

**Roberto Tambini  
Chief Executive**

Please contact: Trevor Baker  
Please telephone: 01784 446267  
Fax Number: 01784 446333  
Email Address: [t.baker@spelthorne.gov.uk](mailto:t.baker@spelthorne.gov.uk)  
Our Ref: TB/Cabinet  
Date:- 24 September 2010

**NOTICE OF MEETING:**

**CABINET**

**DATE: TUESDAY 28 SEPTEMBER 2010**

**TIME: 5.00 p.m.**

**PLACE: GODDARD ROOM, COUNCIL OFFICES, KNOWLE GREEN, STAINES**

***[Refreshments for Members are available from 4.30pm in the Members' Room.]***

**TO: MEMBERS OF THE CABINET:-**

<b>Members of the Cabinet</b>	<b>Cabinet Member Areas of Responsibility</b>
J.D. Packman [Chairman]	Leader of the Council
R.A. Smith-Ainsley [Vice-Chairman]	Planning and Housing
F. Ayers	Community Safety
S. Bhadye	Independent Living
C.A. Davis	Economic Development
G.E. Forsbrey	Environment
Mrs. D.L. Grant	Young People and Culture
Mrs. V.J. Leighton	Finance and Resources
Mrs J.M. Pinkerton	Communications

**EMERGENCY PROCEDURE [THE LIFT MUST NOT BE USED]**

**In the event of an emergency the building must be evacuated. All councillors and staff should assemble on the Green adjacent to Broome Lodge. Members of the public present should accompany the staff to this point and remain there until the senior member of staff present has accounted for all persons known to be on the premises.**

**[PLEASE NOTE THAT THIS AGENDA IS AVAILABLE IN LARGE PRINT ON REQUEST TO TREVOR BAKER ON TEL: 01784 446267]**

## IMPORTANT PUBLIC NOTICE

### MOBILE TECHNOLOGY – ACCEPTABLE USE

Use of mobile technology (e.g. mobile telephones, Blackberries, XDA's etc.) in meetings can:

- Interfere with the Public Address and Induction Loop systems;
- Distract other people at the meeting;
- Interrupt presentations and debates;
- Mean that you miss a key part of a decision taken.

#### PLEASE:

Either switch off your mobile telephone etc. **OR** switch off its wireless/transmitter connection and sound for the duration of the meeting.

***THANK YOU FOR YOUR CO-OPERATION IN THIS MATTER.***

## REVISED AGENDA

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> To receive any apologies for non-attendance.	
<b>2. MINUTES</b> To confirm the Minutes of the Meeting and Special Meeting held on:- (a) 20 July 2010 (b) Special Cabinet 23 August 2010	<b>5 - 10</b> <b>11 - 12</b>
<b>3. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST</b> To receive any disclosures of interest from Members in accordance with the Council's Code of Conduct for Members.	
<b>4. MINUTES OF THE SPELTHORNE YOUTH COUNCIL MEETING</b> <i>[Councillor Mrs Grant]</i> To receive the Minutes of the Spelthorne Youth Council meeting held on 20 July.	<b>13 - 14</b>
<b>5. MEMBERS DEVELOPMENT STEERING GROUP</b> <i>[Councillor Mrs Pinkerton]</i> To receive and consider the Minutes of the Members Development Steering Group held on 13 July 2010.  Note: Recommendation (d) Skills Portal  At the request of the Cabinet Member Cllr Mrs J. Pinkerton, the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Leader, has approved under urgent action, expenditure to enable Spelthorne to obtain and set up the members' development skills portal in time to have it available for members' use in the last 8 months of this administration.	<b>15 - 18</b>
<b>6. CAPITAL MONITORING REPORT 2010/11</b> <i>[Councillor Mrs Leighton]</i>	<b>19 - 28</b>
<b>7. REVENUE MONITORING REPORT 2010/11</b> <i>[Councillor Mrs Leighton]</i>	<b>29 - 46</b>
<b>8. STREET CLEANSING VEHICLE REPLACEMENT PROGRAMME - KEY DECISION</b> <i>[Councillor Forsbrey]</i>	<b>45 - 52</b>
<b>9. NEW GOVERNANCE MODELS - OUTCOME OF CONSULTATION KEY DECISION</b> <i>[Councillor Packman]</i>	<b>53 - 58</b>
<b>10. REVISED BUILDING CONTROL FEE CHARGING SCHEME</b> <i>[Councillor Forsbrey]</i>	<b>59 - 78</b>

11. **CHRISTMAS LIGHTS** 79 - 82  
*[Councillor Forsbrey]*
12. **CAPITAL FUNDING FOR SALIX PROJECT** 83 - 90  
*[Councillor Forsbrey]*
13. **ISSUES FOR FUTURE MEETINGS**  
Members are requested to identify issues to be considered at future meetings.
14. **URGENT ITEMS**  
To consider any items which the Chairman considers are urgent.
15. **EXEMPT BUSINESS**  
To move the exclusion of the Press/Public for the following item(s), in view of the likely disclosure of exempt information within the meaning of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972, as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 and by the Local Government (Access to information) (Variation) Order 2006
16. **EXEMPT REPORT - WRITE OFFS [Gold Paper]** 91 - 101  
*[Councillor Mrs Leighton]*  
***[Paragraph 3 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)]***
17. **EXEMPT REPORT - STANWELL NEW START PROJECT – UPDATE ON NEGOTIATIONS [Gold Paper]** 103-108  
*[Councillor Packman]*  
***[Paragraph 3 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)]***

## **MINUTES OF THE CABINET**

**20 JULY 2010**

### **PRESENT:**

Councillor J.D. Packman (Chairman, Cabinet Member and Leader of the Council);  
Councillor R.A. Smith-Ainsley (Deputy Leader of the Council, Vice-Chairman of the Cabinet and Cabinet Member for Planning and Housing);  
Councillor F. Ayers (Cabinet Member for Community Safety);  
Councillor G.E. Forsbrey (Cabinet Member for Environment);  
Councillor Mrs D.L. Grant (Cabinet Member for Young People and Culture);  
Councillor Mrs. V.J. Leighton (Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources) and  
Councillor Mrs J.M. Pinkerton (Cabinet Member for Communications); and

**Apology:** Councillor C.A. Davis (Cabinet Member for Economic Development)

### **1618. MINUTES**

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 8 June 2010 were confirmed as a correct record.

### **1619. MINUTES OF THE SPELTHORNE YOUTH COUNCIL MEETINGS - 26 MAY and 17 JUNE 2010**

The Cabinet discussed the Minutes of the Spelthorne Youth Council meetings held on 26 May and 17 June 2010. The Cabinet Member for Young People and Culture wished it to be recorded that the Youth Council was doing an excellent job.

**RESOLVED** to note the Minutes of the Spelthorne Youth Council meetings held on 26 May and 17 June 2010.

### **1620. REVENUE OUTTURN REPORT 2009-2010**

The Cabinet considered an update report on the revenue outturn position and the level of transfers from reserves and the reasons for the variances identified against the budget agreed in February 2009.

The options considered were in the main body of the report.

**RESOLVED** that Cabinet notes the report on Revenue Outturn for 2009 - 2010.

### **1621. CAPITAL OUTTURN REPORT 2009-2010**

The Cabinet considered a report on the provisional outturn figures for 2009/10 on the Capital Programme and the list of schemes requested by Heads of Service to be carried forward.

The options considered were in the main body of the report.

**RESOLVED** that the Capital Outturn Report 2009/2010 be noted and the requests to carry forward a total of £567,000 be approved.

## **CABINET – 20 JULY 2010**

### **1622. DISCRETIONARY RATE RELIEF POLICY**

The Cabinet considered a report on the criteria for awarding discretionary rate relief and determining the level of relief awarded to those organisation based upon the contribution that such organisations make to the local area and to formulate a policy for granting discretionary rate relief on the grounds of hardship.

The options considered were in the main body of the report.

**RESOLVED** that the Cabinet approves and adopts the attached policy and approves the charity relief applications as set out in Appendix A, B & C to the report of the Assistant Chief Executive dated 20 July 2010, for 2010/11.

### **1623. \*AIRTRACK – PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON THE SECOND ADDENDUM TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT**

The Cabinet considered a report on the second Addendum to the Environmental Statement produced by Heathrow Airport Ltd in July 2009 for Airtrack which summarised the new information and the extent to which it meets the Council's existing 79 points of objection. The addendum dealt with some objections and previous omissions and was subject to formal public consultation.

The options considered were in the main body of the report.

**RESOLVED** that the Cabinet recommends the Council that the response set out in Appendix A to the report of the Deputy Chief Executive to the Cabinet, dated 20 July 2010, be endorsed.

### **1624. AREA INVESTMENT PROGRAMME**

The Cabinet considered a report setting out proposals for a flexible procurement delegation for the area improvement projects so that there was no delay in implementing any of the schemes.

The options considered were in the main body of the report.

**RESOLVED** that Cabinet decisions under Contract Standing Orders for the Area Investment Programme be delegated to the Deputy Chief Executive in consultation with the Leader of the Council.

### **1625. LALEHAM PARK**

The Cabinet considered a report outlining options for substantially improving Laleham Park.

The options considered were in the main body of the report.

