

MINUTES of the meeting of the **COMMUNITIES, ENVIRONMENT AND HIGHWAYS SELECT COMMITTEE** held at 10.00 am on 5 October 2023 at .

These minutes are subject to confirmation by the Committee at its meeting on Monday, 4 December 2023.

Elected Members:

Catherine Baart
Steve Bax (Vice-Chairman)
John Beckett
Liz Bowes
Stephen Cooksey
Jonathan Hulley (Chairman)
Andy MacLeod
Jan Mason
Cameron McIntosh
Lance Spencer (Vice-Chairman)
Richard Tear
Buddhi Weerasinghe
Keith Witham

27/22 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Cllr Liz Bowes and Cllr Keith Witham

28/22 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS: 5 JULY 2023 [Item 2]

The minutes were agreed as a true record of the meeting.

29/22 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

None received.

30/22 QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS [Item 4]

1. There was one question received from Barbara Rogers. A response had been provided and sent to the member of the public.
2. A Member noted that attendance for public questions would be better if there were still local committees.

31/22 CLIMATE CHANGE DELIVERY PLAN ANNUAL UPDATE [Item 5]

Witnesses:

Marisa Heath, Cabinet Member for Environment
Katie Stewart, Executive Director for Environment, Transport and Infrastructure
Carolyn McKenzie, Director, Environment
Katie Sargent, Greener Futures Group Manager
Cat Halter, Climate Change Strategic Lead

Key Discussions:

General

1. The Cabinet Member for Environment summarised the 2030 and 2050 targets of the Council and affirmed the Council 's ambitions to reaching those targets. There were many challenges in reaching the targets including the national policy context, grid infrastructure and funding. The Cabinet Member paid tribute to the work of the team which was recognised nationally. The Executive Director for Environment, Transport and Infrastructure added that the work was increasingly a cross-county, cross-Council endeavour and highlighted the strong partnerships in place.
2. A Member asked the Cabinet Member if recent Government announcements would derail progress towards net zero targets. The Cabinet Member said the context was challenging but the Council was committed to reaching its goals. Changes to national vehicle decarbonisation timelines were unhelpful. The Climate Change Strategic Lead added that the Climate Change Committee highlighted in their June report that the current government framework was not sufficient for reaching future targets for electric vehicles. Recent national announcements weakened carbon policies around vehicles, home insulation and gas heating and would negatively impact the Council 's ability to meet its targets. Reforms related to the grid were positive but would only be effective if planning laws were strengthened. A Member asked if it was better that more achievable targets were set. The Cabinet Member for Environment said that there was a willingness within business and the public to press ahead with the agenda.

Progress Towards Council 2030 Target

3. The Chairman noted that the assessment of the 2030 target was *Green on track with risk* and asked if this was an accurate reflection. The Cabinet Member for Environment confirmed it was but acknowledged a degree of risk. Good progress had been made on streetlighting and decarbonising the Council estate which made up for 91% of the target. The Greener Futures Group Manager expressed confidence that the service would achieve the 2030 target.
4. A Member noted that activity and investment should be driven by impact and asked if it would be possible to give an impact assessment to increase understanding of which activities or projects would make the biggest difference to reducing carbon. The Climate Change Strategic Lead noted that this would be difficult. Creating a rating had not been achievable to date, but impact was considered strongly across all actions. It was important to reflect the level of control and ability of the local authority to act.
5. The Director of Environment added that with limited resources, the Council was continually looking at how to maximise impact by collaborating with partners the support of the Greener Futures Reference Group was welcomed.
6. A Member raised concerns about the new street lighting in her area and queried if they had turned dimmer over time. The Executive

Director for Environment, Transport and Infrastructure offered to hold a conversation with Cllr Mason regarding this issue.

2030 Key Projects

7. A Member asked how the Council would assist boroughs and districts on decarbonising fleet waste vehicles due to their high costs. The Climate Change Strategic Lead noted that the 2030 target only covered vehicles owned and operated by the Council. There were only a few low carbon options commercially available. The Council would work with local authorities to help them consider potential solutions.
8. The Director of Environment explained that the Surrey Environment Partnership was looking at what could be funded and done with boroughs and districts. The Cabinet Member for Environment noted that decarbonisation of fleets would only be considered at the end of life of a fleet. A Member asked if it was realistic to decarbonise fire service vehicles by shifting to hydrogen vehicles or offsetting. The Climate Change Strategic Lead said there were no low carbon commercially available fire vehicles currently but would be open to new decarbonised vehicles on the market.
9. The Chairman asked why progress on decarbonising the Council fleet had stalled. The Climate Change Strategic Lead answered that 450 vehicles were owned and operated by the Council. A new procurement, management approach was needed as well as new policies and the creation of a fleet management unit. Once these were in place, fleet decarbonisation could progress. The Cabinet Member for Environment emphasised that Surrey was only looking to change vehicles at their end of life.
10. A Member asked how the public could be encouraged to take up active travel. The Cabinet Member for Environment said more needed to be done to raise awareness around what it was and to encourage uptake. The Executive Director for Environment, Transport and Infrastructure noted that having attracted funding to improve infrastructure for active travel, the Service was trying to work with the communications team and external partners to consider how to reach people best.
11. A Member asked a question on school travel and the difficulty of changing behaviours. The Executive Director for Environment, Transport and Infrastructure noted that it was a challenging topic, and the safety element was critical in creating infrastructure that worked with children and created best practices such as walking and biking. It must be sold to the public as a choice. The Cabinet Member for Environment stressed that this was also a social issue, if the infrastructure was put in place, then behaviour changes would occur.
12. A Member asked a question on the Council Retrofit programme and why currently only 7 buildings had been retrofitted against a goal of 200 by 2030. The Greener Futures Group Manager answered that decarbonising buildings was a lengthy process. 83 were currently being assessed for retrofit potential with a funding bid for a further 20 buildings. The Service was collaborating closely with Land & Property

who were working up an asset strategy which would be completed by March 2024 and would be updated annually. The Director of Environment stressed that fully decarbonising would rely on the grid which was out of the Council's remit and could delay projects by up to 8 months.

13. The Member asked if building retrofit would still be red this time next year. The Cabinet Member for Environment said that there was full confidence in the plan and the ambition was for it to be green although there were dependencies on funding and the budget priorities.
14. A Member asked a question on carbon literacy training for staff. The Cabinet Member confirmed that 3357 staff members had completed the carbon awareness training. The Climate Change Strategic Lead noted that there were two levels of carbon training at the Council: an online course that all new starters complete and a one-day carbon literacy course. The carbon literacy pilot programme was aimed at the senior leadership team who had all completed it. Some pledges as part of the training have had a positive real-life impact. The Cabinet Member for Environment noted that there were issues around Member uptake on training.
15. A Member asked what the total target figures were for the Council's corporate 2030 target. The Climate Change Strategic Lead answered that the aim was a 40% carbon reduction by 2025 compared to the 2019 baseline. In the last four years, a 34% reduction in carbon emissions had been achieved and the Council was on track to meet the 2030 target.
16. The Chairman asked a question on the effectiveness of the Greener Futures Board. The Cabinet Member for Environment noted that the matter was under consideration. The Board needed to become more a mechanism for delivery. A new co-chair position had been created, Professor Lorenzo Fioramonti from the centre of sustainability at the University of Surrey had been appointed and would bring a level of independence. The Board was looking to diversify by having local authority, businesses, and nature group representatives. The Director of Environment noted that it was key to ensure that the Greener Futures Board was linked with boards like the Growth Board.

Progress Towards Surrey's 2050 Target

17. A Member asked a question on low carbon busses. The Assistant Director, Strategic Transport said that the Council was on track to over-deliver and by 2025 was projected to have 101 low carbon busses. The Service was also in discussion with four local bus companies to discuss future opportunities. The Member asked how many busses were operating in Surrey. The Assistant Director answered that around 700 buses operated in Surrey and on cross border routes covering contracted and commercial services.
18. A Member noted that transport emissions accounted for 41% of Surrey's emissions and asked about the barriers to progress. The Assistant Director, Strategic Transport said that key challenges were current behaviours and choices by residents and businesses. There

was a need for behaviour change and better engagement with local businesses.

19. A Member asked why there were only 134 EV charging ports, but the target was for 1700 delivered by 2050. The Greener Futures Group Manager noted that 190 would have been installed before the end of 2023 and that number would grow rapidly over the next five years. The Member asked where the 10,000 by 2030 target came from. The Climate Change Strategic Lead noted it was based on total publicly available charge points needed relating to demand and the number would be updated shortly.
20. A Member noted that targeted behaviour change must target the right people to influence behaviours and not disadvantage people with disabilities. The Cabinet Member for Environment agreed that infrastructure must improve, and the Service was not expecting anyone with health conditions to stop making car journeys if that was the best choice of transport for them.
21. A Member asked a question on the effect of Gatwick's potential expansion on journeys through Surrey and Surrey's emissions. The Assistant Director, Strategic Transport agreed that expansions would have a negative impact on emissions and the Council must work closely with relevant parties to ensure sustainable plans are developed. A Member noted that Farnborough airport was also looking to expand. The Cabinet Member for Environment noted that although the airport was in Hampshire, the Council was working with groups on this issue also.
22. A Member asked a question on fuel poor and vulnerable households, 1380 had been treated with funding for a further 200 in place. What percentage did this represent of Surrey? The Cabinet Member answered 7%. The Greener Futures Group Manager said that this was a big priority for the Council although it costs a lot to decarbonise homes and there was no return on investment. The Service was considering how to attract and generate income to fund the programme. For households not vulnerable but poor, the scheme was exploring how to support these households by creating events in key neighbourhoods where people could access free advice and food. The Cabinet Member noted that organisations like Draft Busters do a lot around Surrey to help households with minimising heating loss.
23. A Member asked what the interaction was between Surrey and local boroughs on decarbonisation to address energy efficiencies. The Climate Change Strategic Lead noted that the Council was working proactively with Boroughs and Districts on this. The plan was to develop evidence and guidance to be applied to all new builds in the development of local housing plans.
24. The Cabinet Member for Environment noted a Member's point that Member's should be better engaged with EV charging point rollout in their constituencies.
25. The Chairman asked a question on community engagement events taking place across Surrey. The Cabinet Member for Environment

clarified that community engagement was different than behaviour change. Behaviour change was a long-term goal and achieved through communicating concise and consistent messaging. The Director of Environment echoed that many engagements had taken place, and the service needed to work out how to turn those interactions to positive and sustained change.

26. There was a discussion on the Committee's proposed recommendations. The Cabinet Member for Environment said that the Council had been recognised nationally for hard work on its progress to NetZero and that should be reflected in the recommendations

27. The Chairman thanked all witnesses for their work.

Actions/requests for further information:

1. ETI officers would follow up with Cllr Jan Mason on the issues raised in regard to street lighting in her area.
2. The Assistant Director, Strategic Transport and Cllr Catherine Baart to hold a discussion on the Gatwick Airport expansion plan.

Recommendations:

That the Communities Environment and Highways Select Committee

1. Welcomes the progress made overall and in particular the significant progress made at Surrey Council level and the range of achievements to date including 6kt reduction in carbon emissions, £2.5M of annual bill savings, £5M of additional funding and 0.3MW of solar power.
2. Recognises the challenging national policy context and the difficulty changing attitudes locally but urges continued drive and ambition in those areas that Surrey does control including Council building retrofit, aspects of EV rollout, solar PV on schools and leased buildings and carbon literacy training for Council staff.
3. Recommends that a greater sense of prioritisation of projects (based on impact/cost) was reflected in Delivery Plan documentation given the resource constraints the Council was facing over the medium-term financial period. This would help decision makers assess what matters most and which areas of slippage are of greatest concern. Changes to be made by *December 2024* and considered by the Greener Futures Reference Group.
4. Recommends governance structure be revisited including role and future of the Greener Futures Board, by end 2023.

