

## **Environment, Development and Transport Committee**

### **Minutes of the Meeting held on Friday, 10 November 2017 at 10am in the Edwards Room, County Hall**

#### **Present:**

Mr M Wilby - Chair

Mr M Castle

Mr S Clancy (Vice-Chairman)

Mr P Duigan

Mr T East

Mr S Eyre

Mr C Foulger

Mr A Grant

Mr T Jermy

Mr C Jones

Ms J Oliver

Mr B Spratt

Mr A White

#### **1. Apologies and Substitutions**

- 1.1 Apologies were received from Mr T Smith (Mr B Spratt substituting).

#### **2. Minutes**

- 2.1 The minutes of the meeting held on 20 October 2017 were agreed as an accurate record and signed by the Chairman.

#### **3. Members to Declare any Interests**

- 3.1 No interests were declared

#### **4. Urgent Business**

- 4.1 The chairman updated the committee that an opening ceremony was being held later that day to mark the opening of a 4 mile stretch of the Norwich Distributor Road the following day. Construction was on track for opening of the road in March 2019, with the aim of opening the Wroxham Road section earlier.

#### **5. Public Questions**

- 5.1 One public question was received; see appendix A.

#### **6. Member Questions**

- 6.1 No member questions were received.

**7. Feedback from Members of the Committee regarding Member Working Groups or bodies that they sit on.**

- 7.1 The Committee received an update from Mr Foulger from the NDR Working Group. A short update was given on progress of construction of the road, with the target of opening the road by Spring 2018. Further information on project administration and costs would be reported to the working group when available. The contract position would be reported to the Committee at a later date.
- 7.2 An update was circulated from the Norwich Western link working group; see appendix B.
- 7.3 Mr Castle updated the Committee on the Levy Meeting for the Regional Flood and coastal Committee meeting; due to traffic problems and signalling on the railway the meeting had been postponed until the 24 November 2017;

**8. Adoption of the Silica Sand Single Issue Review**

- 8.1 The Committee received the report outlining the Single Issue Silica Sand Review of the Minerals Site Specific Allocations Development Plan Document for recommendation to full Council.
- 8.2.1 The Principal Planner (Minerals and Waste Policy) reported that Officers were not expecting any speculative applications for silica sand extraction; they were not aware of any sites likely to come forward that were not included in the plan but acknowledged that anybody could make a planning application at any time.
- 8.2.2 The Principal Planner (Minerals and Waste Policy) clarified that Officers were not expecting a legal challenge on adoption of the plan but could not know for sure until after closure of the 6 week period. Officers had received no notice of challenge.
- 8.2.3 The Principal Planner (Minerals and Waste Policy) clarified that any planning applications would have to be determined by the relevant Planning Committee; planning conditions would have regard to adopted policies and consultations with the Environment Agency, Public Health and other statutory bodies to ensure appropriate protection would be provided for local residents.
- 8.2.4 The Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services noted that the Single Issue Silica Sand Review document was recommended for approval by the Planning Inspector, and there were no protests raised against its adoption.
- 8.3 The Committee **RECOMMENDED** to full council to:
1. **NOTE** the content of the Inspector's report into the examination of the Single Issue Silica Sand Review (Appendix 1 to this report);
  2. **RESOLVE** to formally **ADOPT** the Single Issue Silica Sand Review, incorporating the Main Modifications and additional modifications (Appendix 2 to this report);
  3. **RESOLVE** to formally **ADOPT** the associated changes to the Revised Policies Map (Appendix 3 to this report);
  4. **NOTE** that, on adoption, the Single Issue Silica Sand Review would form part of the adopted Norfolk Minerals Site Specific Allocations Development Plan Document.

