

MINUTES of the meeting of the **COMMUNITIES, ENVIRONMENT AND HIGHWAYS SELECT COMMITTEE** held at 10.00 am on 8 March 2022 at Council Chamber, Woodhatch Place, 11 Cockshot Hill, Reigate, Surrey, RH2 8EF

These minutes are subject to confirmation by the Committee at its meeting on 14 June 2022

Elected Members:

- * Catherine Baart
- * Stephen Cooksey
- * Colin Cross
- Paul Deach (Vice-Chairman)
- * John Furey
- David Harmer
- Jonathan Hulley
- Andy MacLeod (Vice-Chairman)
- * Jan Mason
- * Cameron McIntosh
- * John O'Reilly (Chairman)
- * Lance Spencer
- * Keith Witham

(= present at the meeting)*

10/22 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Paul Deach and Andy Macleod, Helyn Clack substituted for David Harmer, Robert Hughes substituted for Jonathon Hulley

11/22 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING: 21 JANUARY 2022 [Item 2]

The minutes of the Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee held on 16 September 2021, 15 December 2021, 21 January 2022 and 7 February 2022 were formally agreed as a true and accurate record of the meetings.

12/22 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

None received.

13/22 QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS [Item 4]

None received.

14/22 YOUR FUND SURREY UPDATE [Item 5]

Witnesses:

Mark Nuti, Cabinet Member for Communities

Marie Snelling, Executive Director for Customer & Communities

Jane Last, Head of Community, Partnerships & Engagement

James Painter, Communities Partnerships Manager

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Chairman observed that Your Fund Surrey (YFS) had yet to accomplish the level of bids expected by Members and questioned if Officers were confident that the fund could realistically match expectations on the numbers of approved projects. The Head of Community Partnerships and Engagement explained that Your Fund Surrey was a new fund, and the process was developed to support communities through the process, allowing the Council to adapt by learning from communities and to develop new guidance and support through its life. It was noted that YFS was just through the first year of operation and the team had supported many applicants through to final bid. YFS had been launched during COVID-19 and therefore the on the ground Communications campaign was not as it would have been in normal times, despite this a large number of applications had come through which the team would expect to recommend for funding
2. The Chairman stated that progress had been slower than expected and asked if the future approval rate would be set as per the expectation anticipated when the Fund was set up i.e. around 100 per annum. The Cabinet Member for Communities confirmed that applications were being processed more quickly with planned communications, engagement and advertising expected to maximise applications.
3. A Member commented that the sharing of Your Fund Surrey information with Members needed to be prioritised to allow them to communicate the benefits of the scheme with residents. The Cabinet Member for Communities noted the information was available on the Members' Portal and said that work would take place with Members to ensure they had the information required to engage with their communities.
4. A Member asked how areas without community groups or voluntary activities could access this funding, particularly considering the Council's ambition to 'leave no one behind.' The Cabinet Member for Communities confirmed that communities that would benefit from extra support and encouragement to submit applications were being

identified. Guidance was being offered, as were one-to-one sessions and support from the voluntary sector in some cases.

5. A Member noted that the application process was causing delays and that they had been approached by organisations reporting a lack of communication from the Council once bids were submitted. The Executive Director explained that a balance had to be struck between a robust application process and being able to approve as many bids as possible, that there were no targets on application throughout, rather the emphasis was on supporting communities through the process at their pace. Members were encouraged to highlight any applicants that had encountered a lack of communication regarding the progression of their submissions.
6. A Member, part of the Your Fund Surrey Advisory Panel, sought to reassure the Committee that the Fund, although in its early stages, was well managed. The Member added that consideration of an appeals process for failed applications would be beneficial. The Cabinet Member for Communities stated that information would be easier to locate following the launch of the dedicated communities' channel on the Members' Portal and agreed to investigate the possibility of an appeals process.
7. A Member reported being unaware of bids in their division and issues with communications to prospective bidders. The Cabinet Member for Communities said that a short form application process for smaller projects was being investigated, in addition to the possible implementation of technology allowing applicants to track their submissions. Also, the team would ensure that all Members were aware of the Members portal report which would show them all applications and their status.
8. A Member asked if resources for the Fund could be directed elsewhere, for example Greener Futures or Active Travel, to better support communities. The Cabinet Member for Communities said that the fund did not take resources away from other schemes and that the YFS team had strong connections with colleagues from across the organisation to support community led projects in these areas.
9. The level of direct Member involvement in the fund was queried despite references to Member participation to support and facilitate applications within the report. The Cabinet Member for Communities highlighted that all applications are required to have a supporting statement from the relevant Division Member as part of the process and stated that Members championing projects was key to the success of the fund.

10. A Member said that every Member should receive notification when an application was made by their community with their support and advice being mandatory and noted capacity for this to be built into the local and joint committees' function. The Head of Community Partnerships & Engagement confirmed that Members were able to see applications coming through via the report on the Members Portal or through accessing the Commonplace map and that an initial check was made to identify existing divisional Member connection with the applicants. Members were then required to add a statement about a project as part of the process.

Cameron McIntosh joined the meeting at 11:01am

11. The Chairman, in noting the July 2020 Cabinet report, asked if a scale of increase in delivery could be guaranteed, otherwise, fundamental reconsideration of the fund would be essential. The Cabinet Member for Communities reiterated that having completed the first year and with the end of lockdown it was expected that more applications would be ready to come forward to decision. The Community Partnerships and Engagement Manager confirmed that COVID-19 public health restrictions being eased would result in more community engagement

12. The Chairman asked for reassurance that applications received annually would be closer to 100 than low double digits by this time next year. The Cabinet Member for Communities expected improved figures to be reported to the Select Committee when the Fund returned for scrutiny.

Resolved:

The Select Committee:

Expresses its concern that the number of Your Fund Surrey (YFS) approvals has been disappointing in contrast to the ambitions expressed in the July 2020 Cabinet Report.

The Select Committee:

1. Strongly advocates that the rate of progress dramatically accelerates in the next two years and calls on the Cabinet to institute immediate action to ensure delivery with an update report (in 9 months) to the Select Committee.
2. Expects the process for small bids to be 'short-form' in scope to encourage applications as intended in July 2020 and expediate the entire process so intended delivery gathers space.
3. Urges improvement in Member engagement by YFS team and the Council (including proactive communication with local

Divisional Members about projects/applications in their area including relevant boroughs and districts).

15/22 OUTLINE BUSINESS CASE FOR THE RE-PROCUREMENT OF WASTE TREATMENT & DISPOSAL SERVICES - UPDATE [Item 6]

Witnesses:

Natalie Bramhall, Cabinet Member for Property & Waste

Carolyn McKenzie, Director of Environment

Alan Horton, Programme Manager

Richard Parkinson, Resources & Circular Economy Group Manager

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. A Member asked how targets included in the business case were selected and how they compared to other councils. The Cabinet Member for Property & Waste confirmed that targets were drawn from the Surrey Climate Change Strategy 2020 and although no specific benchmarking had taken place, the targets were ambitious.
2. A Member asked how seriously the in-house option to treat and dispose of Surrey waste had been considered and what research had been undertaken into multiple contracts. The Cabinet Member for Property & Waste explained that the Council did not have the infrastructure and expertise to carry out all waste treatment requirements such as the disposal of residual waste, the composting of green waste or the recycling of road sweepings and it would not be possible to create a new infrastructure to manage these operations by September 2024. It would be possible to manage some operations around Community Recycling Centres (CRC), waste transfer stations and associated transport operations as well as the operation of food waste as they would be Council owned, however the Council would not have the expertise required for this and would have to rely on transferred staff or buy in. A single contract would result in the contractor having full responsibility; however, it was unlikely that one contractor would provide all services. Disaggregating would result in greater competition and value for money. The Resources & Circular Economy Group Manager confirmed that other councils manage multiple contracts successfully and no difficulties were expected.
3. A Member asked what work had been done with district and borough councils and any possible efficiencies from working in partnership. The Resources & Circular Economy Group Manager said that contamination was a costly problem for the Council and the greatest savings relate to unifying collection arrangements.

4. A Member asked if the carbon footprint of each bid would be balanced against financial savings. A Member asked if the carbon footprint of each bid would be balanced against financial savings. The Cabinet Member for Property & Waste stated that the carbon footprint of the current waste treatment and disposal service had been baselined and that a carbon impact assessment tool would be used to analyse the impact of the various bids when submitted
5. A Member asked if new contracts might result in extended opening hours for CRCs. The Cabinet Member for Property & Waste explained that current reduced hours were the result of efficiencies from 2015. Pricing options to increase opening hours for the CRCs would be included as part of the re-procurement in addition to the possibility of developing pedestrian access at some locations.
6. A Member asked if the Council could veto shipping waste material abroad. The Cabinet Member for Property & Waste explained that there were insufficient processing facilities in the UK and to veto the export of material abroad would result in incineration in the UK, significantly impacting cost and carbon impact
7. The carbon benefits of recycling compared to disposal outweighed the impact of shipping some waste abroad, and in any case, contractors will be subject to UK waste regulations regarding exports.
8. The Chairman asked if the reported reference to market engagement taking place in February and March 2022 had been completed. The Resources & Circular Economy Group Manager advised that this had been taking place since 2021 and responses to the current round were due to be returned at the end of March 2022 with assessment taking place soon after. The Chairman requested a briefing note on the current round of engagement once this had been assessed.
9. The Chairman asked if a disposal facility in Surrey for easily recyclable items had been considered. The Cabinet Member for Property & Waste confirmed that investigations were ongoing into establishing a Materials Recycling Facility (MRF) to sort material into recyclables before being transferred to processing sites throughout the country.

Resolved:

The Select Committee:

1. Is minded, in principle, to support the multiple-contracts option rather than the continuation of a single provider.

2. Welcomes the good working relationships established with the district and borough councils in Surrey and expects these to be sustained through the contractual processes and beyond.
3. Asks Cabinet Member, as part of the Outline Business Case (OBC) for the re-procurement of Waste treatment and disposal services process and negotiation, to enable the extension of opening hours of Surrey County Council Recycling Centres to cover the entire week; and to develop pedestrian access to recycling facilities. Also, the OBC and the final assessment of bids should also consider and include carbon impact assessments.
4. Requests Service (working with partners) to encourage more joined-up communication and outreach to residents about potential waste contaminations (and how to avoid this) in their weekly bins
5. A short update note about the progress, when the next stage in the process is achieved, to be provided to the Select Committee.

16/22 ADOPTION OF MOVING TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT POWERS [ITEM 7]

Witnesses:

Matt Furniss, Cabinet Member for Transport & Infrastructure

Katie Stewart, Executive Director for Environment, Transport & Infrastructure

Lucie Monie, Director, Highways & Transport

Richard Bolton, Highways and Operations Infrastructure Group Manager

David Curl, Parking & Traffic Enforcement Manager

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. A Member asked if items currently on the Integrated Transport Scheme (ITS) list would be reevaluated with any requirement to reconfigure a location considered for camera installation instead. The Cabinet Member for Transport & Infrastructure confirmed this and that assessment of the busiest junctions would be prioritised. The Parking & Traffic Enforcement Manager added that if no low-cost solution could be implemented with engineering solutions an enforcement camera could potentially be used instead.

2. A Member requested clarification regarding the process to raise locations of concern. The Cabinet Member for Transport & Infrastructure gave highways@surreycc.gov.uk for reporting concerns and noted that the adoption would not come into force until June 2022.
3. A Member asked if a solution to enforcing pavement parking restrictions would continue to be looked at. The Cabinet Member for Transport & Infrastructure confirmed that there had been no response from the Government following their consultation on pavement parking and that an update would be requested.
4. A Member queried if cycle lanes would be included in any forthcoming ban on pavement parking. The Cabinet Member for Transport & Infrastructure confirmed that new rules would apply to mandatory cycle lanes, identified by a solid line.
5. The Chairman asked what the outcome might be of the review of yellow box junctions. The Parking & Traffic Enforcement Manager confirmed that surveys had been conducted in the previous week and were being analysed for areas suitable for enforcement camera use.
6. The Chairman asked Officers to consider presenting an All-Member Seminar on this subject. The Cabinet Member for Transport & Infrastructure agreed that a seminar could be presented to members in late summer after powers come into effect in June 2022.
7. A Member asked if there was a cost to the Council when a camera was turned off. The Cabinet Member for Transport & Infrastructure explained that cameras were not turned off but if they ceased to act as a deterrent, an alternative location would be identified for their use. The cost of cameras covered the technology of image processing software for continual operation.
8. A Member asked if the adopted powers would be used across the county so that residents could see that the issue was being tackled. The Cabinet Member for Transport & Infrastructure said that proof was required by the Department for Transport that specific criteria were being followed but when powers had been adopted they could be spread throughout the county as required, following the process set out in the report.

Resolved:

The Select Committee:

1. Supports the draft recommendations to Cabinet outlined in the report.

2. Asks the Cabinet Member/Service to consider arranging an all-Member Seminar on this topic (Adoption of Moving Traffic Enforcement Powers) covering the changes, practical implications, selected sites, associated process and Members' role.
3. Requests Cabinet Member to write to the relevant Government Minister for further details about pavement parking.

17/22 RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKER AND FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME [Item 8]

The Select Committee noted the Recommendation Tracker and the Forward Work Programme.

18/22 DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING: 14 JUNE 2022 [Item 9]

The Committee noted its next meeting would be held on 14 June 2022.

Meeting ended at: 12.42pm

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank