

**TO THE MEMBERS OF SPELTHORNE BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**SUMMONS TO MEETING**

**You are hereby summoned to attend the Meeting of the Council of the Borough of Spelthorne to be held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Knowle Green, Staines on Thursday 13<sup>th</sup> December, 2001, beginning at 7.30pm, for the purpose of transacting the business specified in the Agenda set out on the next page.**

**MICHAEL TAYLOR**  
***Chief Executive***

**Please Note:-**

**EMERGENCY PROCEDURE - THE LIFT MUST NOT BE USED.**

In the event of an emergency the building must be evacuated. All Members and Officers should assemble on the Green adjacent to Broome Lodge. Members of the Public present should accompany the Officers to this point and remain there until the Senior Officer present has accounted for all persons known to be on the premises.

**PUBLIC SPEAKING AT COUNCIL MEETINGS**

**(1) Question Time**

Public "Question Time" at Council meetings is now at the start of meetings. This is an opportunity for any person to ask the Leader of the Council a question about the Council's activities or issues which affect the Borough.

**A written copy of a question from a member of the public must be submitted to the Chief Executive's office before Noon on the day of the meeting.**

**(2) Representations on Recommendations**

When the Council is considering a recommendation made to it by the Executive or a Committee any resident can put forward views on the issues involved by making representations to the Council for three minutes before the Council discusses the recommendation and makes a decision.

**Anyone wishing to make representations on a recommendation must notify the Chief Executive's office before Noon on the day of the meeting.**

## A G E N D A

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

2. MINUTES

To confirm as a correct record the Minutes of the Council Meeting held on 11th October, 2001. **(Attached at APPENDIX 1 [pages 4 to 9] )**

3. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

The Leader or his nominee to answer questions raised by members of the public *(provided questions have been submitted in writing to the Chief Executive's office before Noon on the day of the meeting)*.

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

- (a) Pursuant to Section 94 of the Local Government Act, 1972 and Standing Orders 41(1) and (2), to receive declarations from any Members who have interests in any matters to be considered at this meeting; and
- (b) Pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), to consider inviting Members declaring their interests under (a) above to remain at the meeting during the discussion of the items concerned.

5. MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Mayor to make any announcements.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE

To consider the recommendations of the Executive on the following matters:-  
**(Attached at APPENDIX 2 [page 10] )**

- 1. **Crime and Disorder Delegations**
- 2. **ICT and E-Government Strategy – Progress and Financial Implications – Key Decision**

To consider any recommendations from the meeting of the Executive to be held on 11<sup>th</sup> December, 2001 in relation to the following matters ***[to follow]***:-

- 3. **Council Constitution – Key Decision**  
***Note: [please bring to the meeting your copy of the Council Constitution circulated to all Members under separate cover on 30<sup>th</sup> November.]***

4. **Outline Budget 2002/2003 – 2005/2006 – Key Decision**
5. **Minor Works and Services Programme 2002/2003 – Key Decision**
6. **Capital Programme - 2002/2003 – 2005/2006 – Key Decision**
7. **Council Tax Base for Tax Setting**
8. **Expenditure on Housing Development Programme**
9. **Spelthorne Leisure Centre – Replacement of Floor in Pool and Other Improvement Items – Key Decision**
10. **Sunbury Leisure Centre – Water Treatment Systems – Key Decision**

Note: Members of the public may make representations not exceeding 3 minutes on individual recommendations before they are discussed (*provided notice of their wish to do so has been given to the Chief Executive's office before Noon on the day of the meeting*).

7. RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE STANDARDS COMMITTEE

To consider the recommendations of the Standards Committee on **the Confidential Reporting Code (Whistleblowing Policy)**:- (Attached at **APPENDIX 3 [page 11]** )

8. NOTICE OF MOTIONS

To receive any Notice of Motions submitted under Standing Order 11.

9. REPORT FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE EXECUTIVE

To receive a report from the Leader of the Council on the work of the Executive. (Attached at **APPENDIX 4 [pages 12 to 14]** )

10. REPORTS FROM THE CHAIRMEN OF THE COMMUNITY, ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEES

To receive reports from the Chairmen of the three Overview and Scrutiny Committees on the work of their Committees. (Attached at **APPENDICES 5, 6 and 7 [pages 15 to 25]** )

11. REPORTS FROM THE CHAIRMEN OF THE LICENSING, PLANNING AND STANDARDS COMMITTEES

To receive reports from the Chairmen of the Licensing, Planning and Standards Committees on the work of their Committees. **(Attached at APPENDICES 8, 9 and 10 [pages 26 to 31] )**

12. QUESTIONS ON WARD ISSUES

The Leader or his nominee to answer questions from Members on issues in their Ward *(provided questions have been submitted in writing to the Chief Executive's office before Noon on the day of the meeting)*.

13. GENERAL QUESTIONS

The Leader or his nominee or relevant Committee Chairman to answer questions from Members on matters affecting the Borough or for which their committee has responsibility *(provided questions have been submitted in writing to the Chief Executive's office before Noon on the day of the meeting)*.

14. APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES

**Ashford Relief in Need Charities**

This appointment was deferred by the Council at its meeting on 30<sup>th</sup> October, 2001. To appoint a representative, in place of Mrs. M.N. Merry (deceased), to serve as Nominative Trustee on the Ashford Relief in Need Charities for 4 years until 13th December, 2005.

**St. Mary's C. of E. Junior School, Clare Road, Stanwell**

To appoint a representative to serve on the Governing Body of St. Mary's C. of E. Junior School, Stanwell, until 13th December, 2005.

**Shortwood Infant School, Stanwell New Road, Staines**

To appoint a representative to serve on the Governing Body of Shortwood Infant School, Staines, until 13th December, 2005,

15. URGENT BUSINESS

To consider any urgent business.

16. EXEMPT BUSINESS

To move the exclusion of the press/public for the following item, in view of the likely disclosure of exempt information within the meaning of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972.

17. EXEMPT RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE

- (a) To consider any exempt recommendations from the meeting of the Executive to be held on 11<sup>th</sup> December, 2001 in relation to **Staines Community Centre, Staines – Key Decision (Paragraph 9 – Proposed Terms of a Contract) ( APPENDIX 11 ) [to follow]**
- (b) To answer any questions which relate to exempt business.

[-Council 13/12/01](#)

## MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL EXECUTIVE

11TH OCTOBER, 2001

Present:-

Councillor F. Davies (Chairman of the Executive and the Leader of the Council)

Councillor J.D. Packman (Vice-Chairman and Deputy Leader of the Council and Portfolio holder for Community Safety and Community Liaison;

Councillor E.K. Culnane, Portfolio holder for Elderly Services

Councillor Mrs. D.L. Grant, Portfolio holder for Youth Services;

Councillor E.J. Searancke, Portfolio holder for Environment and Planning;

Councillor R.A. Smith-Ainsley, Portfolio holder for Corporate Services

**\*\*In Attendance:** Councillor M.A. Appleyard, Leader of the Labour Group and Councillor I.J. Beardsmore, Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group

*\*\*[Both Councillors had given prior notice to the Chairman of the Executive that they wished to speak on Staines Community Centre, Staines – Key Decision.]*

### 28. MINUTES

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 2<sup>nd</sup> October, 2001 were confirmed as a correct record.

### 29. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

**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.

### 30. STAINES COMMUNITY CENTRE, STAINES – KEY DECISION (Paragraph 9 – Proposed Terms of a Contract)

*General Exception – Content of the Forward Plan.* A statutory Notice under Regulation 15 (1) (a) of The Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements)(Access to Information)(England) Regulations 2000 had been published on 26<sup>th</sup> September by the Chief Executive to inform the Chairman of the Community Committee that the Executive would be considering a report on Staines Community Centre as a key decision, notice of which had not been published 14 days in advance of the 14th September, 2001, being the start of the Council's current Forward Plan.

*Summary.* The lowest tender received for the construction of the new Staines Community Centre had exceeded the approved budget for the project. An update on the outcome of the analysis of the tenders received for the construction of the new Staines Community Centre was considered together with options for the way forward and the likely completion dates for each option.

*Options.*

- (1) Accept the lowest tender received, subject to the Council approving an increase in the budget to cover the full cost of the scheme as tendered.
- (2) Seek additional tenders for the modular building as specified to achieve a bid closer to the budget for the project.
- (3) Re-tender the project based on a design and build contract for a conventional building.
- (4) Appoint consultants to produce both a detailed design and the tender documents for a conventional building on a build only basis.

*Chosen option and reason.* The Executive felt it desirable in the context of achieving best value to recommend the Council to agree to delay the final decision on the project until tenders for Option 3 above were received.

**RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND** that in view of potential savings from specifying a conventionally constructed building, the contract for the construction of the new Staines Community Centre be re-tendered on a design and build basis (Option 3 in the exempt report of the Director of Community Services) with the final decision on the preferred method of build and the appointment of the successful contractor being delayed until the tenders are received.

*Declarations of Interest.* None

## RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE

### 1. CRIME AND DISORDER DELEGATIONS

1.1 The Executive has considered a report on proposals for changes to Officer Delegations in respect of crime and disorder activities covering action in accordance with the existing Crime and Disorder Strategy and within the Spelthorne Partnership Board's annual budget. The proposals also incorporate any new initiatives, including those covered by Home Office Grant, for example funding for Neighbourhood Wardens in high crime areas. The Executive felt that it was desirable as a matter of good practice to formalise these Officer Delegations.

### 1.2 The Executive recommend that the Council:

- (1) **(1) Agree that powers be delegated to the Chief Executive to take any action in accordance with the 3-year Spelthorne Crime and Disorder Strategy providing it is within the Spelthorne Partnership Board's annual budget; and**
- (2) **(2) Agree that any new initiatives be delegated on a similar basis, but in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Community Safety and also on the basis that reports be made to the Executive if any additional financial support is required.**

### 2. ICT AND E-GOVERNMENT STRATEGY – PROGRESS AND FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS – KEY DECISION

2.1 The Executive has discussed a report on progress made with the implementation of the Council's Information and Communications Technology (ICT) and Electronic Government Strategy and has considered the financial implications for current and future Capital and Revenue budgets. There is statutory requirement for this Council to implement its ICT in accordance with the E-Government Strategy Statement endorsed by the Executive earlier this year and then submitted to and approved by the DTLR.

### 2.2 The Executive recommend that the Council:

**Approve a Supplementary Capital Estimate of £42,000 to finance the balance over budget of the anticipated ICT Capital requirements for the remainder of 2001/2002.**

COUNCILLOR FRANK DAVIES

*Chairman of the Executive*  
**2001**

**13th December,**



## RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE STANDARDS COMMITTEE

### 1. CONFIDENTIAL REPORTING CODE (WHISTLEBLOWING POLICY)

- 1.1 The Standards Committee considered a report from the Monitoring Officer on the need to make minor procedural changes to the Council's Confidential Reporting Code. The Committee noted that the code was introduced in early 1999 and since that time no changes had been. The first change proposed is to amend the introduction so there is a specific reference to the Public Interest Disclosure Act 1998, which is the statutory basis behind the code. The second change is to reflect the Councils' new Executive arrangements and the fact that the Standards Committee has now been appointed.
- 1.2 The Committee felt that these changes would provide a good opportunity to remind the staff of the existence of the code.

### 1.3 The Standards Committee recommend that Council:

**Approve the following procedural changes being made to the Council's Confidential Reporting Code:**

- (a) **Paragraph 1 – Introduction – be amended to make specific reference to the Public Interest Disclosure Act 1998;**
- (b) **Paragraph 7.6 – How To Raise Concerns – be amended:**
- i) **to refer to the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Standards Committee as possible contact points for staff rather than the Chairman of the Review and Scrutiny Committee; and**
  - ii) **to make it clear that the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Standards Committee are non councillors and that the Committee have a specific role in enhancing probity.**

Murray Litvak  
*Chairman of the Standards Committee*  
**2001**

**13th December,**

[-Council 13/12/01](#)

## **REPORT OF THE LEADER ON THE WORK OF THE EXECUTIVE**

The Executive has met twice since the last Council meeting and this is an overview of the main items considered. We have made recommendations to the Council on various issues and these appear separately on tonight's agenda.

I set out below a brief summary of some of the significant issues we have been discussing.

### **MODERNISATION AND ICT ISSUES**

**Forward Plan** – We have noted the updated Forward Plan of Key Decisions to be taken by the Executive for the period 1<sup>st</sup> November, 2001 to 28th February, 2002.

**Document Image Processing and Workflow System – Key Decision** – We have approved Comino plc as the preferred supplier for the Council's Document Image Processing and Workflow System, which initially will be implemented in the Revenues and Benefits Section, and have agreed the IT Capital costs of £112,000 for the provision of hardware, software and the Comino implementation work.

### **COMMUNITY SAFETY ISSUES**

#### **Crime and Disorder Issues –**

We have noted the outcome of the Audit of Crime and Disorder in the Borough and the issues emerging, in particular issues / incidents in Borough Parks. We have agreed that the Crime Audit and Survey findings be used as the basis for public consultation towards the development of the Spelthorne Crime and Disorder Reduction Strategy 2002 – 2005 to be considered by the Executive in March 2002. We have endorsed the holding of a Seminar for all Members at Knowle Green in the early part of 2002 to receive feedback on the various consultations and to consider future key priorities and targets and any financial implications.