## 9. Ash Dieback Project update

- 9.1.1 The Committee received the update report on the achievements and results of the Ash Dieback Project to date, focusing on highway trees
- 9.1.2 The Senior Arboricultural and Woodland Officer introduced the report and gave an update on current data related to ash dieback in Norfolk. Findings from research related to trees on Norfolk County Council sites would be presented to Business and Property Committee in January 2018.
- 9.2.1 The Senior Arboricultural and Woodland Officer clarified that tree replacement may be on a like for like basis in some instances however on trails would likely not due to ecological management of the sites.
- 9.2.2 The Senior Arboricultural and Woodland Officer reported that there was an ecological, wildlife and landscape benefit to retaining the existing tree landscape, as not all would succumb to the disease; it was estimated that more than 50% of trees with dieback would be felled. Felling licences would be needed for landowners looking to fell large amounts of trees.
- 9.2.3 The Senior Arboricultural and Woodland Officer clarified that the cost of new trees was dependent on the type of tree, ranging from £1 for small saplings to £500 for large trees. External funding was being sought for this and this was being included in the strategy. A range of tree varieties would be planted to provide resilience against different diseases.
- 9.2.4 There was no update on the Earlham Institute and John Innes Centre project to develop disease resistant strains of tree however noted it may take up to 10 years.
- 9.2.5 It was suggested communication with town and parish councils would be helpful.
- 9.3 The Committee:
  - 1. **NOTED** the update and **AGREED** to continue to support the ash dieback project;
  - 2. **SUPPORTED** the recruitment of an additional support post to enable the Council to fulfil its responsibilities under the Highways Act with regard to tree safety.

## 10. Great Yarmouth Third River Crossing – Stage 2 public consultation

- 10.1.1 The Committee considered the report setting out the consultation process and responses received for the Great Yarmouth Third River Crossing Project.
- 10.1.2 The Lead Communications Officer updated the Committee that in order to evidence the strong local support that funding was needed as a priority, a social media campaign had been launched, backed by the EDP and Great Yarmouth Mercury. It would be promoted on the Councils Twitter and Facebook page; she encouraged members of the committee to retweet and share the campaign using the hashtag #gy3rc.
- 10.1.3 The Lead Communications Officer **agreed** to post support on Cllrs behalves where needed.

- 10.2.1 The positive impacts of the project were noted and discussed, and the benefits which would be brought to Yarmouth, Lowestoft and the surrounding areas.
- 10.2.2 The statement in the report “Suggestion that the commitment to lift the bridge on demand of all commercial vehicles cannot be met” was queried. The Infrastructure Delivery Manager reported that modelling was based on the number of openings needed for projected vessel movements; this comment was from concerns raised during consultation. The bridge would open for commercial river traffic.
- 10.2.3 The scale and size of vessels was looked into when designing the height of the bridge; the final height was determined due to the height needed to carry the road above Southtown Road. It was not cost effective to build higher than this, as well as causing a visual and environmental impact.
- 10.2.4 In order to engage with stakeholders more in the next round of consultation, there would be more work with social media, as discussed, and more had been done to engage with businesses and the wider town, which would continue.
- 10.2.5 Mr East proposed that the committee agree that the bridge would be opened within the next 5 years; the Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services confirmed that a decision was still needed from Department of Transport in relation to funding, and the timeline was for construction to start in 2020.
- 10.2.6 The Vice-Chairman asked the Chairman to put pressure on the Government and local MPs; the Chairman clarified that he had been putting pressure on the local MP and this was being followed up with the social media campaign.
- 10.3 The Committee:
1. **NOTED** the outcomes of the consultation described in this report;
  2. **NOTED** the specific issues (as detailed in Section 3.0 of the report) raised as part of the consultation that would need to be considered in more detail during the next stage of scheme development;
  3. **APPROVED** the further development of the preferred scheme which provided for a bascule bridge with a clearance of 4.5m over the water at average high tide, as set out in the outline business case. The next steps would include a further statutory public consultation in 2018 on the detailed scheme, and the results would be reported to Committee prior to the submission of an application for planning consent.

#### 10.4 Highways annual survey results

- 10.4.1 The Head of Highways updated the committee on the 2017 results of the highways annual survey:
- Norfolk County Council were ranked 7<sup>th</sup> out of 31;
  - The overall score was 54%;
  - Street lighting scored below average, reduced by 6% from last year;
  - Rights of way was below average, reduced by 1% from last year;
  - Enforcement and obstructions was also below average from last year;
  - Local bus services improved by 6% from last year;
  - Provision of drains and highway drainage and keeping drains clean improved;
  - A press statement would be prepared for release after the meeting.

