

AT A MEETING of the ECONOMY, TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT  
SELECT COMMITTEE of the COUNTY COUNCIL held at The Castle,  
Winchester on Thursday, 16 April 2015.

**PRESENT**

Chairman:  
p Councillor Sharyn Wheale

Vice-Chairman:  
p Councillor Geoff Hockley

Councillors:

a Graham Burgess	p Roger Huxstep
p Charles Choudhary	a Rupert Kyrle
p Shaun Cully	p Peter Latham
p Philip Fawkes	p Steve Rippon-Swaine
a Brian Gurden	p David Simpson
p Edward Heron	p Mark Staplehurst

Also in attendance: Cllr Sean Woodward, Executive Member for Economy  
Transport & Environment

85. **BROADCASTING ANNOUNCEMENT**

The Chairman announced that the press and members of the public were permitted to film and broadcast the meeting. Those remaining at the meeting were consenting to being filmed and recorded, and to the possible use of those images and recording for broadcasting purposes.

86. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Graham Burgess, Cllr Rupert Kyrle and Cllr Brian Gurden. The conservative and liberal democrat substitute Members had been invited to attend in their place, however were unable to attend.

87. **DECLARATION OF INTEREST**

Members were mindful that where they believed they had a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in any matter considered at the meeting they must declare that interest at the time of the relevant debate and, having regard to the circumstances described in Part 3 Paragraph 1.5 of the County Council's Members' Code of Conduct, leave the meeting while the matter was discussed, save for exercising any right to speak in accordance with Paragraph 1.6 of the Code. Furthermore Members were mindful that where they

believed they had a Personal interest in a matter being considered at the meeting they considered whether such interest should be declared, and having regard to Part 5, Paragraph 4 of the Code, considered whether it was appropriate to leave the meeting whilst the matter was discussed, save for exercising any right to speak in accordance with the Code.

88. **MINUTES**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 20 January 2015 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

89. **DEPUTATIONS**

No deputations were received at this meeting.

90. **CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chairman reported that at the Cabinet meeting held on 30 March 2015, the Cabinet considered a report regarding the Transformation to 2017 programme. As part of this report, Cabinet agreed a timetable for public consultation and consideration of savings proposals for 2016/17. Consideration would be given to whether adjustments should be made to the meeting dates scheduled for this committee, depending on the timing of business to be considered.

91. **UPDATE: LOCAL FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT**

The Committee considered a report from the Director of Economy, Transport & Environment providing an update on management of the County Council's responsibilities as a Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) to manage local flood risk (see Item 6 in the Minute Book).

Members heard that:

- Work was ongoing to implement improvements as a result of the flood incident investigations, following the flooding experienced in the winter of 2013/14
- Not all the flooding experienced in Hampshire meets the requirements of the current government funding system to fund mitigating schemes. The County Council had developed a Pathfinder project to tackle groundwater flooding, however the government had not supported this proposal
- The government had come up with a limited trial mechanism for bundling together small schemes, to make them eligible for the existing funding mechanism. The County Council had submitted bids under this scheme

- Government had changed the requirements for implementation of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDs) included in the Flood and Water Management Act. The responsibility to approve SuDs on new developments now sits with the local planning authority, rather than the LLFA. However, LLFAs will be a statutory consultee for surface water as of 15 April 2015 and will have 21 days to respond when consulted. Historical data suggests the County Council is likely to be consulted on around 400-450 such applications per year

Following questions Members heard:

- The footnote on page 6 should read 10 developments (rather than 100) are of 250 dwellings or more each year
- When responding regarding SuDs applications, a range of options were available from 'no comment' to a detailed response, and standard advice could be used
- If the County Council could not support a SuDs proposal, the Council would provide evidence to support it's position, to defend the position should the developer appeal
- It would be the developers responsibility to ensure the ongoing maintenance of SuDs, and it was likely this would be discharged through use of management companies. There remained a risk that responsibility would be passed back to Local Authorities in the future, however the County Council would continue to make representations to the government that this would not be feasible without associated funding
- The process for getting landowners to take action to maintain watercourses had been streamlined, and in the majority of cases, discussing the situation with them generated a response; it had not been necessary to take any cases through the courts

Members commented:

- That it would be helpful to see a list of the Flood Action Groups in Hampshire. It was agreed a list could be provided to committee Members

RESOLVED:

That Local Flood Risk Management remain on the work programme for a future update, likely to be in 2016 (with flexibility to receive an update sooner if there are significant changes to report).

List of Flood Action Groups be circulated

Update work programme

92. **UPDATE: HIGHWAYS MAINTENANCE RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Committee received an update from the Deputy Director of Economy, Transport and Environment (Highways, Traffic, and Transport Service Stream) regarding the recommendations made by the committee in January 2015 relating to highways maintenance (see Item 7 in the Minute Book).

Members heard that:

- In relation to recommendation one regarding control of weeds on the highway, discussions had been held with Hart District Council, who would be taking this on as a trial as of 1 April 2015
- In relation to recommendation two regarding management of overgrown vegetation, a streamlined process was due to be implemented in the next six to eight weeks. Discussions were being held with parishes in Cllr Huxstep and Cllr Heron's divisions regarding issuing notices on the County Council's behalf
- In relation to recommendation three, regarding maintenance of drainage close to highways. The recording of highway assets on rural sections of the highway network was now 80% complete, and was due to be finished in the next four weeks. The same parishes managing vegetation would be invited to cover watercourse maintenance notices as well in due course
- In relation to recommendation four regarding grass cutting, an audit of current practice was underway, and further information could be provided at a future update
- Regarding the future arrangements once the current term highway maintenance contract comes to an end, it was noted that a report was due to be considered by the Executive Member for Economy Transport & Environment on 12 May 2015 on the progress to date assessing the options, including the input of the Select Committee

RESOLVED:

That the recommendations from these working groups remain on the work programme for a future update. The timing to be determined, likely to be in early 2016, to allow time for the trial ways of working to have taken effect.

Update work programme

93. **PARISH LENGTHSMAN SCHEME**

The committee considered a report from the Director of Economy Transport & Environment regarding the parish lengthsman scheme (see Item 8 in the Minute Book).

Cllr Heron declared a personal interest: that his nephew is a parish lengthsman. (Cllr Heron chose to remain in the meeting for the item)

Members heard:

- That the current parish lengthsman scheme had initially been a pilot initiated in 2009 involving 19 parishes. The scheme had been popular and was now operated in 91 parishes in Hampshire
- The cost of the scheme in the current financial year was £130,000. If the scheme covered all parishes, around £280,000 of revenue expenditure would be required. It had been decided to review the funding of the scheme, given the budget pressures the County Council will be facing in future years. Consideration would be given to whether parish council's could part fund the scheme in future

Members commented:

- That the proposed task & finish group should consider the range of functions the lengthsman undertake and what the impact would be if the County Council had to find other ways to undertake those tasks (including functions linked to other departments e.g. footpath maintenance)
- That consideration be given to opportunities for partnership funding, including from district Councils, and opportunities for the County Council to provide assistance e.g. investigate the possibility of a collective public liability insurance policy
- That consideration needed to be given to areas that are not parished. The Chairman suggested the task & finish group include Members from both parished and non parished areas
- That feedback from parishes suggested the administration of the scheme could be improved, and consideration could be given to allowing larger clusters of parishes to form
- That consideration be given to what else parish lengthsman could do for the County Council or District Council's, and therefore if funding from the budget for such functions could be used to support the scheme

RESOLVED:

That a Task & Finish Group regarding the Parish Lengthsman Scheme be initiated, with a terms of reference as provided at Appendix 3 to Item 8.

Membership to be:

Cllr Wheale, Cllr Heron, Cllr Latham, Cllr Huxstep, Cllr Staplehurst, Cllr Simpson (and potentially a second

Arrangements be made for the Task & Finish group

liberal democrat Member to be confirmed, as the labour spokesperson declined a place on the group due to the time commitment).

94. **UPDATE: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT WORKING GROUP**

The committee received a presentation from the Assistant Director for Economy Transport & Environment (Economic Development Service Stream) providing an update on the issues considered by the economic development Working Group (see Item 9 in the Minute Book).

Members heard:

- That Hampshire County Council is the accountable body for the Enterprise M3 Local Economic Partnership (LEP). A stronger assurance framework was now required to ensure decisions made by the LEP were transparent and robust
- It was anticipated the Growth Deal funding would leverage in extra funding from other sources. Each LEP had been awarded around £150 million of Growth Deal funding, which it was expected would amount to around £500 million in total investment leveraged in per Growth Deal, meaning around £1 billion of investment across the two LEP areas
- All LEPs are required to have Growth Hubs, to deliver effective business support. The Enterprise M3 Growth Hub will include the use of 'growth champions' – high calibre individuals with senior business background to provide advice to high growth businesses
- Both LEPs have secured funding under the EU programme, which requires match funding on a 50/50 basis. The Solent LEP has advertised for partners to provide a 'business support hub'. The County Council is interested in this opportunity, as an opportunity to bring in external funding for business support and inward investment work undertaken by the County Council
- There may be a review of LEPs or their geographies under the new government following elections in May 2015

Following questions Members heard:

- That discussions were underway regarding the possibility of the LEPs providing support for the superfast broadband programme
- The LEPs appeared to be willing to support projects where available – it was up to the County Council to identify and develop suitable proposals
- A range of intelligence is used to identify businesses with high growth potential, including 'on the ground' intelligence from officers working with

businesses as well as data regarding recruitment, registration of intellectual property rights etc

- The Enterprise M3 Growth Hub contract includes targeting 200 high growth businesses per year for support, however the intention is to focus on outcomes and not just reaching a pre-determined number. Rather than advertising the offer to all, the approach would be to selectively target particular businesses

Members commented:

- That in future funding may be directed increasingly to areas that can demonstrate they have spent existing funds in ways that have contributed to growth.

RESOLVED:

That the update is noted.

95. **WORK PROGRAMME**

The Chairman presented the Committee's forthcoming work programme (Item 10 in the Minute Book).

The Chairman highlighted that since the last meeting, the Executive Member for Economy Transport & Environment had taken a decision in March to initiate a trial A Board licensing scheme in Andover, and suggested that the Select Committee review the progress of the trial. This had therefore been added to the work programme (see page 8). The timing of this topic coming to the committee was to be determined, depending on when the trial starts.

The Chairman also highlighted that on page 4 it was indicated that a budget report would be coming to the June meeting. Following the 30 March Cabinet decision regarding the Transformation to 2017 programme, the timescales had been revised. It was now anticipated that an item on 'Consideration of Departmental Transformation to 2017 savings proposals and public consultation feedback' would be considered in mid September instead.

Cllr Heron requested that the item on animal casualties on the roads requested at the last meeting be scheduled for one of the remaining meetings in 2015.

RESOLVED:

That the Committee's work programme be approved subject to any amendments made at this meeting.

Update work programme

---

Chairman, 15 September 2015