



Buckinghamshire County Council
Select Committee
Environment, Transport and Locality Services

Date: Tuesday 19 May 2015

Time: 10.00 am

Venue: Mezzanine Room 2, County Hall, Aylesbury

AGENDA

9.30 am Pre-meeting Discussion

This session is for members of the Committee only. It is to allow the members time to discuss lines of questioning, areas for discussion and what needs to be achieved during the meeting.

10.00 am Formal Meeting Begins

Agenda Item	Time	Page No
1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE	10.00am	
2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST To disclose any personal or disclosable pecuniary interests.		
3 MINUTES Of the meeting held on 14 th April 2015 to be confirmed as a correct record.		5 - 12
4 PUBLIC QUESTIONS		



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE



This is an opportunity for members of the public to put a question or raise an issue of concern, related to Environment, Transport and Locality Services. Where possible, the relevant organisation to which the question/issue is directed will be present to give a verbal response. The member of public will be invited to speak for up to four minutes on their issue. A maximum of 30 minutes is set aside for the Public Questions slot in total (including responses and any Committee discussion). This may be extended with the Chairman's discretion.

For full guidance on Public Questions, including how to register a request to speak during this slot, please follow this link:

<http://www.buckscc.gov.uk/about-your-council/scrutiny/get-involved/>

- | | | |
|----------|---|------------------------|
| 5 | CHAIRMAN'S REPORT
For the Chairman of the Committee to provide an update to the Committee on recent scrutiny related activity.

Members are asked to note the update report from Cath Marriot on the Safer Bucks Plan 2015-16. | 13 - 14 |
| 6 | ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL ENVIRONMENT DUTIES
An Overview item for Members to examine the Council's statutory duties as record keeper, its ability to carry out its duties and charging opportunities to generate income whilst delivering high quality advice.

Contributors:
Mrs Lesley Clarke OBE, Cabinet Member for Planning and Environment
Mr Simon Newell, Environment Team Leader
Mr Phil Markham, Senior Archaeology Officer
Ms Julia Wise, Historic Environment Records Officer
Mr Mike Farley, Bucks Archaeological Society | 10.10am 15 - 30 |
| 7 | COMMITTEE INQUIRY - OUTLINE SCOPE
Members are asked to consider the draft outline scope for a proposed Inquiry into Flooding in Buckinghamshire.

The Committee are asked to agree the outline scope and proposed timelines and to note the membership for the Inquiry group, which will then meet to further refine the scope and agree the approach members wish to take. | 11.30am 31 - 34 |
| 8 | SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2015-16
Members will discuss the Work Programme and forthcoming Committee items. | 11.45am 35 - 38 |

Members are asked to read through the Transport, Environment and Economy (TEE) Business Unit Plan 2015/16-2017/18 ahead of the meeting (Please see the link below) and highlight any issues that the Select Committee might wish to consider in future.

<https://democracy.buckscc.gov.uk/documents/s56428/TEE%20Business%20Unit%20Plan%202015-18.pdf>

9 DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING

12pm

The next meeting will take place on Tuesday 23rd June 2015 at 10am in Mezzanine Room 2, County Hall, Aylesbury. There will be a pre-meeting for Committee Members at 9.30am.

Purpose of the committee

The Environment, Transport and Locality Services Select Committee shall carry out scrutiny functions for all policies and services relating to environment, transport and locality services, including: Environmental sustainability; Planning & development; Transportation; Road maintenance; Locality services; Community cohesion; Countryside services; Waste, recycling and treatment; Trading standards; Resilience (emergency planning); Voluntary & community sector; Drugs and alcohol issues; and Crime and disorder and crime and disorder reduction partnerships (community safety partnerships).

In accordance with the BCC Constitution, the Environment, Transport and Locality Services Select Committee shall also sit as the designated Crime and Disorder Committee and will hold the countywide Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership (known as the Safer Bucks Partnership) to account for the decisions it takes and to take part in joint reviews with District Councils of District Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships.

Webcasting notice

Please note: this meeting may be filmed for subsequent broadcast via the Council's internet site - at the start of the meeting the Chairman will confirm if all or part of the meeting is being filmed.

You should be aware that the Council is a Data Controller under the Data Protection Act. Data collected during this webcast will be retained in accordance with the Council's published policy.

Therefore by entering the meeting room, you are consenting to being filmed and to the possible use of those images and sound recordings for webcasting and/or training purposes. If members of the public do not wish to have their image captured they should sit within the marked area and highlight this to an Officer.

If you have any queries regarding this, please contact Member Services on 01296 382876.

If you would like to attend a meeting, but need extra help to do so, for example because of a disability, please contact us as early as possible, so that we can try to put the right support in place.

For further information please contact: Kelly Sutherland on 01296 383602; Email ksutherland@buckscc.gov.uk

Members

Mr W Bendyshe-Brown
Mr T Butcher
Mr D Carroll (VC)
Mr W Chapple OBE
Mrs L Clarke OBE

Mr D Dhillon
Mr P Gomm
Mr S Lambert
Mr W Whyte (C)



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE





Buckinghamshire County Council
Select Committee
Environment, Transport and Locality Services

Minutes

ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT AND LOCALITY SERVICES SELECT COMMITTEE

Minutes from the meeting held on Tuesday 14 April 2015, in Mezzanine Room 2, County Hall, Aylesbury, commencing at 10.00 am and concluding at 12.17 pm.

This meeting was webcast. To review the detailed discussions that took place, please see the webcast which can be found at <http://www.buckscc.public-i.tv/>. The webcasts are retained on this website for 6 months. Recordings of any previous meetings beyond this can be requested (contact: admin@buckscc.gov.uk)

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mr W Bendyshe-Brown, Mr T Butcher, Mr D Carroll (Vice-Chairman), Mr P Gomm and Mr W Whyte (Chairman)

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE

Mrs L Clarke OBE, Mr D Djemil, Mr A Fowler, Mr C Oliver, Ms A Poole, Mr L Scrafton, Mrs K Sutherland (Secretary), Ms K Wager and Mr T Williams

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Mr Chapple OBE, Mr Dhillon and Mr Lambert.

2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Mr Gomm declared an interest for Agenda Item 7 as Chairman of Crimestoppers. Mr Carroll also declared an interest for Agenda Item 7 as the Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner for the Thames Valley.

3 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 17th March were confirmed as a correct record.



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE



The Chairman asked if the Sustainable Drainage (SUDS) report has been taken on to Cabinet. It was agreed that the Committee Adviser would check on the progress of the report.

ACTION: Committee Adviser

4 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

There were no public questions.

5 CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

The Chairman welcomed Mrs Kelly Sutherland to the meeting in her new role as Committee Adviser and reminded members that Miss Kama Wager, Committee Adviser would attend the meeting later to discuss the draft Section 106 report with members. The Chairman had recently attended a member briefing on Legal Highs. It was also noted that the Business Unit Plan for Transport, Environment and Economy 2015/16-2017/18 had been agreed by the relevant Cabinet Members. It was agreed that this would be circulated to members and a link to the Plan would be included in the minutes.

ACTION: Committee Adviser

<https://democracy.buckscc.gov.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?ID=3896>

6 COUNTRY PARKS: A BETTER DELIVERY MODEL FOR BUCKS

The Chairman welcomed Mrs Lesley Clarke OBE, Cabinet Member for Planning and Environment, Mr Andrew Fowler, Head of Country Parks and Mr Tim Williams, Country Parks Lead Officer to the meeting. The Cabinet Member commented that the Country Parks were jewels in the crown of Buckinghamshire County Council and Andrew Fowler and Tim Williams had come up with creative ways of increasing the income generated by the Parks over the years.

The Chairman asked Mr Fowler to provide a brief introduction for members before inviting members' questions. The following main points were noted:

- As Head of Country Parks, Andrew Fowler was responsible for the strategic direction and finances of the Parks and Tim Williams was responsible for the day to day management.
- BCC has four parks, all in the South of the County, totalling 800 acres. Black Park and Langley Park had complicated ownerships arrangements with Slough Borough Council, South Bucks District Council and London County Council also owning a proportion of the property.
- The Parks were officially designated as Country Parks circa 1968 and were some of the first to be designated in the UK.
- Since 1999 the Country Parks were meant to be self-financing. This proved difficult at first but since 2005 this had been achieved and since 2010 an annual income target has been set for the Parks, over and above their operating costs.
- Black Park was the largest park, 535 acres attracting 570,000 visitors per year with 95% positive comments posted on Trip Advisor's website. Go Ape have both an Adult and

Junior course on offer at Black Park and Segway hire and bike hire are also available. In addition there is a very successful café overlooking the lake and Evergreen Forest Tots also offer pre-school activities in the Park.

- Langley Park is 151 acres, made up of more formal gardens including a large rhododendron collection which is of international importance. Langley Park recently benefitted from a £3.1million restoration project financed mainly by the Heritage Lottery Fund. There are also 178 veteran trees in the park so the site could potentially be designated as a Site of Scientific Importance (SSI). Langley Park features a small café and children's play area and attracts 170,000 visitors per year.
- Denham County Park is more informal, covering 69 acres between the River Colne and the Grand Union Canal. The Colne Valley Visitors Centre is there and the Park attracts 127,000 visitors per year. Thorney Park at 47 acres features a lake for angling. This Park was previously a landfill site.
- BCC have developed a number of projects to generate income from the Parks, but the main income is from the café, which has a turnover of approximately £500,000 and generates an income for BCC in the region of £100,000, filming licences, BCC events and income from Go Ape.
- In 2011, Martin Tett who was the Cabinet Member at the time, made provision for a development fund of £300,000 per year, over a three year period to assist with income generating initiatives. Andrew Fowler has carefully managed this fund and work is currently underway on proposals for a visitors centre at Black Park. Outline designs which are currently being costed were circulated to the Committee for information. This was likely to cost £1.5million and £722,000 remained from the development fund.
- The car park at Black Park would be redesigned over the off season. This was needed to expand parking availability in peak season and would generate increased income. Other projects being considered included extending the car park and providing indoor seating at Langley Park.
- Officers would like a view from members as to what is the best delivery model for the Country Parks in the future. Should BCC retain management of the Parks or sell them off, relinquishing control completely or perhaps consider setting up a Charitable Trust or a Local Authority Trading Company (LATC).
- Members discussed the complicated ownership arrangements which dated back to the 1940s. It was noted that South Bucks District Council received a nominal base rent from BCC each year but no other parties either received any income or contributed any funding to the upkeep of the Parks. BCC own the freehold of Denham Court Estate, which is on a 99 year lease to Buckinghamshire Golf Club and BCC pay a peppercorn rent to the Golf Club for the Denham Country Park.
- 75% of visitors to the Park come from West London, Slough, Hillingdon etc
- Members congratulated Andrew and Tim for the increasing visitor numbers to the Parks. A member commented however that he would like to see a vision for the Parks for the next 20 years and an indicator from the officers as to how the different options for delivery models could work and how they would impact on the County Council. It would also be very useful to see a proper balance sheet for the accounts, laying out clearly income, expenditure and the level of subsidy from BCC. **It was agreed that Andrew Fowler would supply the Committee with a balance sheet.**

ACTION: Head of Country Parks

- Members noted that the Country Parks are self-funding and also contribute an income target each year which comes back into BCC – last year this was just under £71,000.
- The Cabinet Member advised the Committee that a reverse heat pump had been investigated for Black Park lake using energy saving funding but ultimately the pipework was going to be too costly so funding of £170,000 allocated for the project was passed back to the Place service.
- The Cabinet Member also reported that the possibility of creating additional Parks in Little Marlow or as part of the Bernwood Opportunity Zone were being considered, building on the success of the Country Parks self-financing policy.

Members discussed the future options for the Country Parks. Four years ago members were generally keen to protect and retain the Country Parks. A member suggested that an Inquiry group could be set up to assist and advise the service. The Chairman suggested that there might be synergies between the Country Parks and Green Park, which was now part of the wider Adventure Learning Foundation (ALF) ALF also included Longridge and Shortenhills. Andrew Fowler advised that they had worked with Longridge in the past, but the focus of the ALF was on Education and their sites were not public access parks, whereas the Country Parks remit was conservation, forestry and recreation. Andrew Fowler also had concerns that if the Country Parks had been incorporated into the ALF, they would have effectively subsidised the other activities, as the income generated by the Country Parks was significantly higher.

The Chairman drew the discussion to a close by outlining two options – the first was to set up a small Inquiry group to investigate further or alternatively request that the officers provide further information as suggested regarding the accounts and the complexities of ownership and then bring back a fuller report outlining the options for the future management of the Country Parks to a future Committee meeting for consideration.

The principle of setting up an Inquiry Group on Country Parks was agreed by the Committee. The Cabinet Member welcomed this and offered her support to the Inquiry Group. The Chairman agreed that Mr Bill Bendyshe-Brown would lead an Inquiry group and Mr Phil Gomm would be a member of this.

ACTION: Committee Adviser to liaise with Chairman on the next steps.

The Chairman thanked Lesley Clarke OBE, Andrew Fowler and Tim Williams for attending the meeting.

7 LEGAL HIGHS: PREVALENCE AND IMPACTS IN BUCKS

The Chairman welcomed Mr Huseyin Djemil, Drug and Alcohol team (DAAT) Commissioner, Mr Lee Scrafton, DAAT Commissioner and Co-ordinator and Ms Amanda Poole, Trading Standards and Community Safety Manager. Ms Poole also introduced Mr Chris Oliver who was taking over as Community Safety Manager following a career in the Police. The Chairman invited the officers to provide an overview of the work they had completed to date in relation to Legal Highs and the following main points were noted:

- In 2013, Legal Highs or New Psychoactive Substances (NPS) were mainly used by festival goers and were purchased on the dark web using Bitcoin. Now the market has matured and become more mainstream.
- In 2014, BCC commissioned a Needs Analysis which was undertaken by a team of Academics who were able to generate their own dataset. This has led to an increased understanding of the issues and the prevalence in Bucks.
- Bucks organised an inter-authority group with Northants, Milton Keynes, Oxfordshire and Bedfordshire to share intelligence on Legal Highs and it became apparent that Bucks were leading the discussions.
- BCC have delivered training to partners such as Probation and Floating Support providers as been retained and will deliver more training in future. A Legal Highs trainer has been retained and will deliver more training in future. A practitioner forum was also held in February.
- A key issue is finding a way of contacting NPS users as they are unlikely to present at treatment centres. BCC have supported an Engagement Café in Aylesbury and are exploring the best way of establishing an online presence.
- Drug testing procedures are also being reviewed as NPS do not show up on traditional drug tests, which has implications for Safeguarding and Integrated Offender Management (IOM)
- Public Health and the Police and Crime Commissioner helped to fund the research. Public Health have shared the findings with Public Health England and John Moores University have asked to undertake a secondary analysis.
- The DAAT have delivered a members briefing and produced a short video about NPS.
- The DAAT conducted a joint operation with Trading Standards at a head shop in High Wycombe. Test purchases were made and substances were tested but nothing illegal was found. Amanda Poole reported that the South East region had been working over the last few months to identify supply routes and gather intelligence across the region. Members felt it was important to disrupt the supply chain.
- It was noted that Mephedrone, a stimulant which had previously been a legal high was now illegal and classified as a Class B drug or a Class A drug if prepared for injection. A small cohort in Aylesbury were injecting mephedrone in significant quantities and needles were being shared, leading to serious health risks.
- A member asked if it were not possible to arrest someone for causing harm if they were sharing needles, but officers explained that a virus like Hepatitis C can incubate for up to three months, so it is not immediately apparent. In addition, it would be impossible to prove who was harming who and the DAAT would prefer not to criminalise this behaviour but help individuals to change their lifestyles.
- The Bucks Herald had featured a piece on Legal Highs and although the article was quite balanced, the headline was not. The DAAT were very careful with any communications they released about NPS as any press or publicity, even if this is negative, leads to experimenting and an increase in use.
- There was a discussion about the success that Ireland have had in banning NPS use and members wondered why this approach could not be adopted within the UK. **It was agreed that officers would look into the legislation used in Ireland and report back to the Committee.**

ACTION: DAAT Commissioners

- Drugs were not seen as a priority for Thames Valley Police currently, yet Legal Highs are included in the Bucks Community Safety Plan which was agreed at Cabinet yesterday. Mr Chris Oliver, new Community Safety Manager commented that whilst drugs were not seen as a priority for Thames Valley Police, the protection of vulnerable people was a priority and Legal Highs would be covered within that.
- Members congratulated the DAAT officers for the work they had done to date and for raising awareness of the Legal Highs issue, but advised that an Action Plan was now needed with input from all partners, perhaps as part of the wider Community Safety Plan. Members wanted to see more urgency.

The Chairman thanked Huseyin Djemil, Lee Scrafton, Amanda Poole and Chris Oliver for attending the meeting. It was agreed that a further update on the development of a partnership Action Plan and timelines would come back to the June 23rd meeting of the Committee.

ACTION: DAAT Commissioners

8 S106 DRAFT INQUIRY REPORT

The Chairman welcomed Miss Kama Wager, Committee Adviser to the meeting and the Committee considered the draft S106 Inquiry report.

A member commented that he felt the Executive Summary could be stronger as it had missed a key point that the Inquiry group were very concerned about the lamentable loss of a number of officer roles which led to a loss of oversight, direction and income for Buckinghamshire County Council, in relation to S106.

The wording of Recommendation 3 was amended to read 'We recommend that the Cabinet Member sets out clear criteria for how *he or she* will ensure *Buckinghamshire County Council allows* for appropriate local member involvement at early stages

A member expressed concerns through his recent experience with dealing with S106 locally that when Transport for Buckinghamshire (TfB) submit proposals for S106 work their quotes are not properly market tested and he asked if a further recommendation about market testing quotes to ensure value for money could be added to the report. Another member reported that he had experience of S106 monies being inadequate for what was needed on the ground. In response, Kama Wager, Committee Adviser explained that as this issue had come up outside of the Inquiry it could not be used as evidence in the report. However she reported that internal Audit were doing some work on S106 so this could be investigated by them or alternatively the Finance, Performance and Resources (FPR) Select Committee could be asked to look into this further. The Chairman noted that TfB had signed up for a lot S106 work this year so this could be reviewed by this Committee or FPR Select Committee in a year's time.

The Committee agreed the draft report with the amendments discussed and it was agreed that the Chairman would finalise the report with Kama Wager in time for it to be presented at 11th May Cabinet.

ACTION: Chairman and Kama Wager

9 COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME

The Committee noted agenda items for forthcoming meetings which were itemised on the Work Programme. Members were asked to send any further suggestions of issues for consideration to Kelly Sutherland, Committee Adviser.

ACTION: All members

10 DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING

The next meeting will take place on Tuesday 19th May 2015 at 10am in Mezzanine Room 2, County Hall, Aylesbury. There will be a pre-meeting for Committee Members at 9.30am.

CHAIRMAN



Buckinghamshire County Council Select Committee

Environment, Transport and Locality Services Select Committee

Report to the Environment, Transport and Locality Services Select Committee

Title:	Update on Safer Bucks Plan 2015-16
Committee date:	19 th May 2015
Contact officer:	Cath Marriot, Community Safety Manager

The Select Committee identified two key areas where it wished to have an update on progress and / or see an improvement following the meeting on 17th March 2015.

Consultation

At the time of the meeting, the consultation responses were lower than hoped (480) and were almost all from the Chiltern & South Bucks district areas. Following the meeting, targeted communication went out, via Thames Valley alert to residents of Aylesbury and Wycombe and this increased the responses to 813 and with a fairer spread across the whole county.

Children & Young People

The Committee also wanted assurance that the Safer Bucks Plan priorities would align with existing data on what children and young people viewed as important to them. A couple of meetings took place with key officers from the Safeguarding Children's Board and they confirmed that the priority around "protecting children and young adults" broadly covered the areas that they felt were important. They also confirmed that this priority supports Bucks County Councils' role in the lives of Buckinghamshire's children and young people. They identified some specific themes, raised by young people which included:

- The dangers around substance misuse
- Being safe on the streets and in public spaces
- More information on sexual exploitation

These themes are all being discussed within the partnership so that they can be weaved into the activities that take place across the county.



To add, we are also awaiting the results of the CYP survey, within which there are questions about feeling and being safe. This is expected to further inform our work.





Buckinghamshire County Council Select Committee

Environment, Transport and Locality Services Select Committee

Report to the *Environment, Transport and Locality Services* Select Committee

Title:	Archaeology
Committee date:	19 th May 2015
Author:	Philip Markham
Contact officer:	Philip Markham, Senior Archaeology Officer Tel. 01296 382705 Email pmarkham@buckscc.gov.uk
Cabinet Member sign-off:	Councillor Lesley Clarke

Purpose of Agenda Item

This report is to advise the Select Committee of the roles of the Buckinghamshire County Archaeological Service, the staff which undertake this role and legislative background to this service. In brief we maintain the local Historic Environment Record and provide expert advice on archaeology and related matters.

Background

This report to the select committee was requested by Councillor Warren Whyte following the last bi-annual Buckinghamshire Historic Environment Forum (BHEF) held on the 2nd March 2015. Members of the Forum include elected members from the County and Districts, the County's archaeological service staff, Conservation Officers from the Districts, the National Trust archaeologist, the museum Curator and members of the Buckinghamshire Archaeology Society. Questions were raised by the Forum over the archaeological service's resourcing following the increasing number of large area planning applications, HS2 and East-West Rail. The resourcing of the BHEF emergency recording fund was also raised. This fund allows the professional recording of chance archaeological finds such as the Roman casket burial found during a metal detecting rally.

Summary

This report outlines the legislative background to Buckinghamshire County Council's responsibilities for archaeology and the historic environment. How we work in partnership with the other County Teams, the Districts, the Museum and Historic England (the public body that champions and protects England's historic environment, formerly part of English Heritage, which is now a charity in charge of the properties). It will outline the current set up of the team, resource implications and how unexpected archaeological finds are dealt with. Our income generation will be discussed and the potential opportunities and issues related to resourcing. How we contribute to the tourist economy of Bucks by helping to safeguard our heritage will be briefly noted.

Legislation & Guidance

The National Planning Policy Framework is the main legislation covering archaeology and the historic environment and has an entire chapter (12) on this. The main paragraphs are indicated below:

NPPF Paragraph 169 states:

Local planning authorities should have up-to-date evidence about the historic environment in their area and use it to assess the significance of heritage assets and the contribution they make to their environment. They should also use it to predict the likelihood that currently unidentified heritage assets, particularly sites of historic and archaeological interest, will be discovered in the future. Local planning authorities should either maintain or have access to a historic environment record.

NPPF Paragraph 126 states:

Local Planning Authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats. In doing so, they should recognise that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and conserve them in a manner appropriate to their significance. ...

NPPF Paragraph 144 includes:

When determining planning applications, local planning authorities should ... ensure, in granting planning permission for mineral development, that there are no unacceptable adverse impacts on natural and historic environment, human health or aviation safety, and to take into account the cumulative effect of multiple impacts from individual sites and/or from a number of sites in a locality.

NPPF Paragraph 128 includes:

... Where a site on which development is proposed includes or has the potential to include heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.

NPPF Paragraph 129 includes:

Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. ...

NPPF Paragraph 141 states:

Local planning authorities should make information about the significance of the historic environment gathered as part of plan-making or development management publicly accessible. They should also require developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) in a manner proportionate to their importance and the impact, and to make this evidence (and any archive generated) publicly accessible. However, the ability to record evidence of our past should not be a factor in deciding whether such loss should be permitted.

The NPPF is based in part on United Nations Resolution adopted by the General Assembly A/RES/42/187 on Sustainable Development.

Other Legislation and Guidance includes:

- EIA Regulations
- Minerals Planning Guidance
- Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979
- Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990
- Department of Energy & Climate Change – Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1)
- Department of Energy & Climate Change – National Policy Statement for Electricity Networks Infrastructure (EN-5)
- DCLG Approved – English Heritage - Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning:

Note 1 The Historic Environment in Local Plans

Note 2 Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment

Note 3 The Setting of Heritage Assets

- Chartered Institute for Archaeologists – Standard and guidance for archaeological advice by historic environment services

- Thames Water Archaeology and Cultural Heritage
- Anglia Water – Protecting our Heritage

The Archaeology Team

The Archaeology Team is part of the Environment Team of the Transport, Environment and Economy Business Unit. We have 2.6 full time equivalent staff members consisting of:

Senior Archaeology Officer:	Phil Markham BA (Hons) MA MCIfA
Historic Environment Record Officer:	Julia Wise BA (Hons) MCIfA
Archaeology Officer:	Eliza Alqassar BA (Hons) MA MCIfA
Business Support Officer:	Lorna Pope

Phil has been in post for 1 year, following a similar role in Cornwall and the Isles of Scilly for the previous 9 years. Julia has been in post for over 20 years managing the HER. Eliza has been in post for 6 ½ years following a similar role in Cambridgeshire and has now taken on another role as a temporary Assistant Inspector for Historic England and has reduced her time with us to one day per week for the next six months. We are in the process of finding a temporary replacement for the two days per week she is not available. Lorna has been providing valuable assistance to us for 9 years.

Our Roles

We provide development management advice through the planning process and to utilities where works are often permitted development. Our advice is sought during the pre-development phase and/or the pre-planning application phase, during the application determination phase and post application phase where a condition has been attached to a consent.

This work can involve recommending that a desk based assessment and walk over survey of a proposed development site is undertaken. This would involve an archaeological consultant checking the Historic Environment Record and other records and visit the site so that an assessment of its historic value and potential can be used to inform an applicant and the LPA as to what appropriate works would be required. This desk based assessment may lead to evaluation works such as a geophysical survey – where the different magnetic fields within the soil can be interpreted and often accurately indicate the presence of walls and ditches, trial trenching where targeted trenches are excavated to assess the actual archaeological potential of a site and the significance of any finds. The desk based assessment and evaluation works are normally undertaken at the pre-application stage or during the determination period.

Post consent works are normally undertaken by a condition recommended to the LPA. This may involve an excavation, watching brief, an earthwork survey and/or building recording. These works would be undertaken to an agreed specification, often called a written scheme of investigation. This is often a legal document where enforcement action or legal action

can be taken if required. This, however, would be through the LPA. Field work is monitored to ensure that standards are met and to minimise potential corrective actions.

Following field work there may need to be an assessment of the finds to agree further analysis such as investigating food residues in cooking bowls and/or analysing palaeo-environmental samples to better understand the local environment at the time of the occupation. This could involve looking at plant seeds, animal bone, snail shells, sediments or insect remains. Each can indicate what the local habitats were like, what economic or agricultural activities were taking place and people's living conditions.

This work leads to a report or a number of reports which can be accessed through the Historic Environment Record (HER) and via the University of York's ADS service for digital archives. Following analysis the finds and field work archives are usually deposited with the County Museum.

All of this work is based on the County's Historic Environment Record which is run by Julia Wise who has been a dedicated employee of the Council. This record is on specialist database software known as HBSMR. The records are linked to a geographic information system (computerised mapping) so that their locations can be seen against different map backgrounds and additional information, such as the proposed route of HS2. Julia supplies developers, archaeological consultants, students, academics, community groups, the public and importantly the planning advisors what and where historic environment sites are. When information comes in from the works requested through development proposals, from academic projects and from members of the public the data base and GIS are updated so that the information is available, so that more informed advice can be given and students have up to date information to work with.

The HER is an important element in providing land management advice particularly for agri-environment schemes which help fund the agricultural community of the county.

Tingewick Triangle, Buckingham – Example Site

A brief example of how this works is at a site on the western edge of Buckingham known as the Tingewick Triangle. This site is adjacent to the nationally protected Scheduled site of St Rumbold's well (the site of a medieval holy well). The HER also records a possible late medieval hermitage within the site boundary. Experience has also shown that the county has quite extensive Roman rural remains. During August last year an archaeological consultancy contacted us about the site, supplying us with a geophysical report and requesting advice. Following payment we checked the report together with the HER information and recommended trial trenching to assess the actual archaeological potential.

The consultancy employed an archaeological contractor to undertake this work and their written scheme of investigation was approved by us. During September this work was undertaken causing local concern. As this work was pre-application and on private land the owner did not want us to talk to anyone about the works as it was commercially sensitive. We kept the local members updated as far as we could during this and the local people talked to the archaeologists on site putting themselves at risk from the machinery on site.

Site monitoring was undertaken by Eliza who requested further staff to undertake the works as agreed in the written scheme of investigation. During subsequent monitoring and site meetings we asked for further trenches to be opened up. This work discovered significant Roman remains in the eastern field with good survival of organic material due to the damp conditions. The western field contained a Roman enclosure, a stone scatter near the eastern field boundary and an earlier field system. The northern field work found no significant archaeology.

Following this work and commenting on a number of drafts a report was produced on the site investigations. This was not in the public domain and we could not release it as we had been ordered not to. It was agreed that English Heritage should see the report and we consulted them on this. Comments were received from the Inspector and the Science Advisor. Discussion was undertaken with the consultancy and we recommended that the eastern field was taken out of the development proposal due to its significance. It would also cost a lot of money to appropriately excavate it. We also discussed the western field and mitigation measures if the enclosure and stone scatter could not be protected in situ.

An outline planning application has now been made on the site for up to 400 dwellings, open space including play areas and infrastructure. As this is being written we are in discussion with Historic England (formerly English Heritage) over our responses to the proposal and will have had a site meeting. The responses are likely to welcome that the eastern field is not within the housing and infrastructure area and that no works are undertaken here to safeguard the archaeology. It is likely that if the enclosure and stone spread area cannot realistically be retained then these will be fully excavated. We would also expect to see an archaeological watching brief on any ground works so that buried archaeology is fully recorded. This work would be undertaken by a planning condition attached to any consent, leading to further written schemes of investigation, monitoring, updating the HER and charges.

Our work enabled the discovery of significant Roman remains, their safeguarding by being taken out of the development proposal and will lead to further important information being recovered during the expected archaeological excavations and watching briefs. This information will be made available through the HER and enable an improved standard of advice to be provided for future works in the area. The finds and excavation archive will be deposited with the Museum and will be available for study. Without adequate resourcing the outcome may have been very different.

We also provide advice on policy documents for the County, the Districts, Government, and through the Association of Local Government Archaeological Officers (ALGAO). These documents include Local Plans, Minerals Plans, Neighbourhood Plans and proposed legislation and guidance.

We provide advice to HS2 Ltd through their Heritage sub Committee on archaeological issues and comment on their documents. This involves attending bi-monthly meetings in London and Birmingham. As with all we do, we attempt to make the best of the scheme, that the archaeology is protected, conserved and mitigated appropriately where it cannot be

preserved. This entails raising points at the meetings, requesting clarification of points in documents and recommending amendments to better protect our heritage. With our petitioning points likely to be raised at the HS2 Select Committee in the House of Lords we work closely with our County HS2 colleagues. If not resolved prior to the select committee we may have to attend to debate to argue our position.

Where resources allow we undertake outreach and Eliza has given talks at a number of schools and at the Roman site in Aston Clinton, which had good media attention. The Roman casket burial excavation and conservation funded by the BHEF emergency fund has also received much media attention and some finds were displayed in the museum. We will also be attending and supplying some information posters for the HS2: Heritage on the Line conference at Weston Turville village hall organised by the Buckinghamshire Archaeological Society on Saturday 16th May. One of the speakers will be Helen Glass the HS2 Heritage Manager. Julia has a lot of involvement with the Council for British Archaeology local branch of the Young Archaeologists Club. She has also provided posters and assisted at the Stoke Mandeville Old Church open day. The team has been involved in a lot of outreach in the past including heritage open days, the festival of archaeology and working with the AONB and the Gardens Trust. Our HLF-funded Unlocking Buckinghamshire's Past project also involved outreach events.

The County's Archaeological Service has one of the largest digital data sets in county, incorporating the HER, GIS and the more publically accessible Unlocking Buckinghamshire's Past website. The HER information can be viewed at different scales with various ordnance survey map backgrounds. The information is regularly requested by consultants, developers, students and by members of the public. With increasing demands and finite resources there will be a backlog for updating the record and delays in the provision of data to our customers.

Our Partners

We work closely with County and District Planners, both development management and policy so that the archaeology of Buckinghamshire is adequately protected and impacts are mitigated through the planning process. Development proposals often have impacts across the different areas of the historic environment and we often work with Conservation Officers, Historic England Inspectors and the Museum; which acts as the archive for any recording activities.

We work closely with the Buckinghamshire Historic Environment Forum (BHEF) which with its emergency fund is the only way of appropriately excavating, recording and conserving significant finds made outside of the development arena, such as by chance finds and those discovered by metal detecting enthusiasts. Without this fund significant archaeology could be lost.

We also work closely with the County's HS2 Team, Flood Team and our fellow environment team members and the Milton Keynes Council archaeologist on sites which cross our respective borders. Other partners include the Buckinghamshire Archaeological Society,

the Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust, local community groups and societies and the parish and town councils to name a few.

We are working with the Chilterns Conservation Board on their Chilterns Hillforts Project which will be applying for HLF funding in the near future. This will look at the environments around these prehistoric earthwork monuments which is an area of study that has had relatively little work compared to the hillforts of the Welsh Marches. This will lead to conservation and interpretive works to these nationally protected sites and is likely to increase tourist numbers where the sites are publicly accessible. The former County Archaeologist for Hertfordshire is currently leading on this for the Chilterns Conservation Board.

Buckinghamshire Historic Environment Forum (BHEF) Emergency Recording Fund

The Emergency Recording Fund was established in September 2000 by the Buckinghamshire Historic Environment Forum (formerly the Countywide Archaeological Advisory Committee). The purpose of the fund is to enable the emergency recording of important archaeological remains (including above and below ground features, artefacts and associated environmental deposits) which are unavoidably under imminent threat of significant damage or destruction without adequate provision for their recording.

The fund covers the administrative areas of Aylesbury Vale District Council, Chilterns District Council, Milton Keynes Council, South Bucks District Council and Wycombe District Council. There is a protocol for the operation of the fund which outlines the purpose of the fund, criteria for fund expenditure and the procedures to be followed. This fund has been substantially depleted by the excavation and analysis of the Roman Casket Burial found during a metal detecting rally.

There is a Protocol for the Operation of the Emergency Recording Fund (2003), which outlines the purpose of the fund, criteria for fund expenditure and procedures to be followed (see attached). The Protocol has been updated this year but changes have been limited to updating the name of the body responsible for the fund (from CAAC to BHEF) and references to current planning policy.

Use of the Fund

Since 2000 the fund has been called upon five times. These are outlined below:

Year	Site	Description	Amount (ex VAT)
2000/2	Wellwick Farm, Wendover, Aylesbury Vale	Roman burial discovered by metal detectorist and excavated by AS&C	£2,259
2005	New Inn, Stowe, Aylesbury Vale	Building recording at New Inn, Stowe, for the National Trust	£1,500
2010	40 Church Lane, West Wycombe, Wycombe district	Recording of graves by Northamptonshire Archaeology on behalf of the National Trust	£1,000

2012/13	Heathley Chase, Wolverton Road, Milton Keynes	Neolithic human remains discovered during construction of housing estate and excavated by Albion Archaeology	£1,982
2014/15	Creslow, Whitchurch, Aylesbury Vale	Roman casket burial discovered by metal detectorist and excavated by Oxford Archaeology	£5,452

Contributions to the Fund

Initial contributions for the fund were set at £300 per annum per authority (total £2100 pa). The lower and upper limits of the fund were originally set at £2000 and £5000 respectively. In 2001 it was agreed that contributions should be weighted depending on the size of each local authority (doubled in the case of Milton Keynes Council to reflect its unitary status). The table below shows the contribution made by each local authority. Contributions are typically £1000 per annum, although occasionally the contributors have had a “holiday” when the fund has not been called upon.

Table 2. Size and contribution of each authority (as agreed in 2001)

	Area (km ²)	% Contribution	£ Contribution (2013/14)
Aylesbury Vale District Council	903	20%	£200.00
Buckinghamshire Archaeological Society	n/a	5%	£50.00
Buckinghamshire County Council	1564	40%	£400.00
Chiltern District Council	196	5%	£50.00
Milton Keynes Council	309	15%	£150.00
South Bucks District Council	141	5%	£50.00
Wycombe District Council	325	10%	£100.00

Proposed Increase in Contributions

The fund currently stands at c. £1,800.00, which is inadequate should the fund need to be called upon in the near future.

Options:

- Increase contributions from existing contributors to top up the fund

- Invite the National Trust, the Bucks Museum Trust and the Weekend Wanderers to contribute to the fund
- Increase the upper limit of the fund bearing in mind raised costs of fieldwork since the fund was set up

Opportunities and issues for the Council over resourcing

The Archaeology Team provides an excellent service but with increasing demands this will not be possible to achieve in the future with current resourcing. The HER only provides the service it does by Julia working far more hours than contracted, day in day out. With increasing demands on the advice side to continue at the current level of service the time taken to make responses to consultations will need to be reduced which means less time for research and providing less optimal advice.

We could increase the work done if resourcing improved. This could possibly be achieved by having service level agreements with the Districts as other County archaeological services have, but we would not want to see the historic environment deteriorate in Districts which would not fund the service. As Districts cuts are implemented the number of Conservation Officers is reducing and we expect that if this continues the public and developers will turn to us to provide advice. It is a role we could possibly provide for the districts if resourcing was available for this.

The service provides	The benefits of the service	The risks of an under resourced service
Implementing national planning guidance	Conformity with national guidance Sustaining and enhancement of local historic environment Early indication of impact on heritage assets Managed risk Forward planning and potential heritage gain	Unsustainable development Loss of significant archaeological remains Unexpected discoveries Wasted applications Unplanned costs and delays
Providing advice on Policy documents	Conformity with legal requirements Sustaining and enhancement of local historic environment	Unsustainable development Inspectorate challenge Loss of significant archaeological remains
Pre-application consultation on development proposals	Early indication of impact on heritage assets Avoidance of wasted applications Managed risk Forward planning and costing of	Unexpected discoveries of heritage assets such as human remains Wasted applications Unmanaged risk Unplanned costs and delays to

	potential heritage gain	application
Appeals and Public Inquiries	Specialist in-house advice and support	Unexpected consultancy costs
The HER provides information to developers, consultants, the public	The continued excellent service is maintained	The service cannot operate without an up to date and adequately resourced HER
The service provides advice and information Agri-environment Schemes	This government scheme runs according to plan Land management schemes undertaken Increased funding for local rural business Community access	The scheme does not cover archaeology in Buckingham Stewardship agreements don't take place Less funds go to rural businesses
Promoting localism and community engagement	Enhanced sense of community pride and ownership	Reduced sense of community pride and ownership

Income Generation

The Buckinghamshire County Archaeological Service introduced charging for providing Historic Environment Record information a number of years ago and was the first to introduce charging for planning advice and site monitoring services. The charges were revised for 2014/15 and generated over £25,000, in the last financial year, a 20% increase on the previous year. Charging, of course, has resource implications and takes time away from the actual work. The charging policy was endorsed by our cabinet member.

Eliza researched the charging issue during late 2013/early 2014 and presented the results in the Historic Environment Charging Review which was approved in March 2014. The Association of Local Authority Archaeological Officers (ALGAO) was consulted and there were 23 responses and approximately half were charging for advice. Legal advice was obtained prior to the adoption of the Charging Policy for Historic Environment Advice Services and regard was made to BCC's Charging for Services Protocol. Charging for advice is permissible under section 93 of the Local Government Act 2003. Charging for the supply of environmental information is potentially problematic so the approach adopted was to charge for the licensing of such information for commercial re-use. Different authorities have different methodologies for charging. Our current schedule of charges is included in the appendix.

Hertfordshire County Council

No charge is made for commercial planning advice or for advice provided to the local authorities but £60 per hour is charged for responding to commercial requests for information from the Historic Environment Record.

Cambridgeshire County Council

Historic Environment Record searches are charged at:

Up to 1km radius search £100

Up to 2km radius search £150

Up to 4km radius search £200

Development management advice charges have a sliding scale:

	Cat 1<5 Units	Cat 2 6<50 Units	Cat 3 51<100 Units	Cat 4 101<250 Units	Cat 5 & 6 251<1000+ units
Pre-Application Enquiry	£35	£75	£100	£125	By negotiation
Stage 1: Evaluation	£150	£300	£425	£500	By negotiation
Stage 2: Investigation	£250	£475	£725	£925	By negotiation

Bedford Borough Council

HER searches

	Up to 1km	Up to 2KM	Up to 4km
5-10 day turnaround	£124	£186	£248
2-5 day turnaround	£155	£217	£279

Development Management Advice

Evaluation	Charge
Cat 1 - 1 Unit	£155
Cat 2 - 2-9 Units	£279
Cat 3 - 10-49 Units	£403
Cat 4 - 50-199 Units	£496
Cat 5 - 200+ Units	By negotiation

Investigation	Charge
Cat 1 - 1 Unit	£248
Cat 2 - 2-9 Units	£465
Cat 3 - 10-49 Units	£680
Cat 4 - 50-199 Units	£930
Cat 5 - 200+ Units	By negotiation

We provide a complete archaeological service for all of the Districts which is currently not charged for. It may be appropriate for a Service Level Agreement to be agreed between the County and the Districts to support the provision of this service. We recognise that there are significant pressures on local authorities and heritage services such as Conservation Officers (primarily involved with the historic built environment) are subject to reductions.

There have been abortive attempts to get the Districts to fund Service Level Agreements since at least 1994 and potentially earlier. Wycombe contributed £2,400 in 2008-9 but we are not aware of any other payments before or after. Of the 23 responses from ALGAO approximately half had service level agreements in place. Essex and Cambridgeshire County Council archaeology/historic environment services have service level agreements with all of the Local Planning Authorities for archaeological advice, based on a 50% cost recovery formula. In Essex, these have been in operation successfully for six years and in Cambridgeshire for four years. Hertfordshire noted that developing SLAs with the local authorities which have been used to a free service has been a difficult process which is why a cost recovery of 50% was proposed. It was anticipated that this would be reviewed in due course.

Service Level Agreements with large housing developers is not a very realistic opportunity as these companies usually have their own favourite archaeological consultancy's which discuss these usually large scale developments with us.

The Archaeology Service operates closely with the other environmental services (ecology and landscape) providing the longer term potential of providing an integrated service across the whole county and more efficient provision for developers and the public.

Appendix

BCC Revised Schedule of Charges for Historic Environment Services - 2014

Licence for re-use of Historic Environment Record information provided		
	Development and commercial inquiries	Educational and conservation inquiries ¹
Remote/Digital search (single project use)	£100 for standard search ⁱⁱ £150 for extended search Unusually large/complex searches to be individually costed	Nil for standard searches £50 discretionary charge for extended or complex searches
Visit to HER (in addition to above)	£50 for standard search £75 for extended search area Unusually large/complex searches to be individually costed	Nil for standard searches £25 discretionary charge for extended or complex searches
Priority search (2 working days)	£50 surcharge to above	£50 surcharge to above
Printing/photocopying	£0.10 per sheet	£0.10 per sheet
Licence for reproduction of images	County Museum/Centre for Bucks Studies rates apply	No charge
Provision of information and advice for Higher Level Stewardship – as national agreement		
	Large holdings (above 50 hectares)	Smaller holdings (under 50 hectares)
HER search and written advice	£150 ⁱⁱⁱ	£75
Pre-application consultation: provision of advice		
	Major developments (requiring EIA or with an equivalent significant effect on the historic environment) ^{iv}	Minor developments
Written advice	£200 + VAT, can include provision of advice letter, pre-application brief and agreement of assessment/evaluation schemes Additional £150 for bespoke briefs for very large or complex cases.	£60 + VAT, can include provision of advice letter, pre-application brief and agreement of assessment/evaluation schemes Nil for householder and
Meeting in addition to written advice	£50 + VAT	£50 + VAT Nil for householder and
Post-consent: approval of project documentation and monitoring		
	Major developments requiring open area excavation or equivalent mitigation	Other developments

Assess, comment on and recommend for approval a written scheme of archaeological investigation	£200 + VAT, includes preparation of a project brief Unusually large/complex cases to be individually costed.	£60 + VAT Nil for householder and community/charitable works
Monitoring site visit	£60 plus VAT	£60 plus VAT
Assess, comment on and accept final report, recommend discharge of condition	£200 + VAT, includes written comments and consideration of one revision	£60 + VAT, for written comments if significant amends required. Nil for householder and

ⁱ Not for profit activities only - includes listed building or conservation area consent applications for works not also requiring planning permission

ⁱⁱ Standard searches are those involving no more than 50 monument records or updates of a search undertaken within the past 5 years

ⁱⁱⁱ VAT is not chargeable on HER searches or Higher-Level Stewardship

^{iv} For residential purposes a major development is one where the number of dwellings to be constructed is 10 or more (or a site area of 0.5 hectares). For all other uses, a major development is one where the floorspace to be built is 1000 square metres or more, or where the site area is 1 hectare or more

^v 'Community/charitable works' applies to any non-commercial customer

Inquiry Scope

Title	Flooding in Bucks 2013-14: Lessons Learned
Signed-off by	Warren Whyte, Chairman of ETL Select Committee
	Sara Turnbull, Head of Member Services (Statutory Scrutiny Officer)
Author	Kelly Sutherland
Date	7 th May 2015
Inquiry Group Membership	Proposal is that the Inquiry will be chaired by Warren Whyte supported by the full Committee membership
Member Services Resource	Member Services will provide the following officer support: Sara Turnbull, Head of Member Services – Policy Advice and Report Quality Assurance Kelly Sutherland – Policy Lead & Project Management
Lead Cabinet Member	Mrs Lesley Clarke OBE, Cabinet Member for Planning and Environment
Lead HQ/BU Officer	Mrs Karen Fisher, Strategic Flood Management Team Leader
What is the problem that is trying to be solved?	To ensure that lessons learned from the 2013-14 flood experiences will lead to improved responses from Buckinghamshire County Council and relevant partners in the event of flooding incidents in future.
Is the issue of significance to Buckinghamshire as a whole?	During the winter of 2013-14, a number of communities across the County were affected by surface water, fluvial and/or groundwater flooding – from Denham in the South to Aylesbury in the North.
Is the topic of relevance to the work of BCC?	Yes.
Is this topic within the remit of the Select Committee?	Yes.
What work is underway already on this issue?	The Flood Management Team have completed Section 19 investigations into flood incidents and have looked at preventative measures. The Resilience team have also assessed the Council's emergency response and have been involved in the multi-agency lessons learned process. Community Emergency Plans, held by Parish and Town Councils, have been encouraged as a result.
Are there any key changes that might impact on this issue?	Increased development across the County and associated drainage implications. Cutbacks to resources in the Public Sector. Climate change – possible increase in periods of heavy, prolonged rainfall. Approval of Marlow Flood Alleviation Scheme (FAS)
What are the key timing considerations?	Would like the Inquiry's recommendations to be made by Winter 2015-16.
Who are the key stakeholders &	Buckinghamshire County Council (incl TfB) District Councils

decision-makers?	Parish Councils Environment Agency Utility Companies e.g Thames Water Bucks Fire and Rescue Service
What might the Inquiry Achieve?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Educate residents and elected members on how best to deal with Flooding emergencies • Ensure a more co-ordinated response between agencies/stakeholders in future.
What media/communications support do you want?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Press release to launch inquiry evidence-gathering • Press release to promote the report once published

Evidence-gathering Methodology

What types of methods of evidence-gathering will you use?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desktop research • Evidence gathering meetings • Visits to flood sites • Local Area Forums – use previous minutes/reports of LAF meetings in areas affected by Flooding
How will you involve service-users and the public in this inquiry?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Invite written submissions from any Bucks residents who experienced flooding in 2013-14 • Invite representatives from Resident's Flooding Groups to meeting to give evidence and answer members' questions – possibly Marlow as an e.g. of River flooding, Hughenden Valley as an e.g. of sewage issues and The Willows as an e.g. of Surface Water flooding.

Outline Inquiry Project Plan

Stage	Key Activity	Dates
Scoping	Inquiry Scope Agreed by Select Committee – propose to hold an initial meeting late May to further refine the scope with members.	May/June 2015
Evidence-gathering	21st July Select Committee Meeting – Inquiry Evidence from BCC Officers – Karen Fisher, Andy Fyfe, rep from TfB. Setting the scene, understanding BCC's responsibilities around flooding and emergency response, what work has been done internally as a result of the 2013-14 flooding.	21 st July 2015

	8th September Select Committee Meeting – Inquiry Evidence from Residents and Key Partners – invite resident’s groups to talk about their experiences at the time of the flooding and afterwards, to highlight any issues. Then speak to reps from District Councils, Parish or Town Councils, Environment Agency, Utility Companies such as Thames Water, to understand their different duties and responsibilities and how they responded in 2013-14. Would they do anything different now as a result of lessons learned?	8 th September 2015
	Visits to Flood Sites?	August/September according to member availability
Developing Recommendations	Inquiry Group/SC meeting – Key Findings Report & Possible Areas of Recommendations considered	September 2015
	Testing & developing recommendations with stakeholders	Late September
Reporting	Final Inquiry Group report with recommendations completed (signed-off by SC Chairman)	October
	Report published for Select Committee	
	Select Committee agrees report to go forward to decision-makers	October/November 2015
	Cabinet/Partner considers recommendations	November/December 2015

Date	Topic	Description and purpose	Contact Officer	Attendees
Environment, Transport & Locality Services Select Committee				
19 May 2015	Archaeological & Historical Environments Statutory Duties	Overview Item - For Members to examine the Council's statutory duties as record keeper, its ability to carry out its duties and charging opportunities to generate income and deliver high quality advice	Kelly Sutherland, Committee Adviser	
19 May 2015	Committee Inquiry Scopes	Members will consider scoping documents for upcoming inquiries	Kelly Sutherland, Committee Adviser	
19 May 2015	Committee Work Programme	Members will discuss the the Committee Work Programme and forthcoming Committee items.	Kelly Sutherland, Committee Adviser	
23 Jun 2015	Committee Work Programme	Members will discuss the the Committee Work Programme and forthcoming Committee items.	Kelly Sutherland, Committee Adviser	
23 Jun 2015	Public Transport Inquiry - progress update	For Members to receive 6 month update to monitor progress towards the Committee Inquiry recommendations.	Mike Freestone, Director of Transport	Ruth Vigor-Hedderly, Cabinet Member for Transportation
23 Jun 2015	TfB Update	For Members to receive an update on the new client staffing structures following the recruitment process and on the customer focus improvements.	Mike Freestone, Director of Transport	Gill Harding Ruth Vigor Hedderly, Cabinet Member for Transportation

28

Agenda Item 8

Date	Topic	Description and purpose	Contact Officer	Attendees
23 Jun 2015	The Council's role and internal process for new developer works on the highway.	For Members to receive an update on the outcome of a review into how S278 works (developer works on the highway) are undertaken and improvements that the service can take forward as a result.	Stephen Walford, Senior Manager PSD/PAC	Stephen Walford, Growth & Strategy Director, Christine Urry, Highways Development Team Leader, Martin Dickman, Environment Services Director
21 Jul 2015	Flooding in Bucks	INQUIRY EVIDENCE: For Members to consider the impact of flooding in the county, the Council and partnership response and lessons learnt.	Karen Fisher, Strategic Flood Management Officer	Lesley Clarke OBE, Cabinet Member for Environment.
8 Sep 2015	Committee Work Programme	Members will discuss the Committee Work Programme and forthcoming Committee items.	Kelly Sutherland, Committee Adviser	
17 Nov 2015	Committee Work Programme	Members will discuss the Committee Work Programme and forthcoming Committee items	Kelly Sutherland, Committee Adviser	
17 Nov 2015	Public Transport Inquiry update	Recommendation Monitoring: for Members to scrutinise progress against the Committee's recommendations, one year after Cabinet agreement	Tá ^/d/^^•q } ^, Öã^&q Á -Á/æ •] [!oÁ	Ruth Vigor-Hedderly, Cabinet Member for Transportation Neil Gibson, MD of TEE Business Unit Gill Harding, Director for Strategic Business Development

Date	Topic	Description and purpose	Contact Officer	Attendees
17 Nov 2015	S106 Inquiry Update	For Members to receive 6 month update to monitor progress towards the Committee Inquiry recommendations.	Kelly Sutherland, Committee Adviser	

