

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

### **Minutes of the Meeting held on Friday, 16 March 2018 at 10am in the Edwards Room at County Hall**

**Present:**

Mr M Wilby - Chair

Mrs C Bowes

Mr M Castle

Mr S Clancy (Vice-Chairman)

Mr P Duigan

Mr T East

Mr S Eyre

Mr C Foulger

Mr T Garrod

Mr T Jermy

Ms J Oliver

Mrs C Walker

Mr A White

#### **1. Introduction and Thanks**

- 1.1 The Chairman welcomed members of the Highways Team and a Norfolk Farmer to the Meeting, who helped clear roads during the recent snow. He was proud of the work of Norfolk County Council (NCC) staff during the snow and felt the efforts of the Highways Team, Contractors and Farmers deserved special thanks for going the extra mile, having worked 12 hour shifts and in treacherous conditions. He thanked members of the public who helped neighbours and friends. On behalf of the Committee, Council and Norfolk the Chairman thanked the staff present and all Highways Staff in depots across the County, who were a credit to Norfolk.
- 1.2 Mr East echoed the praise of the Chairman to the Highways Team, Emergency Services and Farmers during the 'Beast from the East'. He asked the Assistant Director of Highways why snow ploughs weren't deployed earlier and if lessons had been learned, noting the forecast snow. The Assistant Director of Highways reported that farmers were contacted on the Monday ahead of snow and around 80 deployed on contract to assist. It was difficult to know when to deploy ploughs until the extent of snowfall was clear.
- 1.3 Mrs Walker thanked the crews who kept Norfolk 'open for business', helping elderly residents, keeping shops open and buses running, and thanked the Highways Team for their excellent work. She was critical of Greater Anglia Railway services from Yarmouth which were cancelled despite other rail services and buses running. The Vice-chairman noted that Norwich Airport was able to run services the next day.
- 1.4 Mr Castle reported that Cllr Squire had attended a gritting run and wanted to express admiration of the work.
- 1.5 Mr Jermy agreed with comments made; he felt the snow had shown Norfolk and its staff at their best. He noted that carers and Adult Social Services staff had also gone the extra mile during this time, and wished to thank staff for their good work.

## **2. Apologies and Substitutions**

- 2.1 Apologies were received from Mr T Smith (Mrs C Bowes substituting) and Mr A Grant (Mr T Garrod substituting). Also absent was Mr C Jones (Mrs C Walker substituting).

## **3. Minutes**

- 3.1 The minutes of the meeting held on 19 January 2018 were agreed as an accurate record and signed by the Chairman subject to the following amendment:
- Page 10: Mr Castle was nominated as a **member** of Third River Crossing member group, not Chairman.
- 3.2 9.2.3: Mr East did not recall receiving the letter discussed at this point. The Chairman agreed to look into this.

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

- 4.1 No interests were declared.

## **5. Urgent Business**

- 5.1 The Chairman had met with the trails team at Beeston Bump where they had repaired the footpath, which was part of the National Trail; he thanked the team for maintaining access to one of the best views in Norfolk.

## **6. Public Questions**

- 6.1 No public questions were received.

## **7. Member Questions**

- 7.1 Two member questions were received and the answers circulated; see Appendix A.
- 7.2.1 Mr Roper asked a supplementary question: “does the Chairman agree with Andrea Leadsom MP that charging residents for taking household DIY waste to the tip is unfair and could be a lead factor in the increase in fly tipping?” The Chairman said he accepted her views however noted she was no longer the Environment Minister.
- 7.2.2 Mr East asked for the response to Mr T Smith’s question to be expanded to show the contribution of Cllr M Strong; the Chairman replied that he thanked all who contributed to securing these services.

## **8. Verbal update/feedback from Members of the Committee regarding Member Working Groups or bodies that they sit on.**

- 8.1 An update from the Norwich Western Link Project Member Working Group was circulated; see appendix B.

- 8.2 An update from the Norwich Depot Hub Member Group was circulated; see appendix C.
- 8.3.1 Mr Foulger updated members from the most recent meetings of the Third River Crossing Members Working Group and Norwich Distributor Road (NDR) Working Group:
- The Third River Crossing had been agreed to be of national significance by the Secretary of State and was estimated to be completed by 2022-2023; the Working Group would complete a site visit in the next 2-3 months to identify any potential problems;
  - Completion of the NDR had been delayed by the snow until the end of the Easter bank holiday weekend. Mr Foulger was pleased to note positive reports given in the EDP (Eastern Daily Press). Pressures in the budget remained, however work continued with contractors to address these.
- 8.3.2 Concern was raised over press coverage related to the Third River Crossing.

