



Norfolk County Council

Environment, Development and Transport Committee

Minutes of the Meeting held on Friday, 09 November 2018 at
10am in the Edwards Room, County Hall

Present:

Mr M Wilby (Chairman)

Mr M Castle

Mr S Clancy (Vice-Chairman)

Mr P Duigan

Mr T East

Mr S Eyre

Mr A Grant

M Chenery of Horsbrugh

Mr T Jermy

Ms J Oliver

Mr T Smith

Mrs C Walker

Mr A White

1. Apologies and Substitutions

1.1 Apologies were received from Mr C Foulger (M Chenery of Horsbrugh substituting).

2. Minutes

2.1 The minutes of the meeting held on 12 October 2018 were agreed as an accurate record and signed by the Chairman.

2.2 Details on blocked Public Rights of Way would be sent to Mr T East.

3. Members to Declare any Interests

3.1 No interests were declared.

4. Urgent Business

4.1.1 The Chairman shared with the Committee that funding had been allocated by Government for pothole repairs. The Assistant Director of Highways and Waste reported that the Government had announced £420m of funding for Local Authorities for pothole repairs; current indications using the single funding formula were that the County Council would receive about £13m. This would allow more funding to be put into pothole repairs in the Fen Area as well as the whole of Norfolk.

4.1.2 The Chairman reassured Members that the funding would be ringfenced for highway repairs; the funding was specifically for spend on local authority roads not trunk roads.

4.2.1 An update was given on the Summer 2018 National Highways and Transport survey:

- 113 Local Authorities took part; Norfolk County Council came fourth out of 28 County Councils who took part, up from seventh in 2017
- "Traffic levels and congestion" and "footpaths" scored highest
- "Street lighting" scored mid table; a further programme of LED upgrades was planned to improve street lighting further

- “Public footpaths” and “Public Rights of Way” tended to score in the lower quartile so volunteering options would be looked into to support maintenance.

4.2.2 The Chairman and Committee thanked the highways team and staff for their performance, especially bearing in mind issues caused by the ‘Beast from the East’ and bad weather over the winter of 2017-18.

4.3 The need for high quality pothole maintenance was noted. The west of Norfolk and the Fens had a unique set of issues; Officers were looking into how to address these.

5. Public Questions

5.1 One public question was received and the answer circulated; see appendix A.

5.2 Ms Parkhouse, Chair of the Wensum Valley Alliance was concerned about the massive impact that new road building had on climate change; she asked whether the final cost of the Broadland Northway would include yet-to-be declared compensation totals and cost of borrowing, and over how many years. She hoped that some road maintenance funding would be ringfenced for Broadland Northway repairs.

5.3 The Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services replied to Ms Parkhouse that compensation claims could be put in after 12 months of opening the road and up to 7 years after and they could not be included in the final agreement with Balfour Beatty.

6. Member Questions

6.1 One Member question was received and the answer circulated; see appendix A.

6.2 Cllr Kemp asked a supplementary question: she was concerned that following cancellation of the incinerator project, tonnes of waste may be being incinerated out of the County and asked for the Waste Advisory Group to be brought back. She discussed initiatives to reduce waste other than incineration such as setting up Community Fridges and introducing environmentally friendly technology to process food waste.

6.3 The Chairman replied that the Council worked closely with the Norfolk Waste Partnership and districts across the County on initiatives such as food waste collection and community fridges. The Waste Advisory Group was not due to be set up again; districts worked together as the Waste Partnership and it was up to them to decide whether to carry out food collection.

7. Update from Members about Member Working Groups or bodies that they sit on

7.1 No updates were given.

8. Point of Order

8.1 The Committee agreed to take item 12, Norwich Western Link, next and then proceed with the running order as set out on the agenda.

9. Norfolk Western Link – Options Proposal

9.1.1 The Committee considered the report outlining proposals to enable the project to

proceed to an Options Consultation on a shortlist of Norwich Western Link options:

- The Chairman had been in touch with Members of the Norwich Western Link (NWL) liaison group, Parish Representative Meeting at Weston Longville who gave feedback on proposals
- Parish Councils' feedback included concerns around uncertainty of the location and design of the junctions with the A47 (being led by Highways England) and that details in the consultation should include journey times. They suggested options should follow similar alignment where there was close overlap (ie south end of options B & C, and north end of options C & D).

9.1.2 The Infrastructure Delivery Manager circulated an updated map to that shown in the appendix to the report; see appendix B.

9.2 In discussion and in response to Member questions the following points were noted:

- The yellow line on the plan showed the proposed route for the Hornsea proposal; the A47 dual carriageway junction would be located to avoid any impact
- The Vice-Chairman thanked the team and noted public support for delivery of the project shown by the initial consultation
- Decreased funding available for key services and public transport was noted alongside the importance of investing in infrastructure for Norfolk
- A robust business case and comprehensive funding package would be required as the project was taken forward to the next stages
- Potential environmental impact was discussed, with reference made to Transport for Norwich; increased pedestrianisation, an increase in cycling, and a 500,000 increase in public transport passenger journeys was reported across Norfolk, mostly related to Norwich improvements; the increase in passenger journeys was against the national trend
- A bid was being developed as part of the Transforming Cities funding for around £100m to further develop transport in Norwich
- Detail on each option would be laid out in the consultation showing the benefits and environmental and other constraints and impacts
- Each option would be reviewed against final objectives taking account of the consultation feedback
- Discussions were underway with the contractor about the final cost of constructing the Broadland Northway
- The economic case for the road was also important for Dereham and surrounding areas to help them access economic areas of Norwich.

9.3 As per the amended plan seen and agreed in the meeting:

1. With 11 votes for, 1 vote against, and 1 abstention, the Committee **RESOLVED** to **APPROVE** the proposed four shortlisted options for the Norwich Western Link
2. With 11 votes for and 2 abstentions, the Committee **RESOLVED** to **PROCEED** with a non-statutory public consultation on these shortlisted options

There was a break at 10.45 until 11:15 for the Council Remembrance Service.

10. Norfolk Strategic Infrastructure Delivery Plan (NSIDP) refreshed for 2018

10.1 The Committee received the report on the NSIDP pulling together information on key strategic infrastructure projects needed to deliver economic growth in Norfolk and detailing Norfolk's infrastructure priorities to the government and its agencies.

10.2 In discussion & in response to Member questions the following points were noted

- Local Authority and non-Local Authority controlled projects were now separate in

the plan; Local Authority controlled projects now contained more detail and were broken down into stages

- Detail on Norfolk's Growth report was **requested**
- Detail on how many jobs and affordable homes would be created and how this compared to the East of England was **requested**
- It was suggested that "actual" housing figures were included in the plan; the Senior Planner explained the housing figures used were based on developer proposals and district local plans
- Projects in Local Authority Control were listed on pages 18-20 of the report; jobs, housing numbers and a list of projects could be **provided** to Members
- An update would be given on delivery of the New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership (NALEP) Norfolk and Suffolk Economic strategy; NALEP adopted the Norfolk and Suffolk Economic Strategy in November 2017 and had recently met to discuss delivery of the strategy
- In response to a query around the geography of projects included it was explained that Leaders, Chief Executives, Planners and Economic Development Officers had agreed which projects to include in the plan; there were many other locally important but less strategic infrastructure projects across Norfolk. Norwich had the most projects, followed by other large towns, due to the size of the urban centres
- A clear definition of green spaces was **requested**
- Economic development was discussed and its importance for the Council

10.3 The Committee **AGREED** to welcome and support the production of the Norfolk Strategic Infrastructure Delivery Plan, together with its annual review and endorse the strategic and inclusive approach to infrastructure planning.

11. Update on Recycling Norfolk's Disused Railways

11.1 The Committee discussed the report outlining plans to bring disused railways and under-used parts of the transport network back into full use as cycling and walking routes.

11.2 In discussion and in response to Member questions the following points were noted:

- M Chenery of Horsburgh spoke as the Member Champion for Railways; some preserved track beds had been built on and he asked if there would be guarantees that the rail would not be jeopardised if there was a revival; the Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services replied that gaining control of disused railways prevented them being built over; owning assets would allow appropriate transport use to be determined in future
- Some isolated stretches of rail were owned by the Council; feasibility studies would identify if they had significant value; some were already used for walking or bridleways
- The Secretary of State had indicated that more disused branch lines should be opened so it was noted that it would be wise to ensure projects did not compromise future development or reopening of lines
- Heritage Railways had been consulted with and positive discussions held about railways at Whitwell and Hunstanton
- Dual use was possible in many places to maintain and preserve the track bed
- Stakeholders were engaged with before the public as this allowed problems and non-viable options to be identified before taking options to public consultation
- There was work on a France Channel England bid on tourism and recycling the disused railways

11.3 The Committee **RESOLVED** to:

1. **NOTE** the development of the feasibility work and support the bid for a capital contribution to the project
2. **AGREE** public consultation on the pilot route proposals
3. **AGREE** the use of the term Greenway to refer to these types of facility in the future.

12. Recycling Centre Sites and Service Provision

12.1 The Committee considered the report with a proposal for a location to replace the Mile Cross Recycling Centre in Norwich, which would close in 2021.

12.2 In discussion and in response to Member questions the following points were noted:

- Norfolk has reached its highest recycling rate at 46.7%; the EU target of 50% recycling was a national target that did not flow down locally. Norfolk's Recycling Centre performance was strong at 77% diversion, an increase from 2016-17
- In response to a question about the low rates in Great Yarmouth it was explained that Great Yarmouth received less green waste as it was urban and due to a long-standing focus on home-composting, which diverted some green waste away from recycling centres and collections
- The layout of the Caister Recycling Centre had been redesigned to better encourage recycling and reuse
- It was established that the priority was to run services efficiently and increase recycling, for example, through use of reuse shops, site infrastructure improvements and improving ease of use of sites
- Visitor numbers and postcode mapping for Mile Cross customers was carried out to help inform a replacement site; as a move may impact customers in south Norwich the relocation of Ketteringham Recycling Centre was being suggested with improved layout and road accessibility factored in
- A Member Working Group was in place; Officers would work with them on a communications plan and communication around the Mile Cross replacement site
- Concern about car registration plates not all being recorded at some centres was raised; it was explained that following audits, visitor numbers were now being recorded accurately or adjusted as required
- Discussions were held on an ongoing basis with staff at sites to gather ideas and feedback
- Feedback was given that the Sheringham Recycling Centre was not big enough and need to be expanded at scale or replaced.
- Information on capital and revenue for the project was **requested** for future reports
- Cllr J Mooney spoke as local member for Wymondham:
 - Cllr Mooney was pleased with the recommendation to replace the Wymondham Recycling Centre as access to the current site was not good
 - As Wymondham was a growing town, a larger site and updated facility was needed
 - Cllr Mooney thanked the Head of Waste and all the team for the work they had put into the project and improving recycling figures across Norfolk
- From a cost benefit analysis perspective, whilst split level sites were more expensive to construct in the short term, they were cheaper in the long term due to operational cost reductions and provided easier access for all
- If agreed, the reuse shop at Wereham was planned for the 2018-19 financial year after recruitment of an additional site operative as it was the busiest part time site
- Defibrillators were ready to order following approval by Committee and Norse were able to provide training to staff for their use; positive feedback had been received from staff at sites where training had been provided previously

12.3 The Committee:

1. **SUPPORTED** continued negotiations to agree terms for the acquisition of the preferred site to replace Mile Cross Recycling Centre and to ask Business and Property Committee to approve the acquisition
2. **SUPPORTED** the schemes being put forward for the capital programme to replace Ketteringham Recycling Centre, expand Sheringham Recycling Centre and replace Wymondham Recycling Centre
3. **SUPPORTED** an additional reuse shop at Wereham Recycling Centre alongside the reuse shops planned for Wells, Bergh Apton, and Snetterton
4. **APPROVED** the installation of defibrillators across all 20 recycling centres.

13. Residual Waste Contract Arrangements

13.1 The Committee received the report outlining proposals to extend or replace existing arrangements to treat residual waste due to end in 2020, to allow the County Council to fulfil its statutory responsibility for managing waste as a Waste Disposal Authority

13.2.1 In discussion and in response to Member questions the following points were noted:

- There had been a 10% increase in Refuse Derived Fuel prices but as the contract extensions would be increased by RPI the County Council would be protected from a £1.2m price increase.
 - Some operators were deterred by the County Council's policy on incineration and some were mindful of existing capacity in existing facilities; Officers were not looking at identifying sites or developing facilities.
 - Of approximately 200,000 tonnes of waste 50,000 tonnes was incinerated in Suffolk to generate electricity. The rest was processed locally into fuel at sites in Rackheath, Cosstesey and Wisbech. This fuel was exported to Combined Heat and Power facilities on the continent where it was incinerated to generate electricity and heat, which had a lower carbon impact than use in UK plants that only generated electricity
 - The main focus of the Waste Partnership was waste reduction; reuse and recycling, landfill, incineration of waste and recovery of energy from waste all sat below those in the waste hierarchy
 - Norfolk County Council was ranked fourth as a Waste Disposal Authority for how little waste was sent to landfill which was noted as positive
- 13.2.2
- Reducing the amount of waste produced was discussed
 - The team was thanked for their work in ensuring effective methods of disposing of and recycling Norfolk's waste

13.3 The Committee

1. **AGREED** to extend existing contractual arrangements to treat waste by one year to 2021
2. **SUPPORTED** continuing the inter authority agreement with Suffolk County Council by one additional year to 2021
3. **NOTED** that in 2017/18 199,281 tonnes were sent to incineration and 4,191 tonnes was sent to landfill
4. **AGREED** that the Chairman would send a letter on behalf of the committee to the department on their good work as outlined in the report

14. Finance Monitoring

14.1 Members considered the report containing financial monitoring information for the services reporting to the Committee for 2018-19.

- 14.2 In discussion and in response to a Member question it was confirmed that unfilled posts were posts in back office teams which were left unfilled as part of vacancy management to make savings.
- 14.3 The Committee **NOTED**
- a) The 2018-19 revenue budget for the Environment, Development and Transport Committee and the current forecast outturn position
 - b) The Capital programme for this Committee
 - c) The balance of reserves brought forward to 2018-19

15. Forward Plan and decisions taken under delegated authority

- 15.1 The Committee reviewed the forward plan and delegated decisions taken by Officers
- 15.2.1 Vice-Chairman Cllr Clancy suggested that Officers carried out research/a desktop study in anticipation of a Highways England Scheme related to the Acle Straight; the Committee **AGREED** that this work should be carried out.
- 15.3 The Committee **REVIEWED** and **AGREED** the forward plan.

16. Member Working Group Terms of Reference

- 16.1 The Committee considered the report setting out a proposal to establish the Task and Finish Group requested by Full Council to consider the issues of banning balloons and Chinese lanterns and single use plastic products.
- 16.2.1 Mr M Castle **PROPOSED** that Cllr S Squire be appointed to the Working Group.
- 16.2.2 The Chairman **PROPOSED** that the group had 6 members.
- 16.2.3 The Chairman **PROPOSED** Mr S Clancy as Chair, and the remaining 5 Members to be Mr B Spratt, Mr T White, Mrs S Squire, Mr T East and Mr T Jermy.
- 16.3 Mr T East asked for a substitute from the Liberal Democrat group to be appointed to attend in his stead due to difficulties attending due to his disability.
- 16.4 The Committee
- **AGREED** to appoint 6 Members to the Task and Finish Group
 - **APPOINTED** Mr S Clancy as Chair of the Task and Finish Group
 - **APPOINTED** Mr B Spratt, Mr T White, Mrs S Squire, Mr T Jermy as Task and Finish Group Members
 - **AGREED** that a Member would be appointed from the Liberal Democrats in place of Mr T East

The meeting closed at 12.22

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

MEMBER/PUBLIC QUESTIONS TO ENVIRONMENT, DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE: 9 NOVEMBER 2018

5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

5.1 Question from Jenn Parkhouse

Until last week, the cost of the Northern Distributor Road stood at £205million although Norfolk County Council had previously acknowledged that this was not the final figure.

Last week it was reported that repairs and alterations would have to be undertaken at a cost of £120,000. Does this mean that the final figure is £205,120,000?

Response by Chairman of EDT Committee

No, the final account for the Broadland Northway (NDR) is still to be finalised and details will be reported to Committee when this is completed. Now that the road is opened it is part of our road network and the majority of the cost of the more recent works to the roundabouts is related to maintenance (eg replacement of signing and damaged kerbs) and this is not therefore part of the original capital cost of the project.

6. MEMBER QUESTIONS

6.1 Question from Councillor Alexandra Kemp

Norfolk County Council could make massive savings overnight, by providing the right incentives immediately for all Districts to recycle food waste, and by intensifying the message to the public. My constituents are concerned food waste makes up a third of municipal waste, around £60,000 tonnes a year, but only three Districts, King's Lynn, Broadland and Norwich provide food waste collections. NCC pays £60.36 a tonne in waste credits to Districts for recycling food waste but pays £110 a tonne to dispose of food waste the Districts do not recycle. Norfolk Waste Partnership signed the Courtauld Agreement: could the Committee provide the right financial levers to make the commitment a reality?


Response by Chairman of EDT Committee

The financial support the County Council gives to districts for the recycling they collect is worth around £9.2m this year. As explained in an item on today's agenda the Norfolk Waste Partnership is currently exploring alternative models, supported by national charity Wrap and consultants Eunomia, so that the Partnership can consider the merits of any alternative

approach to incentivise and facilitate change further, work which was instigated by this Committee.

This year the County Council has shared costs with Broadland District Council to help expand its food waste collection in to new areas and is also seeing the benefit of work with Norwich City Council to secure £60,000 of external funding from Wrap, which has been used to increase food waste collected in its area and led to around 10,000 requests for food waste caddies.

Across the county we are also working hard to reduce food waste. The Norfolk Waste Partnership delivered a range of activities with Sainsbury's focussed on food which also led to the development of a large network of community fridges and the County Council is leading the way with its 'Love Food Hate Waste' and 'Plan Eat Save' initiatives and also with its work with the Suffolk Waste Partnership on a 'Food Savvy Campaign'.



DO NOT SCALE

Key


Constraints

- Listed Building, Grade I
- Listed Building, Grade II*
- Listed Building, Grade II
- Veteran Trees
- Special Area of Conservation
- Site of Special Scientific Interest
- County Wildlife Site
- Ancient Woodland
- Scheduled monument
- Roadside Nature Reserve
- Flood Zone 3
- Flood Zone 2
- National Grid Gas Pipeline
- Homsea Project Three

Shortlisted Options

- A47 Preferred Route Alignment
- Option A
- Option B
- Option C
- Option D

Drawn By: ukcc002
 File: "Q:\WSP_UK\WSP_D\Cambridge\DP\ECF\70041922 - Norwich Western Link\Mapfiles\NWL_Shortlisted_Options_with_constraints_08_11_2018.mxd"
 Contains Ordnance Survey data © Crown copyright and database right 2018.

DRAWING STATUS:	DRAFT		
	 62-64 Hills Road, CB2 1LA Cambridge Tel: +44 (0)20 7314 5000 Website: www.wsp.com		
CLIENT:	NORFOLK COUNTY COUNCIL		
ARCHITECT:	N/A		
PROJECT:	NORWICH WESTERN LINK		
TITLE:	SHORTLISTED OPTIONS CONSTRAINTS PLAN		
SCALE @ A1:	1 : 15,000	CHECKED:	UKPJ007
CAD FILE:	N/A	DESIGN/DRAWN:	UKECF002
PROJECT No:	70041922	DRAWING No:	70041922 - 013
		APPROVED:	N/A
		DATE:	08/11/2018
		REV:	B
© WSP Global Inc			