**RESOLVED** that the Cabinet authorises the Officers to proceed with option 1 as set out in the report of the Assistant Chief Executive dated 20 July 2010 and instructs the Open Spaces and Sustainability Manager to proceed with obtaining quotes and commence public consultation over the future of Laleham Park as detailed in the Proposal section of the report.

## **CABINET – 20 JULY 2010**

### **1626. \*CORPORATE PLAN AND PRIORITIES**

The Cabinet considered a report on progress on achievements of the Corporate Plan 2008-2011 for 2009 and amendments to the plan including a reduction in the number of priorities for 2010/11.

The options considered were in the main body of the report.

**RESOLVED** that Cabinet recommends Council to agree the reduction in corporate priorities and approve the revised Corporate Plan 2008-11 (2010 3rd Revision)

### **1627. JOINT MUNICIPAL WASTE STRATEGY – CONSULTATION RESPONSE**

The Cabinet considered a report on an interim review and responses to a public consultation on the Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy which set out a 20 year plan for the management of household waste in Surrey.

The options considered were in the main body of the report.

#### **RESOLVED:-**

1. that Cabinet notes the process for an interim revision to the Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy (JMWMS);
2. that Cabinet agrees the proposed revisions to the JMWMS as provided in Appendix 1 to the report of the Assistant Chief Executive dated 20 July 2010 and authorises the Head of Sustainability and Leisure to send a copy of the report to the Surrey Waste Partnership; and
3. that Cabinet notes the proposed timeline for the adoption of the revision in relation to the meeting of Cabinet in October 2010.

### **1628. COMBINED HEAT AND POWER PROJECT**

The Cabinet considered a report, in principle, on a project to implement a Combined Heat and Power (CHP) system to provide heat and electricity for Knowle Green offices and Spelthorne Leisure Centre, through the tendering of an Energy Services Contract.

The options considered were in the main body of the report.

**RESOLVED** that Cabinet authorises officers to proceed with the detailed development of this project.

### **1629. PARTNERSHIPS**

The Cabinet considered a report on the Council's current position on Partnerships and how it might deliver services in the future with Partners.

The options considered were in the main body of the report.

**RESOLVED** that the Council:-

## CABINET – 20 JULY 2010

- a) continues to work with Surrey First but also continues to develop partnerships with a wide range of partners including other local authorities and external partners.
- b) develops a partnership approach as a key feature of a new financial and resources strategy and
- c) agrees to include a partner impact assessment in its committee reports template in the future

### 1630. EXEMPT BUSINESS

**RESOLVED** that under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public and press be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in the paragraph, of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act, indicated below.

### **1630. SPELTHORNE COMMUNITY ALARM NETWORK (SPAN) CONTRACT RENEWAL [Paragraph 3 – Information relating to the financial and business affairs of any particular person (including the Authority)]**

Cabinet considered a report requesting an exemption to contract standing orders to enable the Council to enter into a further contract with Mole Valley District Council for the call monitoring and call handling elements of the SPAN service.

**RESOLVED** that Cabinet agrees the exemption to Contract Standing Orders to enter into a further four year contract with Mole Valley District Council for the SPAN call monitoring and call handling service.

### **NOTES:-**

- (1) ***Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee are reminded that under Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule, the "call-in" procedure shall not apply to recommendations the Cabinet makes to the Council. The matters on which recommendations have been made to the Council, if any, are identified with an asterisk [ \* ] in the above Minutes.***
- (2) ***Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee are entitled to call in decisions taken by the Cabinet for scrutiny before they are implemented, other than any recommendations covered under (1) above.***
- (3) ***Within three working days of the date on which a decision of the Cabinet or a Cabinet Member is published, not less than three members [one of whom must be the Chairman] of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee are able to "call in" a decision;***
- (4) ***To avoid delay in considering an item "called in", an extraordinary meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee will be convened within seven days of a "call in" being received if an ordinary meeting is not scheduled in that period;***
- (5) ***When calling in a Cabinet decision for review the members doing so should in their notice of "call in":-***



## **CABINET – 20 JULY 2010**

- ***Outline their reasons for requiring a review;***
  - ***Indicate any further information they consider the Overview and Scrutiny Committee needs to have before it in order to conduct a review in addition to the written report made by officers to the Cabinet;***
  - ***Indicate whether, where the decision was taken collectively by the Cabinet, they wish the Leader or his nominee (who should normally be the Cabinet Member) or where the decision was taken by a Cabinet Member, the member of the Cabinet making the decision, to attend the committee meeting; and***
  - ***Indicate whether the officer making the report to the Cabinet or the Cabinet Member taking the decision or his/her representative should attend the meeting.***
- (6) The deadline of three working days "for call in" by Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in relation to the above decisions by the Cabinet is the close of business on 29 July 2010.**

## MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL CABINET MEETING

23 AUGUST 2010

### PRESENT:

Councillor J.D. Packman (Chairman, Cabinet Member and Leader of the Council);  
Councillor R.A. Smith-Ainsley (Deputy Leader of the Council, Vice-Chairman of the Cabinet and Cabinet Member for Planning and Housing);  
Councillor F. Ayers (Cabinet Member for Community Safety);  
Councillor S. Bhadye (Cabinet Member for Independent Living)  
Councillor C.A. Davis (Cabinet Member for Economic Development)  
Councillor G.E. Forsbrey (Cabinet Member for Environment);  
Councillor Mrs. V.J. Leighton (Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources) and  
Councillor Mrs J.M. Pinkerton (Cabinet Member for Communications)

**Apology:** Councillor Mrs D.L. Grant (Cabinet Member for Young People and Culture);

### 1631. MINUTES OF THE LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK WORKING PARTY– 2 AUGUST 2010

The Cabinet considered the Minutes and Recommendations of the Local Development Framework Working Party held on 2 August 2010, on the approach to achieving a high standard of design and the context to the draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on the Design of Residential Extensions and New Residential Development.

**RESOLVED** that Cabinet approves the draft SPD for public consultation.

### NOTES:-

- (1) ***Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee are reminded that under Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule, the "call-in" procedure shall not apply to recommendations the Cabinet makes to the Council. The matters on which recommendations have been made to the Council, if any, are identified with an asterisk [ \* ] in the above Minutes.***
- (2) ***Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee are entitled to call in decisions taken by the Cabinet for scrutiny before they are implemented, other than any recommendations covered under (1) above.***
- (3) ***Within three working days of the date on which a decision of the Cabinet or a Cabinet Member is published, not less than three members [one of whom must be the Chairman] of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee are able to "call in" a decision;***
- (4) ***To avoid delay in considering an item "called in", an extraordinary meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee will be convened within seven days of a "call in" being received if an ordinary meeting is not scheduled in that period;***

## CABINET – 23 AUGUST 2010

- (5) *When calling in a Cabinet decision for review the members doing so should in their notice of "call in":-*
- *Outline their reasons for requiring a review;*
  - *Indicate any further information they consider the Overview and Scrutiny Committee needs to have before it in order to conduct a review in addition to the written report made by officers to the Cabinet;*
  - *Indicate whether, where the decision was taken collectively by the Cabinet, they wish the Leader or his nominee (who should normally be the Cabinet Member) or where the decision was taken by a Cabinet Member, the member of the Cabinet making the decision, to attend the committee meeting; and*
  - *Indicate whether the officer making the report to the Cabinet or the Cabinet Member taking the decision or his/her representative should attend the meeting.*
- (6) *The deadline of three working days "for call in" by Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in relation to the above decision of the Cabinet is the close of business on 31 August 2010.*

SPELTHORNE YOUTH COUNCIL  
MINUTES

20 July 2010

Held in the Leacroft Youth Centre, Staines

PRESENT:

Gemma Anscomb	Ian Doggett	David Porter
Connie Cronin	Dominic Hillman	Matthew Sutch
George Daubney	Vivien Miller	Charlie Whitley

Apologies: Sophie Clark, Dan Hitch, Joe McVey, Lily O'Neill and Molly O'Neill.

In attendance:

Gail Lewis – SCC Youth Worker

Andy Holdaway – SBC Youth and Arts Manager

Gill Hobbs – Committee Manager

Prior to the start of the meeting, Matt Joblin, a youth worker at the Leacroft Centre, distributed a questionnaire asking for views on the Surrey County Council “transforming services” agenda, which the youth councillors discussed and completed.

28/10 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 17 June 2010 were agreed as a correct record. The Youth Council noted that contrary to Minute 26/10 it had been decided to invite new members to join the Youth Council in September, as it was the beginning of the new school year.

29/10 FEEDBACK FROM SCHOOLS

There was no feedback from the school councils represented.

30/10 CALENDAR OF MEETINGS

The Youth Council received a calendar of meeting dates for both the Youth Council and Children and Young People Partnership from September 2010 to July 2011.

31/10 PROJECT GROUPS

Visit to European Parliament

Letters had been sent to 5 MEPs requesting assistance with funding for the visit but no responses had been received to date. A follow up letter would be sent in September.

### 32/10 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

#### Publicity for Youth Council

The Youth Council had a lively discussion about publicising the Youth Council to attract more members. It was agreed to produce a leaflet for distribution at future events, maintaining the present logo and providing information on the Youth Council inside.

Other suggestions for publicity included:

- A Youth Council stall at Community events such as Ashford on the Map and Stanwell Fair.
- An information board at the Youth Awards with photos of work undertaken by the Youth Council.

#### Management Committee

The Youth Council agreed that a new Management Committee would be elected at the October 2010 meeting and that the roles on this Committee would be proportional to the number of youth councillors.

