

**MINUTES** of the meeting of the **COMMUNITIES, ENVIRONMENT AND HIGHWAYS SELECT COMMITTEE** held at 10.00 am on 14 June 2022 at Surrey County Council, Woodhatch Place, 11 Cockshot Hill, Reigate, Surrey, RH2 8.

These minutes are subject to confirmation by the Committee at its meeting on Thursday, 6 October 2022.

**Elected Members:**

- Catherine Baart
- \* Helyn Clack
- \* Stephen Cooksey
- Colin Cross
- \* Paul Deach (Vice-Chairman)
- \* Jonathan Essex
- \* John Furey
- \* David Harmer
- \* Jonathan Hulley
- \* Andy MacLeod (Vice-Chairman)
- Jan Mason
- \* Cameron McIntosh
- \* John O'Reilly (Chairman)
- \* Lance Spencer
- Keith Witham

(\* = in attendance)

**25/22 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]**

Apologies were received from Colin Cross, Helyn Clack substituted for Keith Witham and Jonathan Essex substituted for Catherine Baart.

**26/22 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS: 8 MARCH 2022 [Item 2]**

The minutes of the Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee held on 8 March 2022 were formally agreed as a true and accurate record of the meeting.

**27/22 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

Cameron McIntosh declared an interest in Item 5, A Devolution Deal for Surrey, noting his employment with the Department for Levelling Up Housing and Communities (DLUHC) and left the meeting for this item.

**28/22 QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS [Item 4]**

None received.

**29/22 A DEVOLUTION DEAL FOR SURREY [Item 5]**

Cameron McIntosh left the meeting at 10:07am

**Witnesses:**

Tim Oliver, Leader of the Council

Rebecca Paul, Deputy Cabinet Member for Levelling Up

Michael Coughlin, Executive Director Partnerships, Prosperity and Growth

**Key points raised during the discussion:**

1. Vice-Chairman inquired if the devolution deal would provide Surrey County Council (SCC) any meaningful powers and whether any such deal would be fully funded to allow delivery. The Leader of the Council informed that a Level 2 deal would not guarantee any new or additional funding. Two aspects that might bring some funding within a Level 2 deal were around skills and adult learning – funding was currently provided through Local Enterprise Partnerships Scheme (LEPs). A Level 2 deal would provide the County Council the powers and responsibility to address the SCC's key focus areas of growing a sustainable economy, tackling health inequality, enabling a greener future and empowering communities.
2. A Member asked for clarity around the specific powers that would be devolved. The Leader of the Council said that potential devolved powers identified by the government had been set out in the 'Devolution Deal for Surrey' paper with areas for further devolution to be discussed more broadly with the districts and boroughs.
3. A Member noted that the government had confirmed there would be no financial assistance to authorities to offset the powers devolved. The Leader of the Council said that devolution of the LEPs and adult education functions could bring with them pre-existing funding already available to them, this would be the only additional funding available through a Level 2 deal.
4. A Member queried if the SCC would submit a devolution bid if the districts and boroughs were not in agreement. The Leader of the Council noted that districts and boroughs had no right of veto, however following the positive engagement that had taken place following a programme of visits to various districts and boroughs to explain the deal, no opposition had been raised so far and the aim was to reach a unanimous approach.
5. The Member asked if Surrey County Council expected to take over any of the Shared Prosperity Fund (SPF) and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funding that were currently district funded sources. The Leader of the Council noted the SPF's priority of supporting economic development and SCC needed to consider this within functional economic areas on a county wide

level to achieve the greatest possible financial benefit. CIL funding was a matter for government to change or offer guidance on but the Leader of the Council noted the importance of using CIL to support the infrastructure and mitigate the impact of housing developments.

6. A Member asked for clarification regarding the transfer of LEP, SPF and CIL funding and enquired what would happen if all the districts and boroughs voted against a county deal. The Leader of the Council explained that examples of pots of money that may be included in a county deal had been provided to districts and boroughs and would follow conversations between all three tiers of government to ensure a wider benefit to residents. It was hoped that districts and boroughs would continue to engage positively and share the SCC's aims as part of a county deal.
7. The Chairman asked for clarity on the role of the LEPs and their position within a county deal. The Executive Director for Partnerships, Prosperity and Growth explained the discussions currently taking place with Coast to Capital and Enterprise M3, LEPs were? to join to create a singular offer in the Surrey Enterprise Hub. The proposal to bring the four main LEP local government functions was under discussion with districts and boroughs as well as economic development officers. These responsibilities would be assumed with the transferral of funding they have already received and the appropriate elements of that funding deployed at the most appropriate level.
8. The Chairman, in reference to the Level 2 powers noted in the report, asked what 'some local control of sustainable transport' meant in practice. The Leader of the Council noted that this could potentially include the ability to introduce bus franchising in addition to the transfer of taxi and private hire vehicle licensing to the upper tier authority.
9. The Chairman, in reference to the last bullet point on slide 10 'facilitating conditions for double devolution under a county deal' asked what those conditions would be in practice. The Leader of the Council explained that there was no commitment to particular functions but encouraging engagement with the districts and boroughs to identify their priorities was key.
10. A Member asked when the scrutiny of the suggested areas for focus noted on slide 27 would take place, as no business cases had been submitted to date. The Leader of the Council said that a detailed business case would be produced during the summer to come back to the Select Committee in the autumn.
11. A Member noted that the centralisation of taxi licencing powers and the Surrey Enterprise Hub had not been mentioned during

the recent consultation with Reigate and Banstead district. The Leader of the Council said that these were government suggestions and it was not yet known if SCC would be perusing them as part of a bid. The Leader of the Council reiterated that this was not a consultation with districts and boroughs, rather a conversation and the opportunity to explain and discuss the administration of any bid with feedback would be sought at the end of the process.

12. A Member, in reference to the Level 2 powers noted in the report ‘some local control of sustainable transport’ suggested the inclusion of fare setting powers to address inequality and provide more affordable public transport.
13. A Member asked if there were additional governance and scrutiny structures planned within the SCC. The Leader of the Council said that a conversation could be had if Members did not feel there was enough scrutiny by raising it with the Chairman of the Chair & Vice Chair Select Committee. A Member said that their question did not refer to current scrutiny but scrutiny and governance around the proposals that will be provided in the autumn as some areas would require separate focus and resources. The Chairman noted that the provision of further reports as mentioned by the Leader of the Council previously would steer this process.
14. A Member said that an update on the timelines from this point would be useful due to the changes expected going forward.
15. A Member asked what the barriers were to agreeing a deal with the government who were on record as saying that they want to secure a deal where Level 1, 2 and 3 powers are built in and asked for a commitment that SCC would work for a deal that includes all three levels of powers, meaningful to the residents of Surrey. The Leader of the Council said that the government were clear that to acquire Level 3 powers, a directly elected mayor, leader, or single accountable individual would be required, therefore subsuming all the Level 3 powers into a level 2 conversation would not work. It was expected that in a straightforward Level 2 deal, 80 per cent would be common to all authorities with the possibility that the other 20 per cent could be tailored to local circumstances. SCC would be ambitious in its submission with one bid based on the bill and a supplementary submission setting out the areas that would be beneficial for SCC to manage itself.
16. A Member questioned if SCC skills development would be advanced by going forward with a Level 2 bid. The Leader of the Council noted the skill shortage in many areas and said that a Level 2 deal would provide the responsibility, opportunity and

some funding into a local skills improvement plan to set out a clear path, this was currently being developed.

17. A Member asked if residents had been consulted regarding their thoughts on a democratically elected Mayor for Surrey. The Leader of the Council confirmed that there had been no discussion or consultation with residents and said that Members were free to request this course of action.

18. A Vice-Chairman noted concern regarding the ambitious timescale for this project and invited comments regarding this. The Leader of the Council said that there was nothing within the Level 2 powers that required SCC to change current processes.

**Resolved:**

The Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee:

1. Supports the objective of Surrey seeking a County Deal on the basis of Levels 1 and 2, agrees with the principal stakeholders identified, and the proposed timetable.
2. Commends a cautious assessment, including any future governance, of what a Level 2 County Deal for Surrey will mean in practice, particularly for residents, businesses, community groups and other stakeholders to avoid raising expectations that may not be satisfied. This should be reflected in all communications and engagements.
3. Requests that the Surrey County Council continues to bring boroughs and districts on board to develop a broader consensus in order to jointly support the journey for a County Deal.
4. Asks that an update report – including a timeline, further and specific details raised (CIL, LEP funding, transport, skills shortage and apprenticeships mapping across the county etc.) – be brought back to the Select Committee by October 2022.

Cameron McIntosh re-joined the meeting at 11:08am.

**30/22 ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT & INFRASTRUCTURE PERFORMANCE REVIEW (APRIL 2021 - MARCH 2022) [Item 6]**

**Witnesses:**

Matt Furniss, Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure

Marissa Heath, Cabinet Member for Environment

Katie Stewart, Executive Director, Environment, Transport and Infrastructure

Natalie Fiskin, Chief of Staff I Environment, Transport and Infrastructure

Jo Diggens, Planning, Performance and Improvement Manager

**Key points raised during the discussion:**

1. The Chairman thanked the officers for this important report. He noted the absence of a Key Performance Indicator (KPI) for carriageways in either red or amber condition and asked why performance was not rated higher considering the additional capital expenditure given to highways. The Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure explained that there was a backlog of £300 million and said that £40 million would need to be spent solely on roads to clear the backlog and maintain what has been achieved in recent years. The backlog was being actively addressed, and although the £50 million brought forward is dedicated to roads, the original highways funding included structures such as the drainage network and street columns in addition to roads and pavements. The Planning, Performance and Improvement Manager explained that the aim was to achieve a steady state and noted that the 35 per cent achieved was in line with the rest of the country.
2. The Chairman asked why Surrey County Council was aiming for a steady state rather than improvement. The Cabinet Member for Transport & Infrastructure clarified that with the latest increases in capital funding being made available for highways, SCC was looking to improve.
3. The Chairman asked if a limited addition of KPIs more specific to Surrey could be considered rather than relying on the national picture to reflect that Surrey County Council is achieving a steady state for roads and pavements. The Planning, Performance and Improvement Manager said that this could be broken down and there was potential for a target to be set to provide further information on how much of the road network is rated red.
4. A Member said that in a recent meeting of the Greener Futures Reference Group, it was reported that targets to achieve the overall programme had an amber rating. The Member noted the detailed suite of KPIs for the Greener futures activity would not be available until early 2023 and asked if this reflected the urgency required by the climate emergency passed almost three years ago. The Chief of Staff, Environment, Transport and Infrastructure explained that since publication of the report, data had recently been superseded and Members that attended the recent Greener Future Member Reference Group would have seen more up to date 2030 target data which became available last week. These latest figures show that Surrey County Council's organisational emissions have reduced by 27 per cent since the original baseline year of 2019/2020 when the aim had

been a 33 per cent reduction, and that did not mean that net zero would not be met by 2030 but a five to six per cent deviation was expected. The amber rating reflected that the programme was slightly behind the trajectory but remained achievable.

5. A Member asked if a KPI could be added to reflect the success of programmes to ensure successful communications and engagement with residents and communities. The Chief of Staff, Environment, Transport and Infrastructure invited suggestions for additional KPIs, particularly around the improvement and development of work planned around customers and engagement and the possible development of Greener Futures engagement to be included on the forward work plan with input from the Greener Future reference group if appropriate.
6. A Member noted that residents preferred that projects were completed before new ones began and asked when information regarding the next set of work rounds planned specifically through the Horizon programme would be available to share with residents. The Cabinet Member for Transport & Infrastructure confirmed that Horizon's future considerations were available by district through the interactive map on the Surrey County Council website
7. A Member asked if SCC should be making representations to the government regarding a possible shortfall in electricity generation due to the implementation of climate change objectives. The Cabinet Member for Transport & Infrastructure confirmed that discussions were already taking place with UK Power Networks due to Electric Vehicle Chargepoint roll-out as a country wide limitation for the delivery of such infrastructure has been identified.
8. A Member noted the 11 per cent increase in people killed or seriously injured on Surrey's roads due to an increase in vehicle speeds and suggested a KPI pointing to the strategic change required in terms of speeds on roads. The Cabinet Member for Transport & Infrastructure drew the committee's attention to the comments and trends on slide 11 of the report and noted that an increase in vehicle speeds had been identified during the pandemic when traffic was freer flowing and whilst the figure had increased in 2021 it was lower than 2019. The Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure considered the inclusion of a multi-year view as year-on-year reporting could be misleading. The Planning, Performance and Improvement Manager confirmed that a further breakdown of these figures could be provided if required.

9. A Member, in noting the report's reference to 11 per cent of materials collected for dry or mixed recycling not being recycled asked if recycling rates reported to the public could reflect the amount of waste recycled, not collected. The Executive Director, Environment, Transport and Infrastructure agreed that the overall picture was key to SCC's objective of reducing waste, and that this could be picked up as part of the Directorate's Rethinking Waste transformation programme. Clarity around that would be useful in addition to fully understanding what was being collected and how it could be reduced.
10. A Member said that the KPIs should include the amount of residual waste disposed of, regardless of it being incinerated or going to landfill. The Planning, Performance and Improvement Manager explained said that numerous measurements could be provided and agreed to provide Members with a variety of waste metrics if that was considered useful.
11. A Member, in referring to highways KPIs, said that the deterioration of road surfaces was often due to repeated utility works and suggested a KPI around conversations with the utilities companies to form a plan to reduce the number of times roads are dug up, thereby providing a coordinated data/KPI and prolonging the life of the surface.
12. A Member noted the reported number of trees planted and queried how the cutting down of trees had been factored in. The Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure confirmed that only diseased, dying or dangerous trees were cut down from the highway adding that over 1000 trees were lost due to storm damage resulting in a slight deficit. The Planning, Performance and Improvement Manager said that detailed net figures were being counted and could be provided if required. A Member requested a representative net figure was reported publicly so that it is meaningful. The Planning, Performance and Improvement Manager confirmed this would be possible.
13. A Member asked if the data provided in isolation, or the actions to be considered were to be scrutinised by the Committee. The Cabinet Member for Transport & Infrastructure said that it was for the Committee to decide if the suggested KPIs included in the report were useful, to decide which they would like regular reports to be measured against and to make suggestions for any new ones to be included.
14. A Vice-Chairman queried the red rating for workforce and customers on page 46 of the report linked to the National Highways and Transport Survey. The Planning, Performance and Improvement Manager agreed that the figure could be improved upon and a customer enquiry improvement

programme was underway. As part of this programme, positive feedback had been received from residents regarding works being carried out outside of properties and the level of response to defects reported.

15. A Vice-Chairman said that highways concerns were at the top of residents' complaints to elected members. As last year saw a major restructuring within the service, how were complaints now being measured and assessed. The Planning, Performance and Improvement Manager confirmed that as a result of the recent restructure, the focus was on the resources available with consistency being key. Information from the two stage complaints system was being analysed to better understand the reasons for complaints and response times to complaints. An Environment, Transport and Infrastructure customer dashboard was currently being designed to aid and improve the experience.
16. A Member, in referencing the financial sustainability quote on page 46 'we are expecting that only £1 million of the £3 million Green Homes Grant Local Authority Delivery (GHLAD) funding will be spent due to delays etc.' asked if the unspent £2 million would be lost. The Chief of Staff, Environment, Transport and Infrastructure confirmed that the un-spent £2 million would likely have to be returned. SCC identified that The South East Energy Hub had failed to procure a partner in time to deliver phase 2 at which point SCC put together a consortium bid directly to Action Surrey to spend the £1 million that is currently in the process of delivery. To prevent this occurring again, however, there is a plan to tender for a partner to manage all three-to-five-year contracts for future phases.
17. A Member said that despite repeated reassurances, several Community Recycling Centres (CRCs) still have very limited opening hours and asked what the programme was doing to address that. The Executive Director, Environment, Transport and Infrastructure confirmed that previous commitments around the consideration of opening hours were agreed to be picked up as part of the re-procurement process. The current integrated waste contract was due to end in September 2024 and further information would be brought back to the Select Committee as and when the re-procurement progressed.
18. A Member asked how the service was avoiding working in silos and ensuring a more holistic approach. The Cabinet Member for Transport and Highways confirmed that services were currently working together with planning, placemaking, highways and flooding.
19. A Member asked if a KPI around technology could be considered as this was a way forward for Surrey as an ambitious

County Council. The Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure said that a KPI around technology or innovation could be investigated.

20. A Vice-Chairman queried if pavements were classified as a separate category for performance and asked what was being done to improve pavements in the county, considering the Surrey County Council's priorities on active travel, health and wellbeing, and environmental factors. The Planning, Performance and Improvement Manager confirmed that pavements were measured separately to the carriageway. There were two programmes for pavements, preventative and reconstruction and more detailed information regarding these could be shared if Members would find it useful.
21. A Vice-Chairman asked what indicators were there to source appropriate funding to identify and target the most easily achieved set of tasks as soon as possible. The Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure said that meetings with the districts and boroughs were being organised to discuss joint strategic priorities for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) bids from the County Council. These regular meetings would ensure bids were ready for the funding rounds. The Executive Director, Environment, Transport and Infrastructure added that attracting external funding was critical to SCC's plans, hence two indicators that were already being developed and were included under the financial sustainability theme and priority header. The Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure encouraged Members to identify where improvements can be delivered more quickly.
22. A Member noted that the £100,000 Member Fund could not be spent on pavements because apparently there was no resource to do the work.
23. A Member asked if there would be a carbon budget for the next financial year and would there be a budget item for carbon that was measured monthly or quarterly in the same area. The Executive Director, Environment, Transport and Infrastructure confirmed that a carbon budget was being developed and would be made available alongside the development of the Council's 23/24 budget with the aim of being a council wide target and monitored by the directorate.
24. A Member noted that some of the climate change KPIs were not available until recently and queried when they would be scrutinised. The Chief of Staff, Environment, Transport and Infrastructure confirmed that the report being prepared for Cabinet in October would come back to the Select Committee, containing more detailed metrics and actions.

25. A Member, in referring to the two climate change deadlines of 2030 and 2050 noted the high level of detail to scrutinise and asked if targets around both with reports would be possible. The Chief of Staff, Environment, Transport and Infrastructure agreed to work with Members to provide the information required.
26. The Chairman asked if SCC could have acted earlier to prevent the loss of the £2 million GHLAD funding. The Chief of Staff, Environment, Transport and Infrastructure said that SCC had allowed South Eastern Energy Hub to do what they had set out to do and action was taken as soon as indication of the non-procurement was realised, the short funding window exacerbated the situation. Action to implement a three to five year more stable position would avoid a repeat of this. The Executive Director, Environment, Transport and Infrastructure noted that as part of an innovative approach to accessing funding and procuring different services, new territories were being encountered and to innovate, lessons would have to be learnt along the way.

**Resolved:**

The Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee:

1. Welcomes the broad and credible KPIs produced by Environment, Transport and Infrastructure (ETI) Directorate as valuable tools for elected members and residents to monitor performance.
2. Shares the concerns, specifically on funding, waste and customer satisfaction, marked as red and to be confirmed (TBC) and expects an even greater focus on improvement in these areas. Notes that the greener futures/climate indicators will be brought back to the full committee in October 2022 as part of climate change delivery plan report and the carbon budget to sit alongside the council's budget.
3. Requests a performance update report on an annual basis be provided to the CEH Select Committee with the waste metrics aligned with national statistics in the next update.
4. Urges the service to explore more ways to tap into local knowledge whilst – where possible – learning from similar work undertaken by other authorities to promptly deliver on relatively easily achieved tasks first.
5. Asks that, if not already in place, relevant KPIs and targets be developed to reflect the urgency on climate emergency and other comments made by Members of the Select Committee, e.g., KPI around innovation and technology; targets for carriageways; road safety; communication and engagement under Greener Futures; in

Highways, transport and other service areas to ensure implementation of Local Transport Plan 4 as quickly as possible. Also, information be provided about net trees planted; utilities/maintenance work undertaken; progress on carbon budget, CIL and other funding sources. Notes that in some cases, presentation of multi-year data would be more useful.