We have also agreed that in the context of developing a drugs strategy the Council-owned premises in Thames Street, Staines will continue to be used for community drug support purposes, as part of the Spelthorne Crime and Disorder Reduction Strategy. We have supported the recent bid for Home Office funding of £70,000 for 2 Neighbourhood Wardens for Stanwell and Sunbury Common, respectively.

In addition, we have approved a Supplementary Estimate of £25,000 to cover the cost of reinstating Security Patrols for Borough Parks for the remainder of the current financial year. The overall report on Issues in Borough Parks to be considered by the Executive in January 2002 will include details of the monitoring by the Officers of the effectiveness of the Security Patrols for Borough Parks.

### **STAINES TOWN CENTRE ISSUES**

**High Street, Staines – Pedestrianisation – Key Decision** – We have accepted the lowest tender submitted by Carillion in the sum of £1,264,415.10 for the construction of the High Street, Staines Pedestrianisation Scheme. We agreed that the total cost of the scheme of approximately £1.6 million would be financed by the New Schemes Fund budget of £925,000, together with the contribution of £675,000 from Surrey County Council.

## **ARTS, LEISURE AND RECREATION ISSUES**

**Sunbury Millennium Embroidery – Application for a Capital Partnership Grant** – We have awarded a Capital Partnership Grant of £42,000 to the Sunbury Millennium Embroidery Fundraising Committee, subject to the three main conditions recommended by the Director of Community Services in his report.

## **FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO LOCAL ORGANISATIONS**

**Applications for Grant Aid** – We have awarded a grant of £1,800 to Staines Brass Band from the Lotteries Fund towards the cost of the Band competing in the National Brass Bands Competition recently held in Preston. We also supported the application from the 2<sup>nd</sup> Ashford Scouts Group and authorised the Director of Community Services, in consultation with myself as Chairman, to approve immediate grant aid to fund repairs to the building to make it secure; to provide new heating units within the building; and to cover rental payments. The Group's request for further grant aid to fund other security works like floodlights will be considered in the context of the overall report to the Executive in January on Issues in Parks.

## **HOUSING AND COMMUNITY CARE HOUSING ISSUES**

**Supporting People Commissioning Body – Key Decision** – We have noted the current progress towards Spelthorne implementing the Government's Supporting People arrangements in Surrey and have nominated Councillor Ted Culnane, the Portfolio holder for Adult and Elderly Services, and Mr. Ian Murray, the Head of Housing and Community Care Services for appointment as the standing Spelthorne Borough Council members of the Surrey Supporting People Advisory Group.

**Standard Nominations Agreements** – We have considered proposals, which will facilitate the effective management of nominations in future. We have agreed that a fresh nomination agreement be entered into with Activity Housing Association in relation to Nos. 5 and 6 Vibia Close, Stanwell to secure nomination rights to the Council. We have confirmed that in all cases where the Council supports social housing through social housing grant or secures it through planning agreements, the Council will require nomination rights to 100% of first lettings and 75% of relets, and have authorised the Director of Community Services to approve and enter into any agreements necessary to secure this, including fresh agreements following any transfer of ownership of properties between social landlords.

**Supplementary Estimate – Bed and Breakfast Accommodation** – We noted that an increase in the budget for Bed and Breakfast was needed to take account of the current trend of rising costs and agreed a Supplementary Estimate of £77,400 for 2001/2002 to increase the budget from £162,590 to £239,990. We agreed that further consideration would be given, as part of the Council's Best Value Review of Housing, to the causes of the increase in Bed and Breakfast costs and to the long-term financial implications of reducing the problem.

## **HIGHWAYS ISSUES**

**Tothill Car Park, Staines – Key Decision** - We have considered the options for refurbishing the Tothill Car Park and for the way forward. We have supported, in principle, the option of undertaking essential maintenance, plus full improvements and the installation of CCTV to achieve secure by design status, plus exploring the options for making improvements to the access and signing. The full refurbishment cost would be £704,000 and the installation of

CCTV would be at a capital cost of £100,000. We have agreed that before any refurbishment takes place, consideration should be given, as part of the Council's Best Value Review of Car Parks, to various issues including the development potential of the Car Park and potential partnership arrangements with the private sector.

COUNCILLOR FRANK DAVIES

*Chairman of the Executive*

**13<sup>th</sup> December, 2001**

[-Council 13/12/01](#)

## **REPORT OF THE CHAIRMAN ON THE WORK OF THE COMMUNITY COMMITTEE**

The Community Committee met on 8<sup>th</sup> November 2001 to consider the Monitoring of the Leisure Centres Management Contract as part of the Committee's ongoing review.

The Committee met at the Sunbury Leisure Centre and was given a tour of the premises and its facilities.

The meeting itself was held at Sunbury Manor School and I would like to thank the School for making accommodation available for us.

The Head of Leisure Services gave a presentation on the Client Contractor Split. She outlined how the Contract worked, beginning in the late 1980s when the Council tendered the Leisure Centre's management under the then regulations for Compulsory Competitive Tendering. The Council's policy for the management of both Spelthorne and Sunbury Centres had been contained in the contract documents and embodied in the management contract, which had been awarded to Sports and Leisure Management. (SLM)

The Council is responsible for the external fabric of the building, glazing, programming, car parks and grounds maintenance and SLM is responsible for management and day-to-day operation of the two Centres, the internal decoration, staffing and cleaning. The Council undertakes joint capital investment projects as well as partnership projects, with capital investment from SLM, which involves profit sharing. In addition, the Council and SLM also undertake advertising on a partnership basis.

The Council's Leisure Client Officer explained that he worked with the Area Manager of SLM, who was based at Spelthorne, and the Sunbury Leisure Centre Manager, on a day-to-day basis including investigating complaints from the public. He also carried out inspections of the Leisure Centres on a regular basis as well as unannounced visits.

SLM had set up a customer forum at the Spelthorne Leisure Centre, which had been running successfully for some years. A similar forum has now been established for Sunbury Leisure Centre. These fora share information and provide useful feedback from customers, the Council and SLM on all aspects of the Centres and their programmes.

The Council's Leisure Development Manager explained that a number of projects were being undertaken to improve both Leisure Centres. Currently, Sunbury Leisure Centre was awaiting an improvement to the lighting in the car park, which was due to be started any day. The climbing wall was due to be enhanced in May 2002 and there was a need to look at upgrading the pool plant equipment.

The Council works closely with SLM to develop both services and facilities, an example being the fitness suite at Spelthorne.

The total assets of both Leisure Centres amounts to around £100 million and the Council has to protect such assets through maintenance of the buildings and updating of equipment, responding to changes in leisure activities and by investment in the buildings and long-term development.

The Council are currently looking at both Centres in terms of energy efficiency savings and other Agenda 21 issues. Most of the energy consumed by the Leisure Centres involves heating the water for the swimming pools. In common with most other Leisure Centres,

Spelthorne is looking at increasing the effectiveness of the use of energy for this purpose and reducing inefficiency.

As part of the Borough's new Culture and Leisure Strategy there is a need to look at Stanwell and develop a strategy to increase the area's access to sport and leisure facilities, as Stanwell has a significantly lower participation rate in leisure activities compared to other parts of the Borough.

The Area Manager of SLM had been appointed at the beginning of September and with reference to the Sunbury Leisure Centre stated that he and the Manager of Sunbury Leisure Centre had developed and were continuing to develop a very positive relationship with the new Head Teacher of Sunbury Manor School, Louise Duncan.

He highlighted those issues that had previously been raised by Members, such as staff recruitment and retention, access control at the Spelthorne Leisure Centre and building presentation.

He then went on to outline what action had been taken to overcome the problems which had been identified.

As far as staffing issues were concerned, SLM had achieved reaccreditation in Investors in People. An NVQ programme had been initiated at Spelthorne Leisure Centre for lifeguards and this would be extended to other areas of work. It was the intention to use training programmes in conjunction with staffing structures that would create clear progression for staff. This structure together with enhanced salaries, had helped to boost morale and improve cohesion and motivation.

To improve building presentation, SLM has introduced dedicated cleaning teams, improved standards of cleanliness, with more consistent levels of cleanliness, which in turn has led to fewer complaints.

Improvements to buildings include refurbishment of the reception area at Sunbury Leisure Centre, improved car parking, the introduction of information zones and the resurfacing of squash courts at Spelthorne. Water quality and levels have improved and water features at Spelthorne are now operational. As a result Membership has increased and feedback from Customer Fora has been more positive.

Access control at Spelthorne has been improved with the installation of new turnstiles. Whilst these are not yet fully operational, staff feel more secure and the public cannot gain access without proper supervision. There is less vandalism and income is likely to increase as a result.

New classes have been set up. The wet side is strong but the dry side is capable of further development.

In response to a question from a Member about the GP referral scheme, SLM explained that this scheme had recently been upgraded and relaunched and was a successful part of Spelthorne Leisure Centre's varied programme and that it would be part of the Council and SLM's joint promotion policy.

A member asked what effect the opening of Holmes Place had had on Spelthorne Leisure Centre.

SLM explained that this was a smaller operation targeted at different clientele, with more upmarket and self-motivating customers. The operation of Spelthorne Leisure Centre was far more complex.

SLM intend to undertake more market research and surveys to establish the leisure needs of their customers but feel that there is room in the market for such differing types of leisure provision.

In response to a Member, SLM explained that the number of hours for cleaning had been increased for Spelthorne and the dedicated cleaning teams operated across 15 hours per day. There were 7 checks on the cleanliness of toilets per day, 5 of which were documented and listed in the toilets themselves.

A Member referred to a previous statement that Stanwell residents' use of leisure facilities is less than the remaining areas of the Borough and asked what was being done to address the problem. The Leisure Development Manager indicated that as part of the Council's new Culture and Leisure Strategy, the matter would be looked at within the next 2/3 years.

As Chairman of the Committee, I received an e-mail complaining about the policy on employment of instructors who wished to work at other establishments, such as Holmes Place, whilst in the employment of SLM. In response, the Area Manager of SLM undertook to investigate the matter, but as the situation had only recently occurred SLM did not have a formal policy on this matter. He further stated that it was necessary to work with Holmes Place as a Leisure provider for the area.

I would like to draw Members' attention to the fact that this e-mail was also extremely complimentary about the service and standards of provision at Spelthorne Leisure Centre.

In reply to a question from a Member on recruitment and retention, SLM stated that this had been stable for the last 8 months, following the improvement in training, structure and enhanced salaries.

As regards the involvement of the Leisure Centres in the Best Value review process, the Committee was advised that the Centres have just carried out a survey as part of the Council's Best Value review, using Best Value Sport England performance indicators and these are being analysed.

The Council's Leisure Development Manager confirmed that most of the complaints about Spelthorne Leisure Centre related to cleanliness but these were progressively reducing following the Centre's employment of dedicated cleaning teams throughout the day. He was also receiving positive feedback from customers on suggestions for developing existing or providing new services.

Members were also informed that the nursery, which had been built on land adjoining the Leisure Centre was a separate entity but provided a service to users of the Leisure Centre.

I wish to thank the representatives from SLM and Officers for attending the meeting and for their contributions to the discussions with Members.

## **Issues For Future Meetings**

The following items were requested by Members of the Committee to be included in our work programme for the future.

1. The work of Community Health Councils
2. Shepperton Health Centre update; and

Councillor Mrs P. A. Smith asked for the subject of day centres to be brought before the Committee at the earliest opportunity.

Councillor George Trussler  
*Chairman of the Community Committee*

**13th December, 2001.**

[-Council 13/12/01](#)



## **REPORT OF THE CHAIRMAN ON THE WORK OF THE ECONOMIC COMMITTEE**

**The Economic Committee has met once since the last Council meeting and this report gives an overview of the issues we considered.**

Due to the nature of the items being considered at this meeting I invited all members of the Executive to attend the meeting to participate in the discussion and raise questions on the External Auditor's Management Letter. In addition to this I invited the Leader of the Council as Chairman of the Executive to give the Committee an indication of the Executive's approach to next year's budget and to assist the Committee in its discussions on this.

### **1. EXTERNAL AUDITOR'S MANAGEMENT LETTER**

- 1.1. Andrew Lovett from the Council's external Auditors, HLB Kidsons attended the meeting to give a talk on the annual auditor's letter for 2000/2001.
- 1.2. He made reference to three notable achievements which demonstrated the Council's successes and the effectiveness of our policies and management arrangements namely:
  - (a) The substantial progress made in implementing the new executive management arrangements, which is well in advance of the statutory deadline of May 2002;
  - (b) Achieving beacon status for services for care of the elderly;
  - (c) The good progress made with other bodies working in Spelthorne through the Local Strategic Partnership, which is developing the community strategy.
- 1.3. The Committee was pleased to note that an unqualified opinion had been issued on the Council's financial statements and that the financial outlook remained healthy.
- 1.4. The Committee asked the Executive to note that the Auditor's Management Letter had been very positive and complementary towards the effective management arrangements we have in place.

### **2. PERFORMANCE INDICATORS 2000/2001**

- 2.1. The Committee looked at the audited Performance Indicators for the financial year 2000/2001 with comparisons for 1998/99 and 1999/00, where this was possible. The indicators particularly noted by the Committee were those set out under the general headings of Corporate Health and Housing Benefits.

### **3. OUTLINE BUDGET 2002/2003 – 2005/2006**

- 3.1. The Committee in considering details of the revenue expenditure and financing projections for the four-year period ending on 31<sup>st</sup> March 2006 received a presentation from the Director of Resources. The presentation identified an increasing budgeting deficit over the Outline Budget period and set out the reasons for this. It also identified options available for reducing the deficit for next year, which was projected at £648,000. These possible options included reductions in service expenditure, increasing income, efficiency savings, a council tax increase above inflation and the increased use of revenue reserves.
- 3.2. The Committee discussed the main reasons why the projected deficit had increased substantially from last year and noted that this was mainly due to

housing benefit costs, increased insurance premiums and the increased costs of introducing new IT.

- 3.3. The Committee noted the annual revenue support grant settlement would not be announced until 4<sup>th</sup> December, but were advised that the level of settlement for Spelthorne should be in the region of 2½% higher than this years figures.
- 3.4. The Committee have recommended to the Executive the approach to the budget outlined in Appendix B to the report of the Director of Resources which basically suggested that:
- (a) there be no reduction in expenditure;
  - (b) expenditure slippage in the region of £250,000 be allowed for;
  - (c) the Council tax be increased by 5%, which would raise an additional income of approximately £100,000; and
  - (d) the temporary increase in use of reserves be supported.

In addition to the above the Committee agreed that:

- (e) a further review of all significant income budgets be carried out with a view to raising further income from fees and charges.

#### **4 MINOR WORKS AND SERVICES PROGRAMME 2002/2003**

- 4.1. The Committee discussed bids for one off schemes to be funded under the Minor Works and Services Programme for 2002/2003. The Committee have requested that the 13 schemes identified by 8 Councillors be assessed for feasibility and costed prior to a decision being made.
- 4.2. The total value of schemes submitted by officers is £168,650 which is within the proposed outline budget of £182,050.
- 4.3. The Committee agreed to recommend to the Executive that the programme be supported subject to only 10 of the 19 Notice Boards being renewed next year and the suggested allocation of £40,000 for the felling of dead and dying trees being removed from the programme.

#### **5. CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2002/2003 – 2005/2006**

- 5.1. The Committee considered a proposed Capital Programme for the years 2002/2003 to 2005/2006, which covered the Housing Investment Programme, Other Services and the New Schemes Fund.
- 5.2. The Committee agreed to recommend the Executive to support the Capital Programme submitted.

#### **6. GENERAL FUND BUDGET MONITORING FOR APRIL TO SEPTEMBER 2001**

- 6.1. The Committee discussed the current position of actual expenditure against the original budget for the period April to September 2001 and noted that there appeared at this stage to be a potential overspend of £66,627, but that it was too early in the year for this to be meaningful.
- 6.2. In addition, and for the first time, the Committee received details of the monitoring of capital expenditure to the end of October. The details gave an indication of the status of the schemes and showed that 53% of the budget had been spent to date, which is roughly on target.

#### **7. FEES AND CHARGES REVIEW – COLLECTION OF SMALL AMOUNTS**

- 7.1. The Committee had previously asked for the outcome of an internal review of the cost effectiveness of collecting small amounts of income to be reported. The main concern was the cost of raising low value invoices. We received a progress report on the review and agreed that the final outcome be reported to the Committee in January.

## **8. STAFF SALARY ISSUES**

- 8.1. The Committee considered a report showing staff related efficiency savings made since 1990 and a comparison of the salary budget as a proportion of the total Council budget in 1990 and 2001. We were pleased to note that considerable savings had been made and salaries now represented 23% of gross expenditure as against 36% in 1990/91. We also noted that the number of full time staff excluding manual workers in 1990 was 394.7 compared with 263.10 in 2001, although these figures were affected by major factors such as the sale of our housing stock.

## **9. ISSUES FOR INVESTIGATION**

- 9.1 The Committee have agreed that it would be desirable to look in depth at what could be done to address the increasing costs of insurance, increasing amounts of housing benefit costs, which cannot be recovered and more radical ways of addressing the projected budget deficit for future years. The Committee agreed that a small Working Group involving myself, Councillor Hermes and Councillor Mrs Weston and the appropriate Portfolio Holders should look into these issues.
- 9.2. Councillor Stubbs suggested that at some stage we should look into what, if any, budget savings had been achieved since Members' IT had been introduced. Councillor James has asked for information to be provided about the cost of providing Meals on Wheels and the criteria used as to who should be supplied with meals and the costs associated with Spelride.

## **10. MEMBERS DEVELOPMENT**

- 10.1. I would like to take this opportunity to report on the findings of the Members Development Working Group, which looked at a range of initiatives to help Members fulfil their role and responsibilities under the new political management arrangements through a revised approach to Member Development.
- 10.2 The Working Group which also involved the Portfolio Holder for Corporate Services, Councillor R.A. Smith-Ainsley met on two occasions and prepared a report for the Executive to consider at its meeting on 11<sup>th</sup> December, 2001.
- 10.3. The report specifically recommended a revised approach to Councillors induction, closer communication channels between Members and Officers and a Member Development Task Group.

Councillor Mrs Martine Hyams

*Chairman of the Economic Committee*

**13th December, 2001**

[-Council 13/12/01](#)

## **REPORT OF THE CHAIRMAN ON THE WORK OF THE ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE**

The Environment Committee met on the 15<sup>th</sup> November, 2001, to consider issues that had been raised as a result of discussion at our last meeting in September which give rise to concern to Members and the residents of Spelthorne, on abandoned vehicles, cleansing, fly-tipping, litter and graffiti.

As well as the Officers of the Borough Council who are responsible for dealing with such matters, we welcomed Bob Stranks, Head of Surrey's Waste Management, to the meeting and I would like to thank him for his attendance as well as participation.

The Committee was informed that arising from its recommendations at its last meeting; the Executive had appointed myself to serve on the Surrey Travellers and Community Forum; that a letter had been sent to DTLR to seek clarification of Government policy on invasion and occupation of both public and private land by travellers and the problems experienced by residents and costs incurred in cleansing land following occupation; and that Surrey Trading Standards had supplied a range of leaflets which would be made available from the Council's main entrance foyer and had agreed to write an article for inclusion in the next Borough Bulletin.

The Head of Engineering (Client Services) explained that the Council's powers derived from the Public Health Act 1875. There had been an attempt in 1974 to standardise the approach of Local Authorities to the problems of litter, cleansing and waste disposal but this had not been completely successful.

The Environmental Protection Act 1990 had set standards to keep areas free from litter involving the frequency of clearance. The intention of the 1990 EPA had been to set standards which the public could understand by zoning land and setting a frequency for cleansing. Town Centres were zoned as 1, dense residential 2 and urban residential 3. In general terms, zone 1 areas needed to be continually swept with zone 3 returned to a litter free status every two weeks or so. In Spelthorne the frequency for cleansing meant that Town Centres were swept on a continual basis Monday to Friday with cleans on Saturday and Sunday. All residential roads were litter picked and cleansed monthly and footways were swept every 12 weeks.

To cater for littering between cleans the Council had a rapid response squad during working hours and for emergencies 24 hours a day.

Fly-tipping is defined as being as little as a plastic bag of rubbish up to a load of 8 cubic yards or more. Spelthorne aims to remove all fly tips within 48 working hours. However, the Council is not responsible for those areas which are not defined as public highways and does not clear private or communal pathways.

Spelthorne clears 4000 tonnes of litter per year from its highways excluding the M25 motorway but including the A30. It has been estimated that if a regular cleansing procedure were not carried out then litter would accumulate, over a period of a year, to a depth of 6 inches on all the Borough's roads.

The budget for this cleansing is £1 million for highways plus another £100,000 for parks and open spaces. Of the total figure, around £50,000 - £75,000 deals with fly tips from the highways, parks and open spaces. Litter volumes in Spelthorne are greater than other Surrey districts but the volume of traffic is greater and more comparable with the London Boroughs.

The Officer responsible for dealing with abandoned vehicles within the Borough then explained that under the Civic Amenities Act and the Environmental Protection Act 1990, District Councils were responsible for the collection of abandoned vehicles, which included trailers and anything attached, from any public highway, footpath or bridleway. The County Council had a responsibility for disposing of the vehicles.

In 1999 Local Authorities dealt with 120,000 abandoned vehicles at an estimated cost of £33m for recovery, storage, disposal, DVLA enquiries and administration costs. In the year ending April 2001, Spelthorne removed 596 vehicles at a gross collection cost of £14,900, which did not include officer time etc.

The County Council gave a "disposal credit" of £14.57 per vehicle amounting to £8,683.72. Most of the vehicles dealt with had reached the end of their useful life.

*Of the 596 vehicles removed in Spelthorne, 114 had been burned out and 280 had been stripped prior to removal. A recent habit was to fill the vehicle with garden rubbish, which had to be dealt with before removal and involved additional costs. The number of vehicles to be removed during the current year was expected to approach the 1,000 mark. Where a vehicle appeared to have some value it had to be kept in storage for one month before disposal and of this category very few were ever reclaimed.*

From the point of notification it is the policy of the Council to remove abandoned vehicles as quickly as possible, subject to the statutory requirement of giving Notice of seven days before removal and the availability of the contractor to carry out the work.

The Assistant Chief Executive circulated a consultation document on Abandoned Vehicles to Members at the meeting and suggested that the Committee might wish to discuss this following the conclusion of the Officers' presentations.

We then turned to the problem of graffiti and the Head of Contract Services explained the Council's response.

*In 1993 the DSO gained a budget of £5,000 to remove offensive graffiti from walls, fences and other structures on or adjacent to the highway, excluding statutory undertakers boxes. Most of these areas were not in the ownership or under the control of Spelthorne.*

*Increasing problems were being experienced in parks with graffiti, particularly on children's play areas.*

*Most graffiti was carried out on private property and the Council tried to encourage owners to remove it and offered advice and information by way of assistance. However, the response from statutory undertakers was negative as they had no provision in their budgets for removing graffiti nor did they feel that it was their civic duty to do so.*

*Under the Council's fear of crime strategy, a policy on graffiti was being drawn up and estimates had been sought from the DSO to provide an instant response unit, which would cost in the region of £40,000 per annum.*

*Currently the response time was 48 hours and in most cases this was possible but subject to the use and availability of contractors.*

*The Assistant Chief Executive reported on a DEFRA circular outlining problems associated with the collection and disposal of refrigerators, carried out by Local Authorities as part of*

*their waste disposal function, and the subsequent removal of gas and insulation foam containing CFCs. The Head of Waste Management at Surrey County Council, (SCC) commented that this would pose a real problem, as in Surrey 3-4,000 fridges were discarded every year*

*He stated that all the issues that had been touched on by the previous speakers involved a number of agencies in the waste disposal process. Part of his function was to encourage joint working between these agencies to provide higher standards and better service for customers. He was working towards the development of a joint strategy for waste disposal in Surrey and to move forward cooperatively and collectively.*

*A Surrey Waste Management task group had been set up to consider and reflect the views of those authorities that had a duty for disposal.*

*Members raised the question of the Charlton Lane plant, which is a magnet for fly tipping and the charging policy, which has encouraged fly tipping rather than disposal through the proper channels. The Head of Waste Management at SCC explained that the charging policy was not the responsibility of Surrey County Council but that of Surrey Waste Management. Whilst the County Council accepted and made provision for the disposal of household waste it had no duty to receive industrial waste. Unfortunately there were a number of unscrupulous commercial companies who actively avoided carriers licensing regulations and incurring charges for disposal of industrial waste materials, by fly tipping.*

*Members reiterated their view that since the introduction of charges for disposal of trade waste, these costs are being incurred by Spelthorne in disposing of material that has been fly tipped. The Head of Waste Management at SCC stated that the County Council was not able to dispose of trade waste free of charge and that since 1999 such charges had been the responsibility of Surrey Waste Management. The disposal of household waste was paid for by precept. The Government had introduced a landfill tax as an incentive to recycle more material and because the country was running out of landfill sites and this increased the costs to all those involved in waste disposal.*

*A Member asked who was responsible for the area in the immediate vicinity of Charlton Lane and the Head of Waste Management responded that the contractor was responsible for minimising such incidents. He further stated that the Government had carried out consultation on fly tipping and through this, Local Authorities had sought an extension of the EPA to check on carriers of Trade Waste. However, the Government decided not to grant these powers to waste collection authorities.*

*He concluded by saying that Surrey University had carried out a comprehensive survey of Surrey residents seeking their views on what they thought of waste disposal facilities in Surrey. So far an analysis had shown over 90% satisfaction with existing facilities. The results of the survey were available to Spelthorne.*

*In response to a question from a Member as to why the cost of disposing of abandoned vehicles could not be recovered from recycling, the officer responsible for abandoned vehicles explained that traditionally an "end of life vehicle" had some value in its metals and replacement parts content however, this had changed. Metal prices had collapsed in world markets, de-pollution of vehicles cost more than ever, used tyres were previously an income and tyre disposal now costs £3.50 per vehicle (+ labour).*