Andy Macleod arrived at 10:09

Lance Spencer arrived at 19:11

32/22 SURREY TRANSPORT PLAN (LTP4) DELIVERY PLAN [Item 6]

Witnesses:

Matt Furniss, Cabinet Member for Transport, Infrastructure and Growth

Katie Stewart, Executive Director – Environment, Transport & Infrastructure

Paul Millin, Assistant Director, Strategic Transport

Lucy Monie, Director, Highways and Transport

Steve Howard, Transport Strategy Manager, Environment, Transport & Infrastructure

Key points made in the discussion:

General

1. The Chairman asked a question on the impact of delays in the development of the Surrey Transport Plan. The Transport Strategy Manager, Environment, Transport & Infrastructure said that the Council had been waiting 18 months for the Department for Transport to issue guidance and an associated carbon reduction toolkit . The Cabinet Member had written to the Secretary of State. The response would be shared with the Committee.
2. A Member asked how national attitudes would affect motivations for delivery. The Cabinet Member emphasised that the service was offering residents as many sustainable transport options as possible. The Member noted that some residents had encountered issues with EV cables running over pavements. This was considered an obstruction. The Cabinet Member explained that the Trojan Trial Project which allowed residents to charge their vehicles by way of a gully laid across the pavement. A trial was underway. The Cabinet Member agreed to revert to the Member with the cost to resident of implementing this approach.

Delivery Plan Approach

3. A Member asked a question about pace of delivery of the Transport Plan – numbers of car movements in Surrey had increased not decreased. The Cabinet Member said that progress was being made where there was public support for example for walking and electric biking schemes. The Executive Director for Environment, Transport and Infrastructure noted that even though there was no formal delivery plan yet in place, delivery was nonetheless taking place.
4. A Member asked if the Council would bid for additional funding for the Transport Plan. The Cabinet Member for Transport, Infrastructure and Growth answered that HS2 diverted funds would be bid for by the Council for major infrastructure improvements. Additionally, the Council had recently been awarded £3.9 billion for bus services in Surrey and the £2 bus cap fare remained in place.

Engagement

5. A Member asked how consultation could be managed in the context of residents feeling that car ownership was under attack. The Cabinet Member stressed that motorists were not being attacked. A new and slower co-design process was being adopted. This involved longer and more thorough consultation to make sure residents were on board with any plans.

Governance, Monitoring & Measuring Success

6. A Member asked a question on what measures might be considered to make short car journeys less attractive. A range of possible options were flagged including reducing parking, traffic calming and management measures and road user charging. The Cabinet Member emphasised that this was not currently under consideration. The Member also asked how the Council would define the acceptable level of public support from residents for any new measures. The Cabinet Member answered that Councillors had an important role in deciding what was acceptable in their division. An effective codesign process was critical.
7. A Member asked a question on the timeline of the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans (LCWIPs) for all districts and boroughs. The Transport Strategy Manager said that the plan would be completed by 2024 as there was a 5 stage Department for Transport process. The Member noted that most of these plans were centred around town centres and asked about cycling infrastructures in those areas. The Transport Policy Team Manager noted that the Local Cycling and Walking Improvement Plan addressed the issue. Local street improvements would improve connectivity from people's front door to their destination. Connectivity across Surrey was the biggest consideration. The Cabinet Member noted that space was an issue, but allocation of space was still being considered between motorists, walkers, and cyclists.
8. A Member asked a question on cycling lanes. The Cabinet Member stressed the importance of providing infrastructure for residents to have the option to choose their mode of transport.

Delivery Progress

9. A Member asked if the EV rollout was too ambitious considering the lack of progress. The Cabinet Member noted that non-EV vehicles could park in EV spaces in some town centre and residential locations. The Transport Policy Team Manager noted that the original pilot EV scheme had issues, but the service had developed a road map with government bodies that laid out how to deliver infrastructure. The Member asked if the plan was being developed in Tandridge and pushed for a rollout in rural locations. The Cabinet Member said less commercially viable areas like rural locations were targeted by the Council through subsidised funding.
10. The Cabinet Member answered a question to a Member regarding transport measures in residential areas. Measures were being put in

place in residential areas only with resident's support and measures including lower speeds in school and residential areas, healthy streets – planting trees, minimal impact on motorists but high impact on walkers and cyclists. The Transport Strategy Manager answered the Member's question on Key Performance Indicators and said that local data monitoring would need to take place.

