

MINUTES of the meeting of the **ENVIRONMENT & TRANSPORT SELECT COMMITTEE** held at 10.00am on Wednesday 19 September 2012 at County Hall, Kingston upon Thames.

These minutes are subject to confirmation by the Select Committee at its meeting on 8 November 2012.

Members:

- * Steve Renshaw (Chairman)
- * Mark Brett-Warburton (Vice-Chairman)
- * Victor Agarwal
- * Mike Bennison
- * Stephen Cooksey
- * Will Forster
- * Chris Frost
- * Pat Frost
- * David Goodwin
- * Simon Gimson
- A Frances King
- * Geoff Marlow
- * Chris Norman
- * Tom Phelps-Penry
- * Michael Sydney
- A Alan Young

Ex officio Members:

Mrs Lavinia Sealy (Chairman of the Council)
Mr David Munro (Vice-Chairman of the Council)

Substitute Members:

- * Mrs Margaret Hicks

In attendance:

- * John Furey (Cabinet Member for Environment & Transport)

* = present
A = apologies

PART 1

IN PUBLIC

50/12 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Frances King and Alan Young. Mrs Margaret Hicks substituted for Frances King.

51/12 **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (19 JULY 2012) [Item 2]**

The minutes were agreed as an accurate record of the meeting.

52/12 **DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS [Item 3]**

Michael Sydney declared a personal interest in Item 7 on account of being the Chairman of the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) Board. It was confirmed that this was not a pecuniary interest.

53/12 **QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS [Item 4]**

There were no questions or petitions to report.

54/12 **RESPONSE BY THE EXECUTIVE TO ISSUES REFERRED BY THE SELECT COMMITTEE [Item 5]**

Key points raised during the discussion:

- There were two responses to report, the response to the interim report of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Task Group and the response to Committee's recommendation that the Council should develop a water management policy. The Committee was pleased with the responses provided.
- The Cabinet Member had requested that Officers in the Environment Service draft a policy position on water management to be considered by the Environment and Transport Select Committee within six months.

55/12 **FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME AND RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKER [Item 6]**

Key points raised during the discussion:

- Some Members expressed concern that the item on Tree Maintenance had been deferred to the next meeting. The Chairman stated that when the item came to Committee in April 2012, Officers acknowledged that tree maintenance had not been prioritised as it should. The November meeting would provide an opportunity for Members to continue to drive progress in this area.
- It had been agreed with Cabinet that the Countryside Task Group would report its findings to the Committee in March 2013 rather than January 2013, due to the large scope of the project.
- Pat Frost raised concerns regarding the Permit scheme, as she felt that it was cutting across the remit of the Utilities Task Group for which she is the Chairman. The Cabinet Member stated that he would look into the issue and ensure the task group had the opportunity to scrutinise the scheme as part of its work.

- The Chairman confirmed that the Flood Management Consultation Response item was still on track to come to the November meeting.
- It was suggested that the Highways Maintenance Five Year Programme be considered at the same meeting as the mid-year performance report for the Council's Highways Maintenance Contractor May Gurney. The items were currently scheduled for subsequent meetings in December 2012 and January 2013 and it was felt that there could be benefit to considering the items together. The Chairman stated that he would review whether this was possible outside of the meeting.
- Two Members stated that they had recently received negative feedback regarding Skanska performance in their areas. The Chairman stated that he would request an update for Members for a future Select Committee bulletin.

Actions/further information to be provided:

- That an update on the performance of Skanska be provided with a future Select Committee bulletin.

56/12 **SURREY HILLS TRADEMARK LICENCE AGREEMENT [Item 7]**

Declarations of interest:

Michael Sydney declared a personal interest in Item 7 on account of being the Chairman of the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) Board. It was confirmed that this was not a pecuniary interest.

Witnesses: Rob Fairbanks (Surrey Hills, AONB Director)

Key points raised during the discussion:

- Rob Fairbanks introduced the report, the purpose of which was to propose that Surrey County Council licences the Surrey Hills Trade Mark to the Surrey Hills Enterprises Community Interest Company (CIC).
- Businesses will be charged to use the Surrey Hills logo, although it was recognised that this would not raise a significant amount of money in itself. However, it was hoped that it would raise the value and awareness of the Surrey Hills brand as a whole.
- The AONB Director confirmed that he was aware there was another Surrey in Canada and that this was not relevant to the licence agreement.
- The revenue from the Surrey Hills trademark would be invested back into the funding priorities of the Surrey Hills Enterprise CIC. The Chairman stated that the Committee may wish to scrutinise this spend at a future meeting.

- It was hoped that a community of businesses could be established who would be able to self-regulate the use of the trademark. There was also the possibility that Surrey Trading Standards could assist with regulation if required, although it was recognised that this would not be a priority for them.
- As part of this work consultation had taken place with other AONB such as the Cotswolds and the Chilterns, however the move to trademark the logo was seen as being nationally innovative.

Actions/further information to be provided:

None.

Recommendations:

That the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport approves the Trademark Licence agreement with Surrey Hills Enterprises CIC.

Select Committee next steps:

- That the Select Committee scrutinises the effectiveness of the Trademark Licence Agreement at a future meeting.

57/12 **REPORT OF THE WINTER MAINTENANCE TASK GROUP [Item 8]**

Declarations of interest: None.

Witnesses: Simon Mitchell (Maintenance Plan Team Leader)
Jason Russell (Assistant Director, Highways)

Key points raised during the discussion:

- Simon Mitchell introduced the report, the purpose of which was to consider the proposed future options for the provision of Winter Service, following the reconvening of the Winter Maintenance Task Group.
- There had been some minor improvements to improve coverage of the priority network although overall the network remains as last year, with May Gurney introducing a further fleet of 16 vehicles.
- A licensing agreement had been drawn up which would enable Parishes and other statutory authorities to provide and maintain grit bins on the highway, in line with the Localism agenda. The Committee was very supportive of this proposal.
- If the barcode solution for grit bins was approved by Cabinet, they would be introduced through a rolling program. All grit bins would have barcodes in place by the winter of 2013/14.
- Concern was expressed that there was not enough grit bin provision near schools. Witnesses stated that there was criteria guiding the provision of

grit bins but if Members wanted additional bins there were opportunities to purchase them through their allocations.

- Members requested that they be provided with a grit bin resupply cost for when the £1000 funding for a four year period had elapsed, as it was felt that after this time the grit bin would still be serviceable. Officers informed the Committee that this would be incorporated into Surrey's winter service provision going forward.
- Since the Council moved to a sand/salt mix the problem of salt theft from grit bins had reduced considerably.
- Salt stocks were automatically replenished at the end of the winter season and currently stood at 16,000 tonnes, stored in four depots, which was enough to cover two snow events.
- If there was a severe event where county salt stocks were exhausted and their providers were unable to resupply, then the Council would have to draw on Government reserves. However, witnesses were confident that the Council was in a far stronger position than ever before to deal with such scenarios.
- The figures shown in the report for the contract with May Gurney were the base figures for an average winter. There is a £150,000 contingency fund available for severe weather events.
- 55 salt runs took place last winter, in comparison with 75 runs and 62 runs in the two previous winters. However, when the weather is more severe double the amount of salt is used on a run.
- Members expressed concern at the Council's ability to replenish salt stocks during an extreme weather event, when up to 1000 tonnes of salt could be used per day and Central Government had the ability to strategically acquire part of Surrey's stocks for use elsewhere.
- Officers were asked to confirm why there were two contingency funds for severe weather. Witnesses responded that although there was £5 million severe weather contingency fund for the Council as a whole, there was felt to be benefit to having the smaller contingency fund specifically for Highways use.
- It was confirmed that all major hospitals were included on the priority route and the accesses to these sites had been reviewed.
- It was requested that the figures in paragraph 32-35 of the report be uploaded onto the Members portal.
- It was noted that there was some missing information from the Waverley section in Appendix D – District and Borough Footway Agreements. The Chairman stated that it would be worthwhile including the statement 'As agreed with the District or Borough Council' underneath each table in this appendix.

- In relation to the Tatsfield Parish Trial (para 7.19), witnesses confirmed that the only cost incurred by Surrey County Council was the purchase of the signs. If the trial was successful Officers would look to see if other parishes were interested in similar schemes, however there was no obligation on the Council to provide this service.
- It was asked how the Council could encourage shops to clear the pathways outside of their shops. The Chairman stated that this was something to negotiate through the Chamber of Trades. He also stated that he had purchased some snow clearing equipment for his local Chamber of Trade through his Member Allocation.

Actions/further information to be provided:

- That Members are provided with a cost plan for restocking grit bins.
- That the figures in paragraph 32 – 35 of the report be uploaded onto the Members portal.
- That the following amendments are made to appendix D of the report:
 - The missing information for Waverley is added.
 - That 'As agreed with the District or Borough Council' is added underneath each table.

Recommendations (to Cabinet):

- a) That the recommendations of the Winter Performance Task Group (set out as recommendations 1 – 7 on page 2 of this report) and the attached Winter Service Plan 2012/13 be considered for adoption.
- b) That a response be provided for each recommendation, agreeing actions as appropriate.
- c) That the Members of the Winter Performance Task Group be thanked for their work.

Select Committee next steps:

None

58/12 **SURREY PRIORITY NETWORK AND ASSOCIATED PROJECTS [Item 9]**

Declarations of interest: None.

Witnesses: Simon Mitchell (Maintenance Plan Team Leader)
Jason Russell (Assistant Director, Highways)

Key points raised during the discussion:

- Simon Mitchell introduced the report, stating that this was the most comprehensive review of the Surrey Priority Network in the past 25 years. The review was looking at how the network stands against current best practice and legal advice. Key benefits would include a better

maintenance profile, a clearer urban/rural split between routes and better targeted major maintenance.

- There were other reviews taking place alongside this project such as a footway survey and a review of where the legal boundaries of the County are. The outcomes of all of these projects will culminate in changes being made to the current inspectorate system.
- 300 new manual survey sites had been identified in order to help inform the review. It was agreed that Local Committees could ask to review the sites in their areas if they wished.
- It was requested that more information be provided on HGVs, particularly the issue of satellite navigation systems directing HGVs down roads with narrow bridges. Officers stated that they would provide more information to the Committee on this issue outside of the meeting. The Chairman added that this topic had been considered previously by the Committee and a guidance note for HGV companies/drivers had been drawn up as a result.
- It was possible that there could be some significant resource implications as a result of the review; however it was too early in the process to say exactly what these might look like.
- It was likely that the number of driven inspections would increase as a result of the review. This would allow the inspectorate to see the roads from a driver's perspective and prioritise maintenance accordingly.
- It was hoped that by aligning the priority network with the national code of practice, the Council would be better prepared to defend itself in court cases.

Actions/further information to be provided:

- That the Committee are provided with an update on the Council's HGV strategy in a future bulletin.

Action by: Jason Russell

Recommendations:

That the Committee:

- a) Approve for use Option 1 for the Carriageway Hierarchy (CoP standard) categories and inspection frequencies described in this report and detailed in Annex 1.
- b) Approve for use Option 1 for the Footway and Cycleway Hierarchy categories and inspection frequencies described in this report and detailed in Annex 2 and 3.
- c) Support the continued development of a phased introduction for a) and b) above, details of which will be reported to Cabinet on 27 November 2012.

- d) Approve an annual rolling programme of up to 150 new and updated traffic counts to facilitate the continued joint development of the Surrey County Traffic Model and SPN database (especially on the proposed SPN 3, 4a and 4b networks).
- e) Approve continued work to integrate the SPN database and Surrey County Traffic Model so future accuracy of options testing based on a single methodology is maintained.
- f) Agrees that APG should, in future, undertake an annual review to update the SPN in accordance with the methodology described in this report to ensure that network change and functionality continue to be appropriately reflected.
- g) Supports the continuation of the HIT Boundary Project and Footway Network Survey in support of the SPN review.
- h) Agrees that the data and analysis included in this report informs and supports the 'Defect' work-stream established at the Surrey Highways Roadmap Workshop held on 8 March 2012.

Select Committee next steps:

None.

59/12 **OPERATION OF CIVIL PARKING ENFORCEMENT IN SURREY [Item 10]**

Declarations of interest: None.

Witnesses: Richard Bolton (Local Highways Services Group Manager)
Dave Curl (Parking Team Manager)

Key points raised during the discussion:

- Richard Bolton introduced the report, the purpose of which was to update the Committee on proposed enforcement arrangements prior to going to Cabinet.
- The Committee strongly expressed the view that surpluses received from on-street parking charges should be re-invested in the towns and wards in which they were raised, and not be used to subsidise other areas. Concern was also expressed that in cases where a local authority was enforcing in another area it could not be seen to export its share of the surplus to its own area. It was confirmed that it would be the decision of the relevant Local Committee from the area where any surplus arose, as to where any surplus was allocated and that it would not be used to subsidise the deficits incurred by enforcement authorities.
- The main concern expressed by the Committee regarded the proposed 60/20/20 split of surpluses between the Local Committee, enforcement agent and County Council respectively. Particular concern was raised as to how the 20% figure for the County Council had been decided and the Committee requested that a detailed explanation be provided.

- The Committee was informed that the County's 20% would be used to fund the Parking Team and general Highways services, though this would not be ringfenced for any particular Borough. Concern at this fact was expressed by the Committee as it had suggested that there should be no use of surpluses as a cross-subsidy. Justification for this spending was given on the grounds that parking enforcement was a County Council function, and that although Districts and Boroughs paid the cost of such measures as road markings, their contribution did not cover the full costs of enforcement.
- It was confirmed that there may be local variation in the percentage split of surpluses and that the 60/20/20 proposal was notional. Members were informed that the final figure would be determined by the Cabinet Member for Environment & Transport and Assistant Director for Highways in consultation with the relevant Local Committee Chairman.
- The Committee expressed concern at proposals that in situations whereby Districts and Boroughs were the enforcing authority, they would be able to keep their share of the 20% surplus and decide how it should be spent independently of the Local Committee. The Select Committee felt that it was not equitable for County Members to have no influence over the use of the 20% share, while Borough Members would have influence over their 60% share through their Membership of the Local Committee.
- Further concern was expressed at two specific cases, whereby the enforcing agency was a neighbouring District or Borough and it was not felt equitable that 20% of any surplus should be 'exported' from the area in which this surplus was raised. In these cases, the Select Committee felt that consideration should be given to the 20% also coming back to the Local Committee from where the surplus was raised (as per recommendation b), so that disbursement would be decided by the relevant Local Committee, or an alternative split be proposed.
- The Committee expressed the view that each Local Committee should have a local scrutiny role for on-street parking enforcement within its area.

Actions/further information to be provided:

- That the Committee be provided with a detailed explanation of the justification and purpose for the 60/20/20 split of surplus.

Recommendations (to Cabinet):

- a) That the introduction of new agency agreements be supported in line with the terms specified within the report. However, the Committee expresses concern at the 60/20/20 split of surplus and asks for clarification of its justification and purpose.
- b) That Local Committees have a formal scrutiny role for on-street parking enforcement within their area.

- c) That the Assistant Director, in consultation with the Cabinet Member be authorised to enter into suitable alternative short term arrangements to ensure continuation of on-street parking enforcement.

Select Committee next steps:

None.

60/12 **DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 10]**

The date of the next meeting will be November 8 2012.

[Meeting Ended: 12.30]

Chairman