to progress the improvements/issues identified, it would like the following conditions included in the contract extension agreement:

- Delivery of a new joint procurement strategy which addresses the sub contractor performance management issues and actively supports local businesses.
- Implementation of a new performance framework for Kier and its supply chain which incentivises good performance and consequences for poor performance.
- An efficiency action plan which looks at integration opportunities to reduce duplication of effort and waste in teams.
- A firm commitment from Kier to support our Customer Service Excellence ongoing accreditation requirements, which includes a review of customer defect reporting and programme management processes and an improved website.
- A new Communications and Engagement Strategy which should be embedded into all future schemes and is linked to the contract performance framework to ensure compliance.

**RESPONSE:**

I would like to thank the Board for their comments and scrutiny of the report, including the officer presentation in Part 2 of the meeting, and for commending the recommendation to Cabinet. I would also like to take this opportunity to thank the Member Reference Group once again for their thorough review of the Kier contract. Their findings have been instrumental in shaping the terms of the contract extension, which will ultimately deliver greater strategic alignment, value for money and improved services for residents. Surrey and Kier officers are working together to develop plans to ensure the contract conditions required by the Member Reference Group are successfully implemented. These conditions and associated contract modifications will be enshrined in a contract extension agreement and will be signed by the end of June 2016, subject to Cabinet approval on the 2 February. In line with the recommendations made in their report I will now be asking the Member Reference Group to review their terms of reference to consider their ongoing role in the contract and the service's wider long term strategic plans.

**John Furey  
Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding  
2 February 2016**

This page is intentionally left blank



## ECONOMIC PROSPERITY, ENVIRONMENT AND HIGHWAYS BOARD ACTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKER- 2016/17

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

<b>Date of meeting</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Recommendations/ Actions</b>	<b>Achieved or Still Outstanding</b>	<b>Responsible Officer:</b>
26 Jan 2016	<b>REFERRAL OF COUNTY COUNCIL MOTION [Item 7]</b>	That the outcome of the motion is reported back to County Council.	<b>ACHIEVED-</b> A report outlining the outcome of the debated motion was submitted to the 9 February 2016 County Council meeting.	David Harmer/Scrutiny Officer
26 Jan 2016	<b>SUPERFAST BROADBAND UPDATE [Item 9]</b>	It was agreed by the Chairman that a progress report on the project would be deferred to the 21 April board meeting. The item was originally scheduled for 10 March.	<b>ACHIEVED-</b> An officer update report on the progress of the Superfast broadband project has been added to the forward work programme for April 2016.	Scrutiny Officer
26 Jan 2016	<b>THE AGREEMENT BETWEEN SWT AND SCC TO MANAGE THE COUNTRYSIDE ESTATE [Item 10]</b>	For the Board to send a recommendation to Cabinet outlining concerns around the agreement for SWT to manage the Countryside estate.	<b>ACHIEVED-</b> A recommendation outlining the Boards concerns and reservations was originally scheduled to be considered at the Cabinet meeting on 23 February. As the item was pulled from the Cabinet agenda, the Chairman decided to hold sending this recommendation to Cabinet. In the meantime a Countryside MRG meeting was scheduled for 25 February to discuss the boards concerns.	David Harmer/Scrutiny Officer

This page is intentionally left blank

# Economic Prosperity, Environment & Highways Board – Forward Work Programme 2016/17

10 March 2016  
(Public)

- Operation Horizon Update- (combined Year 2 & Year 3 assessment and programme for Year 4 & Year 5)
- Surrey Infrastructure Study

21 April 2016  
(Public)

- Superfast Broadband Update
- Local Transport Review
- Officer Update Report on the Basingstoke Canal
- Revised Asset Management Strategy for Highways and Transport

## Future Scrutiny Topics

**Potential topics that can be scheduled for scrutiny when appropriate as well as long term and ongoing items are listed below.**

- Report on Road Safety- June 2016
- Surrey Rail Strategy Progress Report- June 2016
- CIL & Section 106 Progress Report- June/July 2016
- Basingstoke Canal Governance Final Report- tbc

## Member Reference Groups/ Task Groups

### Ongoing Member Reference Groups and Task Groups of the Board

<b>Basingstoke Canal Task Group</b>	Michael Sydney George Johnson David Harmer (Spokesperson)	To consider the most effective governance option for Surrey county council in relation to the Basingstoke Canal of which Surrey is a joint owner. Recommendations of this Task Group will enable the county council to decide whether they continue their involvement with the Basingstoke Canal or make changes to the current joint ownership model.  <i>The task group is due to report back to the board in spring 2016.</i>
<b>Countryside Management Member Reference Group</b>	Bill Barker Michael Sydney Stephen Cooksey David Harmer (Spokesperson)	To report to EPEH 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.  <i>The MRG meets on an ad hoc basis as and when the service requires support.</i>
<b>Customer Service Excellence Member Reference Group</b>	John Beckett Stephen Cooksey George Johnson Victoria Young Richard Wilson (Spokesperson)	To support the Highways Service's journey to achieve the Customer Service Excellence (CSE) Standard.  <i>The MRG meets on an ad hoc basis as and when the service requires support.</i>
<b>Finance Sub-Group</b>	Mike Bennison Stephen Cooksey George Johnson Bob Gardner Richard Wilson David Harmer (Spokesperson)	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.  <i>The sub group is scheduled to meet on a quarterly basis.</i>
<b>Highways for the Future Member Reference Group</b>	Stephen Cooksey Peter Hickman Richard Wilson Mike Bennison (Spokesperson)	To allow Member input into the Highways Service's plans for the future long-term management of Surrey's highways.  <i>The MRG meets on an ad hoc basis as and when the service requires support.</i>

<b>Local Transport Review Member Reference Group</b>	David Goodwin Peter Hickman Michael Sydney Pat Frost (Spokesperson)	To assist the E&I Directorate in its Local Transport Review project.  <i>The MRG will be restarting meetings in early 2016.</i>
<b>Winter Maintenance Task Group</b>	David Goodwin David Harmer Stephen Cooksey (Spokesperson)	To provide scrutiny and oversight of Surrey's annual Winter Maintenance policy.  <i>The task group meets in the summer to discuss the future winter maintenance policy.</i>

**Economic Prosperity, Environment and Highways Board**  
10<sup>th</sup> March 2016

**Surrey Infrastructure Study**

**Purpose of the report:** Policy Development and Review

The Surrey Infrastructure Study provides an evidence base of infrastructure requirements across the County for the period to 2030. The Study will inform future work to develop an Infrastructure Strategy to ensure effective delivery of strategic infrastructure requirements to support sustainable economic growth.

**Introduction:**

1. In 2014, Surrey Leaders agreed to move towards a Local Strategic Statement as part of the Strategic Planning and Infrastructure Partnership for Surrey. Assembling an overview of infrastructure needs was seen as an important element of the initial, evidence gathering stage of the work and Surrey Chief Executives commissioned the Infrastructure Study last year.
2. The Study was produced by Aecom and developed through close work with a range of stakeholders. It has now been completed and signed off by all of the Surrey local authorities.

**About the Study**

3. The Study is a technical evidence base of Surrey's infrastructure needs to 2030 covering:
  - Transport (roads, rail, bus, cycling, walking)
  - Education (primary, secondary, early years, further and higher education, adult learning)
  - Health and social care (primary care, acute, mental health, adult social care)
  - Community services (libraries, youth services, community centres, indoor sport)
  - Green infrastructure (open space and recreation, SANG)
  - Utilities (electricity, gas, water, sewage, broadband)
  - Waste
  - Flood defences

- Emergency services (ambulance, police, fire)
4. It sets out for Surrey as a whole and for each borough and district as at July 2015:
    - The potential scale and distribution of growth reflecting existing and emerging Local Plans
    - An assessment of the infrastructure requirements needed to address existing deficits and to support growth
    - An estimate of infrastructure costs, secured and expected funding and potential funding gaps
  5. As well as working closely with planning officers in all the boroughs and districts, a wide range of stakeholders have been engaged to inform the study including SCC services, transport operators, utility companies, higher education providers, CCGs, the Environment Agency, Surrey Nature Partnership and the two LEPs.
  6. The full study will be circulated to members in advance of the meeting.

<b>Key Findings</b>
---------------------

7. The report is a snap shot at July 2015 and presents an examination of social and economic drivers and the potential distribution of planned development in Surrey.
8. It provides an overview of infrastructure needs and requirements across the county for a range of infrastructure provision covering transport, education, health and social care, green infrastructure, utilities and flood defences.
9. As well as the County wide picture, the Study includes an analysis for each district and borough of planned development and proposed infrastructure investment.
10. The study identifies that Surrey authorities are planning to accommodate 47,053 new homes over the period to 2030 with an associated population increase of 60,991 people which represents an increase in population of 5%. Over the same period the creation of an additional 59,000 jobs is projected.
11. The cost of delivering the infrastructure to support this level of growth is estimated to cost at least £5.37bn. Of this figure, a funding gap of £3.2bn has been estimated. The largest funding gaps have been identified in provision of rail and highways infrastructure. It should be noted that this represents high level estimates based on best available data. See page 131 of the Study for full information on the cost caveats.

<b>Conclusions:</b>
---------------------

12. The study has been developed to demonstrate to Government, infrastructure providers, local communities and business the challenges



being faced across Surrey in funding the infrastructure to support growth and protect and enhance the quality of life of existing and future residents. It highlights that there is a substantial funding gap if growth in Surrey is to be managed in a sustainable way, which can only be exacerbated by growth pressures from London and any airport expansion.

13. The Study will be used to demonstrate the challenges faced in accommodating and supporting growth and in particular to:

- Improve forward planning by relevant services and organisations
- Provide the basis for an understanding across Surrey of the distribution of growth and associated infrastructure
- Develop a planning and investment framework for Surrey to help districts and boroughs put in place their Local Plans and satisfy the Duty to Cooperate.
- Support bids for funding through the LEPs for shorter term infrastructure investment and lobbying national transport infrastructure agencies to shape their investment plans
- Contribute to analysis of wider strategic developments in London and the South East
- In the context of devolution, support the development of a 3SC Infrastructure Strategy

<b>Recommendations:</b>
-------------------------

14. To note the findings of the Surrey Infrastructure Study and the next steps.

-----

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

**Contact details:** 020 8541 8091, [lesley.harding@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:lesley.harding@surreycc.gov.uk)

**Sources/background papers:** None

This page is intentionally left blank