11. A Member asked a question on public support for liveable neighbourhoods. The Cabinet Member said that it would depend on area to area and stressed the importance of addressing the root issues and creating solutions. The Member asked a question on the compatibility of the Carbon Assessment Tool from the DfT. The Transport Strategy Manager noted that based on draft forms seen, the service was hopeful on compatibility.
12. A Member asked a question on the adaptability of on demand bus services. Could local intelligence be fed into the design of services. The Assistant Director, Strategic Transport said that the busses were designed to meet the needs of the community and had built in flexibility to meet requirements. Local bus services were less flexible, but where there was a notable change in demand, bus services could be adapted through operator and Council collaboration to meet the demand.
13. A member asked a question on road safety outside of schools. The Assistant Director, Strategic Transport said just under 10% of schools had been earmarked for improvement, funded from a £3 million Council investment over three years. The Member noted that parent parking was a major issue for children walking in and out of schools and asked if drop off area's being banned was still the Council's policy. The Assistant Director, Strategic Transport said drop off points at schools could create large traffic lines and congestion. The Service preferred to identify 'Park and Stride' sites a short distance from the school, which decentralised the issue of congestion.
14. A Member asked a question on the process of safety routes to schools. The Assistant Director, Strategic Transport Group Manager answered that the Safer Travel Team assess the safety of routes to schools to identify issues, making recommendations for improvements .
15. A Member raised concerns over Danetree Primary School's road safety. The Cabinet Member for Transport, Infrastructure and Growth offered to hold a conversation with Cllr Mason.
16. The Chairman asked a question on Highway Maintenance policies and if there was appetite to align the Highway Maintenance with cycling routes. The Director of Highways and Transport answered that there were currently many footways that were being assessed and the aim was to create more footways that could be categorised highly. Cycleways were also being assessed. The team had also been identifying areas for increasing the number of bus stops.
17. A Member asked when the report on footways would be shared. The Director answered that the aim was for the end of 2023.

Actions/requests for further information:

1. The Cabinet Member for Transport, Infrastructure and Growth would share the response regarding guidance and the carbon reduction toolkit from the Secretary of State and the Transport Minister when received.
2. The Cabinet Member for Transport, Infrastructure and Growth to share with the Committee the cost to residents of EV charging pavement gulleys currently being piloted under project Trojan.
3. The Assistant Director, Strategic Transport to hold a conversation with Cllr Richard Tear on on-demand busses.
4. The Cabinet Member for Transport, Infrastructure and Growth to advise Cllr Jan Mason on actions to improve road safety for Danetree Primary School.

Recommendations:

That the Communities Environment and Highways Select Committee:

1. Endorses the proposed approach to developing the plan, specifically that it would include *a prioritised programme of measures and interventions* supported by a clear *prioritisation process and funding strategy*. These would be vital in maximising the effectiveness of spend and ensuring carbon reductions can be maximised in a resource constrained environment.
2. Supports the proposed annual progress report and ongoing involvement of the Select Committee and the alignment of the Surrey Transport Plan Delivery Plan cycle to the Climate Change Delivery Plan (noting that the former was the single most critical component of the latter and that if it fails, so too does the Climate plan).
3. Recommends that an update was provided to members on progress aligning Highways Maintenance and Inspection policies and procedures with LTP4 by end 2023; and that this be combined with the update that the Cabinet Member had already committed to provide Council members on the Task & Finish Programme (Streets and Environment Services) if appropriate.

33/22 RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKER AND FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME [Item 7]

Key points made in the discussion:

1. A Member raised concern over the role of scrutiny in private session groups and asked for all members to see the reports and outcomes of Task & Finish groups.
2. A Member echoed that he was unhappy with the report that came out at the last session. The Chairman expressed agreement that all Member's should have the opportunity to see the outcomes of Task &

Finish groups and expected the leader of the Council to offer clarity at the next Full Council meeting.

34/22 DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING: 4 DECEMBER 2023 [Item 8]

The next Committee meeting will be held on Monday 4 December 2023.

Meeting ended at: 12:51

Chairman

Question submitted by Barbara Rogers, Monday, September 11, 2023

The attached article in the Farnham Herald in July this year, reports on a speed camera project, funded by East Hants District Council, aimed at combatting dangerous speeding in that area. The project proposes **fixed cameras running 24/7**, monitored by volunteers with the data then passed onto the police. Whilst there is a Speed Watch scheme operating in Surrey, the East Hants scheme is a much better scheme: it has the full backing of the local district council and the cameras are fixed, thus gathering much more data, in particular, of those drivers who offend later into the evening. I witness this sort of behaviour every single day on Castle Street in Farnham.