Whereas previously the Grant Givers project group was made up of members from the Management Committee, it was agreed that in future all youth councillors who had received the appropriate training would rotate to contribute on this project group.

#### Sunbury Cross Re-Development

George Daubney attended a meeting about the re-development of Sunbury Cross and contributed to the discussion on behalf of the Youth Council.

#### Youth Centres

The Youth Council agreed to meet at Sunbury Youth Centre for some of their meeting dates in 2010-2011.

## MEMBERS DEVELOPMENT STEERING GROUP

13 JULY 2010

Present:

Councillor Mrs J.M. Pinkerton (Chairman)

Councillor A.P. Hirst (Vice-Chairman)

Councillor Miss .M.M. Bain

Councillor Mrs V.J. Leighton

Councillor Miss N. Hyams

Councillor Mrs M.W. Rough

**APOLOGIES:** Apologies were received from Councillor Mrs S.A. Dunn.

### 1/11 ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN

**RESOLVED** that Councillor Mrs J.M. Pinkerton be elected Chairman for the Municipal Year 2010/2011

### 2/11 APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIRMAN

**RESOLVED** that Councillor A.P. Hirst be appointed Vice-Chairman for the Municipal Year 2010/2011.

### 3/11 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 29 March 2010 were confirmed as a correct record.

### 4/11 MEMBER DEVELOPMENT ARRANGEMENTS

The Steering Group discussed with the Assistant Chief Executive his report which covered four specific areas relating to member development arrangements.

Mark Palmer the Development Director from South East Employers was in attendance to discuss the reaccreditation process and the elected member skills portal.

#### **(a) SE Charter for Elected Member Development Self Assessment Template.**

The Steering Group discussed with Mark Palmer the Development Director from South East Employers a draft self assessment template and action plan required in order to demonstrate commitment to the Charter. The following areas of the template were discussed:

*Paragraph 2.4 – Process for identification of needs at individual and Council wide level:* The Steering Group noted that there was a need to show that all members had been consulted on their member development needs possible via a development plan and to have at least a 70% return on the annual questionnaire sent to members.

*Paragraph 4.3 – Investment in learning and development is evaluated in terms of benefits and impact.* The Steering Group noted the need to show how member development linked into the Council's corporate priorities.

*Paragraph 5.3 - Hold events for the community to encourage people to become community leaders:* The Steering Group noted the need to provide evidence of raising the profile of the political role such as promoting the role of a councillor and how to become a councillor on the council's website.

The Steering Group went on to discuss the arrangements that needed to be put in place for the reassessment which was due to take place by October 2010. The assessment would involve a full day assessment with a panel of assessors meeting with members and officers.

**The Steering Group noted** the arrangements being put in place for the re assessment against the Charter standards.

### **(b) Elected Member Development Skills Portal**

Mark Palmer from South East Employers gave a demonstration on an Elected Member Development Skills Portal that had been produced by the South East Employers in partnership with Jobs Go Public.

The Steering Group discussed with Mark Palmer how the portal would work and noted that the portal would enable a councillor to:

- Complete a brief personal demographic and learning preferences survey
- Self assess their level of skills across the political skills framework
- Add names of people to provide 360 degree feedback across the same political skills framework.
- Receive anonymous feedback from contributors and view an overview of this feedback together with additional information.

The Steering Group discussed the cost of the system which was in the region of £1000 per annum or £3,500 for a four year period.

**The Steering Group agreed to recommend to the Cabinet** that the council pilot the scheme at a cost of £995 for 2010/2011.

### **(c) Development Activities 2009/2010**

The Steering Group discussed and noted member development activities during 2009/2010 which had generally been well attended with an average attendance of 40%.

### **(d) Development Activity 2010/2011**

The Steering Group discussed the development events budget for 2010/2011 which had been set at £4,900 and in line with the Member Development Framework.

**The Steering Group agreed to recommend to the Cabinet** the following proposals for allocating the development budget for 2010/2011

Re accreditation for Member Development Charter	£1000
Pilot for Skills Portal	£1000
Planning Training as per TRA report	£1900
To offset the cost of the Licensing training (£1500)	£1000
Total	£4900

**(e) Development Events for 2011/2012**

The Steering Group agreed that the next meeting be held in September 2010 with the main item for discussion being the induction programme for new members following the Borough Election on 5 May 2011.





## **2010/11 CAPITAL MONITORING REPORT**

**Cabinet 28 September 2010**

### **Resolution Required**

### **Report of the Chief Financial Officer**

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

#### **How does the content of this report improve the quality of life of Borough Residents**

Money spent on capital schemes enables the Authority to ensure that residents are able to have an improved standard of living and facilities.

#### **Purpose of Report**

To provide Cabinet with the spend figures for the period April to July 2010 on the Capital Programme.

#### **Key Issues**

- The current position shows that we have spent £487 k to date against an original budget of £2,204k and against a revised budget of £2,767k.
- The spend for the period of 487k is 22% of the original budget and 18% of the revised budget. The corresponding figures for the previous year covering the same period was an outturn of 495k which was 24% of the original budget and 21% of the revised budget.

#### **Financial Implications**

As set out within the report and appendices

#### **Corporate Priority**

All 6 Priorities.

#### **Officer Recommendations**

**Cabinet is asked to note the report.**

**Report Author: Adrian Flynn, Senior Accountant 01784 444268**

**Contact: Terry Collier, Chief Financial Officer (01784 446296)**

**Portfolio Holder: Cllr Vivienne Leighton**

## **1. BACKGROUND**

1.1 The purpose of this report is to update Cabinet on the capital spend against the budget position of schemes which have been included in the Capital programme.

1.2 To inform Cabinet of the reasons for variances.

## **2. KEY ISSUES**

### **2.1 Capital**

(a) Attached, as [Appendix A](#), is the current spend to date on capital covering the period April to July 2010.

(b) For the period ending 31 July 2010, capital expenditure £0.487m (22%) of the original budget and (18%) of the revised budget.

(c) The equivalent spend in the corresponding period of the previous year was £0.495m.

2.2 Whilst it is still relatively early in the financial year, the following significant variances are worth noting:

(a) Verge maintenance equipment actual spend £63k against budget of £60k, excess spend to be funded from virement from wheelie bins provision.

(b) Business transformation projects (Internet (GOSS); document management; mobile working and customer relationship management (CRM) project initiation is in progress of being completed and approved by the Business Improvement Board to ensure there are clear measurable deliverables and resources available to deliver, hence the reason for the very limited spend to date. Due to resource constraints it is likely that the CRM solution (160k) will need to be scheduled for 2011-12.

(c) Area Regeneration projects whilst only £14k spend/committed in first four months, the delivery of the project works to be undertaken in the autumn are anticipated to bring the spend up to Budget.

## **3. PROPOSALS**

3.1 Cabinet to note the current spend position.

## **4. BENEFITS AND SUSTAINABILITY**

4.1 Careful monitoring of the budgets enables greater information on the likely outturn position which enables improved treasury management interest forecasts as predicted underspends or slippages can be incorporated when calculating the likely outturn position for investment income.

## **5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

5.1 Any under spend on the approved capital programme enables the Authority to invest the monies to gain additional investment income or can be used to fund additional schemes identified.

**6. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS/OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

- 6.1 Schemes which are currently incomplete require a budget carry forward, may have contractual obligations which could leave us liable to litigation if they are not allocated the funds to complete the works.

**7. RISKS AND HOW THEY WILL BE MITIGATED**

- 7.1 Projected outturns are based on the best knowledge of the Heads of Service at a given point in time and may change if there is a major change in circumstances. Regular monitoring and updating of the projections will enable these changes to be picked up and corrective action taken in a timely manner to ensure that necessary corrective can be taken.

**8. TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION**

- 8.1 Bi-monthly monitoring reports are prepared for Management Team and incorporate revised actual and projected outturn figures.

**Report Author: Adrian Flynn Senior Accountant: 01784 444268**

**Background Papers: There are none.**



## **2010-11 Revenue Monitoring Report**

**Cabinet: 28 September 2010**

### **Resolution Required**

**Report of the Chief Financial Officer**

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

#### **How does the content of this report improve the quality of life of Borough Residents**

This report shows the Authority's revenue spend figures and how resources were spent on providing services for residents for the period April to July 2010, which is a third of the financial year.

#### **Purpose of Report**

To provide Members with the Revenue spend figures

#### **Key Issues**

- The actual spend to date, at net expenditure at service level, shows that we have spent £2.302m against the year to date budget of £4.916m.
- The Interest earnings for the period amounted to £137k and the full year earning's forecast is £391k
- Loss of Government grants totalling £149,000 affecting planning development control and economic development.
- Despite the loss of the above grant, the forecast projected outturn variance is currently estimated as a £23k under spend.

#### **Financial Implications**

As set out within the report and appendices

#### **Corporate Priority**

All 12 Priorities.

#### **Officer Recommendations**

**Cabinet is asked to note the report**

**Contact: Terry Collier, Chief Financial Officer (01784 446296)**

**Cabinet Member: Cllr Vivienne Leighton**

## MAIN REPORT

### 1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to update Members on the revenue spend position as at the 31 July 2010.
- 1.2 To inform Members of the reasons for the variances identified against the budget agreed in February 2010.
- 1.3 In the Budgets agreed for Heads of Service it is always anticipated that there will be budget variances from the original budget. This ensures that the Authority meets any change in the needs of the service to adapt to any unexpected changes which happen in the period.