10.4.2 It was suggested it would be useful to look at areas which scored more highly to learn from them. This was noted. The Head of Highways said it would also be useful to look at how the Council communicated to residents what it was doing.

10.5 There was a break at 10:50 until 11:08 for the Norfolk County Council remembrance service.

## **11. Norfolk Infrastructure Delivery Plan**

11.1 The Committee received the report outlining the Norfolk Infrastructure Delivery Plan (NIDP), which set out known high level strategic infrastructure needs for the upcoming 10 years.

11.4.1 The Senior Infrastructure & Economic Growth Planner informed the Committee that the Infrastructure Delivery Plan was a live document produced in partnership with the district councils, infrastructure and utility providers which would be regularly reviewed. It had been approved by joint Officer groups, and the authorities' Chief Executives and Leaders from across the delivery plan partnership.

11.4.2 A Member **suggested** that "digital innovation and efficiency" be added into the plan with specific reference to mobile phones.

11.4.3 It was **suggested** that the listed projects were shown under two headings of "projects with Norfolk County Council funding or control" and "projects of strategic importance to Norfolk where Norfolk County Council were involved in delivery". The Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services clarified that the Council was one delivery partner among many of this plan; more details of individual schemes were shown later in the plan including the identification of the lead authority for each project.

11.4.4 It was **suggested** that the Plan should make reference to the aspiration that infrastructure should be provided in advance of housing development; the Chairman **suggested** putting this forward as a recommendation.

11.4.5 A Member argued that the document was not a delivery plan as delivery of the projects within it were subject to outside influences and many details were unknown. The Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services clarified that the document was intended to set out known high level infrastructure needs, bringing together information to demonstrate to Government Norfolk's investment needs for funding, to enable delivery of the projects. Discussion was held over the name which it was felt did not reflect the true intention of the document. The Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services **agreed** to feed all comments from the meeting back to the delivery partners for the next iteration of the Plan.

11.4.6 The Chairman updated Committee that the developers for the Long Stratton Bypass were likely to put in a planning application this December 2017.

11.4.7 It was **suggested** that removing the word "delivery" from the title, to "Norfolk Infrastructure Delivery Plan", would allay concerns raised about the title of the document. The Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services **agreed** to feed this suggestion and others raised in the meeting back to the delivery plan partnership.

- 11.5
1. The Committee **ENDORSED** the Norfolk Infrastructure Delivery Plan and **SUPPORTED** the strategic approach to infrastructure planning with a caveat for aspiration for the Committee to see detail on timescales and detail;
  2. **RECOMMENDED** that Norfolk County Council work to the principle that infrastructure should be provided in advance of housing development

## **12. Greater Norwich Development Partnership – progress on the joint Local Plan**

- 12.1 The Committee considered the report outlining progress on the Greater Norwich Local Plan and providing an opportunity for Members to consider the proposed public consultation document ahead of its commencement in January 2018.
- 12.2.1 Feedback had been received that the consultation document was too long however it was noted that the document would be supported by an information leaflet which would identify key issues and direct people to the questions. It was necessary to include all relevant information in the consultation document, resulting in the large size of the document.
- 12.2.2 The emphasis on future health care provision when future sites were approved was queried; this was **noted** for future consideration.
- 12.2.3 The Principal Planner clarified that the consultation was aimed at all interested parties including the public, businesses, the development industry and statutory consultees such as Parish Councils, Highways England and other Government agencies.
- 12.2.4 The Principal Planner explained that County Council policies and priorities aimed to locate estate scale housing allocations close to services, including primary schools, based on sound planning principles while also seeking to avoid ongoing legacy costs.
- 12.2.5 It was confirmed District Councils were the final decision making bodies and the Greater Norwich Development Partnership would make recommendations to them.
- 12.3 The Committee **AGREED** to:
- **NOTE** progress on the production of the Greater Norwich Local Plan; and
  - **SUPPORT**, in principle, consultation on issues and options, with the final decision on the 20 November Greater Norwich Development Partnership Board's recommendation taken under delegated powers.