## **9. Highway Parish Partnership Schemes 2018/19**

- 9.1 The Committee considered the report setting out the proposed parish partnership programme for 2018/19 following analysis and review of the applications submitted.
- 9.2.1 The Chairman thanked the EDP for front page coverage of this in the day's paper.
- 9.2.2 The Asset and Capital Programme Manager updated the Committee that of the 10 reported rejections, 4 had subsequently been agreed, 2 were in further discussion and there were 4 firm rejections. Following a request for clarification, the Asset and Capital Programme Manager gave detail on the 4 rejected schemes and reported that the 4 subsequently agreed schemes amounted to £6,500.
- 9.2.3 Mr Garrod discussed how Coltishall Parish Council worked in partnership with neighbouring parishes, NCC and police to identify areas for Vehicle Activated Signs.
- 9.2.4 Concern was raised that the schemes could be filling gaps created by money being taken from other budgets; the Assistant Director of Highways replied that the aim of the Parish Partnership Scheme was to develop local solutions from local knowledge. Good relationships between Local Members and parish councils were reported.
- 9.3 The Committee **APPROVED** all bids listed in Appendix B for inclusion in the Parish Partnership Programme for 2018/19.

## **10. Recommendations of the Norfolk Strategic Planning Member Forum**

- 10.1 The Committee received the report detailing the Norfolk Strategic Planning Framework (previously the Norfolk Strategic Framework) recommended for approval by the Norfolk Strategic Planning Member Forum at their meeting in December 2017.
- 10.2.1 All District Councils in Norfolk had now agreed the framework.
- 10.2.2 The Vice-Chairman wished to amend the terminology in the framework to specify that the framework was around the duty to co-operate with all partners, to highlight the importance of the co-operative approach.

- 10.2.3 A Member was concerned about paragraph 5.5, which laid out the response to a request at a previous Committee meeting to include the tributaries of the Wensum. The Principal Planner confirmed that this issue would be addressed through the proposed Green Infrastructure Strategy.
- 10.3 The Committee **RESOLVED** to **ENDORSE** the Norfolk Strategic Planning Framework as part of the ongoing duty to co-operate process.

## **11. Committee Plan 2018/19**

- 11.1.1 The Committee considered the three year forward plan, setting out how its areas of responsibility would be shaped by the ambition of “*Caring for our County: A vision for Norfolk in 2021*”, and the principles of the “*Norfolk Futures*” strategy.
- 11.1.2 The Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services **suggested** a waste indicator should be included in the plan. The Chairman agreed with this and would include it in the resolution.
- 11.2.1 It was suggested there was not enough information included related to bus services.
- 11.2.2 A Member noted that acquiring funding from government was important for delivering schemes and the service; some Members raised concern about a recent interview with the Leader, which it was felt could impact on the reputation of Norfolk and on its ability to influence MPs.
- 11.2.3 It was suggested that performance monitoring measures on p61 of the report, particularly red measures, should not been removed, and that measures for monitoring air pollution were important such as cars idling and morning traffic.
- 11.2.4 A Member raised the importance of monitoring rail services and maintaining the East Midlands Rail line service. Having an increased focus on waste disposal was highlighted as important.
- 11.2.5 The Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services clarified that the Performance Management report at item 14 gave further detail on performance indicators including waste and transport indicators; these would evolve over time and could be influenced by Members’ input.
- 11.2.6 The Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services noted that the East Midlands Rail line could not be used to monitor Norfolk’s performance; the interim Team Leader for Transport reported that NCC consistently gave evidence on use of the East Midlands line and responded to the proposal for it to be split to say that it should be kept as a direct Norwich to Liverpool service.
- 11.2.7 In response to concerns raised about an article in the EDP, the Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services replied that Officers would continue to work professionally with officials in Whitehall, based on evidence, and engage with stakeholders to work towards delivering the Third River Crossing.
- 11.2.8 The Vice-Chairman asked for the wording on p50 to be changed to ‘...continue to push for the business case for the Norwich Western Link’.

11.2.9 The Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services clarified that energy use, including for street lighting was reported into Business and Property Committee.

11.3 The Committee **RESOLVED** to:

1. **AGREE** the Environment, Development and Transport Committee Plan, set out in Appendix 1 of the report;
2. **NOTE** the Committee's contribution to, and responsibilities for, Norfolk Futures, NCC's transformation plan;
3. **AGREE** the inclusion of an indicator on residual waste volume to report to Policy and Resources Committee for monitoring purposes.

## **12. Sub National Transport Bodies and the East of England Sub National Transport Forum**

12.1 The Committee received the report containing detail on how Sub-national Transport Bodies (STBs) could investment decisions on the major transport networks.

12.2.1 Detail was requested on funding sources and priorities of the STB. The Interim Team Leader for Transport reported that Transport East had suggested a work programme to start work on a transport strategy across the area, including a look at schemes and identify priorities. STBs could have influence over rail services, road programmes and the major road network, therefore Officers would initially meet with the other Local Authorities to identify key priorities.

12.2.2 It was noted that districts had representation on the Forum.

12.2.3 It was **requested** that minutes of the East of England Sub National Transport Forum were circulated to the Committee.

12.2.4 The similar interests of Norfolk and Suffolk related to dualling of the A47 and the possible disadvantages of not being a devolved authority were discussed.

12.2.5 The Vice-chairman queried what the priorities for the Council would be for the STB, and **requested** that the Committee receive regular reports on progress of the STB.

12.2.6 The Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services reported that Transport for the North had published a draft "30 year forward investment plan" asking for £60bn from the Government for infrastructure. Concern was raised that the 'northern powerhouse' had more authority than Norfolk to do this; the Chairman replied that this was the time for Norfolk to step up.

12.2.7 The Chairman requested that the committee agree a £6000 annual contribution towards the Forum, to be kept under review, to cover operating costs of the STB.

12.3 The Committee **RESOLVED** to:

1. **NOTE** the engagement of Norfolk County Council in the East of England Subnational Transport Forum, represented by the chair of Environment, Development and Transport Committee;
2. **CONSIDER** the benefits of being a member of a Sub-national Transport Body;
3. **INCLUDE** the £6,000 annual contribution towards the STB.

### 13. Risk management

- 13.1 The Committee reviewed the risk management report providing information from the latest Environment, Development and Transport Committee risk register as at March 2018, following the latest review conducted in February 2018.
- 13.2.1 Concern was raised over the amber rating given to the Third River Crossing; the Risk Management Officer reported that the score reflected that it was the beginning of the project, recognising the project risks moving forward. The Economic Development Manager added that the direction from the Secretary of State was important however risks around programme and budget meant it was right to remain cautious. The overseeing board received updates on risks.
- 13.2.2 It was queried how risk scores were arrived at and raised that the public may not understand the scoring. The Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services reported that risks would decrease as the project progressed; there were 30 risks involved in the project and each were worked through methodically. As a local member Mrs Walker **asked** to be kept informed on progress.
- 13.2.3 The Infrastructure Delivery Manager reported that formal consultations would be carried out through the year to engage with the public.
- 13.3 Mr T White left the meeting at 11:02
- 13.4.1 Mr Foulger, as Chairman of member working group, was pleased with the work of Members. He felt the work for the NDR working group had started late, therefore, taking forward learning from this, he was pleased at the responses of Officers from challenges given by Members.
- 13.4.2 Mr Castle, a member of the Working Group, noted that the NDR project had more opposition than the Third River Crossing, which had a broad agreement.
- 13.4.3 It was noted that the public may not understand the positives of the project being amber at this early stage. The Economic Development Manager replied that a statement would be brought to the member update.
- 13.5 The Committee:
- a) **NOTED** Risk RM14336 - Failure to construct and deliver the Great Yarmouth 3rd River Crossing within agreed budget (£121m), and **AGREED** timescales (construction completed early 2023), which was reported by exception (in paragraph 2.2 and Appendix A of the report), and changes to other departmental risks (in Appendix D);
  - b) **AGREED** that the recommended mitigating actions identified for the new risk RM14336 in Appendix A were appropriate;

### 14. Performance management

- 14.1 The Committee reviewed the performance report based upon the revised Performance Management System, implemented as of 1 April 2016, and the Committee's 13 vital signs indicators.
- 14.2.1 It was queried why the key measures of "percentage of people able to reach a market

town within 60 minutes on public transport” and “average journey speed during morning peak time” had been changed. The Senior Analyst reported that “average journey speed...” would be reported to Committee separately; this had not been reported on for some time as the data had been unreliable. The Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services reported that new software was being purchased to report on road network operation, including speed on the network and provide greater detail.

- 14.2.2 The Infrastructure Development Group Manager reported that current data received from the Department for Transport was a crude measure of operation of the network and did not give empirical data such as who used the network, bus patronage, walking or cycling data. The new software would allow mobile phone software to be accessed to see how the network was operating live to provide a holistic view on its operation.
- 14.2.3 “Access to key services by public transport” was noted as a positive inclusion; it was noted how many buses were subsidised and that awareness should be raised in order to promote them and increase usage.
- 14.3 The Committee:
  - 1. **REVIEWED** the performance data, information and analysis presented in the vital sign report cards and **AGREED** the recommended actions identified were appropriate;
  - 2. **AGREED** to the removal of the “Average journey speed during morning peak time” measure.

## **15. Finance monitoring**

- 15.1.1 The Committee received the report giving information on the budget position for services reporting to the Committee for 2017-18, information on the revenue budget including forecast over or underspends and identified budget risks, an update on the forecast use of reserves and details of the capital programme.
- 15.1.2 The Finance Business Partner for Community and Environmental Services reported that an update had been circulated to Members on the cost of dealing with issues caused by the snow. The Chairman thanked the Assistant Director of Highways for the updates which kept everyone up to date during the snow.
- 15.2.1 Reference was made to the update received and its impact on data in the report; the Finance Business Partner for Community and Environmental Services confirmed the report was drafted prior to these issues and therefore there may be an impact on reserves, however that it was not a cause for concern.
- 15.2.2 The ability to forecast the cost of gritting was raised in light of the recent weather; the Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services reported that winter spend was monitored over a number of years and the budget was adjusted according to this. Noting that the winter of 2017 was a mild winter, it was hoped that this year’s hard winter would not impact on the budget when taken over time.
- 15.2.3 Some of the variances seen in the report were queried. The Finance Business Partner for Community and Environmental Services reported that differences seen in planning were due to residual waste: a time delay was seen in information from districts. Travel and transport saw charges for transport based on activity not invoices received.

- 15.3 The Vice-Chairman left the meeting at 11:20
- 15.4 The Committee **NOTED**:
- a) The Forecast out-turn position for the Environment, Development and Transport Committee revenue budget and **NOTED** the current budget risks being managed by the department;
  - 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.
- 16. Forward Plan, decisions taken under delegated authority and Working Group Terms of Reference**
- 16.1 The Committee reviewed the forward plan, decisions taken under delegated power and proposed terms of reference for the Great Yarmouth Third River Crossing Member Working Group.
- 16.2.1 Mr Castle **requested** a report on the East Midlands Rail including detail on numbers, and usage, and including the current position of "London in 90".
- 16.2.2 Mr East noted that this would also be discussed at the Norfolk rail group. The Chairman **asked** Mr East to let Mr Castle and Mrs Walker know the date of the next meeting.
- 16.3 The Committee:
- 1. **REVIEWED** the Forward Plan at Appendix A of the report and **requested** addition of a report on the East Midlands Rail Line;
  - 2. **NOTED** the delegated decisions set out in section 2 of the report;
  - 3. **APPROVED** the Terms of Reference for the Great Yarmouth Third River Crossing Member Working Group, as set out in Appendix B of the report.

The meeting closed at 11:24

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



## MEMBER/PUBLIC QUESTIONS TO ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE : 16 MARCH 2018

### 5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

#### 5.1 No public questions

### 6. MEMBER QUESTIONS

#### 6.1 Question from Cllr Dan Roper

Can the Chairman of Environment, Development & Transport Committee, comment on the contradiction between the Government statement by Lord Bourne in the House of Lords on 20 March 2017 (HL5836) and page 20 of its Litter Strategy for England April 2017, on the legality of charging local residents for DIY waste at household waste recycling centres?

#### Response by Chairman of EDT Committee

I do not believe that there is a contradiction as Government's 2017 Litter Strategy expanded on the earlier statement by stating that:

*'It is therefore important that, where charges are proposed, they are proportionate and transparent and are made in consultation with local residents so that local services meet local needs.'*

This added clarity to the Government's view is in line with legislation which is why many other authorities, for example Suffolk, Oxfordshire, Dorset and Hampshire already adopt a charging approach for construction and demolition type waste.

#### 6.2 Question from Cllr Thomas Smith

As we have now had the news that our excellent local operators are stepping in to keep buses running in West Norfolk (and well done to the chairman and staff who've worked so quickly for us all), following Stagecoach leaving the district, can the chairman assure us that our subsidised routes (especially the 5, 1 and 3 buses within Lynn town) will keep going.

#### Response by Chairman of EDT Committee

As stated in the recent press release, the services 5 and 3 have been registered commercially by West Norfolk Community Transport and the service 1 by Lynx Bus, to continue running from 29th April when Stagecoach withdraw.

### **6.3 Supplementary Question from Cllr Thomas Smith**

Given the recent confirmation the subsidises are to continue I am sure we shall get interest for all the routes being left vacant, would he be able to orchestrate getting timetables of the amended services out to everyone (one per household like the Norfolk mag we send out), in the affected areas and confirm to residents that these will all be public buses and their bus passes will work, I know there have been rumours they won't which I am sure the Chairman's quashing will stem."

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

As reported in the recent press release, local operators have come forward and registered replacement services for the Stagecoach routes, predominantly on a commercial basis. Publicity for these services is the responsibility of the individual operators, although we will help to keep people informed via member and parish briefing notes. The area covered is too large for a leaflet drop to be practical.

Contact details of the operators were included in the press release and their individual websites will be updated with details of the replacement services over the coming weeks. There is also a page on our own NCC website to help keep the public informed ([www.norfolk.gov.uk/stagecoach](http://www.norfolk.gov.uk/stagecoach))

All services will be public buses and therefore concessionary bus passes will work.

**Norwich Western Link Project - Update for EDT Committee from Working Group (for 16 March 2018)**

Further to previous meetings of the Norwich Western Link (NWL) project Member Working Group and following the last report provided at the 20 October EDT Committee meeting, the most recent meeting of the Group was held on 7 March 2018 to provide a progress update. 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. The project team set out the most recent changes to the delivery programme, which relate to the statutory processes and the coordination of these with other projects. The change is to avoid confusion as the individual A47 projects are delivered through their public examinations and also to balance the resources being used by HE for the projects. Whilst this delay is disappointing, HE have made it very clear that they remain committed to delivering all of the Road Investment Strategy funded projects, and also that there is no change to the previously published construction dates, with the N Tuddenham to Easton project planned for construction from 2021/22. The Member Group want to be kept informed of progress and want to be made aware of any further changes so that they can escalate any issues immediately if needed.
2. The Group received a further update on the progress for the NWL project. WSP provided details of the work being undertaken during 2018, which has seen the start of the necessary corridor appraisal work using the Department for Transport's sifting tool. Work on specific route assessments will then follow and will feed into consultation processes planned for the end of 2018. Specific discussion relating to the project objectives was held and will feed into a further discussion with the local parish group meeting in April.
3. The Group received further details from the delivery team on proposals developed as part of the communications plan for the project. Work has included engagement with a range of stakeholders, with a good number of replies received so far, but more expected. Discussion was held around further letters being issued to make the list of stakeholders more complete and also to develop a tracker that the Group can monitor. Whilst a range of positive responses have been received to date, the team need to continue to chase up those who have not yet responded. The team confirmed that letters have been sent to all parish council's. It was also confirmed that meetings have yet to be held, but have been/are being arranged with environmental groups.

Details regarding the planned consultation starting after the local elections in May (avoiding purdah) were discussed. The Group previously agreed to the use of an electronic system and a further update was provided following the procurement of the system. A detailed demonstration of the completed system will be provided to the Group before the consultation starts.

4. The Local Plan Review process was briefly discussed. Consultation closes on 22 March 2018.
5. The latest local group meeting (with parish council representatives) was held on 22 February and the details from this were discussed with the Member Group. That meeting provided an update from Highways England as well as from the NWL project team on the corridor and route appraisal process and details regarding the planned consultations during 2018. It also provided an overview of the transport modelling process and explained how a model is developed and how surveyed data is captured and used within the model. The local group was advised that they will see details from the model as it is developed and these will also be discussed with the Member Group.

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

**EDT Committee 15<sup>th</sup> March 2018**

**Norwich Depot Hub Member Group - UPDATE**

- 1 The Norwich Depot Hub Member Group met on the 25<sup>th</sup> February 2018 to discuss progress on the scheme including development of the full business case.
- 2 The full business case is under development and will now be reported to EDT Committee on 18 May 2018. At this stage it is now unlikely that the highways depot element will be included in the proposals. As a result, Broadland District Council are considering their position and this element is also now looking less likely.
- 3 Land discussions are ongoing regarding the preferred site north of the airport, and this now includes discussion on scaling back proposals from a joint depot hub to also consider just a recycling centre, or recycling centre and Broadland District Council depot. The approach to a possible planning application for the wider development at the airport is also being discussed and the Member Group will be kept updated as these details are confirmed.
- 4 A list of alternative options for provision of a household waste recycling centre for Norwich will also be prepared alongside the depot hub scheme including costs, benefits and other considerations. The timing of any decisions needed for alternative sites is also being considered and the Member Group expect to be updated on this to ensure the risk of delivering a new facility is managed.
- 5 A communications and consultation plan has been circulated to the Member group. It is proposed that a consultation on the relocation of the recycling centre is prepared for Summer 2018, subject to any decisions made at EDT Committee on the 18<sup>th</sup> May.
- 6 Since the last member group meeting, Broadland District Council have confirmed they will no longer be involved in this project. The project board and member group will review the scheme in light of this and details will be reported to EDT Committee on 18 May.