

MINUTES of the meeting of the **ENVIRONMENT & TRANSPORT SELECT COMMITTEE** held at 10.30 am on 15 December 2014 at Ashcombe Suite, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 2DN.

These minutes are subject to confirmation by the Committee at it's meeting on the 22 January 2015.

Elected Members:

- * Mr David Harmer (Chairman)
- Mr Mike Bennison (Vice-Chairman)
- * Mrs Nikki Barton
- * Mrs Natalie Bramhall
- * Mr Mark Brett-Warburton
- Mr Stephen Cooksey
- * Mrs Pat Frost
- * Mr David Goodwin
- * Mr Ken Gulati
- * Mr Peter Hickman
- * Mr George Johnson
- * Mr Adrian Page
- * Mr Michael Sydney
- * Mr Richard Wilson
- * Mrs Victoria Young

In attendance

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

78/14 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Mike Bennison and Stephen Cooksey.

Will Forester substituted for Stephen Cooksey.

79/14 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING: 27 OCTOBER 2014 [Item 2]

These were agreed as a true record of the previous meeting.

80/14 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

There were none.

81/14 QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS [Item 4]

A member question was received from Cllr Jonathan Essex. The question and response are attached as annex 1 to the minutes.

Declarations of Interest:

None

Witnesses:

None

Key Points Raised During the Discussion:

1. The Member began by asking if the current Preventative Maintenance Strategy was verbally agreed or available in a written format. Officers explained that all current strategies and policies are published online via the SCC website and that a link to these strategies would be sent to the Member in due course.
2. Officers were asked if they could demonstrate assertions made within the response regarding the level of preventative maintenance currently being carried out. It was explained that current Department of Transport rankings place SCC above some neighbouring counties and in a good position overall nationally on this issue.

Actions/Further Information to be Provided:

None

82/14 RESPONSES FROM THE CABINET TO ISSUES REFERRED BY THE SELECT COMMITTEE [Item 5]**Key Points Raised During the Discussion:**

1. It was re-iterated by the Committee that one of the chief concerns among Surrey residents was the quality of communication with groups involved during the flood recovery process and that this should continue to be addressed going forward.
2. The Committee welcomed efforts made by Cabinet Members to secure recovery funding for residents. It was established that the Cabinet Member is pursuing an extension of the current date of limitation on flood recovery funding (from central government) to allow residents having difficulty claiming financial support more time to do so. The Cabinet Member explained that both DEFRA and the Secretary of State had yet to offer a response to requests for an extension of this kind.

83/14 RECOMMENDATION TRACKER AND FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME [Item 6]**Witnesses:**

None

Key Points Raised During the Discussion:

1. Members discussed the need for more specific information regarding the breakdown of injury and non-injury accidents involving cyclists in Surrey for the period of 2013/14.
2. Members asked why they had not been shown the most recent report regarding the Canal Centre Redevelopment Proposals which was discussed at the previous Basingstoke Canal Joint Management Committee. It was made clear to the Committee by the Cabinet

Member, and Officers, that the report had been commissioned as a means of establishing the implications of compiling a business case for the redevelopment of the Canal Centre Site rather than a business case in full.

Recommendations:

None

Actions/Further Information to be Provided:

- Members requested further data be provided delineating between injury and non-injury accidents involving cyclists for 2013/14.

Committee Next Steps:

None

84/14 HIGHWAYS & TRANSPORT MEMBER REFERENCE GROUP REPORT ON THE KIER CONTRACT [Item 7]

Witnesses:

Jason Russell, Assistant Director for Highways and Transport
Mark Borland, Works Delivery Group Manager

Key Points Raised During the Discussion:

1. The report was introduced by the Assistant Director for Highways and Transport (ADHT) who provided a brief overview of the report, highlighting the good level of contact between Surrey, Kier Officers and the Member Reference Group (MRG) both before and during the formation of the report.
2. The ADHT advised that, in line with the MRG's assessment, Kier be allowed to develop a 5 year business plan - in conjunction with Surrey Officers - covering the 2016/21 period to be delivered to Cabinet by the end of next year. As part of this process it was recommended by the ADHT that a one-year extension be granted to the existing contract to allow a business plan to be drawn up. It was also established that the existing MRG should be closely involved in this process.
3. Members were informed that the MRG had also been instrumental in identifying areas requiring improvement such as the current IT infrastructure employed by Highways teams. It was stressed by the Committee that the management of IT infrastructure of this kind would be essential to the success of normal operations going forward and that it was important for Officers to continue to identify areas where SCC and Kier systems can align and to ensure software compatibility where possible. This was noted as being critical to the long term success of the contract; particularly in light of recent IT upgrades being carried out by Kier internally.
4. Members expressed concern over the issues raised in Paragraph 26 regarding the level of communication SCC and Kier are reported to have had with residents up to this point. The Committee stressed the

importance of SCC and Kier representatives having regular contact with Local Committees and endorsed that officers find means of achieving this in the long term.

