

KENT COUNTY COUNCIL

ENVIRONMENT & TRANSPORT CABINET COMMITTEE

MINUTES of a meeting of the Environment & Transport Cabinet Committee held in the Council Chamber, Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone on Wednesday, 5 July 2023.

PRESENT: Mr S Holden (Chairman), Mr N J Collor (Vice-Chairman), Mr N Baker, Mr T Bond, Mr P Cole, Mr D Crow-Brown, Ms M Dawkins, Mr M Dendor, Jenni Hawkins, Mr M A J Hood, Mr A J Hook, Mrs S Hudson, Mr B H Lewis, Mr H Rayner, Mr A Sandhu, MBE, Mr D Watkins and Mr M Whiting

ALSO PRESENT: Mr D L Brazier (Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport) and Miss S J Carey (Cabinet Member for Environment)

IN ATTENDANCE: Mr S Jones (Corporate Director of Growth, Environment and Transport), Ms H Chughtai (Director of Highways and Transportation), Mr M Smyth (Director of Environment and Circular Economy), Mr M Dentten (Democratic Services Officer) and Mr J Potts (Democratic Services Officer)

UNRESTRICTED ITEMS

159. Interests

(Item 4)

No declarations were made.

160. Previous Minutes

(Item 5)

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 23 May 2023 were an accurate record and that they be signed by the Chairman.

161. Verbal updates by Cabinet Members and the Corporate Director

(Item 6)

1. Miss Carey, Cabinet Member for Environment told the Committee that she sent a regular newsletter to Members on her work and that she had no further updates to add.
2. Mr Brazier, Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport provided an update on the following:
 - a) Mr Brazier had visited Chestfield tunnel on the A299 where LED lighting units were being installed which were more efficient and would contribute towards net-zero targets. In addition, the closure required for installation provided an opportunity to carry out remedial work on the highway. He told Members all works would be completed on the 5 July and road reopened by the 9 July.

- b) He updated Members on the partial collapse of the highway at Galley Hill. Exploration of the site by engineers was still underway and legal teams had been heavily involved. A diversion had been put in place and Mr Brazier told Members that whilst it had caused some inconvenience it was working well.
- c) There was a closure at Leeds near Maidstone as South East Water had to excavate B2163 to lay a new water supply. A diversion had been put in place and KCC was working with South East Water to ensure that unsuitable Heavy Good vehicles were not entering narrow rural roads.
- d) He had been working with officers and London borough representatives on their opposition to the Mayor of London's ULEZ scheme. He told Members that although KCC was not party to it, a judicial review into the scheme was being pursued.
- e) A Public Consultation on the forthcoming Local Transport Plan was underway and a briefing session had been provided to all Members of the Council.
- f) The second Tranche of KCC's BSIP allocation funding had been received and plans for its use were being developed.
- g) Mr Brazier had attended the launch of Kent Electric Vehicle Charge Point Network in Folkestone. He told Members that KCC had been working with provider Connected Kerb and a number of the district and borough councils. Over 300 charge points had been installed across Kent. KCC had received £12 million from central government to fund LEVI – Local Electric Vehicle Infrastructure and work was still underway on how this funding would be used.
- h) The Kent Travel Saver application window had opened. A new app had been put in place for applications. Customers needed to apply by the 13 August to ensure they received their passes by first week of term.

3. Members asked Mr Brazier the following questions:

- a) On the road at Galley Hill, Mr Rayner asked whether the Cabinet Member could confirm whether the road would be restored in the future and raised concerns over the financial situation of Thames Water, as a party responsible for the road. Mr Brazier responded that no decision had been made as to whether to close or restore the road. Mr Jones added that his team were exploring options for the site. He said that once the scale of the problem had been assessed, they could then propose solutions. Mr Jones told Members that the financial situation of Thames Water was a concern and whilst Thames Water and their insurers would remain the primary point of contact, KCC would also be liaising with Government in case Thames Water was brought into public ownership.
- b) Mr Baker praised Mr Brazier and the Highways team on their work at the Chestfield Tunnel and for taking local concerns into consideration when arranging the diversions. They asked whether residents could be engaged at the soonest possibility on the planned A299 Thanet Way work in order to accommodate for their concerns and make reasonable adjustments.

- c) Mr Hood asked if the Electric Vehicle pilot would extend to streets made up predominantly of terrace housing. Mr Brazier said that the funding was provided for installation in residential areas. He said installation of charging points on streets made up of terrace houses was difficult and an alternative solution may need to be found.
 - d) The Chairman asked whether contractors had power to divert vehicles, specifically whether they could send heavy goods vehicles along alternative diversions to prevent damage or congestion on narrow rural roads. Mr Brazier responded that the Highways team were working on a scheme to try and deter heavy vehicles from using certain diversions via signage. He told Members that there was difficulty enforcing this under existing legislation.
4. Mr Jones, Corporate Director for Growth, Environment and Transport provided an update on the below:
- a) Mr Jones told Members that KCC had a number of consultations underway. The Local Transport Plan was launched 27 June 2023 and would run until the 18 September 2023, following which further plans would be drawn up and Members consulted. He confirmed that the Kent Street and Malling Road junction improvements, the Sevenoaks town centre walking, wheeling and cycling route, the Cheriton to Folkestone walking, wheeling and cycling route and the Lincoln crossroads on the A229 were all being consulted on. Lastly, there was also a Kent-wide cycling and walking infrastructure plan, which Mr Jones invited Members to comment on.
 - b) Members were told that National Highways and the Department for Transport were carrying out consultations. These were for the next road investment period the 2025-2030 period. Mr Jones explained that the Directorate would contact Members and had prepared a draft response which reiterated the existing priorities of the county.
 - c) He updated Members on Lower Thames Crossing, telling them that an investigation into the development consent order had commenced. All Members had been asked their views on this and were told that the examination would last 6 months. If approved, construction would start in 2026, with the new road and tunnel opened by 2032. His team had been preparing a local impact report as part of this process.
 - d) Other projects included the Longport-Canterbury active travel scheme which was in construction and had progressed well. The Directorate were also preparing for the Mount Field Park development which would provide a new junction arrangement for the A2 bridge alongside other road improvements. The Thanet Parkway station scheme was concluding and the station would open on the 31st of July to Southeastern services.
 - e) Mr Jones updated Members on routine maintenance, between April and June, confirming that 150,000 sq metres of road renewal had been delivered at a cost of £10.5 million. 450,000 sq metres of road preservation had also been carried out at a cost of £4.5 million. 6 new contractors had been appointed to fill potholes and since April and 17,600 potholes had been repaired for £2.2 million. In May a semi-

automatic machine had been introduced to repair potholes and this had proved successful and a second machine had been acquired.

- f) The Public Transport team had provided one of KCC's redundant minibuses to Royal British Legion. Staff from the Fast-track team won an award for best paper demonstrating sustainable transport access at the 2023 Transport Practitioners meeting.
- g) The Bus Service Improvement Plan (BSIP) had been used to support the Big Weekend of free bus transport. It was too early to report the final uptick in journeys taken but it was estimated to be around 30% more than previous weekends.
- h) Mr Jones reported that the waste management team had seen high volumes of waste collected in last few months. He told Members this may be due to the high number of public holidays. Contracts had been exchanged for the development of the Sevenoaks waste transfer station and construction had commenced. He told Members the site would provide sustainable waste disposal operations which accommodated future legislative changes.
- i) Mr Jones praised the Highways First Football Team who got to the final of the Kent Community Cup.

Members asked the following questions to Mr Jones:

- a) Mr Lewis raised concerns that during the Thanet Parkway scheme funding was spent developing a bus stop, but this would now only be used by replacement buses. He claimed this was a lack of strategic oversight by KCC. Mr Jones responded that 95% of operators across Kent were commercial operators and it is up to the individual companies to decide where they will run busses to and from.
- b) Ms Dawkins asked whether there would be an opportunity for a meeting between them and Corporate Director and what community engagement there would be on the Mount Fields site. Mr Jones responded that Section 106 agreement had been signed with the developer and it had identified what infrastructure was required. He told Members that much of this was pre-determined, but that the team would be happy to discuss what this means with the Member.
- c) Mr Watkins commented that he'd recently attended the Transport for South East board meeting as KCC's representative. He informed Members that the Department for Transport and National Highways confirmed at this meeting that they struggled with constrained budgets and that inflation over the last 3 years had made road building more expensive. Mr Jones added that they needed to engage with Government on road building and the role of the County Council in maintaining existing assets in lieu of new key infrastructure projects.
- d) Ms Hawkins asked how much had been spent on the free bus weekend and what the rationale behind it was. Mr Jones told Members it was part of a £19 million deal from Government to demonstrate the bus network in Kent and get people to interact with busses and make them consider travelling by bus in the future. The Member responded that they were concerned by this use of funding when bus services were being reduced. Mr Jones responded that aimed to restimulate ridership and to prevent further service deductions in the future they had to focus on ensuring that routes were commercially attractive.

RESOLVED to note the updates.

162. Performance Dashboard

(Item 7)

Matt Wagner (Interim Chief Analyst) was in attendance for this item.

1. Mr Wagner introduced the report. He told Members that this was the first performance report of the 2023/24 financial year. Of the 19 key performance indicators (KPIs) 9 were rated green, 4 amber and 5 red.
2. The indicators rated red were under Highways and Transport: potholes repaired in 28 calendar days, emergency incidents attended to within 2 hours, priority enquiries completed within 20 working days. Under Environment and Waste the two indicators rated red were: municipal waste recycled and composted and waste recycled and composted at Household Waste Recycling Centres. Mr Wagner then explained to Members the factors that led to underperformance in these areas.
3. Members asked the following questions to Mr Wagner:
 - a) Mr Lewis asked for clarification on appendix one, HT:12. The KPI this related to was rated green, but the appendix made clear that data had not yet been produced in the new financial year. Mr Wagner clarified that the rating had been based on data from March 2023 and told Members the next report would be more accurate as they would have received data from the current financial year.
 - b) Mr Bond asked a question about HT:13, which related to street works permits issued. The Member noted that there had been a sharp increase in the number of permits issued and asked why a percentage rather than the exact figures had been provided. Mr Jones responded that the Directorate had accurate information on this and would ensure that exact figures were provided in the future.
 - c) Mr Hood asked why the Deputy Chief Executive's Department had provided data and were responsible for some of the KPI's under Highways and Transport. Mr Jones told Members the Deputy Chief Executive's Department managed the correspondence for a number of directorates and that this provided consistency of approach, economies of scale and made recruitment easier. He told Members that they were seeing a month-on-month reduction in their backlog.
 - d) Mr Hook asked why the number of potholes repaired fluctuated so much month by month and on greenhouse gasses they asked why greenhouse gas emissions appeared to be flatlining once the very large contribution from the Bowerhouse 2 solar park was taken into account. Miss Carey responded to the question on greenhouse gas emissions, she told Members that KCC was committed to Net Zero and that this meant that there would always be an irreducible number of emissions that needed to be offset by projects such as Bowerhouse 2 and that the solar park at Kings Hill would soon be contributing to offsetting KCC's carbon emissions. KCC was not just relying on offsetting to reach Net Zero but had also been using Public Sector Decarbonisation funding to

invest in double glazing, LED lights and other energy savings. On potholes, Mr Jones responded that the fluctuation was due to poor weather over the winter months. He informed Members that a large amount of repair work occurred in October before the winter weather and then again once the worst of the winter weather is over.

- e) Mr Watkins commented that a seasonal approach was required when comparing emissions, especially as weather and temperature impact the amount of greenhouse gasses emitted and suggested data may be compared this way in the future.

RESOLVED to note the Performance Dashboard.

163. Household Waste Recycling Centre Review - Consultation document *(Item 8)*

David Beaver (Head of Resource Management and Circular Economy) and Hannah Allard (Insight and Development Manager) were in attendance for this item.

1. Following a Point of Order made by a Member under 15.11 of KCC's Constitution, the Clerk clarified that supplementary reports to the meeting's agenda could be published and made available to Members and the public within 5 clear working days of the meeting in accordance with Section 100B of the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985. It was noted that where the constitution and law were in conflict, that the law took precedence.
2. Miss Carey introduced the item. She discussed how Committee Members had helped shape the report via a working group. She told Members that Waste Management were required to reduce costs and balance the books and that this was agreed upon by Members in the budget. She assured Members that this decision was taken as a last resort and by making savings in this area KCC were able to ensure that funding to Social Care services was protected. She told Members that Officers had been tasked with creating a scheme that had the least impact on residents and residents would be consulted.
3. Mr Beaver provided further context to the Committee. He told Members that there was already more capacity than demand in the system and that waste processed by HWRC's had been reducing year on year. He told Members that modelling assumed there would be more rather than less waste in the future and accounted for potential changes in legislation. He reiterated the need to identify savings to support the other services.
4. Members made the following comments and asked questions of Miss Carey, Mr Symth, Ms Allard and Mr Beaver.
 - a) Mr Lewis raised their concerns that the proposed options would disproportionately impact East Kent and that residents should be provided with 'none of the above' as an option in response to the consultation. They also asked why the consultation was Kent-wide rather than targeted to areas likely to lose HWRCs and asked whether the consultation document was final. Miss Carey told Members that consultation questions were not usually reported to committees. She

said that the way options were phrased was intentional and that KCC do have a preferred option. She told Members it had been a data driven exercise and reducing impact has been at the forefront of the decision. Mr Smyth added that paragraph 2.4 were the 4 options that would be consulted on and were not draft options.

- b) Members praised Ms Carey for establishing the Member working group. They were pleased that Members had been consulted prior to the consultation beginning and that a free text output was being included in the consultation.
- c) Mr Bond told the Committee that they were concerned about the decision to reduce waste infrastructure as housing developments were being constructed. The Member asked for the savings per HWRC site.
- d) Ms Dawkins raised their concerns that the booking system was responsible for reducing the numbers attending the sites under consideration for closure. They also asked what impact the consultation was expected to have on the scheme. Miss Carey responded that the booking system was introduced due to problems during lockdown, it was found that it assisted traffic management and was co-designed with residents. A public consultation was held on whether to keep the booking system and a clear majority wanted it to be maintained. On how the consultation would be acted upon, she told Members it is not a referendum and savings will have to be found somewhere but that the public's preferences and comments will be taken into consideration.
- e) Mr Hood told the Committee they were concerned about the Government's push for a free to use waste and recycling service. They also asked whether the decision to close centres would increase the risk of fires at other sites and asked whether sites would be mothballed in case additional capacity is required in the future. Miss Carey agreed that the Government's approach had made matters more difficult and although waste management is funded by council tax, they were subject to legislation. On potential fires, Mr Beaver told Members that fires mostly occur in waste transfer stations rather than at HWRCs. On mothballing, this approach had been considered by the waste management team and they had informed corporate management of their preference.
- f) The Chairman asked if Government action had been considered in future capacity projections, particularly if the Government prevent councils from using a booking system. Miss Carey told the committee that this is a concern and she hopes the government do not go down this route. But that they will continue to work with households to reduce the amount of waste produced.
- g) Mr Hook commented that they were concerned about the impact on Faversham and argued that the proposals would cause disproportionate harm to local residents. They told the committee they would like a map showing the impact of closures on the time it takes to drive to a household waste recycling centre. The Member went on to raise concerns that air-pollution, the relative cost of living, demographics and future congestion had not been considered. Ms Allard responded that consultees would be provided with as much

information as possible and that most of the analytics produced had centred around drive times. She told Members that closures would mean that an additional 12,000 households would need to drive more than 20 minutes to reach a HWRC. Ms Allard also informed the Committee that capacity modelling had been updated following their meeting with the members group and told Members that although some centres could reach capacity on Sundays, all would have enough capacity during the week. Mr Beaver added that the closure of sites on some days would lose more capacity than the complete closure of specific sites.

- h) Mr Cole raised their concerns over the addition of Swanley as a site being considered for closure. The Member asked what changes had been made to the officer's methodology which meant that the Swanley site was being considered.
- i) Mrs Hudson asked on the mothballing of the sites whether this was an option and raised the Tovil, Maidstone Site. Ms Allard told Members future capacity was considered and growth was considered as part of this forecasting. She told Members that respondents will be provided with a graph showing how population growth and other factors will impact capacity in districts. Mr Beaver said they would investigate mothball further and report on it after consultation. A Member asked if the sites would be used for housing, Mr Beaver told the Committee that it was too early to determine.

5. Members voted on whether to agree the recommendations. The votes cast were as follows:

For (9): Mr Baker, Mr Collor, Mr Crow-Brown, Mr Dendor, Mr Holden, Mr Rayner, Mr Sandhu, Mr Watkins and Mr Whiting.

Against (8): Mr Bond, Mr Cole, Ms Dawkins, Ms Hawkins, Mr Hood, Mr Hook, Mrs Hudson and Mr Lewis.

6. The vote passed.

RESOLVED to note the report and measures planned to obtain public and stakeholder views on the proposals to meet budgeted cost savings required for 2023/24 and 2024/25.

164. BSIP Plus - Verbal update

(Item 9)

1. Mr Brazier introduced the item. He told Members that officers were beginning to deliver the tranche 1 schemes, and work was ongoing on the delivery of capital works in Dover, Ebbsfleet and Thanet. Following these, the public transport team would be delivering a bus information portal, real time information at stops and electronic ticket machines. Mr Brazier reiterated that the Kent Travel Saver opened for applications that week and that the price had been held at 22/23 levels using BSIP funding. Additionally, he confirmed that the Minister for Local Transport had visited Kent to announce further BSIP

funding, acceptance of this was subject to a proposed memorandum of understanding and Mr Brazier told Members they would be updated once appropriate. He explained that no further information had been provided on BSIP plus or its potential conditions by central government.

2. Members made the following comments and asked the following questions of Mr Brazier and Mr Jones.
 - a) Mr Lewis commented that they hoped the developments would make busses more reliable and cheaper to use. They told the Committee they believed this would ease congestion.
 - b) Mr Rayner thanked the Cabinet Member for maintaining prices and that this would be of great benefit to parents and carers. The Member welcomed the BSIP funding and BSIP plus.
 - c) Mr Watkins contributed that with any reduction in fares, data should be analysed to see if it led to more users and greater demand. They stated that the data would lead to better initiatives and support bus travel.
 - d) Mr Hood asked whether targeted advertisement or initiatives were being used to get groups who do not regularly use buses to adopt public transport. Mr Brazier responded that this would fall under the remit of the bus working group.
 - e) Ms Dawkins raised the need for reliability in bus services to encourage use. They raised the need to look at successful cities and regions for operational models. Mr Brazier responded that BSIP is being invested in plans to improve reliability. Mr Jones contributed that bus priority projects were aimed at improving journey time and reliability.

RESOLVED to note the update.

165. Environment Agency guidance on managing Polyfluoroalkyl Substances - Presentation

(Item 10)

Sally Harvey (Area Director for Kent, South London and East Sussex, Environment Agency) and Scott Cole (Groundwater and Contaminated Land Specialist) were in attendance for this item.

1. Ms Harvey introduced the work of the Environment Agency and its responsibilities in Kent this included investments in flood defences, maintaining flood defence assets, the regulation of waste and water companies, the regulation of oil and chemical sites, supporting planning decisions, influencing major infrastructure proposals to ensure consideration of the environment, and acting as a harbour and navigation authority on certain waterways.
2. Mr S Cole explained what Polyfluoroalkyl Substances were, how they were monitored and actions the Environment Agency had taken on them. He told Members that there were several scientific studies raising concerns over these products' resistance to degradation. He warned that the scientific studies were ongoing and that conclusions hadn't been drawn but that research was

indicating that these substances may be linked to low birth weights in human reproduction and may be toxic to marine life.

3. Mr S Cole told Members that the Environment Agency had been expanding their techniques for monitoring these substances and that they had been liaising with a wide range of sectors on PFAS. There had been a particular emphasis on finding where PFAS was impacting the Environment and how it entered water. They had monitored 80 groundwater sites across Kent, South London and East Sussex and had a steadily growing database on PFAS in water. Since 2021 they had been able to make use of local funds for prioritised local investigations.
4. The Agency had been developing a cross-government chemicals strategy which will be published later this year. In the meantime, they told the committee, that the agency provides its data to district councils and water companies.
5. Members asked the following questions of Ms Harvey and Mr S Cole.
 - a) Mr Crow-Brown asked if the military fire school at Thanet was a site of concern. Mr S Cole told the Member it was on their radar as were other sites in Thanet including farmland. He told Members that Water Companies have also been instructed to look for PFAS and they have been informing the Environment Agency and the Drinking Water Inspectorate (DWI) is producing a report on this.
 - b) Mr Hook asked if health outcomes could be assessed against sites with high levels of PFAS and which organisations remit it would fall under to assess sites and how sources could be identified. They also asked if the DWI's legal PFAS threshold was lower than other countries. Mr S Cole told Members that the DWI value was agreed with the UK Health Security Agency and that whilst the WHO doesn't provide guidance for PFAS it does provide guidance for the two most common PFAS chemicals and the DWI's threshold is in line with WHO and EU standards and is considered robust and conservative in terms of health. Mr S Cole told Members that the Agency were looking into sources of PFAS nationally and that pilot studies were investigating discharge from sewage and landfill operators specifically. He told Members that KCC's landfill team had been approached to discuss surveying for PFAS. The Environment Agency were targeting sites with higher levels to build a more detailed case study on origin and on mapping health outcomes he told Members that this would fall under the UK Health Security Agency but they were being collaborated with.
 - c) Ms Dawkins asked as evidence is built up, what role would the Environment Agency have in discussing the future of PFAS chemicals and whether they could be filtered out of the water supply. Mr Cole told the Committee that many PFAS chemicals had been withdrawn from use and so going forward the focus would be on managing the legacy of PFAS chemicals. On removal of the chemicals from water systems, Mr Cole told Members that water companies will dilute the water by using multiple sources in order to reduce the amount of chemicals

found in the end product. He added that carbon filtration was useful against some PFAS but not all and the remediation sectors were already looking into this.

- d) Mr Lewis raised concerns about sewage discharge in Thanet by Southern Water. Ms Harvey told Members investigations take a significant amount of time but that the Environment Agency were monitoring this area.

RESOLVED to note the contents of the presentation.

166. Feasibility of temporary road closure actions - Report

(Item 11)

Andrew Loosemore (Head of Highways) was in attendance for this item.

1. Mr Loosemore introduced the item and reported on the feasibility of options considered to address concerns of disruption and road closures across the county. He told Members that a designated Road Closure Inspector had been implemented as a trial and that this had proved successful.
2. Members asked the following questions:
 - a) Mr Bond raised concerns over the lack of communication and coordination between KCC and utility companies on road closures. They were concerned about utility companies undertaking works on roads designated as diversion routes by KCC and asked if closures on roads by utility companies were monitored by KCC.
 - b) Mr Lewis commented that local representatives should contact utility companies and ask for site meetings. The Member said they had pursued this approach in the past and had influenced diversion routes.
 - c) Members raised concerns over the process for checking roadworks on which work had been completed. They believed it was a source of frustration for residents to see a road closed or partially closed when work was already complete.
 - d) Mr Loosemore responded to the Members comments and questions. On emergency closures of roads by utility companies, he told Members that utility companies did not have to inform KCC until 2 hours after urgent work had started. He praised the creation of a designated Road Closure Inspector and told the Committee that his team were in the final stages of agreeing a prosecution process to reduce the number of emergency closures. Mr Loosemore told the Committee that intense negotiations had occurred with South East Water on closures and diversions and that they were keen to make closures or diversions as smooth as possible. He told Members that planning for non-emergency closures often was sufficient and that negative impacts were mitigated. Mr Jones added that Government was concerned about the impact of road closures and a consultation would come forward later in the year.
 - e) The Chairman asked if the Inspector could also look at ways of segregating Heavy Good Vehicles out of diversionary lanes and Mr Loosemore said they would look into this.

3. The Chairman moved an amendment to add “recommend that the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport maintain a dedicated road closure inspection measure and investigate funding to enable its continued provision” to the motion. This was agreed without a vote.

RESOLVED to:

- a) note the details of the report and actions being taken, regarding Temporary Road Closures across the county; and
- b) recommend that the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport maintain a dedicated road closure inspection measure and investigate funding to enable its continued provision.

167. Road Conditions - Update

(Item 12)

1. Mr Brazier introduced the item and told the committee that the update had been brought before the committee on the condition of KCC’s highways and how they would deteriorate overtime based on existing funding. He told Members that if Highways did not receive a funding increase there would be a higher number of roads deteriorating in the future.
2. Mr Lewis raised concerns that roads currently under construction or planned hadn’t been included in the report.

RESOLVED to note the contents of the report.

168. 23/00066: A28 Sturry Link Road - Compulsory Purchase Order

(Item 13)

Richard Shelton (Project Manager) and Lee Burchill (Major Capital Programme Manager) were in attendance for this item.

1. Mr Jones introduced the item. He told Members that the proposed decision sought the ability to use compulsory purchase at the site in order to reduce risk.
2. Mr Shelton explained how the scheme had been progressing and told Members they were at the point where contracts were being developed. He told the Committee that a voluntary purchase was desired following negotiations with landowners but that in order to reduce risk and uncertainty his team were seeking authorisation of the use of compulsory purchase orders if necessary.
3. Members made the following statements and asked the following questions:
 - a) Mr Bond asked where the funding would be found should compulsory purchase need to be used. Mr Shelton responded that there a full costing is available, and that Members were not being asked to consider any increase in budgets, only the use of compulsory purchase as a tool.

- b) Ms Dawkins raised their concerns over the impact on residents and commented that residents believed that there had not been good consultation.
- c) Mr Rayner raised concerns over the cost increase since Members originally agreed to the scheme. They told the committee they were particularly concerned about how long compulsory purchases could take and how much costs could increase during this period. Mr Shelton provided clarity over funding the sources and that developers were delivering on their commitments. He also told Members that the request to be able to use CPO's was in order to reduce risk and he outlined contingency plans which had been made.
- d) Mr Lewis asked how many homes were involved and what the cost of CPO's would be to the council. Mr Shelton responded that no homes were impacted and that the compulsory purchase impacted a single landholder.

4. Ms Dawkins abstained from endorsing the proposed decision.

RESOLVED to endorse the Cabinet Member's proposed decision to give approval to:

- i) all acts required to acquire the land and rights for the carrying out and completion of the A28 Sturry Link Road scheme, including by means of a compulsory purchase order;
- ii) all acts required to provide new, or improved highways including the closure of private means of access for the carrying out and completion of the A28 Sturry Link Road scheme, including by means of a side roads order;
- iii) give delegation to the Corporate Director of Growth, Environment & Transport in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport to take relevant actions including but not limited to entering into contracts and other legal agreements, as necessary to implement the decision; and
- iv) confirm that other decisions in Record of Decision 18/00027 remain extant.

169. Work Programme

(Item 14)

- 1. The following changes were made to the Work Programme:
 - a. that the Environment Agency be asked to return to provide update at a future meeting; and
 - b. that the Drainage Infrastructure Maintenance Report be considered by the committee at its next meeting.

RESOLVED to agree the Work Programme.