*Even if there were facilities where cars could be taken to be disposed of this would not prove a realistic solution as most abandoned vehicles are “end of life”, and people dump them anywhere.*

*An amnesty on abandoned vehicles whereby they were collected from the owner’s home had been tried in the past but had not proved successful. In future it would be necessary to look at innovative ways of dealing with this problem, as current methods were not working.*

*A Member asked about composting and the Head of Waste Management at SCC stated that there would be a facility for composting of green waste at Charlton Lane from next April.*

*In response to a Member’s question about the removal of abandoned vehicles within 24 hours it was stated that contractors would have to be used and this was likely to be too expensive*

*At the conclusion of the presentations and discussions on the matters detailed above, the Committee agreed*

- 1. to express its concern at the increase in graffiti throughout the Borough and urges the Executive to provide means of funding its rapid removal, when considering the Crime and Disorder Strategy for Spelthorne.*
- 2. that a report and presentation be made to a future meeting of this Committee on the use and location of recycling sites.*
- 3. that a report be brought to the next meeting of this Committee on the Government consultation document on abandoned vehicles, with a view to formulating a response and that the appropriate portfolio be invited to attend the meeting.*

Councillor Gerry Forsbrey  
Chairman of the Environment Committee

**13th December, 2001**

[-Council 13/12/01](#)

## **REPORT OF THE CHAIRMAN ON THE WORK OF THE LICENSING COMMITTEE**

The Licensing Committee has met on four occasions since the last Council meeting these being 22<sup>nd</sup> and 29<sup>th</sup> October, and 6<sup>th</sup> and 28<sup>th</sup> November, 2001 and has considered the following applications

### **Applications For A Licence To Drive A Private Hire Vehicle**

*On the 22<sup>nd</sup> October the Committee considered two applications for Licences to drive Private Hire Vehicles.*

In the case of Mr M. Bolds the Committee believed that it could not issue a Licence on the grounds of unsatisfactory references and relevant conviction and the objection of the Police. However, the Committee advised the applicant that this did not preclude any applicant from reapplying, subject to their observing the provision of Spelthorne Borough Council's policy on reapplication.

In the second of the two cases the Committee decided to grant a Licence to Mr. S. Khan, but advised him that his Private Hire Drivers Licence might be in jeopardy if he was found guilty of any further criminal offence. In that event the matter would immediately be placed before the Licensing Committee, which could either revoke or suspend his Licence.

### **Application For A Renewal Of The Existing Public Entertainment Licence – The Cock Inn, 46 Church Street, Staines, Middlesex – Objections To The Grant Of A Licence**

On 29<sup>th</sup> October the Committee considered an application in respect of the Cock Inn for a renewal with no change in conditions from previous years.

The Cock Inn had been first licensed for public entertainment, in 1995. The initial application led to a petition objection with five names from local residents. The previous licence had been granted with conditions attached to the licence including the number of persons to be admitted to not exceed 80 and the entertainment not to terminate any later than 11pm. The licence had been renewed each year since 1995 and there had been no further objections to its renewal prior to this year's application.

In considering this application, the Committee heard and considered evidence and submissions from the Applicant, his witnesses and the concerns of the objector and his witness in this matter. It also considered the objections of residents as set out in their letters and taken into account the observations of the Surrey Police and Surrey Fire and Rescue Services.

The Committee considered the suitability of the applicant and on the evidence presented, with no incidents having been reported to or by the Head of Environmental Health Services and the Police, his previous track record, eight letters of support, the evidence of his character witnesses and the comments of the objectors, considered him to be a fit and proper person to hold such Licence.

The Committee considered the objections of the objector and his witness and believed that the conditions suggested to control noise from the public entertainment itself would satisfy the concerns of the objectors.



We expressed concern about the accountability of staff and management and control of the premises during licensable Public Entertainment events and noted the applicant's willingness to agree that either the Manager or Deputy Manager should be on duty and available during all such events.

From the evidence presented it was clear that the applicant did not keep any record of disturbances or requests to the Police for assistance. Therefore the Committee felt that a proper register should be kept and made available for inspection for this purpose.

The request from Surrey Police for the inclusion of a condition that would require the applicant to work with them to address crime and disorder concerns and issues affecting use of the premises and the late request for installation of CCTV were noted, together with the applicants willingness to comply with these requests. However, the condition regarding CCTV, being a late request by Surrey Police, was felt to be one that should be for the Applicant and Surrey Police to address by negotiation.

The Committee noted that the Applicant was agreeable to fostering good relations with his neighbours and was agreeable to further conditions being imposed on any licence if the Committee were minded to grant this licence.

The Committee therefore decided to grant a renewal of the public entertainment licence subject to conditions.

### **Application For A Licence To Drive A Private Hire Vehicle**

On 6<sup>th</sup> November the Committee again met to consider three more applications for licences to drive a private hire vehicle.

In considering the application from Mr. G. Gilliland, the Committee listened to the evidence before it and considered the comments of the Police and noted the references from his employers.

On this occasion the Committee decided to grant a Licence but that the applicant be advised that his Private Hire Drivers Licence might be in jeopardy if he was found guilty of any further criminal offence. In that event the matter would immediately be placed before the Licensing Committee, which could either revoke or suspend his Licence.

In the case of Mr M. Holmes the Committee considered the evidence before it and listened to the comments of the Police. Whilst taking into account their views, the Committee were concerned that it had received only one reference.

The Committee heard from a character witness, a partner of Studio Cars, who had had no complaints during the 3 years the applicant had worked there.

We expressed our concern as to the nature of the unspent conviction, which was clearly related to his application, and there was concern to ensure the safety of members of the public when using a taxi service in Spelthorne.

We noted that this was his only unspent conviction and his only means of employment by which he supported his family.

The Committee had to balance his personal situation against its duty to protect the public.

There was concern expressed in granting this Licence on the usual terms because of the nature of the offence and because of this the Committee had agreed to grant this licence on the condition that the Director of Community Services in consultation with the Chairman of Licensing Committee reviewed the Licence, 6 months after the date of issue.

For the purpose of this review, the applicant would not incur additional licensing fees when this Licence was reviewed.

In addition the grant of a Licence was subject to the Head of Engineering (Consultancy) being satisfied as to the applicant's Medical report and that he be advised that his Private Hire Drivers Licence may be in jeopardy if he is found guilty of any further criminal offence.

In considering the application from Mr G. Hugo the Committee considered the evidence before it and listened to the comments of the Police and witness.

The Committee took into account the two references presented and also the Head of Engineering's statement that the manager of Checker Cars, where the applicant had worked since March 2001, would have given a reference if requested.

We noted that a spate of criminal offences occurred during 1997 and 1999 but also noted medical evidence that related to behavioural disorder problems identified during this period. In respect of this, the Committee noted the applicant had sought medical treatment and learned to overcome his medical condition and was certified fit to drive as a Private Hire vehicle driver.

Therefore the Committee had agreed a Licence would be granted but that the applicant must be advised that his Private Hire Drivers Licence may be in jeopardy if he is found guilty of any further criminal offence or certified unfit to drive.

#### **Application to renew the existing public entertainment licence, The Royal Hart, 4 Church Road, Ashford, Middlesex**

The last meeting of the Licensing Committee in this cycle took place on 28<sup>th</sup> November and concerned the Royal Hart in Ashford.

An application to vary the public entertainment licence to increase numbers and to change the terminal hour for entertainment had been heard by this Committee on 10<sup>th</sup> September 2001. The variation had been granted subject to a number of additional conditions. In accordance with condition 9 of the Licence, the application for renewal was referred back to this Committee for determination.

the Committee having listened to the applicant noted that there were no objections from the Police or Fire Services and no further objections from the public.

We noted the representations by the applicant regarding conditions 5 and 12 of the Recommendations. With regard to condition 5, the Committee believed that as the police had drafted a new protocol after publication of the application and as the Protocol had only been received by the applicant and the Council two days previously, there was insufficient time for the Committee to properly consider the new Protocol in relation to this application. Therefore the Committee accepted the wording of condition 5 submitted by the applicant, save it will make reference to CCTV being installed and maintained inside and outside the premises.

With regard to condition 12, the Committee was pleased to note the progress made by the new manager and decided to grant the renewal for the full Licence term to terminate on 31<sup>st</sup> October 2002.

The Committee had agreed, therefore, to grant the renewal as per the recommendations and subject to the amendments stated.

Councillor Mrs Pat Weston  
*Chairman of the Licensing Committee*

**13th December, 2001**

[-Council 13/12/01](#)

## REPORT OF THE CHAIRMAN ON THE WORK OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

The Planning Committee has met twice since my previous report to the Council Meeting on 11<sup>th</sup> October 2001. This report therefore gives an overview of the key applications considered by the Planning Committee at its meetings on 10<sup>th</sup> October and 7<sup>th</sup> November 2001. It also gives a brief update on other related matters.

1. The Planning Committee meeting on 10<sup>th</sup> October 2001 dealt with 15 items in total, including one enforcement matter.

Public speaking took place on four of the items with a total of four people taking the opportunity to address the Committee as part of the Council's public speaking arrangements.

The most notable items on the agenda related to:-

- (a) The approval of a retail extension (and other alterations) to the Tesco Store at Sunbury, including modifications to the junction on the A308 to allow right turn movements into Escot Road for all traffic
- (b) the approval of four dwellings at Greenfield Nurseries, Ashford Road, Laleham
- (c) the approval of four dwellings on the site of the children's nursery at 3 Rooksmead Road, Sunbury
- (d) the approval of a new day centre on land adjacent to Debenhams, Thames Street, Staines.

The enforcement item relating to the authorisation of action against the unauthorised installation of roller shutter security blinds in Church Street and Clarence Street, Staines.

2. The Planning Committee report on 7<sup>th</sup> November 2001 dealt with 15 items in total.

Public speaking took place on three of the items with a total of three people taking the opportunity to address the Committee.

The most notable items on the agenda related to:-

- (a) the approval for the conversion of a barn into three dwellings at Staines Road Farm, Shepperton.
- (b) the approval of gymnasium and hall extensions at St David's School, Ashford.

3. Other Matters of Interest

- (i) In terms of recent current performance against the 8 week period for determining planning applications, the figures are as follows:-

	Householder	Overall
August 2001	86%	75%
September 2001	82%	75%
October 2001	71%	60%
November 2001		

- a. The Government's decision to approve Terminal 5 is by now widely known. It is expected that as many as 100 separate planning applications will be submitted by BAA to London Borough of Hillingdon to determine various details of the development. It is likely that Spelthorne will be consulted on a large number of these applications over the next 6-9 months.
- b. Chelsea Village plc have now lodged an appeal against the refusal of planning permission for a Training Academy. A Public Inquiry is likely in March/April next year.

Councillor Gerry Ceaser  
*Chairman of the Planning Committee*  
**2001**

**13th December,**

[-Council 13/12/01](#)

## **REPORT OF THE CHAIRMAN ON THE WORK OF THE STANDARDS COMMITTEE**

**The Standards Committee has met once since the last Council meeting and this report gives an overview of the issues considered by the Committee.**

### **1. MODEL CODE OF CONDUCT**

- 1.1. The Committee discussed in detail the recently issued regulations on a Model Code of Conduct. The Code is divided into three main parts. The first part sets out the general provisions, the second deals with interests and declaring them at meetings and the third sets out the interests which must be registered in a publicly available register and the level of gifts and hospitality that must be recorded.
- 1.2. The Council now has 6 months, from the 5<sup>th</sup> November, 2001, within which to adopt its own local code of conduct and once finalised we will all have two months to sign up to this Code.
- 1.3. The Committee feel that it is important that all Councillors are aware of the new requirements. We agreed the best way forward would be for a seminar to be arranged for all Members, to explain and discuss the model code before the Committee decides what recommendation to make to the Council on the form of our local code of conduct.
- 1.4. The Seminar will be held in the Council Chamber at 7.00pm on Tuesday 5<sup>th</sup> February 2002 and afterwards the Standards Committee will meet to agree what recommendation to make on the local code to the Council meeting on Thursday 21<sup>st</sup> February 2002. It is hoped as many members as possible will be able to attend this seminar to discuss their responsibilities and practical implications of such a code.

### **2. CONFIDENTIAL REPORTING CODE**

- 2.1. The Committee discussed the Council's current Confidential Reporting Code, which was adopted in 1999. It is understood that since its adoption there have been no issues or concerns raised by staff. However the Committee feel that the code needs updating to conform with the Councils' current business system and are therefore recommending to Council that two changes should be made.
- 2.2. The Committee also agreed that this would be a good opportunity to remind staff of the code.

### **3. MEMBERS REPORTS ON ACTIVITIES**

- 3.1. The Committee discussed the returns made to date by Members on their activities for the period April to September 2001. We were disappointed to note that returns had still not been received from nine Members.
- 3.2. We appreciate that the reports would be made publicly available when the details of the allowances members received was published, but felt it might help members in making future returns if the completed forms were made available to them now.
- 3.3. The Committee also requested the Monitoring Officer to contact Group Leaders about the position.

Murray Litvak  
*Chairman of the Standards Committee*

13th December, 2001

[-Council 13/12/01](#)