## **13. Norwich Depot Hub – project initiation**

- 13.1.1 The Committee received the report outlining progress on the scheme to develop a joint depot hub for the County Council's Highways service, Broadland District Council's waste collection services and a Household Waste Recycling Centre.
- 13.1.2 The key driver for the hub was a new location for a household waste centre. Wider potential for the project could be park and ride changes but this would need to be looked at as the project moved forward; there would need to be careful consideration before further decisions were brought back to committee about this.

- 13.2.1 It was suggested that the household recycling centre be designed in a similar layout to the one in Thetford which was felt to have a better size and accessibility than the one at Caister.
- 13.2.2 The Infrastructure Delivery Manager would bring the business case to a future meeting of the Committee; the consultation plan, which was currently draft, would also be brought to a future meeting. This focussed mainly around changes to the household recycling centre.
- 13.2.3 Initial modelling work had been done to ensure there would be no significant impact on the road network, including the capacity of the NDR and its junctions.
- 13.2.4 A bid had been made to the Cabinet Office under the Norfolk One Public Estate for money for feasibility studies and master planning around the scheme; if this bid was not successful, partners would need to put money towards the feasibility study. This would be detailed in the business case.
- 13.3 The Chairman left the room at 11:54; Mr Clancy (Vice-Chairman) in the Chair.
- 13.4.1 The Vice Chairman, seconded by Mr Castle, **proposed** to set up a Norwich Depot Hub task and finish group to work with Officers who would report through the Committee. Mr Castle **proposed** the representation of this group consist of 7 Cllrs, 4 Conservative, 2 Labour and 1 Liberal Democrat.
- 13.4.2 The proposal was unanimously **AGREED**.
- 13.4.3 The Vice-Chairman asked for Political Groups to agree their representatives for the group and forward to the Committee Officer for agreement by the Chairman. It was suggested that a Member, possibly Chairman of the task and finish group, would also be appointed to the Project Board.
- 13.5 Mr Wilby (Chairman) in the Chair, 12:00pm
- 13.6 The Committee:
1. **NOTED** progress on the scheme to date and **AGREED** that the scheme could be taken forward, subject to development of a full business case;
  2. **APPROVED** the establishment of a project board to oversee the delivery of the scheme;
  3. **AGREED** that the board could oversee the delivery of a communications and consultation plan;
  4. **AGREED** to set up a Norwich Depot Hub task and finish group of 4 Conservative, 2 Labour and 1 Liberal Democrat members; membership proposals to be forwarded to democratic services.

## **14. Finance Monitoring**

- 14.1 Members considered the report providing information on the budget position for services reporting to the Committee for 2017-18.
- 14.2.1 The Head of Support and Development for Community and Environmental Services clarified that table 1 showed the forecast outturn and that the service was forecasting to deliver to budget.

- 14.2.2 More detailed information on the actual spend to date was **requested** for future reports.
- 14.2.3 Concern was raised over the wording of a statement within the report; the Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services apologised for this.
- 14.2.4 It was confirmed that the budget proposal related to the waste service was still out to consultation and therefore was not included in the report.
- 14.2.4 The Chairman updated the Committee on proposed specific allocations of the £20m detailed at paragraph 3.5 of the report:
- Market town schemes: £1.25m
  - Footway crossings: £1m
  - Junction improvements: £1m
  - Construction to major schemes £1m
  - Parish partnerships: £150,000
  - Member budget: £500,000
  - Public Rights of Way: £100,000
- 14.2.5 The Chairman asked Officers to bring back a report detailing the listed allocations.
- 14.3 The Committee **NOTED**:
- a) The forecast out-turn position for the Environment, Development and Transport Committee;
  - b) The capital programme for this Committee;
  - c) The current planned use of the reserves and the forecast balance of reserves as at the end of March 2018.