Why can't Surrey implement a similar scheme to deal with the exact same issue in adjacent West Surrey and no doubt further afield throughout the county?

[East Hants leader: Full speed ahead with our plans to catch speedsters | farnhamherald.com](https://www.farnhamherald.com)

Answer:

Faster vehicle speeds increase the risk of collisions and makes the consequences far worse. Speeding vehicles also deter more walking and cycling and can make places less pleasant to live in due to increased noise and air pollution. More local authorities, including Surrey County Council, are adopting the best practice "Safe Systems" approach to improving road safety. This approach asserts the principle that road users will make mistakes, yet at the same time people have a right to safe and healthy mobility. Therefore, it is the responsibility of organisations to work together collaboratively to make the entire road system as safe as possible for all road users. A key priority of this approach is safe vehicle speeds.

Surrey County Council works closely with Surrey Police through the Surrey Road Safe Partnership to develop local speed management plans for each of Surrey's eleven Districts or Boroughs. This means that whenever there are concerns about speeding at a location, we will go and measure the speeds using a device called a speed detection radar. This is a box that is mounted on street furniture such as a lamp column, without most people knowing it is there or what it is for. We have a full-time member of staff dedicated to deploying these devices to collect anonymous data on vehicle speeds for a week. This information is then combined with data on road collisions resulting in injury recorded by the police to ascertain the extent and nature of the speeding and road safety problem at each site. Information on the locations of collisions resulting in injury can be viewed via [CrashMap](#).

Our road safety specialists then meet periodically with Surrey Police's road safety specialists to discuss and agree which sites need the most attention, and what the most appropriate intervention will be. The advantage of this process is that we can collect speed data wherever and whenever we want in Surrey, without being reliant on community groups and volunteers (who will need training) or risk assessments for when volunteers wish to deploy camera equipment. Consequently, we now have comprehensive speed data for over one thousand sites throughout Surrey, and an ongoing active, prioritised programme of interventions agreed with the police. More information on how we do this can be found here: [Managing speeds on Surrey's roads - Surrey County Council \(surreycc.gov.uk\)](https://www.surreycc.gov.uk)

The interventions we use range from traffic calming, permanent average speed cameras, spot speed cameras, vehicle activated signs police officer enforcement or community speed watch. Last year Surrey County Council allocated an additional £3million for investment in speed management measures at sites with a history of collisions and where speeding has been shown to be endemic. More information can be found here: [Agenda for Cabinet](#)

[Member for Transport, Infrastructure and Growth Decisions on Monday, 27 June 2022, 11.30 am - Surrey County Council \(surreycc.gov.uk\)](#)

Looking specifically at Farnham, following speed assessments carried out as part of the Farnham Infrastructure Programme, it is proposed to reduce the existing 30 mph speed limit to 20mph in and around Farnham town centre. The extent of the proposed new 20 mph speed limit in the town centre, including Castle Street, aims to provide consistency of speed limit and align the proposals with best practice to contribute to an effective positive change of character and improved accessibility. Signage and road marking for the new 20mph speed limit are due to be installed in October 2023.

As part of the Farnham Town Centre Improvements scheme, the design proposal allows for raised crossing points mid-way in Castle Street and at its junction with the Borough, these along with widened footways, can give the impression of a more confined road and further result in reduced speeds.

The new 20mph speed limit aim to make a significant difference to traffic speed throughout Farnham and provide a more controlled traffic environment within the town centre. The reduced vehicle speeds will also contribute to improved road safety for all users, creating an improved environment for active travel within the area. This aims to encourage more short trips by walking and cycling, generating an improvement in the health of residents and visitors. This will support delivery of our net zero carbon objectives by helping residents move to active travel modes, coupled with a reduction in noise pollution on sensitive receptors such as residential properties and schools, and improved public perception of safety on footways and carriageways.

More information on the Farnham Infrastructure Programme can be found via this link: [Have Your Say Today - Farnham Infrastructure Programme - Commonplace](#)