

MINUTES of the meeting of the **ECONOMIC PROSPERITY, ENVIRONMENT AND HIGHWAYS BOARD** held at 10.30 am on 2 March 2017 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, 1 June 2017.

Elected Members:

- * Mr David Harmer (Chairman)
- * Mr Bob Gardner (Vice-Chairman)
- Mrs Nikki Barton
- * Mr Mike Bennison
- Mrs Natalie Bramhall
- * Mr Stephen Cooksey
- Pat Frost
- * Dr Zully Grant-Duff
- * Mr Ken Gulati
- * Mr Peter Hickman
- * Mr George Johnson
- * Mr Richard Wilson
- * Mrs Victoria Young
- * Mr Ian Beardsmore
- * Ms Denise Turner-Stewart

- * Present

In attendance

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

1/17 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Nikki Barton, Natalie Bramhall and Pat Frost.

2/17 MINUTES FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING: 12 JANUARY 2017 [Item 2]

The minutes from the previous meeting were agreed as a true and accurate record.

3/17 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

None received.

4/17 QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS [Item 4]

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. A Member question was received from Councillor Victoria Young regarding gulley clearance and maintenance (a copy of the question with a response was tabled, attached at Annex 1).
2. Members raised concerns around the inability of Parishes to find out when roads were scheduled for gulley maintenance. It was further added that many villages in Surrey were not included in the gulley cleansing and maintenance schedule.
3. The Cabinet Member for Highways, Flooding and Transport informed the Board that the response tabled at the meeting was not satisfactory and a full detailed response would be provided to the Board electronically within 2 weeks.
4. Members further queried details regarding the new gulley cleansing contract which would commence in April 2017 and the maps used to identify the gullies in Surrey on the website. The Cabinet Member for Highways, Flooding and Transport stated that some issues had been identified regarding the marking of gullies on maps.
5. It was noted that Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) were responsible for managing the drainage systems and that Surrey County Council were not legally expected to be involved and their position was as a consultee.

Recommendations:

None

Actions:

EP14- For the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding to provide the board with an updated response to the Member Question submitted at the board meeting of 2 March 2017 regarding gulley clearance and maintenance.

EP15- For the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding to provide the board with details of the new gully cleansing contract in place from April 2017 and details of where maps used to locate and report gully cleansing issues on the SCC website are produced.

5/17 RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKER AND FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME [Item 5]

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. In relation to Action EP8, the Board were informed that negotiations with Kier were ongoing and under the current terms of the contract it was not certain whether the Thermal Mapping proposals could be delivered.
2. It was noted that the £340k saving target from winter maintenance would not be achieved this financial year and would be carried forward by the directorate into next year.
3. The Chairman indicated that the Thermal Mapping proposal carried an 'invest to save' element and if agreed, it would increase savings and efficiency of winter service.
4. The Cabinet Member for Highways, Flooding and Transport advised the Board that due to the current financial situation no capital spending would be permitted until the Council achieved a sustainable budget.
5. It was stated that a report on Civil Parking detailing performance per Borough in relation to agency agreements would be provided to Members in 2 weeks time.
6. The Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning advised that the outcome of the Surrey Chief Executives meeting on allocation of CIL funds was available and would be circulated to the Board following this meeting.
7. It was highlighted to the Board that lane hire was not permitted in Surrey and discussions had been taking place over the last 2 years to introduce this and were still ongoing.
8. A Member raised the issue with utility companies blocking roads and whether this could be looked into. The Board were advised that any work being carried out on the roads required permits and this scheme was controlled. Members were advised that the authenticity of these permits could be checked by the Traffic and Streetworks Team.
9. The Cabinet Member advised that a draft report on permit schemes would be coming to the Board in due course as the service were responsible for reporting back on the scheme every 3 years. The Chairman indicated that Officers ensure that this topic was put on the agenda for the induction meeting after the elections so new Members understood the licensing regime.

10. It was noted that the Forward Work Programme appeared light due to the elections and Members were advised to note the date of the Induction meeting on 1 June 2017.

Recommendations:

The Board noted and agreed with the proposed Recommendations Tracker and Forward Work Programme.

Actions:

EP16- For the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding to chase a response to Action EP9 regarding Civil Parking Enforcement on the EPEH actions and recommendations tracker.

EP17- For the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning to chase up a response to Action EP11 and EP13 regarding CIL on the EPEH actions and recommendations tracker.

The Chairman agreed to move Item 6 to the end of the agenda.

6/17 UPDATES FROM MEMBER REFERENCE GROUPS AND TASK GROUPS [Item 6]

Key Points raised during the discussion:

1. The Spokesperson for Basingstoke Canal informed the Board that there was nothing to report since the last meeting and that the task group were due to report back to the Board in summer 2017.
2. Councillor Mike Bennison was thanked by Councillor Richard Wilson for acting as an interim Chair for the Customer Services MRG in his absence.
3. The Board noted that the Customer Service Excellence Member Reference group met on 6 February 2017 to address partial compliances to obtain renewal of accreditation.
4. Members were further informed that Customer Service workshops had been rolled out for new members of staff and group managers.
5. The Spokesperson further advised the Board that an assessment would be carried out later on in the month.
6. Further to the above, it was highlighted that a new Members' bulletin has been launched and the service would welcome feedback from Members.
7. It was also highlighted that a number of enquiries had been received on street lighting and it was suggested that a story be featured in Surrey Matters to explain the rationale behind switching off street lights and the savings it would produce.

8. The spokesperson for the Highways for the Future Member Reference Group advised that an update report would be circulated to Board Members electronically.
9. The Surrey Waste Partnership Future Member Reference group reported that the joint arrangement between Mole Valley, Surrey Heath, Elmbridge and Woking for operating under one single waste collector was producing savings. The remaining Boroughs and Districts were advised that there was an open invitation to join this arrangement going forward.
10. The Finance sub-group met on 24 February 2017 to discuss budget planning for the Environment and Infrastructure Directorate. The sub-group received end of year Revenue and Capital summaries and also considered existing and additional savings options.

7/17 UPDATE ON PROPOSALS TO IMPROVE PEDESTRIAN SAFETY ON BRIDGE STREET, GUILDFORD [Item 7]

Witnesses:

Duncan Knox, Road Safety Team Manager
Keith Taylor, Guildford Local Committee Chairman
George Bowen, Petitioner that attended the 9 June 2016 meeting

Declarations of interest:

None.

Key point raised during the discussion:

1. Mr Bowen, the original Petitioner was invited to speak first and began discussions by giving the Board a brief summary for his reasons for attendance today. The Board were reminded that the petition was a result of a road traffic collision that took place on 20 February 2016, subsequently demanding Guildford Borough Council and Surrey County Council to take immediate action on Bridge Street, Guildford.
2. Members were advised that Bridge Street consisted of a 3 lane system which was difficult to navigate for both road users and pedestrians. The purpose of the petition was to prevent an accident where 2 people lost their lives on 20 February 2016 from occurring again.
3. Mr Bowen expressed the view that the lack of funding from the M3 Local Enterprise Partnership should not prevent the saving of lives and supplementary action should be made to ensure funding was in place to improve road safety for pedestrians on Bridge Street.
4. It was noted that Bridge Street was subject to many road traffic collisions and on average 3 collisions were reported every year.
5. Mr Bowen welcomed improvements to Bridge Street and expressed the view that the outcome the petitioners sought after was to ensure pedestrians safety.

6. The Road Safety Team Manager introduced the report by informing the Board that the report was drawn together from an analysis based over 5 years, however the service was aware of the number of casualties through out the years.
7. It was noted that that the collision that took place on 20 February 2017 was an unusual occurrence where the vehicle mounted the footway. The Board were advised that Officers were waiting on the Coroners report for more details to the cause.
8. Based on the analysis, the Officer reported that the primary focus was at the eastern end of Bridge Street at the junction with Onslow Street, where 31 road casualties were recorded by the Police in just over 5 years.
9. The Officer informed the Board that Surrey County Council were working with Guildford Borough Council towards a long term solution in improving safety on Bridge Street. The raised tables mentioned in the report would help to direct people to cross the road in the right place rather than in an unsafe place.
10. The Cabinet Member for Highways, Flooding and Transport assured the Board that there would be no issue with funding for any improvements to Bridge Street as it would be provided from central budgets and would not be expected to be allocated from Local Committee budgets.
11. The Guildford Local Committee Chairman acknowledged the problem with Bridge Street and stated that the Local Committee had been actively looking for funding to improve safety and was pleased with the assurances from the Cabinet Member to support the issue financially. The Member stated that he was happy with the recommendations stated in the officer report and was disappointed that LEP funding had not been as generous as it could have been.
12. A Member shared the view that the area in question was heavily congested and suggested extra warning signs for pedestrians at the crossing. The Road Safety Team Manager responded that this suggestion had been considered as other Local Authorities had introduced this however as the pavement was quite narrow it imposed physical restrictions.
13. Officers were asked whether there was a case to impose a 20mph speed restriction in the area and installing a camera to prosecute drivers who use the bus lane. Members were advised that a speed limit restriction would do little to improve safety for pedestrians as it does not change the behaviour of drivers and pedestrians. It was further added that any speed restrictions would need to take account of the impact of the town centre as a whole. Members further noted that enforcement of bus lanes in Surrey was the responsibility of Surrey Police and not the Local Authority.
14. The Cabinet Member for Highways, Flooding and Transport stated strongly that there was a requirement for partnership working with

Guildford Borough Council in order to achieve long term pedestrian safety raised at the meeting. Members were advised that Guildford Borough Council needed to decide on a master plan for the town centre which would allow for longer term road safety measures to be implemented. It was added that the Guildford Vision Group put forward a 25 year vision for Guildford town centre which also included the pedestrianisation of Bridge Street.

15. The Guildford Local Committee Chairman informed the Board that the Local Plan for Guildford would be consulted on in June 2017 and the likely adoption of this plan would come into effect in 2018.
16. The Guildford Local Committee Chairman identified the current decision on the new bus stop as an example of the many decisions the Borough is yet to resolve in an effort to explain how much the Borough needs to coordinate through.
17. Mr Bowen stated that excellent points were raised and expressed the view that the most significant point would be acknowledging the issue and working towards an end goal to resolve it. Mr Bowen proposed the Board agree that an action plan is put in place for the pedestrianisation of Bridge Street.
18. The Chairman advised Mr Bowen to attend Guildford's Local Committee meeting when the report is presented for consideration, whereby he can follow the process and raise further concerns if necessary. It was stated that the Scrutiny Board did not have any decision making power and had therefore delegated the decisions around the final proposals to Guildford Local Committee.

Recommendations:

The Economic Prosperity, Environment and Highways Board agreed to support officers with continuing to undertake work to refine the design proposals before presenting options to Guildford Local Committee for approval.

Actions:

None.

8/17 UPDATE ON CHANGES TO THE COMMUNITY RECYCLING CENTRES [Item 8]

Witnesses:

Richard Parkinson, Waste Operations Group Manager
Nicholas Meadows, Change Consultant

Declarations of interest:

None.

Key point raised during the discussion:

1. The Waste Operations Group Manager introduced the report by informing the Board of the recent changes at Community Recycling Centres (CRCs) as per the recommendations agreed by Cabinet in November 2015. The first phase of changes were introduced in April 2016, effectively reducing the operating hours/days of sites and the non-acceptance of some non-household waste materials at certain CRCs.
2. It was noted that charges for soil, rubble and plasterboard were introduced in September 2016, Members were advised that these had been closely monitored and were detailed in the report.
3. The Waste Operations Group Manager reported that the volume of fly-tipping collected by District & Borough Councils for disposal had fallen in the period April 2016 – January 2017. It had reduced by over 1,100 tonnes compared to the previous year saving the council £125,000 in disposal costs. This reduction has coincided with the launch of the fly-tipping prevention strategy in June 2016.
4. A Member sought clarification on whether there has been a decrease in the amount of recycling material collected at CRCs and asked for information on recycling at each CRC. The Member also asked if there had been an increase in queuing at CRCs, where opening days had been reduced. The Officer responded by confirming that there had been a reduction in green waste volumes between April 2016 and January 2017 and consequently a reduction in processing costs. Changes in volumes of other types of recycled materials were less significant,
5. It was noted by the Board that there had not be any particular complaints from the public about queuing as a result of the change in operating hours and queuing at CRCs. It was highlighted that since the introduction of the charging scheme, the sites had become less busy and the Officer advised that data could be drawn together to show vehicle counts at sites if necessary.
6. The Waste Operations Group Manager advised the Board that collecting data in relation to fly-tipping was inconsistent as Borough and Districts reported fly-tipping differently and getting this data accurate was a priority going forward.
7. Further to the above, the Officer informed the Board there was limited data regarding fly-tipping on private land as this information is not really collected by District and Borough Councils. This is an area that the new partnership and intelligence officer is seeking to understand more about, and has already been liaising with groups such as the National Trust and the Surrey Wildlife Trust.
8. A Member expressed the view that the Board should consider a more detailed report on each individual CRC site as it would be promote a broader and better understanding of the impact of changes to residents.

9. The Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning informed the Board that that the County Council had invested a lot of time into the creation of a fly-tipping strategy and was one of the only local authorities with a prevention strategy in place.
10. The Cabinet Member advised that reports by news outlets indicating that there was an increase in fly-tipping in the UK did not apply to Surrey and reinstated the fact that there was a reduction with a saving of £125,000 being made by the County Council.

Victoria Young left the meeting at 11:55am

11. A Member suggested that it would be useful to have data/figures on fly-tipping in each Borough and District. An officer had prepared this information, which was circulated to members. The Cabinet Member advised the Board that not all Borough and Districts collected data around fly-tipping in a consistent way however working collectively going forward would resolve this issue.
12. It was highlighted to the Board that the decision to accept debit/credit card payments only was made after the original consultation in 2015, as the public expressed a strong preference to debit/credit payments only. The Officer stated that the handling of cash transactions on site presented security concerns and additional costs.
13. A Member asked the Board to consider introducing a bottle bank scheme, whereby machines offered money in exchange for glass bottles. The Officer advised the Board that glass bottles did not necessarily have much value and a scheme like this would need Government backing and intervention.
14. The Cabinet Member for Highways, Flooding and Transport shared the view that a bottle scheme would be suitable for festivals, whereby bottles can be collected from festival goers.
15. It was highlighted that fly-tipping incident data was submitted via the Waste Data Flow reporting system to DEFRA by District and Boroughs. Officers indicated that although there was a recording system in place, collecting this data was difficult as recording was diverse and inconsistent throughout the county.
16. It was highlighted that where some District and Borough Councils had reported increases in incidents following the introduction of the charging waste scheme that construction and demolition waste related incidents did not show the same increase. The Officer therefore explained that these reported increases were not linked to the charging waste scheme.
17. The Waste Operations Group Manager explained that trends in fly-tipping were unpredictable however the key objective was in promoting the prevention message and reinforcing the campaign to continue positive results.

18. It was noted that a van permit scheme was in place at CRCs to prevent businesses abusing the service. Officers informed the Board that the service were looking into a number plate recognition system at CRC sites. A Member expressed the view that the scheme would be flawed for people who disposed of waste using a hired rental van.
19. Further to the above, Officers confirmed the Contact Centre was available as a fall back to obtain a permit for anyone who was having difficulty in accessing one online.
20. In an effort to stop fly tipping and tackle bogus waste carriers, Officers reported that they were working with Trading Standards to use Checktrade in conjunction with the waste carriers licence,
21. The Board were informed that the reuse shop in Leatherhead was producing an income of £7,000 per month, and that reuse shops at the CRCs in Woking, Whitley and Earlswood would be open shortly and would generate more income.
22. Officers identified Ebay as a great way to resell goods collected at CRCs and generate further profits. Members shared the view that Ebay was a good opportunity and would work going forward.
23. Officers were asked whether reusable furniture collected at CRCs was ever donated to charity. It was explained that the service has supported furniture reuse projects across the county and would continue to do so. Officers explained that furniture reuse projects did not necessarily always want the furniture collected at CRCs.
24. A Member suggested that there was an opportunity with composting green waste that was collected at sites to reduce disposal costs and informed the Board this was currently happening in Sutton. Officers explained that the County collect up to 30,000/40,000 tonnes of green waste and that composting this would require a lot of resources.
25. It was stated by the Cabinet Member for Highways, Flooding and Transport that district and boroughs were entitled to collect residential garden and bulky waste at an annual charge.

Zully Duff-Grant left the meeting at 12:45pm

Recommendations:

The Board noted and commented on the report.

Actions:

None.

9/17 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC [Item 9]

RESOLVED:

That under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following item(s) of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information under the relevant paragraphs of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

10/17 PARTIAL REFINANCING OF SURREY'S PFI WASTE CONTRACT [Item 10]

Witnesses:

Richard Parkinson, Waste Operations Group Manager
Nick Meadows, Change Consultant

Declarations of interest:

None.

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Chairman gave Members a brief summary to why this item had been included on the agenda. The Board agreed and noted the content of the report and supported Officers with next steps going forward.

Recommendations:

The Board noted the content of the report.

Actions:

None

11/17 DATE OF NEXT MEETING: THURSDAY 1 JUNE 2017 [Item 11]

The next meeting of the Economic Prosperity, Environment and Highways Board will be held on Thursday 1 June 2017 at 10.30am in the Ashcombe Suite, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames.

Meeting ended at: 1.00 pm

Chairman