

## **GROWTH & INFRASTRUCTURE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

**MINUTES** of the meeting held on Wednesday, 28 October 2009 commencing at 10.00 am and finishing at 2.20 pm

### **Present:**

#### **Voting Members:**

Councillor Patrick Greene – in the Chair

Councillor David Nimmo-Smith (Deputy Chairman)

Councillor Lorraine Lindsay-Gale

Councillor Charles Mathew

Councillor Anne Purse

Councillor Keith Strangwood

Councillor Lawrie Stratford (in place of Councillor Gibbard)

Councillor John Tanner

Councillor David Turner

Councillor Nicholas P. Turner

#### **Other Members in Attendance (Whole of meeting):**

Councillor Ian Hudspeth

Councillor Rodney Rose

### **Officers:**

Whole of meeting

S.Whitehead, C. Brodie-Levinsohn (Corporate Core)

Part of meeting

#### **Agenda Item**

#### **Officer Attending**

5. Question and Answer – Park & Ride

Head of Transport and P. Fermer

6. Question and Answer - Archaeological remains and planning

R. Dance (Planning Implementation) and P. Smith

7. Capital Infrastructure Process – Quarterly Update

Director of Environment & Economy

A. Ulusoy-Shipstone (Finance and Procurement)

8. Local Transport Plan 3 Scrutiny Working Group

J. Disley (Environment & Economy)

9. Minerals and waste Development Framework Progress Update

P. Day (Minerals & Waste Policy Team )

*The Scrutiny Committee considered the matters, reports and recommendations contained or referred to in the agenda for the meeting together with a schedule of addenda tabled at the meeting/the following additional documents and agreed as set out below. Copies of the agenda and reports and schedule/additional*

*documents] are attached to the signed Minutes.*

**15/09 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS**  
(Agenda No. 1)

Apologies for absence and temporary appointments were received as follows:

<b>Apology from</b>	<b>Temporary Appointment</b>
Councillor Gibbard	Councillor Stratford

**16/09 MINUTES**  
(Agenda No. 3)

The minutes of the meeting of the Growth & Infrastructure Scrutiny Committee (GI3) held on 16 September 2009 were approved and signed subject to the following:

Date to be corrected to 16 September 2009 and the following names **corrected**/added to the list of those present;

Chairman- Councillor Greene  
Councillors Fitzgerald O'Connor, Tilley, Stratford and Goddard  
Whole of meeting: Director of Environment & Economy,

Item 5 – Head of Communications, Marketing & Public Affairs, N. Graham, and P. Smith (Corporate Core).

Item 6 – C. Brodie-Levinsohn (Corporate Core)

Minute 8/09 - for clarity the grounds for referral to be added at the beginning of each point.

**17/09 QUESTION AND ANSWER - PARK & RIDE**  
(Agenda No. 5)

The Committee undertook a question and answer session attended by Councillors Ian Hudspeth and Rodney Rose, Steve Howell, Head of Transport and Paul Fermer. \*The Chairman proposed that the comments and recommendations made during the discussion be referred to the Cabinet Member for Growth & Infrastructure and relevant officers for consideration. The following are amongst the main recommendations and points for consideration:

- 1) Councillor Tanner – Was interested in the County Council approach to cycle parking – he felt it would be useful, as would dedicated cycle routes from P&R sites.  
**Recommendation** : That officers look at the access to the P&R site and investigate the possibility for providing secure cycle parking and come back to a future meeting with proposals.

2) Councillor Mathew outlined a problem in respect of Seacourt P&R of left turning traffic exiting the site which was used as a means of queue jumping.

Councillor N Turner - Supported action being taken to resolve congestion at Peartree P&R.

**Recommendation** – That officers consider solutions to the problems outlined.

3) It was noted that franchising was being considered and support was given by Committee members to continuing work already begun by the Council to realise potential income streams via franchising of **all** P&R sites. A Member made a special case for Thornhill P&R separately to the others given its particular use by London commuters.

4) Councillor D Turner – Suggested the possibility of rural buses feeding into P&R sites outside of peak hours. It could have a double benefit of taking buses out of Oxford and providing a better service for rural users. Councillor Purse supported the suggestion in relation to Thornhill P&R and its surrounding villages.

Councillor Hudspeth asked that members feed specific ideas through the bus subsidy process. The Committee noted the suggestion and response.

5) Lewknor– A suggestion was made that officers look at the possibility of developing this site as a P&R or airport car park. This was not taken forward following the officer response that there was no interest from the bus company in taking it forward commercially and that numbers suggested that demand from London commuters had reached a plateau.

6) There was support for the introduction of airport parking. Officers advised that the current suggestion was for Redbridge P&R as there was capacity. Other suggestions were made including a new site to better serve all airport bus links. Committee members accepted the officer response that the cost of a new site would not be viable for what would be a fairly small scale operation. It was noted that discussions were ongoing with bus companies. The Committee noted the possibility of airport parking at Redbridge P&R

7) There were mixed views on charging with concern expressed over the danger of displacement parking in the surrounding area if charges were introduced. There was general support for some mechanism of demand management, particularly in relation to Seacourt P&R.

8) Councillor Purse commented that signs were sometimes showing full when spaces were clearly available.

**Recommendation-** That efforts be made to ensure that signs were updated regularly.

9) Councillor Purse suggested that the provision of a telephone even if linked solely to a taxi company would be useful.

**Recommendation** – That officers consider the suggestion and respond to a future meeting on any action taken.

10) Councillor Stratford queried whether there were any plans for a totally new P&R alongside the new developments. Officers responded that they were not currently looking at a new site but were considering options for remote P&R along premium route networks. The Committee noted the officer response.

11) There was some discussion over the pressures around Thornhill P&R, including London commuter traffic and University parking. Councillor Hudspeth recognised the pressures but indicated that the site was difficult being on the edge of green belt. The timetable for the intended planning application with a possible submission next March/April was noted.

RESOLVED: to refer the recommendations and main list of points arising from the question & answer session to the Cabinet Member and relevant officers.

\* Sentence added by Committee on 9 December 2009.

**18/09 QUESTION AND ANSWER - THE COUNCIL'S POLICY ON ARCHAEOLOGICAL REMAINS IN RESPECT OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS**  
(Agenda No. 6)

The Committee received a presentation on activity in relation to archaeological matters and planning. There followed a question and answer session and the following were amongst the points made:

- 1) The definition of archaeology was considered alongside the definition of palaeontology. It was noted that this had changed over time and that palaeontology when linked to the physical environment could be considered alongside archaeology. There was a grey area where fossils met archaeology.
- 2) The difficulties in examining remains within gravel were highlighted by officers. Greater success could be obtained when looking at clay layers below the gravel. Any finds should be recorded and this was monitored. Efforts were being made to seek funding to undertake land form modelling below the gravels.
- 3) Councillor Mathew asked whether it would be sensible to only allow dry digging of gravel beds given the problems associated with wet digging. In response officers referred to the difficulty in enforcing such a condition.
- 4) Councillor Purse asked for more information about dinosaur footprints at Ardley Quarry and referred to a significant dinosaur find that was not known about locally with the remains being held in Cambridge. Rob Dance responded that it was only possible to bring in controls where it was known that something was there and only when there was a planning application. He stressed that conditions had been included in the most recent application. In respect to the lack of publicity of finds it was something he would take up with Councillor Purse outside the meeting.
- 5) In accepting that there was a balance to be struck Councillor Carter queried what could be done to make policies more robust. The County Archaeological Officer replied that progress had been made.
- 6) Asked about policies officers advised that it was a period of change. Local Development Frameworks were coming in and Government was consulting on a new Planning Policy Statement to replace PPG 15 and 16. Officers were working closely

with the Association of Local Government Archaeology Officers (ALGAO) to give a strong response to Government. ALGAO were producing a first draft response. Members asked that they see the response

**RESOLVED:** that the County Archaeological Officer and a planning officer meet with Councillors Mathew and Lindsay-Gale in respect of the Association of Local Government Archaeology Officers response to guidance with a view to a future paper to this Committee as necessary.

**19/09 CAPITAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROCESS - QUARTERLY UPDATE**  
(Agenda No. 7)

The Committee noted a brief presentation and members felt that insufficient time had been given to what was a very important element of their work.

The Cabinet Member for Growth & Infrastructure responding to a query from a Member asked that any ideas on the figures shown be submitted before the Capital Investment Board meeting on 24 November 2009.

Members agreed that this matter be given more time at future meetings and that it be given prominence if appropriate as part of the service & resource planning.

The meeting adjourned at 1.04 pm reconvening at 1.15 pm.

**20/09 LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN 3 SCRUTINY WORKING GROUP**  
(Agenda No. 8)

The Committee noted the update on the Local Transport Plan 3 provided by Councillor David Nimmo-Smith who was a member of the LTP 3 Scrutiny Working Group. John Disley, responding to a question from Councillor Gibbard indicated that all projects would be looked at again in the light of the new plan objectives.

Councillor Stratford suggested that further thought needed to be given to the types defined in paragraph 4 as the categories applied would not be acceptable to some communities.

**21/09 MINERALS AND WASTE DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK PROGRESS UPDATE**  
(Agenda No. 9)

The Committee considered a report (GI9) updating them on the preparation of the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Development Framework.

Responding to questions Peter Day advised that

1) Municipal waste was only a part of the whole picture and the Framework was to look at all waste management options.

2) He agreed that it was difficult when looking at an area specific framework not to be in danger of identifying individual sites. It was something that they would revisit. Mineral working was a particular difficulty as it could only be in areas where it existed.

Companies had been asked to identify sites they would like to see in the plan. It was confirmed that this was a usual practice and that it was important in terms of deliverability of the agreed plan.

3) There were still a few sites working on old mineral planning permissions. These permissions could not be cancelled but they could be reviewed and updated with conditions applied. These existing permissions would be taken into account when looking at further provision.

4) In terms of inert waste there were a number of competing factors that would need to be taken in to account.

5) Planning officers were currently considering the impact of the recent energy from waste applications.

6) It was not expected that the additional municipal waste from new housing development would be unmanageable.

7) He explained how the Stakeholder Forums had been put together and that whilst not intended to be fully representational did attempt to give a cross section of interest groups. It had not met since 2007 and the intention in future was to meet with individual interest sectors.

During discussion Councillor Mathew suggested that Oxfordshire County Council should be more proactive in terms of the review of the aggregate mineral supply policy (paragraph 17 of the report).

The Chairman asked that all Committee members receive a response from officers if any further questions were received by email.

**RESOLVED:** to note the contents of the report.

**22/09 WORK PROGRAMME**

(Agenda No. 10)

**RESOLVED:** to agree:

- (a) that future work programme items should include the full list of topics suggested by Members;
- (b) that an additional meeting be held on 10 March 2010 starting at 10.00am; the agenda to include but not be limited to LTP 3.

..... in the Chair

Date of signing ..... 200