

## **Environment, Communities and Fire Select Committee**

6 December 2018 – At a meeting of the Environment, Communities and Fire Select Committee held at 10.30 am at County Hall, Chichester.

Present: Mr Barrett-Miles (Chairman)

Mr S J Oakley	Mrs Bridges, left at	Mr McDonald
Mr Baldwin	2.35pm	Mr Oppler, left at 2.15pm
Lt Col Barton, left at	Mrs Brunsdon	
2.55pm	Mr Jones	

Apologies were received from Mr Patel, Mr Purchase and Mrs Purnell

Also in attendance: Mr Elkins and Ms Goldsmith

### **Part I**

#### **42. Declarations of Interest**

42.1 In accordance with the Code of Conduct, the following personal interests were declared in relation to:

- Mr Baldwin as a member of the Task and Finish Group (TFG) in relation to Bus Strategy 2018-2026 and Financial Changes to the Non-Commercial Bus Network

#### **43. Minutes of the 14 November meeting**

43.1 Resolved – that the minutes of the Environment, Communities and Fire Select Committee held on 14 November 2018 be approved as a correct record, and that they be signed by the Chairman.

#### **44. Cabinet Member Response to the Committee's Recommendations on the Littlehampton to Bognor Regis Cycle Path (NCN2) - Lessons Learnt**

44.1 The Committee noted the Cabinet Member's Response to the Committee's Recommendations on the Littlehampton to Bognor Regis Cycle Path (NCN2) – Lessons Learnt

#### **45. Gatwick Airport Draft Master Plan 2018**

45.1 The Committee considered a report by Executive Director Economy, Infrastructure and Environment (copy appended to signed minutes).

45.2 Mike Elkington, Head of Planning Services and Lee Harris, Executive Director Economy, Infrastructure and Environment introduced the report which outlined the County Council's draft response to the Gatwick Airport Ltd (GAL) Masterplan consultation.

45.3 *The Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure recognised that GAL hadn't provided a comprehensive amount of detail for the consultation, but that he was open to listening to members and their views before finalising the County Council's response.*

45.4 Brenda Smith, Local Member for Langley Green and Ifield East, was invited to address the Committee. Key points were:

- She believed the initial draft Masterplan was a second runway by stealth.  
Her main concerns were over the impact and effect of airport growth on the immediate surrounding areas affecting Crawley residents particularly in the Langley Green area.
- She felt that although GAL had acknowledged that road improvements would be needed they had provided no detail in the proposals on how to manage greater vehicle movements and deal with higher volumes of traffic in the surrounding areas, potentially leading to West Sussex residents bearing the costs of any road damage and improvements needed .
- She also highlighted the effect of increased noise and subsequent sleep deprivation of those living in affected areas and noted there was little to address the effect that an increase in passenger numbers would have. She believed that if the extension happened it would be disastrous for the neighbourhood and asked the County Council to oppose anything that would lead to a second runway.

45.5 Mr Elkington advised that GAL had said they would carry out a full transport assessment to determine the wider impact of the Existing Standby Runway scenario and that the County Council would need to work with them to address these issues. GAL would also need to do a full environmental assessment of the impact of noise, including on health.

45.6 The Committee made comments including those that follow. It:

- Suggested that even though economic growth was good for West Sussex, it should not be encouraged at the expense of either residents or the environment. Concerns were raised that further expansion could lead to overall economic dominance in the area by the airport and suppress other economic activity. It could also constrain future growth for housing, transport and commercial development that would better benefit residents. It was highlighted that the County Council needed to adopt a neutral position, but to make a strong point that any adverse impacts would need mitigating and that the response also needed a description of the environmental and social impacts
- Raised concerns over the safeguarding of land surrounding the airport especially given the amount of local development planned and suggested the County Council enter into a new legal agreement to seek reassurances over any future construction of a new runway. There were also suggestions that the land could alternatively be used for affordable housing or business and commercial purposes.

However it was agreed that the proposal to work with GAL over land safeguarding was a sound one. Mr Elkington advised that safeguarding land would only be determined by the government and the local plan process would take into account any areas affected. Mr Harris added that GAL had stated that it doesn't intend to develop a new runway south of the existing one and that the draft response doesn't support an additional runway. The purpose of safeguarding land protected the area for the future and that the County Council needed to work with GAL and the other local authorities to determine the boundaries.

- Raised concerns over surface access to the airport and the amount of infrastructure required, including the need for additional junctions on the M23 motorway and the existing rail capacity in the region, especially on the Brighton rail mainline, considered already full to capacity.
- Raised concerns over the noise implications for residents brought about by increased air traffic and significant growth of cargo movements. Also highlighted the need for increased passenger facilities at the airport and the likelihood of additional pressure on local authorities to provide housing in the surrounding areas.

45.7 Mr Harris noted that there was a lack of detail in the draft Masterplan and that GAL had signalled a change of policy around the emergency runway. His view was that it was important to signal to GAL what information was needed if the proposals were to be taken forward. Although it was recognised that GAL was a commercial company seeking to grow, there were a significant number of environmental downsides so a balance needed to be sought. The County Council would seek to work with GAL over the safeguarding land issue.

*45.8 Mr Elkins added that an agreement with GAL would be beneficial and bring about more certainty.*

*45.9 Ms Goldsmith, Leader, advised that the government would look to the County Council to give comment on any agreement for further development.*

45.10 Resolved – That the Committee:

- 1) Supports a neutral but firm response on the Gatwick Masterplan, to include a 1 page summary of the County Council's position and areas of concern as an appendix.
- 2) With specific regard to the Safeguarded Additional Runway scenario, raised concerns but remained neutral, recognising it was a government decision.
- 3) Supports pursuing a new legal agreement with GAL to prevent construction of a new runway to the South of the airport, to be brought back to the Committee when a position is determined.

## **46. On-Street Parking to Support Traffic Management**

46.1 The Committee considered a report by Executive Director Economy, Infrastructure and Environment and Director of Highways and Transport (copy appended to signed minutes).

46.2 Andy Ekinsmyth, Head of Transport and Countryside and Miles Davy, Parking Manager introduced the report which outlined the proposals for a strategic parking management plan programme to implement on-street parking controls following proposals arising from the programme of Road Space Audit's (RSA's), to be progressively rolled out around the County. Key points were:

- The decision to consult upon or formally advertise RSA parking management proposals would be taken by the Director for Highways and Transport, following consideration from the relevant County Local Committee (CLC).
- The decision to implement RSA parking management plans, subsequent changes to parking arrangements and charging structures would be taken by the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure.

46.3 The Committee made comments including those that follow. It:

- Welcomed and supported the principal of the RSA's, but believed the current CLC decision making process worked well and that previous proposals for a change of scheme had been abandoned due to lack of support.
- Raised concerns over the accountability and process of the new proposals if the decision making power was given to senior officers and the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport, believing it would erode local democracy and the relationship between local members and their residents.
- Raised concerns the proposals were a charter for sweeping controlled parking and that costs could be imposed on motorists in towns with no checks or balances, in particular forcing those struggling with finances off the road.

46.4 Mr Jones made the following proposal, seconded by Mr Oppler which the Committee considered: -

46.5 That the Committee, while supporting the continuation of the Road Space Audits to identify parking problems across West Sussex, believes the current CLC arrangements for creating Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ's) are sufficient and the recommendations are not supported.

46.6 A vote was held and the proposal was carried

46.7 Resolved – That the Committee, while supporting the continuation of the Road Space Audits to identify parking problems across West Sussex,

believes the current CLC arrangements for creating Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ's) are sufficient and the recommendations are not supported.

#### **47. Forward Plan of Key Decisions**

47.1 The Committee considered the Forward Plan dated 23 November (copy appended to signed minutes).

47.2 Resolved – That the Forward Plan be noted.

#### **48. Date of Next Meeting**

48. The Committee noted that its next scheduled meeting will take place on 14 January 2019 at 10.30am at County Hall, Chichester.

#### **49. Bus Strategy 2018-2026 and Financial Changes to the Non-Commercial Bus Network**

49.1 The Committee considered a report by Executive Director Economy, Infrastructure and Environment and Director of Highways and Transport (copy appended to signed minutes).

49.2 Bill Leath, Transport Bureau Manager and Andy Ekinsmyth, Head of Transport and Countryside introduced the report which presented the final draft of the West Sussex Bus Strategy 2018-2026 together with recommended changes to financial support to the non-commercial bus network. Key points were:

- The introduction of the Bus Services Act 2017, gave the County Council an opportunity to look at alternative ways to engage and work with bus companies.
- A Passenger Transport Executive Task and Finish Group (TFG) was set up to review the various bus services and a draft strategy was brought to the Committee in June 2018 at the same time as a public consultation took place. The strategy was then redrafted after the TFG took on board all comments. Smart technology, ticketing and other areas to improve bus companies' commercial fares were also reviewed by the TFG.

49.3 *The Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure welcomed members' views on the strategy. He advised that it was important the County Council had a strategy that would deliver residents' requirements and include a funding framework and infrastructure that would assist bus services in the county. He highlighted the need to give guidance to partners and for the strategy to be commercially viable.*

49.4 The Committee made comments including those that follow. It:

- Raised concerns that the reduction or withdrawal of certain bus routes would impact the elderly, isolated and less well-off who depended on them as a lifeline out of their community; noting that the consultation responses had shown there was a great deal of human impact to the implementation.

- Sought reassurance from the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure that subsidies for registered disabled people would not be withdrawn. The Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure advised that these subsidies would not be withdrawn.
- Questioned whether it was correct that as expressed by the South Downs National Park (SDNP) that the County Council had a duty to maintain the level of bus services within the park's boundaries. Mr Leath advised legal advice would need to be sought and then an answer could be provided to the Committee.
- Requested to see the listed criteria that had been provided as guidance to the TFG.

49.5 Mr Jones made the following proposal, seconded by Mrs Brunsdon which the Committee considered: -

49.6 That the Committee supports the principles of the draft Bus Strategy and notes the methodology adopted by the TFG and that the methodology applied only managed to identify around 50% of the savings the Cabinet Member was seeking to find.

49.7 A vote was held and the proposal was carried

49.8 Resolved – That the Committee:

- 1) Supports the principles of the draft Bus Strategy and notes the methodology adopted by the TFG and that the methodology applied only managed to identify around 50% of the savings the Cabinet Member was seeking to find.
- 2) Supports the recommendations of the TFG.

## **50. Exclusion of Press and Public**

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.

## **51. Bus Strategy 2018-2026 and Financial Changes to the Non-Commercial Bus Network**

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

The Committee further discussed the Bus Strategy 2018-2026 and members gave comment.

The meeting ended at 3.15 pm

Chairman