6. Expresses concern on the loss of 2/3 of the £3 million GHLAD grant to retrofit low-income homes but notes that three-to-five-year strategic procurement arrangements have been established to avoid this happening again, and that a new £12.2 million grant to retrofit low-income housing across Surrey will be starting soon.
7. Suggests that in future the Directorate set out what is being put in place to address concerns raised to improve performance across the directorate in these different areas.

#### **31/22 MINERALS & WASTE LOCAL PLAN [Item 7]**

##### **Witnesses:**

Matt Furniss, Cabinet Member for Transport & Infrastructure

Katie Stewart, Executive Director, Environment, Transport and Infrastructure

Lee Parker, Director of Planning, Infrastructure and Major Projects

Caroline Smith, Planning Group Manager

Dustin Lees, Minerals & Waste Policy Team Leader

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

1. The Chairman commended the considerable effort made with regards to the consultation. He asked if the service was content with the response received and was it representative sample. The Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure said that he was satisfied with the feedback for this part of the long process. Stakeholders were not usually enthusiastic until the later stages of the process when locations were discussed and this was the expectation in this case. Themes emerging from the considerable work done by the team to engage hard to reach groups were consistent with general representational feedback. The Executive Director, Environment, Transport and Infrastructure said that recognition that however accessible a consultation, there were certain demographics that would remain unlikely to engage. The Directorate had embraced this and a small amount of spending had been put into the commissioned focus groups, which alongside the more traditional routes for consultation, would ensure that the Directorate is able to access a representative view of its work going forward – a hybrid approach to consultation that the Directorate is keen to develop further.

2. A Member noted commentary received directly from residents who attended the Addlestone library session on the 4th of March 2022 said that “it was only held a matter of days before consultation phase one closed and left little time for residents to incorporate what they had learned from the session into their responses” The Member asked for assurances that more public consultations would be taken into account. The Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure gave an assurance that this would be the case.
3. A Member noted that the regeneration bill references a minerals and waste plan for every local authority with responsibility for its delivery. Given that the next phase of public consultation for this preferred option was due to be considered and progressed in June 2023, a Member queried if there was a sense of urgency to be considered or was the 12-month delay as a result of what was included in the draft legislation acceptable. The Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure explained that the 12-month period was to deliver the technical work necessary to prepare that draft plan for the preferred options and public consultation material.
4. A Member noted that 2011 Minerals Plan currently in place was over 10 years old and when set against the revised national planning framework, was weakened every day. Several major planning applications involving minerals would be put at risk given that the new plan would not be implemented for at least two years. The Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure accepted that the existing plan was out of date but confirmed that it was reviewed in 2014 and again in 2019 against soundness and conformity to the Mineral Plan (MPF) and both reviews concluded that no changes were required.
5. A Member said that to deliver minerals and waste sustainably, proactive planning for specific requirement was required such as proactive planning where renewable energy went alongside the constraining policies. The Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure confirmed that this would be factored in because there was a need to consider what was being planned and the location. The plan was being considered as a circular economy, ensuring a minimal carbon footprint and Greener Futures was interwoven throughout although the government had not ruled out oil and gas based on the current events.
6. The Chairman requested that the committee be engaged in the process to add value and become fully involved in the decision by which a preferred option is decided. The Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure agreed.

**Resolved:**

The Community, Environment and Highways Select Committee noted the report.

**32/22 RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKER AND FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME [Item 8]**

The Select Committee noted the Recommendation Tracker and the Forward Work Programme.

**33/22 DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING: 6 OCTOBER 2022 [Item 9]**

The Committee noted its next meeting would be held on 6 October 2022.

Meeting ended at: 12:25pm

---

**Chairman**