

Environment, Development and Transport Committee

**Minutes of the Meeting held on Wednesday, 21 June 2017 at 10:00am
in the Edwards Room at County Hall, Norwich**

Present:

Mr M Wilby - Chair

Mr M Castle

Mr S Clancy (Vice-Chairman)

Mr E Colman

Mr P Duigan

Mr S Eyre

Mr C Foulger

Mr A Grant

Mr T Jermy

Mrs M Strong

Ms J Oliver

Mr A White

1. Apologies and Substitutions

- 1.1 The Chairman welcomed new and returning Members to the first meeting of the newly constituted Committee.
- 1.2 Apologies were received from Mr T East (Mrs M Strong substituting) and Mr C Jones.

2. Minutes

- 2.1 The minutes of the meeting held on 17 March 2017 were agreed as an accurate record and signed by the Chairman.

3. Members to Declare any Interests

- 3.1 There were no declarations of interest.

4. Urgent Business

- 4.1 There was no urgent business.

5. Public Questions

- 5.1 No public questions were received.

6. Member Questions

- 6.1 Three public questions were received, from Councillors A Grant, A Kemp and a late submission from Cllr B Spratt which the Chairman agreed to accept. See appendices A and B.
 - 6.2.1 Cllr Kemp asked a supplementary question: she noted the road was not a rural

bypass, but included the A10 hi-tech corridor, part of the strategy to get businesses into Kings Lynn who were moving out due to the current road network. She asked if the Committee would follow her example and write to government to prioritise good road networks to support housing growth and access to good, hi-tech jobs.

6.2.2 The Chairman replied that infrastructure was a priority of the Council and **agreed** to write to government regarding road infrastructure for Norfolk.

6.3.1 Cllr Spratt asked his question to the Committee and thanked the Chairman for accepting his question at late notice. See appendix B.

6.3.2 The Chairman believed that delays were caused by some older wires sagging in the heat, resulting in slowing of trains; a full response would be sent to Cllr Spratt after the meeting.

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

7.1 The Major Projects Manager gave an update from the Western Link working group; see appendix C. There was now more engagement with Highways England; a report with more information would be brought to the Committee in September 2017.

7.2 Mrs M Strong updated the Committee that the Broadband Mobile Phones and Digital Member Working Group was now closed.

8. Local Member Highways Budget and Parish Partnership Schemes

8.1.2 The Committee received the report following on from discussions held at the meeting on the 17 March 2017, where Members agreed the setting up of a Local Member Highways Budget of £6,000 per division in 2017/18 for local highway works; this would allow Members to take forward small projects for their local communities.

8.1.3 The budget was available to Members from the day of the meeting; a note would be circulated to all Members giving information on the scheme and a letter would also be forwarded to Members with information on the Parish Partnerships Scheme.

8.1.4 Money to fund the scheme was drawn from Norfolk County Council funds allocated for a Department of Transport bid which became unallocated when the criteria of the original bid was changed.

8.3 The Committee **AGREED** that the Local Member Highways Budget initiative be formally launched; Members were invited to discuss potential schemes that match the criteria in section 1.3 with their local highway officer.

9. Update on the Norfolk Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment

9.1.1 The Committee received the report introducing the draft Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment review, initiated in February 2017, which was due to be submitted to the Environment Agency on 22 June 2017.

9.1.2 It was noted that in the table on page 23, appendix A, the total in row 1 (Norwich)

should read “11146”; the substantive report was correct.

- 9.1.3 The Environment Agency had recommended that Norwich was a priority flood risk area; Great Yarmouth, Thetford and Attleborough could also be considered risk areas. Work to address flood risks was being carried out outside of this assessment such as the urban waterways management plan, where investigations were underway in conjunction with the Environment Agency.
- 9.2 The difference in cost of flood work needed in Great Yarmouth highlighted in this assessment and by the Environment Agency was queried; the Planning Services Manager clarified that costs in the Flood Risk Assessment related to local flood risk mitigation measures such as for flash flooding, whereas the Environment Agency focussed on strategic flooding, resulting in a difference in costings.
- 9.3 The Committee **RESOLVED** to:
- a) **APPROVE** the submission of the draft Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment Review as set out in Appendix A of the report;
 - b) **APPROVE** the identification of a new indicative Flood Risk Area, with the **recommendation** that the Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services, in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair, be delegated power to make minor amendments to the boundaries of that area if required;
 - c) **AGREE** to **delegate** authority to the Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services in consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Environment, Development and Transport Committee Service Committee to make minor final amendments to the PFRA Reviewed ahead of publication by the Environment Agency in December 2017.

10. Appointments to internal and external Bodies

- 10.1 The Committee received the report outlining outside and internal appointments relevant to the Committee.
- 10.2 The Committee **REVIEWED** and **AGREED** appointments to the external bodies, internal bodies and Champions positions relevant to the Committee for the municipal year 2017-18; see appendix D.

11. Better Broadband for Norfolk (BBfN) Programme Update

- 11.1.1 The Committee received the report providing an update on the BBfN programme.
- 11.1.2 The Programme Director, Better Broadband for Norfolk, confirmed that Internet Service Providers did not always inform customers when service had been upgraded. Parish and district councils would receive information from Better Broadband for Norfolk about areas due to receive an upgrade, which could be shared with residents.
- 11.1.3 Openreach received information on problems from Internet Service Providers; a high number of reports indicated a major incident, highlighting the importance of customers reporting problems.
- 11.1.4 The Programme Director could give presentations to communities if needed.

- 11.2 The Committee **REVIEWED** progress of the Better Broadband for Norfolk (BBfN) programme to date.

12. Performance management

- 12.1.1 The performance management report based on the revised Performance Management System and the Committee's 14 vital signs indicators was introduced.
- 12.1.2 The level of performance in winter gritting was discussed. The Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services acknowledged the target for gritting had been very challenging, at 100%. Only 53 compared to the average of 95 gritting actions had been carried out due to the mild winter. Performance of afternoon gritting had been affected by rush hour traffic when compared to a 3am gritting action, for example.
- 12.2.1 Gritting routes were being reviewed; it was noted that gritting of the Norwich Distributor Road would need to be factored into this year's gritting routes. The Chairman thanked the gritting teams for their work.
- 12.2.2 The Assistant Director of Highways explained that gritting routes were reviewed annually. Requests from parishes and Members to add roads onto routes were reviewed following an agreed process.
- 12.2.3 The Assistant Director of Highways confirmed there were no plans to move gritters from the Caister depot or to change gritting operations from this depot.
- 12.3 The Committee
- **REVIEWED** the performance data, information and analysis presented in the vital sign report cards; and
 - **AGREED** that the recommended actions identified were appropriate.

13. Risk management

- 13.1 The Committee received the report providing information from the latest risk register as at May 2017 following a review conducted at the end of April 2017.
- 13.2 The Committee:
- a) **CONSIDERED** the changes to the risk judged as an exception (in paragraph 2.2 and Appendix A), and other departmental risks (in Appendix E);
 - b) **AGREED** that recommended mitigating actions identified in Appendix A were appropriate;
 - c) **AGREED** the definitions of risk appetite and tolerance in Appendix D.

14. Finance monitoring

- 14.1.1 The Committee received the report outlining information on the out-turn position for Community and Environmental Services for 2016-17 reporting to this Committee.
- 14.1.2 The Financial Business Partner for Community and Environmental Services confirmed there were no risks identified for the financial year 2016-17 and a small underspend for the CES Department as a whole was achieved.

14.2 The Committee **NOTED**:

- a) The out-turn position for the Environment Development and Transport Committee;
- b) That the future reporting of the Economic Development Budgets would be to the new Business and Property Committee.

15. Forward Plan and decisions taken under delegated authority

15.1.1 The Committee considered the forward plan for the period September to November 2017 and delegated decisions taken by Officers.

15.1.2 It was requested that an update on the Great Yarmouth third river crossing scheme be added in the forward plan

15.2 The Committee **AGREED** the forward plan

16. Norwich Northern Distributor Road – construction progress update

16.1.1 The Committee received the report providing a summary of the progress made to date in delivering the construction of the NDR project.

16.1.2 The Major Projects Manager reported that sections at the western end of the road may open early, at around October or November 2017, if building work stayed on target; it was not likely that full opening would be achieved by December. Work was being undertaken to ensure an early opening would not cause road disruption elsewhere.

16.2.1 The Chairman noted 1 million work hours had been spent on the project so far.

16.2.2 Mr Jermy discussed the useful tour of the Norwich Distributor Road site given recently. He felt that engagement with Members in this way would be useful in the future and the Chairman recommended that interested Members contact John Birchall to organise a visit to the site.

16.2.3 The Committee

- **AGREED** the details in this construction update report; and
- **NOTED** the potential to open sections of the Norwich Distributor Road early and in advance of the full scheme being completed (subject to more details on this matter to be presented to Committee in September 2017).

17. Exclusion of the public

17.1.1 The Committee was asked to consider excluding the public from the meeting under section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 for consideration of items 18 (Norwich Northern Distributor Road - financial update) and 19 (Greater Norwich Partnership) below, on the grounds that they Involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined by Paragraphs 3 and 3.5 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act, and that the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighed the public interest in disclosing the information.

17.1.2 The Committee was presented with the conclusions of the public interest test carried

out by the report authors and was recommended to confirm the exclusions:

17.2 Item 18 – Norwich Distributor Road - Financial Update:

“An Exemption under Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 and Part 7.4 of the Constitution was required for the Norwich Distributor Road Financial update (a separate general update public report had been provided). This was to protect ‘Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding the information)’ being disclosed.

I had carefully considered and concluded that in all the circumstances of this matter, there was a public interest in maintaining the exemption which outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information. Primarily, if the information in this report were to be disclosed or otherwise made public; the Authority’s ability to manage the difficult and commercially sensitive dialogue necessary with the supplier of the Norwich Distributor Road contract in the coming weeks and months would be significantly compromised, in particular it was necessary to ensure key financial information and associated decision making was not disclosed.”

17.3 Item 19 – Greater Norwich Partnership:

“An Exemption under Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 and Part 7.4 of the Constitution was required for the Greater Norwich Partnership report. This was to protect ‘Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding the information)’ being disclosed.

I had carefully considered and concluded that in all the circumstances of this matter, there was a public interest in maintaining the exemption which outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information. Primarily, if the information in this report were to be disclosed or otherwise made public it could compromise discussions on a number of issues that the partnership was seeking to agree a position on.”

17.4 The Committee **AGREED** the exclusions

18. Norwich Northern Distributor Road - financial update

18.1 The Committee **AGREED** to the recommendations outlined in the report.

19. Greater Norwich Partnership

19.1 The Committee **AGREED** to the recommendations outlined in the report.

The meeting closed at 11.43

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

MEMBER/PUBLIC QUESTIONS TO ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE: WEDNESDAY 21 JUNE 2017

6. MEMBER QUESTIONS

5.1 Question from Cllr Alexandra Kemp

The state of congestion along the A10 was so serious 30 years ago Govt accepted the need for a bypass for West Winch and Setchey from the Watlington Roundabout - Dept of Transport plans dated 1990 are in Norfolk Record Office - the need and the traffic are now greater along the strategic A10 corridor, so what steps has NCC taken to approach Govt and LEP's, to ensure the £0.5 million of public money for the road design, is properly spent on the right road, ensure the bypass is built before new development and expedite A47 Tilney-East Winch dualling?

Response by Chairman of EDT Committee

Although the A10 Setchey and West Winch bypass was a priority for Government in the early 1990s, in 1995 it was withdrawn from their trunk road programme alongside other schemes such as the A140 Long Stratton bypass.

<https://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm199596/cmhansrd/vo951219/text/51219w10.htm> Also, in the meantime both the A10 and the A140 have been de-trunked meaning that they reverted back to local authority control with no legacy funding for bypasses.

Rural bypasses such as these no longer attract government funding as they do not generally address the current housing and economic growth priorities and typically have low benefit to cost ratios. The New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership (NALEP) has set out its investment priorities in its Strategic Economic Plan and this does not include an A10 Setchey and West Winch bypass.

However, due to the significant housing allocation in West Winch and North Runcton, set out in the Local Plan, there is the opportunity to secure a West Winch relief road to provide significant environmental benefits to the A10 in West Winch and facilitate the housing growth largely from developer contributions. This route does not extend to provide relief to the A10 through Setchey and it would be difficult to justify a longer route based on the extent of the planned housing growth.

Pending the outcome of the Borough Councils work on an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP), in terms of development viability, we will know how much of the necessary infrastructure can be afforded by the housing growth and whether there is a need for additional public funding. We will explore all funding avenues for the road including the NALEP and the Homes and

Communities Agency (HCA) and in particular explore advance funding mechanisms to deliver the road at the earliest opportunity.

However, in order to expedite delivery of the West Winch relief road, early scheme development work is required which could cost in the region of £500k in 2017/18 for which we are assembling funds from a variety of sources. This early scheme development work will scope out the objectives and purpose of the road, examine options and alternatives and will need to be robust enough to withstand any challenges to the scheme as it progresses through planning and statutory processes in due course.

With regard to the A47 Tilney to East Winch dualling, this is one of our two next priorities for the A47 and we are lobbying for its inclusion into the Governments next Roads Investment Strategy (RIS2).

6.2 Question from Cllr Andy Grant

Why for the second year on the trot has spraying on kerbs and highways around Great Yarmouth been carried out so late and is Norfolk Highways seeking to be disingenuous by trying to get away with one spray as opposed to the two that are budgeted and paid for?

Response by Chairman of EDT Committee

Our current service standard for weed spraying is two treatments per year. (This standard has remained unchanged for a number of years and is set out in our Transport Asset Management Plan)

Two treatments were carried out in 2016, the first commenced on 6 June and the second on 30 August.

This year our first treatment started on 5 June. We anticipate the second treatment to start at the end of August.

The chemical we use is the industry standard, Glyphosate. Weeds absorb this through their leaves and other green parts and so some weed growth has to exist before the spraying operation starts.

If there are concerns in specific locations about weed growth they should be reported in the normal way for area staff to investigate.

MEMBER QUESTION TO ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE: WEDNESDAY 21 JUNE 2017

6. MEMBER QUESTIONS

6.3 Question from Cllr Bev Spratt

Mr Chairman, a number of my residents have contacted me in the last few days, expressing great concern over the rail delays caused, we are told, by hot weather.

Please can we speak to Network rail, to make the appropriate investment in Norfolk's railway infrastructure so that we are able to rely on trains running on time – something that railways in much hotter countries seem to be able to manage perfectly well?

Response to be forwarded to Cllr Spratt after the meeting on the 21 June 2017.

Norwich Western Link Project - Project update for EDT Committee Chair/Working Group (11 June 2017)

Further to previous meetings of the Norwich Western Link Project (NWL) Member Working Group and the report provided at the 8 July 2016 EDT Committee meeting; a meeting was held on 20 June to provide an update for the EDT Committee Chair and previous Member Group Members. The following provides a brief summary of the meeting:

1. Highways England (HE) attended the meeting to provide an update and briefing on the Easton to North Tuddenham A47 dualling project following their non-statutory consultation on four route options completed in March/April. Their initial findings from the consultation is a preference expressed for two options, and HE are completing further work to develop the details from the consultation to produce a preferred option. The options assessment takes the following into consideration:
 - The need for intervention
 - Environmental impact
 - Consultation feedback
 - Affordability (within the available budget)
 - Value for money (a cost/benefit ratio of at least 1.5)
 - Buildability (within the agreed timeframe)

An announcement on a preferred route is expected during August.

2. Feedback was provided by NCC Members setting out community concerns regarding the need for the old A47 to be retained and 'bypassed' so that the old road can be available if there are ever any problems on the dual carriageway. A further point was the need to consider accessibility to the existing communities, a point HE confirmed was also raised by communities in consultation responses. HE set out that part of their assessment work is to also consider the junction strategy for the preferred route option. In addition, consideration will also be made, by completing sensitivity tests, to understand the impact of potential growth (Local Plan review), the Food Hub Local Development Order and possible options for a NWL. Impacts on the A47 network close to the project are also to be assessed by HE as part of their work (eg Longwater junction).
3. An update on the Local Plan Review process was provided by Phil Morris (Principal Planner- NCC). Phil confirmed that conceptual growth options are: being developed so that they can be reviewed and a preferred proposal agreed for future consultation. Steve Scowen from Broadland. District Council (BDC) provided an update on the Food Hub proposals and the associated Local Development Order (LDO) that is being progressed by BDC. The LDO was reported to BDC Cabinet in May and was agreed subject to a screening decision being considered by the Secretary of State. Depending on that decision, there is potential for the first occupation of the Food Hub site during 2018/19.
4. The Member Group also received a brief update summarising the ongoing NWL project activities planned to be completed ahead of an update report being provided to EDT Committee in September. Details are being developed to facilitate discussions with Natural England and the Environment Agency. Project costings, appraisal and funding options will also be included as part of the work that will be reported in September. It was also agreed that a further stakeholder group meeting (with parish council representatives) should be held during July to follow on from the meeting held in February. This will be provide an opportunity for further feedback on the specific project objectives from each community and to update on project progress.

Environment, Development and Transport Committee Boards/Panels and Outside Bodies

2017/18 appointments shown

1. Norfolk Local Access Forum – 2

The Norfolk Local Access Forum (LAF) represents a variety of countryside interests with regards to improving public access across the county. It provides independent strategic advice to a range of organisations who have a duty to consult the Local Access Forum where there are implications or proposals around public access.

1 Labour - Julie Brociek-Coulton
1 Conservative – Fabian Eagle

The Committee reduced the number of Council representatives from 3 to 2 to free up a space so an additional organisation can be represented on the Forum as overall places are limited. Cycling and Walking Champion is an Ex-Officio Member (see appointment of Member Champions later in this report).

2. Norfolk Waste Partnership Strategic Management Board (2)

Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee

3. Joint Road Casualty Reduction Partnership Board (4)

A partnership that brings together appropriate public, private and voluntary sector commissioner and provider organisations in Norfolk to reduce the number and severity of road traffic casualties on roads in Norfolk, and to increase public confidence that all forms of journeys on roads in the county will be safe.

No appointment

4. Norwich Western Link Member Group

Tim East (LD)
Bill Borrett (Con)
Stuart Clancy (Chair) (Con)
Shelagh Gurney (Con)
Margaret Dewsbury (Con)
Greg Peck (Con)
Chris Jones (Lab)

Part B

Environment, Development and Transport Committee Outside Bodies

1. Wash and North Norfolk Coast European Marine Site Management Scheme (2)

David Collis
Brian Long
Sub – Tony White

The scheme coordinates management by the relevant authorities of the Wash and North Norfolk Coast European Marine Site. The Management Group, which includes representatives from several 'relevant authorities' including the County Council, produces and manages a Management Plan, a statutory requirement.

2. Norfolk Coast Partnership (2 plus 2 substitutes)

Marie Strong
Andrew Jamieson (Simon Eyre sub)

The role of the Partnership Forum is to bring together the perspectives of many organisations through a representative system, to develop policy for the Partnership and to develop, review and implement the AONB Management Plan, the production of which is a statutory requirement.

3. King's Lynn Conservancy Board (1)

Brian Long

The Statutory port, harbour and pilotage authority for Kings Lynn.

5. Marriott's Warehouse Trust (Green Quay) (1)

David Collis

The Green Quay is an Independent Registered Charity and its partners are Natural England, RSPB, Wash Estuary Strategy Group, Norfolk County Council and Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk. The key objectives of the Green Quay are to inform and educate both schools and general public about the Wash, Fens.

6. Environment Agency

(a) Anglian (Eastern) Regional Flood and Coastal Committee (2)

Mick Castle (sub Colleen Walker)
Judy Oliver (sub Brian Iles)

The RFCC is a committee established by the Environment Agency under the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 that brings together members

appointed by Lead Local Flood Authorities (LLFAs) and independent members with relevant experience.

(b) Anglian (Central) Regional Flood & Coastal Committee (1)

Brian Long (sub Tony White)

7. Broads Authority (2)

Brian Iles
John Timewell

8. Norfolk Windmills Trust (3)

Philip Duigan
Martin Wilby
Tony White

9. Caistor Roman Town Joint Advisory Board (1)

Vic Thompson

Management and Development of Caistor Roman Town.

10. A47 Alliance (5)

Chairman of EDT Committee
Mick Castle
Tim East
William Richmond
Mark Kiddle Morris

The A47 Alliance brings together local authorities, MPs, Local Enterprise Partnerships, businesses and other stakeholders to secure improvements to the A47. The Alliance is led by Norfolk County Council but covers the A47 from Great Yarmouth to the A1 just west of Peterborough.

11. Norfolk Flood and Water Strategic Forum (1)

Stuart Clancy

12. Norfolk Strategic Planning Member Forum (1)

Mike Sands

13. Ouse Washes Strategy Group (1)

Brian Long

The role of the group is to ensure that all partners who operate on or depend on the Ouse Washes work collaboratively to meet the current and future challenges facing the Ouse Washes and surrounding communities.

14. Greater Norwich Development Partnership Board (3)

Martin Wilby
Stuart Clancy
Tim East

15. Great Yarmouth Transport and Infrastructure Steering Group (3)

Graham Plant
Mick Castle
Brian Iles

16. Greater Norwich Growth Board

Cliff Jordan

17. Local Transport Body (Chair)

Chair of EDT Committee

18. Local Transport Board (2)

Martin Wilby and Stuart Clancy

19. East West Rail Board (1)

Tony White

Member Champions

Cycling and Walking – Simon Eyre
Historic Environment – Brian Watkins