5. The Committee expressed the view that communication problems impacted local businesses during periods where road maintenance was carried out. Members cited issues with the quality of road signage and the inadequate level of consultation prior to road closures as having adversely affected businesses as a result. The Committee expressed a desire to see the development of a clearer communication strategy in order to tackle this more appropriately in future.
6. Members noted issues concerning the efficiency of current gully cleaning efforts being administered by Conway and expressed a desire to see this addressed more acutely in future.
7. The Committee raised concerns with the points raised in Paragraph 30 regarding the existing organisational structure of Surrey Highways. Members maintained that further restructuring was unnecessary and stressed that previous efforts had resulted in a worsening of communications between stakeholders rather than an improvement.
8. The ADHT advised the Committee that both Kier and SCC are continuously making improvements to the service to make it as robust as possible. It was also acknowledged that improving the quality of communication with residents was key to this and would continue to be at the forefront of this approach going forward.
9. The Committee was informed that one means being considered to address this was the creation of a dedicated public liaison officer within the terms of the contract. Members were concerned whether this was feasible with the funding constraints of the current contract. It was explained that such a position would be funded through further efficiencies in the current contract.
10. Officers explained to the Committee that sub-contractors have been used in the existing framework. It was noted that the service was looking to more localized supply chains for sub-contractual work where appropriate (in line with Kier and SCC standards).
11. Members were made aware that SCC was in a good position in comparison to other authorities on this item. The ADHT explained that the proposed 5 year extension consideration allowed for SCC's proposals to be both more comprehensive in a national context and was unique in this respect.
12. Members of the MRG explained to the Committee that they plan to continue holding each body to account through site visits and conversations directly with Kier and SCC representatives. It was also established that the MRG will meet with Members from Northamptonshire in the New Year to evaluate their experiences with Kier and identify areas where this can improve SCC's existing arrangement.

Recommendations:**The Environment and Transport Select Committee agreed the following recommendations;**

- a) That the Select Committee endorse the proposal that Cabinet approve an initial extension to the Kier contract of at least one year; during which time Kier will be given the opportunity to work with Surrey to develop a 5 year business plan covering the period 2016-2021.
- b) That the Highways and Transport MRG provide ongoing member insight and scrutiny and report back to Select Committee before October 2015.

Actions/Further Information to be Provided:

- Officers to provide the Committee with the finalised Kier contract before it goes to Cabinet in October 2015.
- Member Reference Group to provide the Select Committee with a progress update in due course.

Committee Next Steps:

None.

85/14 COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY OVERVIEW/ THE HORLEY MASTER PLAN [Item 8]**Witnesses:**

Paul Druce, Infrastructure Agreements Manager
 Peter Boarder, Horley Regeneration Project Manager, SCC / Reigate and Banstead BC

i) CIL Overview Report**Key Points Raised During the Discussion:**

1. The Chairman began by inquiring with officers as to the potential for a regular update with Members on the status of Surrey district and boroughs readiness for CIL in line with the issues raised in Paragraph 24 of the report. The Infrastructure Agreements Manager (IAM) raised the potential for the distribution of a quarterly one page bulletin by Boroughs on this going forward to members of the select committee and local committee chairman.
2. Members raised concerns regarding authorities yet to fully implement CIL and how this may impact existing development. The IAM informed the Committee that the failure to adopt CIL could allow certain development to avoid paying developer contributions but the government's chief planner has said, where the issue has been raised, that LPA's have had 5 years to adopt CIL and any shortfall in contributions is therefore a matter for them.

3. Members noted that local committees should be scrutinising in detail how CIL funds are distributed and spent as CIL is adopted across Surrey.

i) Recommendations:

The Select Committee endorsed the following recommendations:

- a) That there be continued collaboration with Borough and District colleagues in their preparation of Local Plans, Infrastructure Delivery Plans, CIL Charging Schedules and Regulation 123 Lists.
- b) Officers continued collaboration with Borough and District colleagues on draft CIL documentation to ensure the County Council is able to support development in each of the areas by securing and providing infrastructure at the required time.
- c) Officers continuing to seek agreement as to how the governance regime for CIL will operate in each of the areas by way of a memorandum of understanding or other suitable agreement, and
- d) The further work required to secure a suitable governance regime in each of the areas, in the light of the possible different models for governance, given that the Woking model is one that appears to offer the most open and transparent collaborative process for deciding which schemes CIL monies should support.

ii) CIL/Horley Master Plan Report

1. The Committee inquired as to the impact of SANGS on CIL payments for Surrey Heath. It was clarified to Members that up to 80% of CIL contributions are diverted to SANGS currently. The Committee asked Officers if this was something that could be determined by Surrey's Districts and Boroughs in future (due to SANGS impact on West Surrey authorities) however it was explained that control of SANGS framework is determined by the E.U. and as such can't be avoided in this instance.
2. The Horley Regeneration Project Manager (HRPM) informed the Committee that authorities can set different CIL rates for different areas of any one borough, in line with a geographical and viability assessment.
3. It was recognised by Members that SCC and its District and Boroughs have a long relationship of working together on these types of items and despite the Committee's recommendations not being fully enforceable it was agreed that this issue would remain a matter of trust between Surrey and its local authorities.

ii) Recommendations:

The Select Committee endorsed the following recommendations:

- a) The principle of the Borough Council's proposal to charge a higher levy for residential development in the North West Sector
- b) Officers making formal representations on the Borough Councils Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule including its Regulation 123 list, as necessary
- c) The two authorities work together to reach agreement by way of a memorandum of understanding to ring fence monies to ensure that there is sufficient funding to deliver the identified infrastructure in and service improvements in the HMP

Actions/Further Information to be Provided:

None

Committee Next Steps:

None.

86/14 SURREY HIGHWAYS- SAFETY DEFECT YEAR 1 REVIEW [Item 9]

Witnesses:

Mark Borland, Works Delivery Group Manager
Paul Wheadon, Commercial and Performance Team Manager

Key Points Raised During the Discussion:

1. The Works Delivery Group Manager (WDGM) introduced the report by explaining that eighty five thousand potholes were fixed in Surrey annually. The Committee was also informed that a six step action plan was developed to provide a framework for the project. Fundamental to this plan was the introduction of a new IT system which went live in August 2014 to replace the previous May Gurney system.
2. The WDGM clarified to the Committee that the flooding event in the beginning of 2014 resulted in an impact on the final Safety Defects Performance figures; causing the performances in these periods to notably miss the current 98% target.
3. Members queried the length of guarantee for each maintained pothole. The WDGM clarified that the time period guaranteed for each repaired pothole by Kier is currently two years.
4. Officers informed Members that the product Viafix was being considered as a replacement for the current material used to repair potholes. It was explained that Viafix offers the same permanent repair option as current methods but offers a guarantee of two years under both dry and wet conditions and minimizes the need for follow up visits.
5. The WDGM explained that the managerial hierarchy had been addressed to enable Surrey and Kier managers to report to one another directly and fully integrate as a result.

6. It was make clear that the quality assurance team focussed on road defects throughout the project.
7. Members inquired as to the current technology used to track potholes within the Surrey area. Officers explained that a new GPS device was being rolled out to enable greater levels of mobile working and identification however it was noted there was still a focus on public reporting. The Chairman noted that Surrey Police had also recently adopted the same hardware for in-the-field application and could be consulted on the implications of such a rollout for Surrey.
8. The Committee agreed that pothole targets should remain high, rather than be lowered, in order to maintain and improve current practice and standards.

Recommendations:

The Select Committee noted and commented on outcomes of the Surrey Defect project's first year.

Actions/Further Information to be Provided:

- Scrutiny Officer to arrange site visit for approximately 6-7 members of the Select Committee to the Incident Response Centre at Meroo.

Committee Next Steps: None.

87/14 AGREEMENT WITH SURREY WILDLIFE TRUST FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL'S COUNTRYSIDE ESTATE [Item 10]

Witnesses:

Lisa Creaye-Griffin, Countryside Group Manager

Key Points Raised During the Discussion:

1. The Countryside Group Manager introduced the report by stressing the services commitment to reducing Surrey's total contribution to the Surrey Wildlife Trust (SWT) to 0% by 2021. It was emphasised that this would be achieved through supporting the re-organisation of the trust and the increased commercialization of its assets in the following 18 months.
2. Members congratulated the Countryside Group Manager on the current turnaround of SWT as it stands in the report. The Committee was encouraged by SWT's move towards greater commercialisation and the efforts to find partners in this regard. It was noted that Property will be looking at how SWT deal with the County's property and smallholdings. SWT's performance in dealing with the built property on the Countryside Estate will be covered in the report that will come to Committee in March 2015.
3. The Committee stressed that it was important to encourage the development of a strong management and oversight structure in the

coming months. It was recognised that this should be as robust as possible and was as crucial to the long term success of SWT as any other future agreements.

4. It was acknowledged by Members that in light of the financial savings being sought across SCC, it would prove difficult to find all the resources necessary to oversee the restructuring of the SWT and SCC agreement.
5. The Committee inquired as to the potential sanctions at SCC's disposal should SWT not achieve its KPIs. Officers explained that should SWT breach an agreement the County were in their rights to break the contract however it might be in the county's interest to avoid this. It was noted that there will be an annual review of the SWT agreement which would go to both the Select Committee and Cabinet for comment. A review would be undertaken every five years to understand whether KPIs were being met.

Recommendations:

The Select Committee agreed the principles of the revised Agreement with Surrey Wildlife Trust before the report goes to Cabinet.

Actions/Further Information to be Provided:

None.

Committee Next Steps:

None.

88/14 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 11]

The next meeting of the Select Committee will be on 22 January 2015.

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank