

MINUTES of the meeting of the **ECONOMIC PROSPERITY, ENVIRONMENT AND HIGHWAYS BOARD** held at 10.30 am on 19 October 2016 at Ashcombe, County Hall, Penrhyn Road, Kingston upon Thames, KT1 2DN.

These minutes are subject to confirmation by the Board at its meeting on Thursday, 8 December 2016.

Elected Members:

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

71/16 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Nikki Barton, Natalie Bramhall, George Johnson, Richard Wilson and Victoria Young.

Colin Kemp substituted for Natalie Bramhall, Margaret Hicks substituted for Richard Wilson and Michael Sydney substituted for Victoria Young.

Apologies were also received from John Furey.

72/16 MINUTES FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING: 8 SEPTEMBER 2016 [Item 2]

The minutes of the previous meeting were agreed as a true and accurate record of proceedings upon correction of Cllr. Mike Bennison's reason of absence from the meeting.

73/16 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

There were no declarations of interest made.

74/16 QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS [Item 4]

There were no questions or petitions received.

75/16 RESPONSES FROM THE CABINET TO ISSUES REFERRED BY THE BOARD [Item 5]

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. It was noted that the Cabinet response to the Winter Maintenance cost saving recommendations was discussed at Cabinet on 18 October. The Chairman attended the Cabinet meeting and stated that the Cabinet supported the board's recommendations.

76/16 RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKER AND FORWARD WORK PLAN [Item 6]

The Board noted and agreed with the proposed Recommendations Tracker and Forward Work Programme. The Chairman explained that more items would be added to the December meeting agenda in due course.

77/16 UPDATES FROM TASK GROUPS AND MEMBER REFERENCE GROUPS [Item 7]

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. It was noted that the Basingstoke Canal Task Group was meeting to discuss governance changes in November 2016 with the aim of reporting back to the board in December 2016.
2. It was noted that the Countryside Management Member Reference Group would potentially meet in December 2016 to undertake a six month review. The Cabinet Member would contact the support officer

and Chairman to discuss this.

3. The Highways for the Future Member Reference Group noted positive progress. It pointed out that the Social Enterprise scheme and Highways Skills Centre were positive works that should be further encouraged. It was stated that the social enterprise scheme would be discussed further with the MRG.
4. The Waste Partnership Future Member Task Group noted that they had met for the first time and had discussed scoping for future meetings. More would be discussed with item 10.

78/16 SURREY LOCAL FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT STRATEGY [Item 8]

Witnesses:

Tor Peebles, Flood Risk Management Strategy and Partnerships Team Leader

Tom Pooley, Flood Risk and Network Resilience Specialist

Declarations of Interest:

None

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. Officers highlighted that the Surrey Local Flood Risk Management Strategy was a refreshed version of the 2014 document which addressed issues regarding historically recent flooding events in Surrey, central government shift in policy and ensuring that the document was a clear public facing document.
2. It was noted that the final version of the document would include specific actions plans that would be attached as appendices.
3. Members queried what provisions were made for the construction of new buildings on flood plains. Officers noted that Surrey County Council sought to ensure that any new construction undertaken on flood plains had sufficient drainage provision, noting that it must allow for a water run off speed limited to green field rates, normally about 5 litres per second (l/s). However, it was noted that Surrey County Council could have recommended refusal of planning permissions based upon failure of this criteria, however the ultimate decision is with the local planning authority.
4. It was highlighted that the strategy would give a clearer indication of the guidelines regarding new constructions on flood plains.
5. Officers explained that flood management maintenance, and flood risk mitigation, was the responsibility of all relevant parties. It was highlighted that there was a cross authority plan, with input involving

riparian land owners and flood action groups, with the aim of ensuring a consistent approach.

6. It was noted that there was responsibility for flood risk mitigation which was with riparian land owners. However, it was noted that there were grants available for use to assist with the mitigation of flood risks of owned riparian land. It was also pointed out that there was a net maintenance of flood risk management through development improvement of drainage and there was in place a Capital Works scheme to deliver small scale flood risk mitigation projects.
7. Members questioned as to what the duties of riparian landowners were to mitigate flood risks and what powers Surrey County Council had to enforce these duties. Officers have the power to inspect watercourses, but this is done reactively not pro-actively, the power to enforce maintenance not improvement. The strategy is looking at mitigating flood risk through improving land owner awareness.
8. Officers explained that any funding for flood risk mitigation projects was distributed through an integrated system in which the partnership board is a key aspect. It was explained that the funding process was a continuing project and that new ways of integration were being examined between all concerned bodies.
9. Members highlighted that the document was useful in presenting an overall strategic picture for Surrey County Council's position, however it was questioned whether the document was an informative one for public consumption and if it would serve to reassure that a good strategic plan was in place. It was highlighted that the report would be circulated for public consultation, which would give the service feedback on its public facing accessibility and that the document would be amended to reflect feedback.
10. Members queried who the public point of contact regarding flooding issues was. Officers noted that the County Highways Officer was a key contact for flooding issues along with the Network Resilience Team.
11. Officers highlighted the partnership approach taken by the service and noted that multiple organisations, including the Flood Risk Partnership Board, Flood Action Groups and Community Planning Groups, were actively involved with the production and development of the Flood Risk Management Strategy.
12. Members expressed satisfaction that the plan demonstrated an integrated approach to flood risk management.
13. Officers explained that there was a programme of maintenance in place on old flood management systems as the risk management

authority to ensure that older systems remain free of impedance. It was highlighted that these schemes of maintenance would be in the Action Plan.

14. It was noted that the service Action Plan would be set by April 2017 although officers would still need to approach district and boroughs for feedback before this time.
15. Members queried the timescales for delivery. Officers explained that the service would be working with partners to ensure delivery and that the consultation regarding the Flood Risk Management Strategy would continue until December 2016. It was noted that upon implementation of comments, the document would be released for public consultation in January 2017 with the support of the Communications team. A final version would be ready for sign off to Cabinet by April 2017.
16. It was pointed out by Members that there was some difficulty regarding Parish Councils and their capability to enforce flood risk management measures upon riparian landowners. Officers noted that Parish Councils did not have legal enforcement powers although they could bid for access to small grants to help maintain drainage.
17. It was agreed that officers would produce a one page briefing on best practice for flood action groups and forums which members could share with local flood forums.

Bob Gardner left the meeting at 11.45

18. It was highlighted that there could be some issues regarding lines of authority between Surrey County Council and the Environment Agency. It was pointed out that the service should work to resolve these issues and work in partnership with the Environment Agency.
19. Members agreed that flood forums should be encouraged and documents with details of flooding key contacts should be distributed.

Bob Gardner returned at 11.48

Recommendations

The Board commented and noted the refreshed local flood risk management strategy for Surrey.

Actions:

- For officers to provide members with a briefing note on best practice for flood action groups and forums.

79/16 SMARTER WORKING FOR THE ENVIRONMENT - POLICY AND ACTION PLAN [Item 9]

Witnesses:

Lesley Harding, Place and Sustainability Group Manager
Bronwen Chinien, Environment Policy Team Leader
Mike Goodman, Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning

Declarations of Interest:

None

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. Officers outlined the Smarter Working for the Environment (SWE) action plan which was part of Surrey County Council's overarching approach to the environment. While it was acknowledged that many issues were global, it was the aim of the plan to improve the County Council's approach to environmental services and manage any environmental impacts on service delivery. The action plan would support income and grant funding bids and would add value to the way we work.
2. It was highlighted that the SWE was a cross service response that had the aim of creating an integrated approach to managing future development risks.
3. The Member for Redhill East expressed support for the initiative, noting the importance of having a single policy framework for joined up delivery of the environment plan. It was also highlighted that the plan presented some value for money opportunities.
4. Members questioned air quality and carbon emissions from motor vehicles within the Surrey region. Officers noted that transport issues and carbon emissions had been a key aspect of the strategy; however it was noted that there was no simple solution to this issue. It was stated that district and boroughs were responsible for monitoring air quality. Members also highlighted that the service needed to engage with partners and with other nearby authorities, such as Heathrow and Gatwick airports, London local authorities and other partners to reduce carbon emissions.

Mike Bennison left the meeting at 12.05am and returned 12.12pm

5. Officers highlighted that development of the policy had included District and Borough Councils within Surrey and that the service was seeking to encourage those without their own policy to adopt the relevant aspects of Surrey County Council's policy to promote best

practice. It was noted that some district and boroughs already had policies in place.

6. Members agreed the policy was encouraging but some parts of the action plan would need revisiting especially in relation to staff parking. Officers explained that the pay and reward strategy would pick up this issue.
7. Members queried traffic congestion data and whether Surrey County Council could acquire access to these figures from District and Borough authorities in order to improve their environmental strategic planning. The Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning, noted that possibilities for securing and utilising this information would be explored.
8. Officers stated that no consultation had been undertaken with London boroughs although discussions had taken place with Heathrow around local environmental impacts. Members were concerned around the collection of air pollution data for Surrey but the Cabinet Member stated that this was a local responsibility which the county did not have control over.
9. Members highlighted that the environmental policy should include more provision for low carbon emission vehicles and electric car charging stations. It was explained that there were no charging points outside the front of County Hall.

Recommendations

The board noted the Smarter Working for the Environment policy and actions plan.

Actions

None

80/16 DEVELOPING A SINGLE WASTE APPROACH [Item 10]

Witnesses:

Matt Smyth, Waste Development Group Manager

Helen Trew, Waste Programme Manager

Mike Goodman, Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning

Declarations of Interest:

None

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. Officers noted that there were opportunities to improve the current system of waste disposal through the proposed changes in the

governance arrangements. It was highlighted that a key benefit to these governance changes was an estimated potential cost saving of £9 – 12 million per year as a result of the co-ownership approach.

2. It was highlighted that four district and borough authorities were moving towards a co-ownership approach: Mole Valley, Surrey Heath, Elmbridge and Woking. It was highlighted the new joint waste collection contract could include other district and boroughs if they wished to join. It is proposed that SCC joins with the four authorities as soon as possible to demonstrate the benefits of co-partnership with early adopters.
3. Officers pointed out that the proposals of co-ownership were being presented to Cabinet in December 2016 and that Surrey County Council's functions could be integrated by 2017, with potential county-wide integration achieved by 2019. The Chairman explained that two of the local authorities were tied into contracts until 2019 and some other authorities have direct service organisations (DSOs) but all had the opportunity to join the partnership at an appropriate time.
4. Members questioned whether waste disposal would be distributed evenly as part of the integration process. It was highlighted by officers that there would be, as part of integration, a more efficient usage of vehicle movement and optimisation of routes as part of the integration to reduce disruption and costs.
5. Members thanked officers for working hard to get the partnership up and running. It was recognised that joint working needed encouragement but would allow for each authority to benefit financially.
6. A member from Mole Valley queried whether the authority would have the opportunity to be involved in the development of Community Recycling Centre (CRCs) proposals and changes. Officers stated that each authority would have the opportunity to be involved in this as savings for residents was the key. CRCs would be part of phase 2 of the partnership project.
7. It was noted that Surrey County Council was not seeking a leadership role in the partnership, and that the arrangement gave the District and Borough authorities in the partnership equal opportunity to actively participate and contribute effectively to the partnership.
8. It was noted by a Member that the report needs to highlight and emphasise efficiency and financial benefits but also parity in the relationship going forward. It was suggested that 'localism' and timescales also be highlighted more.

9. Officers stated that there were plans to introduce three new re-use shops across Surrey by January 2017.

Recommendations

The board noted the report and supported the proposals outlined.

Actions

None

81/16 DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING [Item 11]

The next public meeting of the Board will be held 8 December 2016 at 10.30am, County Hall.

Meeting ended at: 1.10 pm

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank