

**Environmental & Community Services Select Committee**

25 September 2013 – At a meeting of the Select Committee held at 10.30 am at County Hall, Chichester.

Present:

Mrs Brunsdon	Mr R Oakley
Dr Dennis	Mr Tyler
Mr G Jones	Mr Whittington
Mr M Jones	

In attendance by invitation:

- Mr Barnard (Cabinet Member for Residents' Services)
- Mr Montyn (Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport)

Apologies for absence were received from:

- Mr de Mierre (Chairman)
- Mr S Oakley
- Mrs Phillips
- Mr J Rogers (Vice Chairman)

Absent

- Mr Barrett-Miles

In the absence of both the Chairman and the Vice Chairman, the Committee elected Mr Tyler to Chair the meeting.

**Declarations of Interest**

45. In accordance with the Code of Conduct, the following personal interests were declared: -

- Mr R Oakley in respect of item 4 (Responses from E.ON and the Cabinet Member for Highways & Transport), item 5 (Aviation and Gatwick Airport: Comments for the Airports Commission) item 6 (Approval of the West Sussex Local Flood Risk Management Strategy and consultation) and item 7 (Review of the Integrated Parking Strategy) as a member of Worthing Borough Council, and in respect of item 5 (Aviation and Gatwick Airport: Comments for the Airports Commission) as an employee of Network Rail
- Mr Whittington in respect of item 5 (Aviation and Gatwick Airport: Comments for the Airports Commission) as Chairman of the Rights of Way Committee
- Mrs Brunsdon in respect of item 5 (Aviation and Gatwick Airport: Comments for the Airports Commission) as Chairman of the Planning Committee

**Minutes**

46. Resolved – That the minutes of the Environmental & Community Services Select Committee meeting held on 12 July 2013 be approved as a correct record and that they be signed by the Chairman.

**Responses from E.ON and the Cabinet Member for Highways & Transport**

47. The Committee considered responses from E.ON and the Cabinet Member for Highways & Transport (copies appended to the signed minutes) to its recommendations regarding the Rampion Offshore Windfarm.

48. The Committee felt that E.ON had not addressed all the issues it had raised.

49. Resolved – That the Committee requests the Cabinet Member for Highways & Transport to write to E.ON requesting a fuller response.

### **Aviation and Gatwick Airport: Comments for the Airports Commission**

50. The Committee considered a report by the Director of Communities Commissioning (copy appended to the signed minutes) which was introduced by Neil Border, Strategic Policy Team Leader, who gave a PowerPoint presentation (copy appended to the signed minutes) that summarised the report.

51. Local Members from divisions that were most likely to be affected by any expansion at Gatwick had been invited to attend and speak at the meeting. Apart from those already on the Committee, Mr Acraman, Member for Worth Forest Division, was the only local Member able to attend – Mr Acraman felt that: -

- The Council's submission was disappointing, neither a robust critique of Gatwick Airport Limited's (GAL's) position and or a clear statement of the Council's requirements and commitments
- The report should have expanded on the Council's decision in July to support a second runway at Gatwick 'in principle'
- GAL's submission, or a summary of it, should have been included with the report, or otherwise have been made available to members.
- There was insufficient detail or comment in the report on GAL's third option for a second runway and its consequences re air quality, increased noise levels, extra housing and the impact on non-motorway traffic
- The report fails to note that GAL should be asked to make the access improvements necessary for a second runway

52. Summary of Members' questions and comments: -

- The Council's response did not give the protection promised to residents and did not act as a critical friend to GAL
- GAL had made a lot of unqualified assertions
- The impact on the environment from increased air and road traffic had been glossed over
- The information on noise pollution was inadequate and did not take into account weather conditions and frequency/times of flights – a close parallel runway would not widen the area affected by noise, although two wide spaced runways were more common for major airports
- Flights already went over densely populated towns, contrary to GAL's statement, and the situation would worsen with a second runway
- The effect on the job market and influx of workers had not been properly addressed – there could be less diversity of jobs as the area would be even more reliant on the aviation industry and a Gatwick commuter population could put infrastructure pressures on other areas of the county
- Head Office jobs that had moved away from Gatwick might return if there was a second runway, conversely, other businesses might move away

- The Committee doubted that there was room for more housing in the area, especially as there were already plans for more housing in north east Crawley. Concerns were also raised about whether the additional workers could be housed in the coastal strip, given the lack of spare capacity in local schools.
- GAL's estimate of construction costs of between £5-9bn including funds for investment in infrastructure was questioned as a smaller development at Heathrow had cost £4.3bn
- A second runway at Gatwick would promote competition among airports
- The passenger demand forecast should be looked at closely as demand had not increased significantly in the past ten years
- More cross country rail links would be required if capacity at Gatwick increased

53. Mr Border made the following comments in response to the Committee's concerns:

- At the time of writing the report, there was no further information available on noise pollution
- The Council would look to make clear which concerns GAL had to address
- The Commission would look at the forecasts for housing and employment
- The report could be made more robust before submission

54. Resolved – That the Committee asks the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport to:

- i. Strengthen the Council's response, specifically regarding Highways and Transport, capacity for local housing and associated infrastructure, and noise pollution
- ii. Refute assertions made by Gatwick Airport Limited that the Council feels are false, such as flights avoiding densely populated towns

### **Approval of the West Sussex Local Flood Risk Management Strategy and consultation**

55. The Committee considered a report by the Executive Director Communities Commissioning and Service Manager for Highways Services (copy appended to the signed minutes).

56. The report was introduced by Stuart Smith, Service Manager for Highways Services and Flood Risk Manager who told the Committee: -

- The report was intended to bring the Committee up to date with the consultation that ended on 9 September – feedback was still being reviewed, but there had been 78 responses raising 250 issues, of which five main themes were listed in the report. These themes would be addressed in more detail in the final report
- The County Council, as the Lead Local Flood Authority, was responsible only for surface water flooding, not tidal or fluvial flooding, therefore the Local Flood Risk Management Strategy (LFRMS) did not have to consider these but it did address them both
- The purpose of the LFRMS was to set out the roles and responsibilities of partners and how the Council manages the responsibilities set out in the Flood

& Water Management Act and identifies areas of high risk, or wet spots, with a view to further investigation and possible investment

- An initial programme was made up of schemes from Southern Water, the Environment Agency (EA) and district/borough councils, covering all types of flooding
- In the future, prioritisation and funding would become increasingly sensitive issues
- The EA's mechanism for funding was through partnership funding, with the Council being a major contributor
- The EA's Lower Tidal River Arun Strategy sets out withdrawal of maintenance and the need for new tidal defences – a similar strategy was being prepared for the River Adur
- The EA was reviewing its commitments, looking to make efficiencies, including withdrawing from the management of internal drainage boards – the reduction in EA's commitments would put more demands/pressure on the Council as lead Local Flood Authority
- The Council had completed some Surface Water Management Plans and was working on others to identify issues across the county
- It was important to have a prioritisation process applied to all flood mechanisms that were consistent with the Regional Flood and Coastal Committee's medium term plan so that the programme could attract both local and Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs funding – this was being done through the LFRMS

57. Summary of responses to Members' questions and comments: -

- Talks were on-going with the district/borough councils about building on flood plains which worsened sewage surcharging amongst causing other problems
- Flooding from drains could be caused by poor maintenance or excessive surface water, meaning it was difficult to apportion responsibility – the Council was working with the EA and Southern Water on agreed priorities for works which would be paid by partnership funding
- Many small scale incidents were dealt with by on-going highways maintenance and annual improvements

58. Resolved – That the Committee notes the comments from the consultation and requests a further report to come to its November meeting for more thorough scrutiny.

### **Review of the Integrated Parking Strategy**

59. The Committee considered a report by the Director of Communities Commissioning and Service Manager for Transport and Countryside Services (copy appended to the signed minutes).

60. Summary of responses to Members' questions and comments: -

- District/borough councils controlled off-street parking – the County Council dealt with on-street parking for traffic management/safety reasons
- Twenty's Plenty campaign's fitted with parking control schemes
- Increasing cycling lanes meant losing on street parking possibilities
- The needs of each town were looked at separately to find the right balance of parking to encourage people into town centres

- Sufficient loading bays were also necessary for businesses
- The policy encouraged developers to consider providing garages and driveways for parking and encouraged district/borough councils to take these into account when issuing parking permits, but even where garages and driveways existed, it was not possible to force people to use them
- There was a concern that in some areas, residents might rent out their driveways to commuters and park on the roads themselves
- Parking permits were issued to non-residents near some railway stations to maximise on-street parking, not to raise money
- Parking was appraised regularly with new schemes being reviewed after six months
- Verge and footway parking controls might be trialled in Crawley and rolled out, with County Local Committee approval, across the county if successful
- The size limit for cars allowed to park on driveways would be revised as part of any review
- Traffic Regulation Orders would be needed for each verge/footway parking request
- The Highways Department could request home owners to pay for damage caused to verges outside their properties by contractors working on their houses
- The position on enforcement would be clarified after talks with the Police
- The Committee raised queries about parking charges – these would be the subject of a separate report to the Committee in November

61. Resolved – That the Committee asks the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport to take on board its comments on the key policy areas and recommended policies in the strategy

### **Business Planning Group Report**

62. The Committee considered a report by the Chairman of the Business Planning Group (copy appended to the signed minutes).

63. Resolved – That the Committee endorses the contents of the report and the revised Work Programme.

### **Forward Plan of Key Decisions**

64. The Committee considered extracts from the Forward Plan for October to January - the following comments were made: -

- The findings of the Executive Task & Finish Group on strategic investment in unclassified highways would be shared with the Committee
- The Committee requested an update on the situation regarding bus subsidies

65. Resolved – That the Committee notes the Forward Plan.

### **Members' Items**

66. Mrs Brunsdon requested that the Committee consider bus subsidies and the performance figures for the number of people killed or seriously injured on the county's roads.

**Date of Next Meeting**

67. The next meeting of the Committee will be on 20 November 2013 at 10.30 a.m. at County Hall, Chichester. Items likely to be on the agenda include:

- Response to Government guidance on fracking
- Performance and commissioning budgets and plans/Future Council
- Review of On-Street Parking Charges
- Procurement Process for Substance Misuse Treatment Services

The meeting ended at 12.58pm

Chairman.