### 2. KEY ISSUES

- 2.1 In [Appendix A](#) the actual spend is £2.302m against the full year budget of £13.851m.
- 2.2 [Appendices B1 to B9](#) gives a summarised breakdown of the revenue spend by portfolio Area, firstly in overall terms and then breaking each portfolio down by cost centres
- 2.3 Major provisional outturn variances, to the original budget together with officer comments on more significant expenditure / income variances are as follows:

(a) Economic Development

Cost Centre	Comment	Significant Variance
Car Parks	Costs of temporary staff to cover vacant permanent positions exceed vacant post savings.	£105k adverse
	Increased pay and display, season ticket and on and off street enforcement income.	£20k favourable
Staines Town Centre	Income better than budget	£40K favourable
Staines Market	Income less than budget	£12k adverse
Economic Development	Loss of government grant	£49k adverse

(b) Planning and Housing.

Cost Centre	Comment	Significant Variance
Building Control	The income budgets were increased for 10/11, but activity levels are lower than in previous years, resulting in lower fee income.	£23k adverse

Housing Benefits admin	Vacancies for 5 months of the year.	£14k favourable
Housing Benefits payments	Better overpayments recovery than anticipated	£174k favourable
Private Sector Leasing	The present PSL scheme has come to an end, resulting in no spend for 1011.	£66k favourable

Land Charges	Higher income due to more activity	£29k favourable
Development Control	Loss of housing/ planning delivery grant and lower fee income, as not many large applications being received.	£100k adverse

(c) Health and Independent Living

<b>Cost Centre</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Significant Variance</b>
Community Care admin	Staff vacancies	£9k favourable
Meals on Wheels	Temp Staff to cover long term sickness	£13k adverse
Spelride	Temp Staff employed as a result of a delay in the setting up of the partnership with Elmbridge. Increased use of the service.	£13k adverse £13k favourable
Environmental Health admin	Staff vacancies	£61k favourable
Rodent & Pest Control	Increased fees from Stray dogs	£3k favourable



(d) Environment

<b>Cost Centre</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Significant Variance</b>
Streetscene Management and Support	Staff vacancies Contribution from A2D towards Stanwell community warden costs (see community safety)	£49k favourable £17k favourable
Refuse collection	Staff Vacancies  Increased hire of Green waste bins.	£35k favourable  £84k favourable
Depot	Costs of security patrols and increased business rates.	£14k adverse
Environment Services admin	Staff vacancy.	£10k favourable
Street Cleaning	Staff vacancies	£20k favourable
Recycling	Lower collection costs  Lower recycling credits	£46k favourable  £50k adverse

(e) Young People and Cultural Services

<b>Cost Centre</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Significant Variance</b>
Grounds Maintenance	Staff Vacancies Changes to the structure of the nursery.	£60k favourable
Parks Strategy	Drop in football, lettings, licence & Lammas car park income.	£38k adverse

---

(f) Communications and Engagement

<b>Cost Centre</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Significant Variance</b>
Business Improvement	Staff Vacancy	£18k favourable
Taxi Licensing	Fewer applications received	£11k adverse

(g) Community Safety

<b>Cost Centre</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Significant Variance</b>
Community Safety	A2D contribution now reflected within Streetscene management and support.	£14k adverse
Knowle Green	Airtrack public inquiry income will not be achieved this year.	£26k adverse
Responsive Maintenance	Increased maintenance	£20k adverse

(h) Resources

<b>Cost Centre</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Significant Variance</b>
Audit	Staff Vacancies Loss of partnership income from Surrey Heath Borough Council.	£16k favourable £33k adverse
Legal	Higher Legal and court costs Increased fee income	£21k adverse £29k favourable

Customer Services	Temp post made permanent	£17k adverse
Corporate Management	Valuation fees relating to Stanwell new start. Venue hire and funding from Surrey, Safer, stronger communities board	£17k adverse £11k favourable

Council Tax	Reimbursement of legal costs	£10k favourable
	Temp staff costs and overtime payments to cover increased workload.	£15k adverse

### 3. PROPOSALS

Cabinet are asked to note the current revenue spend position.

### 4. BENEFITS AND SUSTAINABILITY

- 4.1 Careful monitoring of the budgets enables greater transparency of budget problems and action to be taken when required on areas identified as areas of concern
- 4.2 A systematic approach to budget monitoring will alleviate problems of major discrepancies not being highlighted until year end.
- 4.3 Constant monitoring of the budgets enables Heads of Service to be held more accountable for their budgetary spend and any major unidentified variations which occur.

### 5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 As set out within the report and appendices.

### 6. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS / OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- 6.1 There are none

### 7. RISKS AND HOW THEY WILL BE MITIGATED

- 7.1 A projected balanced outturn depends on Management Team, Heads of Service and all budget managers managing their budgets within the parameters that were originally agreed and achieving where necessary corresponding growth and savings within those budgets. Careful monitoring of the budgets on a monthly basis ensures that any problems or anomalies are identified and investigated at an early stage.
- 7.2 Any necessary corrective action on major budget variations, which cannot be remedied within the Service, are reported to MAT immediately in order to ensure that as much time and opportunity is had to enable the position to be rectified quickly within the current financial year.

### 8. TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

- 8.1 Bi monthly reports are produced for Management Team.

**Report Author:** Adrian Flynn 01784 444268

**Background Papers:** There are none

## **STREET CLEANSING VEHICLE REPLACEMENT PROGRAMME - Key Decision**

**Cabinet: 28 September 2010**

**Recommendation Required**

**Report of the Deputy Chief Executive**

### **REPORT SUMMARY**

#### **How does the content of this report improve the quality of life of Borough Residents**

Keeping the Borough's streets clean is important to our residents and the purchase of the street cleaning vehicles will enable our Street Scene services to continue to provide this service to our residents on a daily basis, with fewer breakdowns due to the age of the vehicles in use.

#### **Purpose of Report**

The purpose of this report is to seek approval of Cabinet

- (i) for the procurement of six Street Cleansing mechanical sweepers on a lease with maintenance basis for a period of three and five years the aggregate value of which will be in excess of £250,000.
- (ii) procurement methods to be adopted.

#### **Key Issues**

- The Councils fleet of mechanical sweepers is now over three years old and all are due for replacement to ensure cleansing services are maintained at current levels.
- Financial Regulations require that Cabinet approval is required for the procurement of works, goods or services with a value in excess of £250,000.
- Joint procurement of Street Cleansing vehicles from a consortium.
- Tender exercise to test the market and secure best value for money.

#### **Financial Implications**

Annual leasing costs will be met within the existing budget available to the department, there is however the possibility that tenders could come back higher than expected. If this is the case a separate report will be submitted to Cabinet.

**Corporate Priority** 3. Environment, 8. Community Engagement, 9. Sustainable Financial Future, 10. Value for Money , 11. Effective Communications.

#### **Officer Recommendations**

**The Cabinet is asked to authorise Streetscene to obtain costs for both lease & purchase options for the procurement of six specialist vehicles through a framework agreement. These vehicles will replace the equivalent number for use in the Council's street cleaning services.**

**Report Author: Jackie Taylor, Head of Streetscene, Tel: (01784) 446418**

**Area of Responsibility: Nigel Lynn, Deputy Chief Executive (01784) 446304**

**Cabinet member: Councillor Gerry Forsbrey**

## MAIN REPORT

### 1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 Streetscene Services has a rolling vehicle replacement programme in which Specialist vehicles will generally be replaced at three years from the date of acquisition, depending on type, as they become uneconomic to maintain. The Cleansing vehicle fleet as listed in the table below consists of a range of vehicle types and sizes and are of an extremely specialized nature. Some vehicles may be retained beyond the stated replacement date if the Transport Manager deems that the condition of the vehicle merits an extension. In such cases a saving is enjoyed in the lease cost for the extended period, however when the vehicle is ultimately replaced the lease cost may rise.

Vehicle type	Annual lease cost £
Johnston Sweeper	£27,000
Scarab Minor	£24,000
Scarab Minor	£24,000
Town Centre sweeper	£17,000
Schmidt swingo	£22,000
Schmidt swingo	£23,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>£137,000</b>

- 1.2 A short term arrangement has been reached with the current Street Cleansing vehicle supplier which basically extends the current contract for the existing vehicles on a spot hire basis. At this time no extra costs are being incurred.

### 2. KEY ISSUES

- 2.1 A number of Street Cleansing vehicles are due for replacement as existing lease contracts have already expired.
- 2.2 Johnston 13 Long Road Sweeper (acquired March 2006). This vehicle has had its lease extended for 18 months from lease end date which was March 2009. Although it is still operating normally its “down time” due to mechanical failure is increasing, causing operational issues. This vehicle is deployed on sweeping the major roads within the Spelthorne area.
- 2.3 The new Johnston Range comes with an optional water recirculation system that recycles excess water in the body space into the suction nozzle. This conserves water, reduces dust emissions and extends on-station time, it is also the first European-manufactured machine to achieve full PM10 test compliance in stringent air quality tests on whole vehicle emissions.
- 2.4 Scarab Minor Sweepers x 2 (acquired March 2006). These vehicles have been on spot hire since lease end in March 2009. Both vehicles are suffering from significant amounts of “down time” due to mechanical failure. Breakdowns are happening daily which is causing lost time for both machines resulting in scheduled sweeping running late. The life of this type of vehicle is typically four year maximum. These vehicles sweep the smaller side roads on scheduled routes, also town centres early mornings. The new models have Diesel VM motors which give excellent performance that meets and exceeds the latest Euro 5 regulations.
- 2.5 Schmidt Swingo x 2 (acquired March 2006). One vehicle has been on spot hire since March 2009 and the other has been on spot hire since 2008, both vehicles

are deteriorating and “down time” is increasing, resulting in less coverage of the borough. Both vehicles are used for footpath sweeping and EPA work, including main and secondary shopping areas. The new models include features which together combine to provide a long working life and, equally, low maintenance and running costs along with a powerful Euro-4 diesel engine and its automotive traction drive.

- 2.6 Hako Precinct Sweeper (acquired March 2006). The lease expired in March 2009, when we acquired this smaller type of sweeper for the first time in 2006, primarily for use in Staines High Street. Due to their compact size and flexibility they give a greater coverage of car parks and Staines Town Centre. These vehicles were fairly new to the market in 2006 and it is anticipated that the choice of manufacturer will change.
- 2.7 It is likely that the preferred machine will be a Johnston which delivers up to 40% less fuel consumption and utilises the latest cutting-edge sweeper technology for maximum efficiency which results in improved fuel consumption and less wear & tear. These vehicles have ISO14001 accreditation for the environment.
- 2.8 Streetscene has looked at partnering opportunities with a number of authorities;
  - (a) Runnymede Borough Council (RBC) will be procuring a number of refuse vehicles this year and a Johnston Sweeper. Their chosen acquisition method is to outright purchase this vehicle at a probable cost of approximately £110,000, they will be going out to tender later this year.
  - (b) Reigate & Banstead Borough Council have chosen to acquire their Johnston and compact sweepers through the Yorkshire Purchasing Organisation on a 3/5 year Lease (with maintenance).
- 2.9 The tenders received through the YPO were very competitive and it is felt that they did get best value for the Council by following this procurement route which ran very smoothly and involved a minimal amount of officer time. The turnaround time from specification to tenders being returned was 4/5 weeks.
- 2.10 Partnership with Runnymede Borough Council has been explored, however, due to the requirements that both boroughs have for use of the vehicles during the early morning there are no savings that could be achieved. Vehicle numbers could only be reduced if there was willingness by both boroughs to accept lower standards and frequencies of sweeping. In addition to this, vehicles of this nature have a life expectancy based on the number of hours worked and not mileage as is the case with most other vehicles.

**3. OPTIONS ANALYSIS**

- 3.1 The Council could provide Capital Investment for the purchase of these vehicles. Estimated costs are likely to be as follows:

		<b>Average Life</b>
Johnston Sweepers x 1	£110,000	5 years
Scarab Minor x 2	£130,000	3 years
Schmidt Swingo x 2	£120,000	3 years
Town Centre Sweeper	£ 40,000	3 years
	-----	
Total Capital Required	£400,000	

- 3.2 Street Cleansing vehicles have very high maintenance regimes and have very little if any residual value at the end of their working life. There are existing framework agreements in place under which we could purchase these vehicles, this complies with all EC procurement roles.
- 3.3 Secondly, the Council could purchase outright with maintenance and repair for three and five years. This method of procurement takes up officer time and extends the time taken to procure the vehicles, but will achieve as wide as possible test of the market. This tender exercise will require specification of contracts to be drawn up and advertising in the Official Journal of the European, all of which will have associated costs.
- 3.4 Thirdly, go out to tender with options of three and five years contract hire with full maintenance and repair.
- 3.5 Fourthly, procure the vehicles through a consortium such as the YPO who already have similar framework agreements for this type of vehicle set up, as is the case with Reigate & Banstead.

#### **Use of Consortiums**

- 3.6 Increasingly local authorities are benefiting from the use of consortiums for purchasing, the cost of a stand-alone tendering exercise, especially if European tendering rules apply, can be significant. Often these costs in officer time outweigh any savings achieved. Furthermore as large consortiums often have an agreed market share with manufacturers, delivery times can be much shorter. Vehicles or equipment purchased through the consortia route can be shown to be value for money and save significant officer time. It is therefore proposed that if these vehicles are available through an agreed consortium, this procurement route should be investigated before a stand-alone tendering or quotation procedure is considered.
- 3.7 Alternatively, do nothing and accept the consequences of retaining a fleet of street cleansing vehicles which over time will deteriorate further and be subject to increased down time and less working time. This will also cause a downturn in the high scores currently being achieved under Pi 195.

#### **4. PROPOSALS**

- 4.1 The proposal is to draw up the specifications for the vehicles and test the market as detailed in 3.6 following which a full evaluation will be carried out to determine which option will be most advantageous for Spelthorne.

#### **5. BENEFITS AND SUSTAINABILITY**

- 5.1 To promote a clean and green environment by cleaning the district, the latest technology will be employed on the service with more fuel efficient engines, lowering exhaust emissions, thus helping to lower the Council's Carbon footprint.
- 5.2 Provision of a new fleet of vehicles will enable the delivery of the Street Cleansing Services, minimising vehicle downtime and ultimately reducing repair costs.
- 5.3 Increasing standards and further improving on National Indicator Ni195 which monitors the cleanliness of the district as a whole.
- 5.4 It is also recognised that reducing the amount of street litter and generally keeping the streets clean, helps to reduce the fear of or instances of crime. Keeping the streets clean also helps to enhance the Council's reputation.

## **6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 6.1 It is very possible that as a result of this tender exercises annual revenue costs will increase, however, this will not be known until the market has been tested and a full evaluation of potential costs undertaken and a report will be taken back to Cabinet.
- 6.2 Under financial regulations Streetscene have the authority to spot hire vehicles to ensure continuity of service provision.
- 6.3 Officers from Corporate Governance team and the Head of Procurement will work with the Transport Manager and Head of Streetscene in order to ensure the most appropriate procurement option is used to secure the best value for money.

## **7. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS / OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

- 7.1 The vehicles are required to enable the Council to comply with statutory responsibilities in relation to street cleansing.
- 7.2 This approach will enable the most cost effective procurement and management of our vehicle fleet, which will be achieved by:-
  - (a) reducing officer time spent on procurement through the use of consortia.
  - (b) using the right vehicles for the job.

## **8. RISKS AND HOW THEY WILL BE MITIGATED**

- 8.1 Risks will be mitigated by testing the market and will ensure that we achieve best value.
- 8.2 During the course of the production of vehicle specification the Street Cleansing manual workforce and officers from Environment Services will be consulted to ensure vehicle requirements are able to achieve the best possible cleansing and emission standards.
- 8.3 Risk assessments to cover all activities within the service are constantly reviewed to ensure that they are safe and not putting the staff, public and Council at risk.
- 8.4 The use of machines to reduce the manual labour helps to reduce the health and safety risks that staff are exposed to.

## **9. TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION**

- 9.1 The Gantt chart attached at ([Appendix 1](#)) is based on the framework procurement timetable.

**Report Author: Jackie Taylor, Head of Streetscene Services, Tel: (01784) 446418**

**Background Papers:**

There are none.



**NEW GOVERNANCE MODELS - OUTCOME OF CONSULTATION – KEY  
DECISION**

**Cabinet: 28 September 2010, Council 21 October 2010**

**Resolution Required**

**Report of the Monitoring Officer**

**REPORT SUMMARY**

**How does the content of this report improve the quality of life of Borough  
Residents:**

There is no direct affect on the quality of life but the Council is required by law to consult residents on new governance options.

**Purpose of Report:**

To advise councillors about the outcome of the consultation undertaken by the Council on the “Strong Leader v Elected Mayor” issue.

**Key Issues:**

- ⇒ Corporate Governance
- ⇒ Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007
- ⇒ Forthcoming Decentralisation and Localism Bill

**Financial Implications:**

None arising from this report.

**Corporate Priority:**

This issue is not a corporate priority.

**Officer Recommendations:**

**That Cabinet recommends to Council that the Strong Leader model be adopted as the form of governance for Spelthorne Borough Council.**

**Report Author: Michael Graham, Head of Corporate Governance 01784 446227**

**Area of Responsibility: Nigel Lynn, Deputy Chief Executive 01784 4466300**

**Cabinet member: Councillor John Packman**

## MAIN REPORT

### 1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 On 29 April 2010 the Cabinet and Council agreed to undertake a consultation exercise with residents about new options for Council governance. This arose from the legal requirement in the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007; from May 2011 shire district councils will only be able to have one of two forms of governance. The first, known as the Strong Leader model involves a concentration of power from Council to the Leader. The second, is the Elected Mayor model which involves a similar concentration of power from the Council to an individual directly elected by residents every four years.
- 1.2 The Council's initial view was that, of the two options available, the Strong Leader model was to be preferred because:
- (a) Strong Leader and Cabinet model preserves the links with the councillors and representation of wards in the present political system
  - (b) Elected Mayor model introduces the prospect of personality into local politics which although it may be conducive to city government is less appropriate in a small district such as Spelthorne
  - (c) A Strong Leader can be removed by the Council during the term of four years and this is an important constitutional safeguard
- 1.3 The consultation proceeded as planned and the Council consulted in the following ways:
- (a) The reports and decisions were available on the Council's website
  - (b) An article was placed in the Bulletin
  - (c) A dedicated webpage provided details of the changes
  - (d) The Monitoring Officer made presentations at each of the "Have Your Say" meetings over the spring/summer. There was good attendance at most of the meetings and residents asked many relevant questions about the proposed changes and the implications of one model over the other. Further details are given below.

### 2. KEY ISSUES

- 2.1 The Have Your Say meetings drew a mixed response from residents. There were some individuals who expressed a view for Strong Leader and there were equally some who expressed a view for an Elected Mayor. One individual expressed the view that as the Council has already expressed an opinion (see para 1.2 above) the whole issue was already concluded and the matter was a "stitch up". This is of course, wrong. The Council provided a clear account of the way that it was thinking in April 2010 so that residents knew how the Council was currently minded to consider the issues. Providing a preliminary view does not undermine a consultation exercise, it allows residents to challenge the Council on its reasons and to provide a more reasoned response to address the issues.
- 2.2 In undertaking a consultation exercise the Council has to be aware of four elements of good consultation:
- (a) Consultation should take place at a formative stage before decisions have been made.
  - (b) Adequate information should be provided to allow for intelligent consideration and response.

- (c) Sufficient time should be allowed for response.
- (d) The decision maker should actively take into account the outcomes of the consultation when finalising the decision.

2.3 In my view we have conducted a good consultation exercise and to review those points set out in the paragraph above:

- (a) The final decision is to be made in December 2010 so consultation has taken place at a formative stage.
- (b) The Council provided reasons why it was minded to select the Strong Leader model. Full details about the proposed changes including our initial reasoning were publicised in the Bulletin and on the website.
- (c) 12 weeks was required for the consultation. In fact the Council has allowed 13 weeks from 1 May to 31 July 2010. This allowed sufficient time for all those interested in the topic to formulate a response.
- (d) This report now allows councillors to take into account the outcomes of the consultation before the final decision is made.

2.4 In total, nine responses were received by the Council. A summary of the responses is annexed as Appendix 1 along with a brief commentary from the Monitoring Officer.

2.5 Experience from other councils in Surrey shows that our sample size is smaller than others. Surrey County Council received 158 responses, Elmbridge received 100, Guildford 85, Woking 95 and Reigate and Banstead 44. Surrey Heath received the highest number of district responses in Surrey at 179 with a majority in favour of a directly elected Mayor. This is however the only council in Surrey to have a consultation response with a high number of people in favour of a directly elected Mayor. Most other consultation exercises have expressed a preference for a Strong Leader.

2.6 Lower response rates have been received in other parts of the country, for example, Durham City (5), London Borough of Harrow (1) and Birmingham City Council (0). Our experience is therefore not unusual.

2.7 It is difficult to draw any meaningful statistical conclusions from such a small sample of the population that responded. Given that such a tiny minority of people responded to the Consultation it could be speculated that most people understood the position that the Council found itself and accepted that Council's view that the Strong Leader model was to be preferred. Alternatively, it may be that the issue did not engage residents despite the lengths to bring it to their attention. We won't know for sure. It seems there is no strong appetite for an Elected Mayor, given that this was not put forward as the suggested model we have certainly not experienced any kind of "push-back" or counter arguments that it should be seriously considered as a model form of governance for the Borough.

### **3. OPTIONS ANALYSIS**

3.1 The Cabinet can now make a proposal to Council for the preferred form of governance, but still only one of two options is allowed at this time; Strong Leader or Elected Mayor.

3.2 No direct mention was made in the last Queen's speech about plans to allow councils the freedom to choose which form of governance is right for them. However in, *The Coalition: our programme for government* the Government signalled that it would allow councils to return to the committee system should

they wish to do so. It is not clear if this proposal would involve a third option or whether councils would be free to choose any form of governance such as the ability to retain the current Leader and Cabinet model.

- 3.3 The Number 10 website advises that the Decentralisation and Localism Bill will deal with a number of topics affecting local government but the breakdown of the Bill's contents does not mention changes to the local government committee system. It may well be that this is an oversight and the details will be in the Bill once it is published. We will have to wait and see. If there is any detail in the Bill which would affect the options or the timetable proposed in this report then I will ensure that a new report is brought to Cabinet as soon as possible.

#### **4. PROPOSALS**

- 4.1 The responses show a preference for the Strong Leader model, though obviously I repeat the caveat about the statistical sampling available in this consultation exercise.
- 4.2 I think that the most important feature of the consultation exercise is that nobody challenged the Council's reasoning for its initial preference of Strong Leader. Given that the reasons have been widely communicated and we have not met any fundamental objection or opposition I would be content to advise councillors that they are safe to confirm their original view if this is still the view of the Council.
- 4.3 I would therefore recommend that Cabinet proceeds to recommend to Council in December 2010 that the Strong Leader model be adopted as the form of governance for Spelthorne Borough Council. Any additional changes to the system of governance will be reported to Cabinet as soon as they are known.

#### **5. BENEFITS AND SUSTAINABILITY**

- 5.1 Not applicable.

#### **6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 6.1 No direct financial implications at this time. Consultation and preparation of a new constitution will be handled within current resources.

#### **7. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS / OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

- 7.1 Dealt with in the main body of the report.

#### **8. RISKS AND HOW THEY WILL BE MITIGATED**

- 8.1 None apparent.

#### **9. TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION**

- 9.1 Work to prepare the new Constitution and the Transition Arrangements will continue through the autumn.
- 9.2 The Council has to advertise the meeting at which the changes take place. It is proposed to make the decision in December 2010 at which time the new Constitution and the Transitional Arrangements will be finalised.

**Report Author: Michael Graham, Head of Corporate Governance 01784 446227**

**Background Papers:  
There are none**

## Appendix 1

### Responses to the Consultation for Strong Leader v Elected Mayor

No	From	Comment	Monitoring Officer advice
1	BW	Concerned that the Leader would be able to choose his/her own Cabinet. Tendency would be to pick people who agree with him/her thereby reducing democracy.	Unfortunately, the Act outlines the powers available to the Leader or the Mayor and there is no discretion on the part of the Council to introduce a different approach unless the law changes to allow more flexible arrangements.
2	PC	Supports a directly <b>Elected Mayor</b> – it is time for a change. Account should be taken of local people.	Preference noted.
3	GS	Doesn't like either proposal because of the concentration of power. <b>Elected Mayor</b> is the lesser of two evils because the electorate can chose the person they want rather than having a person imposed on them for party political reasons.	Preference noted.
4	JJ	Raises questions about the two options.	Questions from the resident were answered but in the end she did not express a view one way or the other about the two options.
5	SS	Prefers the <b>Strong Leader</b> Model – voting for an additional person as mayor only adds to overall administration. Councillors are better placed to select the strong leader as they will have more direct experience of candidates' skills. Four years would be too long for someone to be in a job if they did not prove up to the position.	Preference noted.
6	KM	<b>Strong Leader</b> preferred.	Preference noted.
7	AP	<b>Strong Leader</b> preferred.	Preference noted.
8	BG	<b>Strong Leader</b> preferred – inability to remove an Elected Mayor for four years is unsatisfactory.	Preference noted.
9	Spelthorne Labour Party	<b>Strong Leader</b> preferred.	Preference noted.



## REVISED BUILDING CONTROL FEE CHARGING SCHEME

Cabinet: 28 September 2010

Resolution Required

Report of the Assistant Chief Executive

REPORT SUMMARY

### How does the content of this report improve the quality of life of Borough Residents

Building Control provides an essential service to protect the health and safety of residents and improve sustainability through the regulation of the built environment.

### Purpose of Report

To report on a proposed revised building control fee charging scheme following a change in legislation.

### Key Issues

- From 1 October 2010, local authorities will be required to change the way that their building control services charge for their fee-earning work. The new Regulations will require Spelthorne's building control service to specify a fee for each individual application/notice based on the estimated time that officers will spend on processing the application, including checking any plans and undertaking any site visits required.
- In order to calculate these fees it is necessary for each local authority to specify a charging scheme based on an hourly rate for officer time.
- It is proposed that Spelthorne adopt a new scheme of charging for building control fees outlined in [Appendix 1](#).
- In setting such charges we must ensure that our chargeable building control functions are fully self funded. Any surplus must be reinvested in improvements to the service. Any deficit must be recouped through increased fees in future years.

### Financial Implications

- If the proposed charging scheme and hourly rate figure is adopted it is anticipated that the Spelthorne's costs in undertaking its fee-earning building control functions will be recovered.
- It may be necessary to adjust the hourly rate next year based on experience of how the new charging regime operates and taking into account any changes in our costs.

**Corporate Priority:** Underlying principles of value for money/sustainable financial future

### Officer Recommendations

**The Cabinet is asked to approve the proposed charging scheme for building control outlined in Appendix 1, for implementation from 1 October 2010.**

**Report Author: Lee O'Neil Head of Environmental Health and Building Control Services (01784 446377)**

**Area of Responsibility: Liz Borthwick, Assistant Chief Executive, 01784 446376**

**Cabinet member: Councillor Gerry Forsbrey**

## **MAIN REPORT**

### **1. BACKGROUND**

- 1.1 The Building (Local Authority Charges) Regulations 2010 came into force on 1 April 2010 and introduce a new way in which building control (BC) charges are set. The new scheme must be implemented by all local authorities by 1 October 2010.
- 1.2 The way local authority BC charges are currently calculated has numerous limitations. For example, the method of charging for certain building work is primarily based around the link to the estimated costs of the works, which in many cases bears no relevance to the building control input.
- 1.3 The principles of the new charging regime require authorities to ensure that the price charged is an accurate reflection of the costs of carrying out the chargeable building control functions. Local authority BC teams will therefore have to calculate fees based on anticipated work involved in dealing with individual applications and notices, taking into account an hourly rate for professional officer time and the estimated time required to undertake the necessary checks, inspections and administrative work involved. The new regime therefore allows local authorities to adjust the fee to take into account the amount of work and its complexity. The government believe that that by making such changes this will provide more flexibility for local authorities in setting charges, enabling them to be more accurate, fair and transparent.
- 1.4 Local authorities still have the ability to set standard charges where the type of building work enables a fair and accurate estimation of the building control input to be made in advance of a building regulations application.
- 1.5 Local authorities will now also be able to charge for providing substantive 'pre-application' advice (i.e. greater than one hour) relating to the building regulations.
- 1.6 Guidance has been issued by The Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) on how the hourly rate for the new charging scheme should be calculated and a "model" charging scheme has recently been produced by the national LABC organisation.

### **2. KEY ISSUES**

- 2.1 Spelthorne must develop and implement its new building control charging scheme by the 1 October 2010. In doing so, it is essential that the costs of our chargeable building control work are fully recovered under the new regime.
- 2.2 The new regulations confirm that building regulations charges should be set at such a level, and be regularly reviewed, to ensure that our chargeable building control work (checking applications, carrying out site visits on building sites, etc.) is fully self-funded. Guidance continues to suggest that this should be considered over a running three year period.
- 2.3 A condition of the new regulations is that any surplus made under the new scheme should be reinvested into building control with a view to continually improving the service to the end users.
- 2.4 Should the service incur a deficit, this must be covered by the local authority and future charges should then be set with the aim of replenishing the Council's budget in future years.



- 2.5 The non-fee earning statutory duties carried out by building control (e.g. dealing with dangerous structures, demolitions etc.) must still be funded from the Council's budget.
- 2.6 Taking into account the requirements of the new Regulations, together with the guidance outlined in paragraph 1.6, it is proposed that Spelthorne adopt a new scheme of charging for building control as outlined in **Appendix 1**. This scheme is based on an hourly rate for officer time of £74.50, which has been calculated to ensure that our costs will be fully recovered.
- 2.7 Our database supplier, CAPS Uniform, is currently in the process of updating their software with a view to ensuring that Council's will be in a position to introduce the proposed changes from 1 October 2010.

### **3. OPTION ANALYSIS**

- 3.1 The preferred option is for the proposed charging scheme for building control to be approved, for implementation from 1 October 2010.
- 3.2 Cabinet could propose an alternative charging scheme/hourly rate, but if this rate is lower this may not fully cover the costs of the service's fee earning building control work.

### **4. PROPOSAL**

- 4.1 It is proposed that the charging scheme for building control outlined in **Appendix 1** be adopted, for implementation from 1 October 2010.

### **5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 5.1 Provided that the proposed scheme of charging and hourly rate figure is adopted, it is anticipated that the Spelthorne's costs in undertaking its fee-earning building control functions will be recovered.
- 5.2 It may be necessary to adjust this hourly rate next year based on experience of how the new charging regime operates from October 2010 to March 2011, together with any changes in costs, e.g. overhead charges.

### **6. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS / OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

- 6.1 Individual charges must be capable of being substantiated and justified in a transparent manner. Officers have worked closely with our accountant to ensure that our costs have been properly considered in calculating the proposed hourly rate.
- 6.2 If excessive charges are made, this could drive the service's building control customers to other providers, i.e. Approved Inspectors.
- 6.3 Failure to set adequate charges would result in the Council failing to fully recover its costs in undertaking its fee-earning building control work. Although any deficit could potentially be recovered by increasing fees for future years, this could take some time to recoup.
- 6.4 Although our officers have tried to encourage all Surrey LA's to agree a uniform fee structure for the commencement of the new charging regime this was not possible due to objections from a number of Councils. Variations will therefore exist across Surrey and nationally, depending on factors such as differing central costs and staffing numbers. Agreement has been reached, however, that all Surrey building control authorities will adopt standard application forms for building regulation applications. These are currently in development.

6.5 Early indications would suggest that Spelthorne's proposed hourly rate would be in the mid-range of those proposed by a number of other Surrey LA's who have completed their calculations, and slightly above their average hourly rate (£69.70).

## **7. RISKS AND HOW THEY WILL BE MITIGATED**

7.1 Once the new charging regime is introduced the service's income for this work will be closely monitored. As this is a totally new way of charging for our building control work we may have to make some further adjustment of our charging scheme over the next year to ensure that our costs are being fully recovered. This situation is likely to be further complicated by the continued volatility in the housing and commercial development markets which could have an effect on the volume of work received by the building control team.

## **8. TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION**

8.1 The new building control charging regime will become operative from 1 October 2010.

**Report Author: Lee O'Neil Head of Environmental Health and Building Control Services (01784 446377)**

**Background Papers: There are none**

## **CHRISTMAS LIGHTS**

**Cabinet: 28 September 2010**

**Resolution required**

**Report Assistant Chief Executive**

### **REPORT SUMMARY**

#### **How does the content of this report improve the quality of life of Borough Residents**

The provision of lights in Spelthorne provides an enjoyable festive shopping experience for residents of the Borough and visitors to Staines.

#### **Purpose of Report**

To report on the award of the contract for Christmas lighting in Staines and consider the future funding of Christmas lights in the borough.

#### **Key Issues**

The value of the contract is over £75,000. Following standing order procedures, the award of the contract must be reported to Cabinet.

Due to the forecast budget deficit and change in financial circumstances, the Council is looking to reduce its revenue outgoings and look to provide services in a different way. Grant funding of Christmas lights in Ashford, Shepperton and Lower Sunbury.

#### **Financial Implications**

The contract value for Staines is £93,600 for a 3 year lease, payable in equal annual instalments.

Grant funding of £4200 for Christmas lights in Ashford, Shepperton and Lower Sunbury.

**Corporate Priority** 6. Economic Development

#### **Officer Recommendations**

**The Cabinet is asked to authorise the Officers to proceed with option 1.**

**Report Author: Mark Rachwal, Open Spaces and Waste Development Officer, 01784 446440**

**Area of Responsibility: Liz Borthwick, Assistant Chief Executive, 01784 446376**

**Cabinet member: Councillor Gerry Forsbrey**

## MAIN REPORT

### 1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 Expressions of interest were advertised for tendering for a 3 year contract to supply and install Christmas lighting in Staines Town Centre.
- 1.2 Five companies expressed an interest and were all invited to tender. Tenders were received from all of these companies:

Millennium Quest Ltd	Hollingworth Court, Turkey Mill Business Park, Ashford Road, Maidstone, Kent, ME14 5PP
Festive Lighting Company Ltd	Blackmoor, West Buckland, Wellington, Somerset, TA21 9LQ
Gala Lights Ltd	Unit 10, Britannia Business Park, Mills Road, Aylesford, Kent, ME20 7NT
Piggotts Company Ltd	London Road, Stantford Rivers, Ongar, CM5 9PJ
LITE Ltd	Unit 2, Farrington Place, Rossendale Road Industrial Estate, Burnley, Lancashire, BB11 5TY

- 1.3 Tenders were evaluated on the basis of price, quality of scheme (including energy efficiency), environmental management and sustainability, health and safety and references.
- 1.4 Due to the variety of display and decorations available, the tenderers ranked in first and second place were asked to provide a formal presentation of their suggested displays. The tenderers were Piggotts Company Ltd and The Festive Lighting Company Ltd.
- 1.5 The presentations were scored on categories of scheme design, suitability of scheme and installation requirements. The scoring was completed by Councillor Gerry Forsbrey, Cathy Munro (Sustainability and Open Space Manager) and Mark Rachwal (Open Spaces and Waste Development Officer).
- 1.6 The successful tenderer is The Festive Lighting Company Ltd.

### 2. KEY ISSUES

- 2.1 The total value of the contract exceeds £75,000. In accordance with standing order procedure, it has been accepted by the Assistant Chief Executive and the Cabinet Member and is now being reported to Cabinet.
- 2.2 The annual budget for Christmas lighting in Staines is:

Staines town centre	£31,200
---------------------	---------

In addition, in 2010/11 grant funding which to a total of £4200 was made as follows:

Ashford	£1,800
Shepperton	£1,800
Lower Sunbury	£600

The 3 areas also receive a total of an additional £2100 for their administrative costs.

These areas receive a grant from the Council which is given to the respective Chambers of Commerce/traders.

- 2.3 Due to current budget deficit, it has been agreed with the Assistant Chief Executive that officers will contact traders and the relevant chambers of commerce in order to work with them to take over the financial and operational responsibility of Christmas lights.
- 2.4 The 3 year period of the new contract for Staines should ensure a successful phased approach which should minimise any negative publicity.
- 2.5 All local authorities in surrounding areas of Spelthorne have financial responsibility for their main town centre Christmas lights.

### **3. OPTIONS ANALYSIS**

- 3.1 Option 1 – that the proposed 3 year contract for Staines Town Centre is awarded and Cabinet instruct officers to work with Chambers of Commerce and traders in the borough to take the responsibility for Christmas lights. **This is the recommended option.**
- 3.2 Option 2 – the contract is not awarded and the tender withdrawn for Staines Town Centre. The result will be no Christmas lights in Staines Town Centre for this and subsequent years.
- 3.3 Option 3 – all grants for Christmas lights are withdrawn as well the contract for Staines Town Centre.

### **4. PROPOSALS**

- 4.1 The 3 year contract is awarded and Cabinet instruct officers to work with Chambers of Commerce and traders in the borough to take the financial and operational responsibility for Christmas lights.

### **5. BENEFITS AND SUSTAINABILITY**

- 5.1 All lights are LED which means a large reduction in electricity usage.

### **6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 6.1 The contract value for Staines is £91,473.45 for a 3 year lease, payable in annual instalments. This includes supply, installation, turn on and off, annual refurbishment of the decorations and their storage.
- 6.2 The budget available for the 3 year period of the lease is £93,600.
- 6.3 The budget will be sufficient to cover the contract value and any additional costs, such as routine/emergency site attendance.
- 6.4 The 3 year contract ensures that Spelthorne Council receives better value. A shorter period i.e. annual contract would mean a higher annual cost that £31,200.
- 6.5 As the budget has been set for 3 years, savings can be achieved from year 4 onwards.
- 6.6 In 2010/11 the Council has grant funded Ashford and Shepperton Chambers of Commerce and Lower Sunbury Traders a total of £4200 towards Christmas lights.

**7. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS / OTHER CONSIDERATIONS** [Community Strategy, Crime and Disorder, Equality, Diversity and Disability Equality, Freedom of Information, Human Rights, Human Resources, Social Inclusion and Sustainability etc.]

- 7.1 The Council will be tied into a 3 year leasing agreement
- 7.2 The successful tenderer will be expected to ensure that the loading capacity of the street lighting is suitable for the recommended decorations

**8. RISKS AND HOW THEY WILL BE MITIGATED**

- 8.1 The risk is that traders refuse to take responsibility for Christmas lights after the 3 year period.

**9. TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION**

- 9.1 The proposed timetable for Staines for 2010/11 is:

Installation of lights	1-2 November
Lights switched on	15 November (anticipated first late night trading)
Lights switched off	9 January
Deadline for removal of lights	20 January

**Report Author: Mark Rachwal, Open Spaces and Waste Development Officer  
01784 446440**

**Background Papers:**

There are none

## **REPORT SEEKING APPROVAL FOR CAPITAL FUNDING A SALIX PROJECT**

**Cabinet: 28 September 2010**

**Resolution Required**

**Report of the Assistant Chief Executive**

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

#### **How does the content of this report improve the quality of life of Borough Residents**

As a local authority we have an important role to play in helping to deliver Government climate change targets. Demonstrating improvements on how we reduce our own energy use (and associated costs) sets an example to the community we are seeking to influence.

#### **Purpose of Report**

- 1) To seek approval for capital provision to be made for the draught proofing of windows at Knowle Green.

#### **Key Issues**

Salix requires Spelthorne to match fund their contribution. Salix funding could be withdrawn if not spent. The council would, also not be seen to be meeting its obligations as part of the climate change strategy if these projects did not proceed. .

#### **Financial Implications**

The total cost of the overall project will be £43,000.

The Council's existing Salix fund will cover £21,500 and we will also receive additional matched funding of £21,500 from Salix.

This project will deliver an annual saving of £8,116 per annum providing a payback to the Council in less than 5 years (net of Salix grant).

Corporate Priority Environment, Community Engagement, Sustainable Financial Future.

#### **Recommendations**

**Cabinet is asked to agree to approve a net capital contribution of £21,500 (and a gross capital provision of £43,000)**

**Officer recommendation is to proceed with the Salix funded project, draught proofing at Knowle Green.**

**Report Author: Francesca Nesbitt, Climate Change Officer**

**Area of Responsibility: Liz Borthwick, Assistant Chief Executive, Tel: 01784 446376**

**Portfolio Holder: Councillor Gerry Forsbrey**

## MAIN REPORT

### 1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 The UK has passed legislation which introduces the world's first long term legally binding framework to tackle climate change. The Climate Change Act (2008) sets legally binding targets to reduce CO2 emissions in Britain by 80% by 2050, with a 26% to 34% reduction by 2020. This act creates a new approach to managing and responding to climate change in the UK through: setting ambitious targets, taking powers to help achieve them, strengthening the institutional framework, enhancing the UK's ability to adapt to the impact of climate change and establishing clear and regular accountability to the UK.
- 1.2 National Indicator 185 "Percentage CO2 reduction from Local authorities operations" - Spelthorne is in a key position to lead on efforts to reduce CO2 emissions by setting a behavioral and strategic example to the private sector and the communities they serve. Via this indicator we can measure our progress in reducing CO2 emissions from Council buildings and transport. The Council can also demonstrate community leadership on tackling climate change. Reducing CO2 emissions provides opportunities to look at efficiency and therefore achievable savings in utility and fuel costs.
- 1.3 There have been eight completed Salix projects to date at Knowle Green, Whitehouse depot and Tothill MSCP. To reduce electric consumption at Knowle Green and the Depot switch off controls were implemented in 2007. In 2008 energy efficient lighting was installed and also a Voltage Minimiser device (Powerperfector) at Knowle Green and depot. These have all had an impact in reducing carbon emissions and electric usage at Knowle Green by 10%. Recent projects to reduce energy costs and CO2 emissions at Tothill MSCP have been installed successfully with energy consumption being monitored. Please see attached [appendix A](#) Salix past, present and future table of projects including cost and consumption savings.

### 2. KEY ISSUES

- 2.1 Salix is an independent company funded by the Carbon Trust to help improve energy efficiency in public sector buildings. The Salix fund is an interest free loan fund made up of 50% finance from the Carbon Trust and 50% from the participating organisation. Under the Salix scheme up to 25% of the annual savings may be kept by the client and the remaining savings used be recycled to be invested in further energy efficiency projects. Spelthorne is committed to delivering the original targets set in 2006 and requires approval from MAT to continue to progress this programme.
- 2.2 Quattro Seal is a unique draught sealing system for all window types and door hatches. The system is also designed to fill all the peripherals cracks such as frame wall, under sills and exit service pipes, which are a major source of heat loss.
- 2.3 Quattro Seal is a well defined system with methodology and application procedures approved by the Building Research Establishment (BRE). Independently produced performance data produced by the BRE backed demonstrates that for an average UK commercial building Quattro Seal reduces



air leakage by a factor of 54% with typical energy savings of 20% and average pay backs of 36 months.

- 2.4 The economic lifetime of the measure (15 years) has been assessed independently by OFGEM. Quattro Seal is recognised by Salix to be both a quick win and a highly effective energy saving system.

### **3. OPTIONS ANALYSIS**

- 3.1 Option 1 - Not to proceed. If this option is chosen we will not be recognising the value of managing our own energy use to help reduce running costs and to help protect our community from the impacts of climate change.
- 3.2 Option 2 – Approval for Spelthorne’s contribution towards the Salix funded projects of £21,500 for Quattro Seal at Knowle Green project.

### **4. PROPOSALS**

- 4.1 To proceed with Option 2, draught proofing at Knowle Green.

### **5. BENEFITS AND SUSTAINABILITY**

- 5.1 The outcome from this project will be a gas usage reduction estimated at 25% and an estimated annual saving of £8,116. Quattro Seal calculates savings and payback based on their Building Research Establishment (BRE) research and experience.
- 5.2 Additional benefits off draught proofing also include sound insulation and reduction in particulate matter entering the building reducing the amount of cleaning necessary in the offices.
- 5.3 The gross pay back period is 4.8 years (see attached [Appendix B](#)) which after taking account of the Salix 50% grant funding is a net payback of just over 2 years for the council.
- 5.4 Many types of public sector bodies have rolled out this project including St Andrew University [this is not a council – better to refer to public sector bodies] which can be viewed on the Salix website as a case study.
- 5.5 The budget for the gas bill at Knowle Green will be reduced by the estimated annual saving, ie the Knowle Green cost centre will bear the risk that the savings will not be as large as estimated.

### **6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 6.1 The total cost of the overall project will be £43,000.  
The Council’s existing Salix fund will cover £21,500 and we will also receive additional match funding from Salix (£21,500).

### **7. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS / OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

No legal implications.

### **8. RISKS AND HOW THEY WILL BE MITIGATED**

- 8.1 Further work is planned to be carried out with regard to the Stock Condition Survey at Knowle Green but it is unlikely this will mean major replacement of the windows which would affect the pay back period.

8.2 The project will help to add to a better working environment as in a number of areas staff feel drafts from the windows

8.3 However it should also be noted that some areas of the building are too hot so a communications plan will be rolled out explaining that this project is one of many to overcome and maintain heating issues and controls at KG and provide a better working environment.

## **9. TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION**

9.1 The Sustainable Development Board (SDS) have agreed the project and happy for the project to be taken to the next stage. It is hoped works will commence this summer with a completion date of October 2010.

**Report Author: Francesca Nesbitt, Climate Change Officer**

### **Background Papers:**

Appendix A –Salix Project list

Appendix B - Project Analysis