## **15. Forward Plan and decisions taken under delegated authority**

- 15.1 The Committee **REVIEWED** the forward plan and **NOTED** decisions taken by Officers under delegated authority, as detailed in section 1.2 of the report.
- 15.2 It was **agreed** that headline data from the highways survey would be circulated.
- 15.3 Additional reports were **requested** on:
- The Norwich Depot Hub business case (paragraph 13.2.2);
  - The Norwich Depot Hub consultation plan (paragraph 13.2.2);
  - A report detailing the allocations listed at paragraph 14.2.4;

The meeting closed at 12:08 PM

**Mr Martin Wilby, Chairman,  
Environment Development and Transport Committee**



**If you need this document in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language, please contact Customer Services on 0344 800 8020, or Text Relay on 18001 800 8020 (textphone) and we will do our best to help.**



## **PUBLIC QUESTION TO ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE: FRIDAY 10 NOVEMBER 2017**

### **5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

#### **5.1 Question from Andrew Illing**

With regards to the Western Link in Ringland, can you guarantee:

- 1) Light and sound proofing the new road: that dark skies policy will be maintained and sound proofing of the traffic through the valley?  
Raising the traffic up will make things far worse.
- 2) Wildlife tunnels will be provided, to enable animal migration?

#### **Response by Chairman of EDT Committee**

We are at an early stage in the delivery of the project, and there will be significant environmental assessment completed as part of the development of possible options. All details and impacts will be subject to extensive public consultation which will start in 2018. Ultimately, a preferred solution, and any associated impacts and mitigation, will be tested at an independent public examination.

**Norwich Western Link Project – Update for EDT Committee from Working Group (for 10 November 2017)**

Further to previous meetings of the Norwich Western Link Project (NWL) Member Working Group and the report provided at the 20 October EDT Committee meeting, a meeting was held on 8 November to provide an update for the Member Group. The following provides a brief summary of the meeting:

1. Highways England's (HE) latest progress for the A47 proposals from North Tuddenham to Easton was discussed, with Mark Frith from Mott MacDonald (representing HE) providing the Group with an update. The phasing of the construction delivery recently announced by HE was discussed, but it was pointed out that the statutory process remains in line with previous proposals, with further formal consultation planned for May 2018. Recent meetings and discussions with local communities were also outlined with plans for further engagement in December, with discussions focussing around the junction strategy for the A47 project. The Group were clear in their expectation that the NCC and HE delivery teams for both projects should work together as much as possible to minimise delays or abortive work where-ever possible for both projects.
2. The Group received an overview of the technical report linked to the EDT Committee report presented at its last meeting on 20 October. In particular there was a detailed discussion on the next steps set out in that report. A more detailed delivery programme will be presented to the Group at its next meeting. The Group provided a clear expectation for the NWL project team to maintain good communication with Highways England.
3. The Group also received a more detailed update from Claire Sullivan from NCC on the proposals being developed as part of the project communications plan. The Group reviewed the high level stakeholder list and provided feedback on this and advised on expectations regarding the scope of engagement. Details of how all communications will be tracked were also provided to the Group and the format for a letter to other Local Authorities from the Member Group was discussed and agreed. The need to respond to articles and letters in the EDP newspaper was also discussed.
4. The Local Plan Review process was briefly discussed with an update from Phil Morris from NCC. Consultation is expected to run from January through to March 2018. An update on the Food Hub development and the associated Local Development Order (LDO) was provided by Steve Scowen from Broadland District Council. The LDO is now in place with a routing agreement signed and completed. There are some conditions of the order which require some work in advance of uses on site occurring, but there is potential for operators to be occupying on site by 2019. The Group raised concerns regarding the management of construction traffic, but noted that permission for the development is now in place. It would be expected that a traffic management plan will be provided and agreed with HE and NCC as part of any construction proposals.
5. The next local group meeting (with parish council representatives) is planned for 14 November and the agenda proposed for this was discussed with the Member Group. This next meeting will provide an opportunity for discussion on the details in the technical report, a run through the next steps for the project in 2018 and how the local group can contribute to this, and details of the planned communications and stakeholder engagement will be discussed, with requests for how the local group can assist with this process.

For more details, please contact David Allfrey (Infrastructure Delivery Manager).  
Tel 01603 223292