

MINUTES of the meeting of the **ECONOMIC PROSPERITY, ENVIRONMENT AND HIGHWAYS BOARD** held at 10.30 am on 12 January 2017 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, 2 March 2017.

Elected Members:

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

In attendance

Mike Goodman, Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning

John Furey, Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding

1/17 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Richard Wilson, Ian Beardsmore and Bob Gardner.

2/17 MINUTES FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING: 8 DECEMBER 2016 [Item 2]

The minutes from the previous meeting were agreed as a true and accurate record.

3/17 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

None received.

4/17 QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS [Item 4]

None received.

5/17 RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKER AND FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME [Item 5]

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. A Member queried whether a response was received from the EM3 LEP funding in relation to Bridge Street, Guildford. The Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding advised the Board that the road safety improvements on Bridge Street was subject to implementation once Guildford's decision around the operation of the traffic lights and relocation of the bus stop was resolved.
2. The Cabinet Member indicated that further information on the application/development would be available and circulated by the end of the January 2017 and the Chairman advised a wider discussion would be anticipated in the next meeting in March.
3. The Board noted the concern raised in relation to Junction 10 in Painshill, however the Chairman reminded Members this was the property and responsibility of Highways England.

Recommendations:

The Board noted and agreed with the proposed Recommendation Tracker and Forward Work Programme.

Actions

EP1- For the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding to circulate to the board an update regarding traffic light management as part of the road safety improvements on Bridge Street, Guildford by the end of January 2017.

**6/17 UPDATES FROM MEMBER REFERENCE GROUPS AND TASK GROUPS
[Item 6]**

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The spokesperson for the Basingstoke Canal Task Group informed the Board that there was no recent update to report on the progression of the Canal and advised anything new will be made known to the new Council, post elections.
2. A Member made reference to page 19 and proposed the deletion of the 'The task group is due to report back to the Board in summer 2016' which no longer applied for the Basingstoke Canal Task Group.
3. The Countryside Management Member Reference Group spokesperson reported to the Board that the MRG were going to meet, following the Board meeting today and any appropriate information would be circulated to Members.
4. The spokesperson for the Finance Sub-Group and Waste Local Plan Member Reference Group advised that an update would be covered in today's agenda, therefore a verbal update at this time would not be necessary as matters would be raised in the reports.
5. It was noted that a full report in relation to the Surrey Waste Partnership Future Member Reference Group had been put to Cabinet including changes which relate to the recommendations around the recycling credits.

**7/17 REVIEW OF THE SURREY WASTE PLAN: RESULTS OF CONSULTATION
[Item 7]**

Witnesses:

Katelyn Symington, Principal Planning Policy Officer
Paul Sanderson, Minerals & Waste Policy Team Manager
Mike Goodman, Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning

Declarations of interest:

None

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Minerals & Waste Policy Team Manager introduced the report and outlined that the current waste plan was adopted in 2008 and was in need of review to cover the period from 2018 to 2033.
2. As the Waste Planning Authority it was Surrey County Council's responsibility to create a new waste plan, which would be adopted from 2018 onwards.
3. Members were presented with a presentation (Annex 1) where Officers touched upon the issues, draft vision and objectives of the Surrey Waste Local Plan Issues and Options consultation results, which ran for a 12 week period.

4. It was noted that no sites were included at this particular stage and the plan included all types of waste streams such as municipal, commercial and industrial and construction and demolition.
5. Officers were queried on the elimination of landfill waste, in terms of reducing it to nothing. Officers responded that it would be more specialist going forward, and likely to be seen as a regional resource rather than local, as there will be less waste being sent to landfill. The Chairman indicated that it would be beneficial to look upon Hampshire's approach who for the last 10 years have paid zero landfill tax for its municipal waste.
6. A Member raised concern with contamination in recyclable waste and raising awareness to educate the public on this issue. The Officer shared the view that there was lack of understanding and also problems accessing information regarding this. Members were assured that comments had been passed on to the Waste Disposal Authority (WDA) to resolve this.
7. The Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning shared the view that there was a big issue with contamination, where waste was rejected as a result of this. Although a campaign on contamination had been carried out, Members were advised more work was essential to reduce this and working with schools and the Waste and Resources Action Plan (WRAP) would help alleviate this.
8. The Board were informed that WRAP were the organisation used by Government to advise on waste and having links with them continues to advantageous.
9. There was a discussion around Brexit and the impact this may have on the future of waste plans. Officers reported that there was uncertainty going forward and that certain risks would be involved. However at this stage the Board were advised the service would continue to carry on as normal until any legislative changes.
10. Officers were asked whether on a national level, the issue of packaging would be reviewed in terms of generating less waste going forward. The Officer informed the Board that the WDA were working on this and had representatives on the packaging Board. At a local level SCC is taking accountability by looking at trends and making changes where necessary.
11. It was noted that Surrey was innovative. Examples to illustrate this included having the best recycling rates with Surrey Heath being ranked third in the country with 64%. The Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning also commended the work of the Surrey Waste Partnership on its new innovative approach.
12. In terms of business waste, Officers reported that they are trying to engage directly with businesses and discuss their objectives and views in taking responsibility for waste. The Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning emphasised the point that businesses should take more responsibility and was keen to work with WRAP to

protect the environment. It was noted that there was a low response rate from businesses in the recent waste plan consultation.

13. With regards to construction and demolition waste, Members were informed a lot of this waste was recycled on development sites, since this made economic sense. Such inert waste could also be positively used to help restore mineral workings.
14. A Member referred to the current move to mixed kerbside recycling facilities asking whether there was any evidence to show how successful this has been. The Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning reported that Surrey Heath used commingle recycling facilities and this was the way forward for councils, It was noted that separate containers would make the process complex.
15. Furthermore, a Member requested whether a statement in relation to recycling could be provided since charges have been introduced at CRC's. Officers informed the Board this information would be collated by the WDA and could be available to Members at a later date.
16. It was explained that although the new plan would be from 2018-33, it would in all probability not formally be adopted until 2019. Officers would look at this but reassured Members that by 2018 a draft plan would be well advanced and would be given increased weight in decision making as it neared formal adoption.
17. It was stated that the consultation had included text which could be perceived as misleading. In particular the 'zero waste to landfill' which a Member explained could be over looked by the public in terms of actually representing energy to waste initiatives. It was suggested that the wording in the consultation be amended and tested with members of the public.

Recommendations

The Economic Prosperity, Environment and Highways Board:

- a. Noted the results of the Issues and Options Consultation related to the preparation of the new SWLP.
- b. Noted the summary report that sets out the responses to the Issues and Options Consultation (**Annexe 1**).

Actions:

None

8/17 ENVIRONMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCE UPDATE [Item 8]

Witnesses:

Ian Boast, Assistant Director for Environment
Jason Russell, Deputy Director for Environment & Infrastructure
John Furey, Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport & Flooding
Lesley Harding, Head of Place Development
Lucy Monie, Head of Highways & Transport

Mike Goodman, Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning
Tony Orzieri, Finance Manager

Declarations of interest:

None

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. Officers introduced the report by way of PowerPoint presentation where the Board were updated on the current budget which included main areas of spend and existing MTFP savings. The Deputy Director for Environment and Infrastructure explained that as part of a budget exercise a Scenario A and B with clear savings targets had to be produced by the directorate.
2. It was explained that in certain areas of the budget it would be impossible to make savings due to the statutory responsibilities attached to these areas. Therefore areas with no or very little statutory obligations would be considered as areas where possible savings could be made. The board would be presented with Scenario A which has been discussed with Cabinet.
3. It was stated that from the existing MTFP savings for Highways and Transport, a further £340K would need to be addressed as part of the winter maintenance savings.
4. The Board were presented with a list of proposed additional savings for both Highways and Transport and Environment and Planning in regards to Scenario A.
5. The Chairman agreed for the meeting to be taken into part 2.

RESOLVED: That under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information under the relevant information under the relevant paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

Recommendations

- a. It was agreed that any recommendations from the Board would be considered at the 18 January 2017 Council Overview Board meeting with final recommendations from all Scrutiny Boards being considered at the Cabinet meeting on 31 January 2017.

Actions:

None

9/17 DATE OF NEXT MEETING: THURSDAY 2 MARCH 2017 [Item 9]

The next meeting of the Economic Prosperity, Environment and Highways Board will be held on Thursday 2 March at 10.30am in the Ashcombe Suite, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames.

Meeting ended at: 1.15pm

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank