

Environmental & Community Services Select Committee

15 January 2014 – At a meeting of the Select Committee held at 10.30 am at County Hall, Chichester.

Present:

Mr Barrett-Miles	Mr R Oakley	Mr Tyler (Chairman)
Mrs Brunsdon	Mr S Oakley	Mr Whittington
Mr G Jones	Mrs Phillips	
Mr M Jones	Mr J Rogers (Vice Chairman)	

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 Circus
- Dr Dennis

Part I

Declarations of Interest

94. No interests were declared.

Minutes

95. Under minute 69, the Committee was told that a new date for the items on bus subsidies and Killed and Seriously Injured to come to the Committee would be decided at the Business Planning Group meeting on 21 January.

96. Under minute 79, penultimate bullet point, 'statues' should be replaced by 'statutes'.

97. Resolved – That the minutes of the Environmental & Community Services Select Committee meeting held on 20 November 2013 be approved as a correct record and that they be signed by the Chairman.

Response from E.ON

98. The Committee considered the response from E.ON (copy appended to the signed minutes) and thanked the Cabinet Member for Highways & Transport for pursuing the matter, however, the Committee was disappointed with the response from E.ON.

99. The Cabinet Member for Highways & Transport said he would respond saying that he and the Committee would like to know if the Council would be consulted over the design and location of the planned visitor centre.

100. Resolved – That the Committee notes the response.

The County Council Draft Budget 2014/15 to 2017/18

101. The Committee considered a report by the Director of Finance & Assurance (copy appended to the signed minutes) which was introduced by Clare Hodgson, Finance & Assurance, who reminded the Committee that this was a draft, and that plans would be reviewed before being presented at County Council on 14 February.

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

- It was possible to carry out planned investment in unclassified roads through the existing contract with Balfour Beatty, but a lot of detailed planning would be required, especially around traffic management – the Council had the officer capacity to commission and monitor schemes such as this, as had been demonstrated by the Watershed programme
- The cost of repairs to roads after the recent flooding would not impact on the budget unless costs went above the amount set aside for repairs at this time of year. The planned spending on unclassified roads would help in the long-term, by increasing their resilience
- Non-essential items in the Highways budget were things such as safety barriers that were some distance from junctions, where their repair was not crucial
- Developer contributions were shown as reducing over the next four years as the figures only showed applied amounts – the figure would increase as more developer money came in
- There was no evidence that reduced street lighting at night led to an increase in crime, and most road accidents at night happened on roads where there was lighting, therefore the plan to reduce night lighting was safe, but needed to be communicated to people to reassure them
- Small scale enhancements in the English National Concessionary Scheme were mainly around free travel for the disabled and their companions – bus subsidies would be discussed by the Business Planning Group to see if the topic should come to the Committee
- There were no plans to reduce bus subsidies, however, concessionary schemes such as 3 in 1 would be looked at to see if they could be run more efficiently
- Any future review of bus subsidies would be based on the new baseline
- The Bus Service Operators Grant had gone from £0 in the 2013/14 budget to £400k in the 2015/15 budget due to a change in Government policy – previously the Department for Transport had paid the grant directly, it now went through the Council
- Information on the Capital Programme relating to cycling networks could be provided, though it was noted that major schemes received external funding
- Fire-fighters, Members and residents would be consulted on any proposed changes to the Fire and Rescue Service – there had been no complaints from residents regarding coverage by the service after the recent redesign. The ability of the service to respond to emergencies within a time agreed by the Council would apply to all fire stations
- Price rise allowances for all contracts were based on the Retail Price Index or market evidence
- Mr Michael Jones requested that it be recorded that he did not agree with recommendation i)

103. Resolved – That the Committee: -

- i. Endorses the County Council Draft Budget for the Committee's portfolio areas for 2014/15
- ii. Asks the Cabinet Member to consider that any subsequent savings proposals are made in the context of savings already made, and their impact

Approval of the Draft Shoreham Harbour Joint Area Action Plan for Consultation

104. The Committee considered a report by the Director Communities Commissioning and Strategic Planning Manager (copy appended to the signed minutes), introduced by Darryl Hemmings, Strategic Planning. He highlighted to the Committee that the Shoreham Harbour Joint Area Action Plan (JAAP) brought together plans to regenerate the area by reconfiguring the Port area, building new homes and creating employment floor space. Existing minerals and waste facilities/capacity would be safeguarded in such a way that peaks and troughs in demand could be accommodated through a combination of safeguarded sites and flexible use of common user terminals.

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

- The proposed approach to wharf safeguarding assumed that wharves at Littlehampton would no longer be used for importation of aggregates in line with the current trend, so should not be adversely affected by the approach to wharf safeguarding at Shoreham
- As it became harder to obtain land aggregates, there would be more reliance on marine aggregates, but the volume of aggregates needed was currently expected to remain similar to present levels
- Aggregates brought into Shoreham by sea peaked in 1989/90 – the JAAP would still enable the Port to handle this amount in the future through capacity provided by those mineral wharves which will continue to be safeguarded, and flexible use of common user terminals, which will also be used for other non-mineral purposes
- The JAAP would not have a negative effect on the Minerals Local Plan as the two plans were expected to be consistent with each other
- The JAAP proposed consolidating port-related activity, not increasing it, in the south and east area of the Port, which should encourage use of the preferred lorry route into the Port - there would not necessarily be an increase in road traffic
- There would be an area set aside for mixed land use beyond the period of the Plan (to 2031)
- The capacity of Shoreham Port was influenced by the size of ship it could accommodate
- If the Rampion Wind Farm was built, it would not impact on Shoreham as ship movements would take place through Newhaven

106. Resolved – That the Committee supports the draft Shoreham Harbour Joint Area Action Plan from a minerals and waste planning perspective

Task and Finish Group – Minerals Local Plan

107. The Committee considered a report by the Head of Law and Governance (copy appended to the signed minutes) which was introduced by Ninesh Edwards, Senior Advisor, Democratic Services, who told the Committee that the Task and Finish Group should consist of four or five Members who would be required to attend around four meetings and, possibly some visits, over a two year period. The following Members volunteered to form the Task and Finish Group: Mrs Brunsdon, Mr G Jones, Mr R Oakley, Mr S Oakley and Mr J Rogers

108. Resolved – That the Committee agrees: -

- i. The appointment of a Minerals Local Plan Task and Finish Group
- ii. The Terms of Reference of the Task and Finish Group
- iii. The membership of the Task and Finish Group

Forward Plan of Key Decisions

109. The Committee considered extracts from the Forward Plan for February to May: -

- The prioritisation and allocation of the additional capital and revenue expenditure to be made available to help increase the resilience of West Sussex Highways would be discussed by the Business Planning Group to determine whether the subject should go before the Committee
- The deadline for decision on the Integrated Parking Strategy and On-Street Parking Charges had slipped to March

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

Date of Next Meeting

111. The next meeting of the Committee will be on 26 February 2014 at 10.30 a.m. at County Hall, Chichester. Items likely to be on the agenda include:

- KickStart
- Future Commissioning Plans to Support the Waste Strategy
- Delegation of Decisions on Classification of County Roads
- Highways Maintenance Contract
- Review of On-Street Parking Charges
- Independent Economic Commission/Strategic Economic Plan/Brighton City Deal

Exclusion of Press and Public

112. Resolved - That under Section 100(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part I, of Schedule 12A, of the Act by virtue of the paragraph specified under the item and that, in all the circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exemption of that information outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

Part II Minutes of the Meeting held on 20 November 2013

(Exempt, paragraph 3, Financial or business affairs of any person (including the authority))

113. Resolved – That the Part II minutes of the Environmental & Community Services Select Committee meeting held on 20 November 2013 be approved as a correct record and that they be signed by the Chairman.

The meeting ended at 12.44

Chairman.