

Please Telephone: Richard Powell (01784) 446240 e-mail: [r.powell@spelthorne.gov.uk](mailto:r.powell@spelthorne.gov.uk)

18th April 2002

TO THE MEMBERS OF SPELTHORNE BOROUGH COUNCIL

## **SUMMONS TO MEETING**

You are hereby summoned to attend the **Meeting of Spelthorne Borough Council to be held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Knowle Green, Staines on Thursday 25th April 2002, 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:** - 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. [ **THE LIFT MUST NOT BE USED** ]

## **PUBLIC SPEAKING AT COUNCIL MEETINGS**

### **(1) Question Time**

Public "Question Time" is at the start of Council 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 a maximum of 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.**

### **(3) Petitions**

The Council has a procedure to enable petitions to be presented formally at Council meetings and for the person presenting the petition to address the Council for a maximum of three minutes about it.

**Anyone wishing to present a petition and to address the Council about it 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 21st February 2002.  
**(Attached at [APPENDIX 1](#) [pages 4 to 15] )**

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

To receive any declarations of interest from Members in accordance with the Council's Code of Conduct for Members.

5. ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE MAYOR, THE LEADER OR THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE

The Mayor to present the Civic Pride Environmental Awards.

6. PETITIONS

To receive any petitions submitted to the Council. Mr. K.S. Thorn of 48 Garrick Close, Staines will present a petition on crime and disorder in the Garrick Close and Wheatsheaf Lane area and will address the Council about it.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE

To consider the recommendations of the Executive on the following matters:-  
**(Attached at [APPENDIX 2](#) [pages 16 to 17] )**

**1. Crime and Disorder Reduction Strategy 2002 - 2005 – Key Decision**

**2. Corporate Governance in Local Government – Key Decision**

**3. White Paper – Strong Local Leadership – Quality Public Services – Summary of Part II - Finance – Key Decision**

**4. Expenditure on Housing Development Programme – 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).

8. MOTIONS ON NOTICE

To receive any Motions submitted on Notice given under Standing Order 14.

9. REPORT FROM THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

To receive a report from the Leader of the Council on the work of the Executive.  
**(Attached at [APPENDIX 3](#) [pages 18 to 20] )**

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 4, 5 and 6 [pages 21 to 24] )**

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

To receive reports from the Chairmen of the Licensing and Planning Committees on the work of their Committees. **(Attached at APPENDICES 7 and 8 [pages 25 to 28] )**

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

**(1) Chennestone Primary School, Manor Lane, Sunbury**

To appoint a representative to serve on the Governing Body of Chennestone Primary School until 24th April 2006, in light of the resignation of the current representative Mrs. Wendy Butt.

**(2) Clarendon County Primary School, Knapp Road, Ashford**

To appoint a representative to serve on the Governing Body of Clarendon County Primary School until 24th April 2006, in light of the resignation of the current representative Mrs. E. Jervis.

**(3) St. Michael's RC Primary School, Feltham Hill Road, Ashford**

To appoint a representative to serve on the Governing Body of St. Michael's RC Primary School until 24th April 2006. The existing representative County Councillor J.G. Carruthers wishes to be considered for re-appointment for a further 4 years until 24th April 2006.

**(4) Shortwood Infant School, Stanwell New Road, Staines**

To appoint a representative to serve on the Governing Body of Shortwood Infant School until 24th April 2006. Following the Council meeting on 21st February 2002, the School were notified that currently the Council had no nominations for this appointment.

The School Governing Body have since put forward the nomination of Mr. Ken Hartley of "Hazelmere", Stanwell New Road, Staines who wishes to be considered for appointment.

**(5) Staines Parochial Charity**

To confirm the re-appointment of Mr. F. Willett as a Representative Trustee to serve on the Staines Parochial Charity until 5th October 2005.

15. URGENT BUSINESS

To consider any urgent business.

16. EXEMPT BUSINESS

To answer any questions which relate to exempt business.

- [Council Agendas and Minutes](#)

THE COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON 21<sup>ST</sup> FEBRUARY 2002

**BOROUGH OF SPELTHORNE**

**AT THE MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE BOROUGH OF SPELTHORNE,  
HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, COUNCIL OFFICES, KNOWLE GREEN,  
STAINES ON THURSDAY 21<sup>ST</sup> FEBRUARY, 2002 AT 7.30PM**

Amos Mrs P C	Forsbrey G E	Ponton Mrs J E
Appleyard M A	Fullbrook J M	Read E I J
Ayers F	Grant Mrs D L	Searancke E J
Beardsmore I J	Hermes A W	Sider R W (Deputy Mayor)
Blampied G G	Hirst A P	Smith J E H
Burrell L J W	James P R	Smith Mrs P A
Ceaser G S	Martin Mrs M J	Smith-Ainsley R A
Crabb T W	Napper Mrs I	Stubbs T
Culnane E K	Norcross Mrs G A	Trussler G F
Davies F (Leader)	O'Hara E	Watkins R
Drinkwater H V (Mayor)	Packman J D (Deputy Leader)	Weston Mrs P
Fisher C M	Paton J M	Wood-Dow Mrs J M

Mr M. Litvak the Chairman of the Standards Committee was also in attendance

H.V. Drinkwater, Mayor, in the Chair

**38/02 APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors V. Agarwal, Mrs M. Hyams, Ms Leedham and Mrs H.E.L. Mellett.

**39/02 MINUTES**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 13<sup>th</sup> December 2001, were approved as a correct record.

**40/02 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

Under Standing Order 12, Mr L.J.F. Brotherton of 1 Link Way, Staines asked the following question to the Chairman of the Planning Committee, Councillor G.S. Ceaser: -

"I have come here tonight to this council meeting to complain about and protest at the council's handling of the planning application for the erection of mobile phone mast. The manner in which the council has carried out this exercise leaves many questions.

To get an answer to why when related to the mobile phone mast it be sited at the corner of Link Way and the Glade, a survey of 39 separate houses produced the following result:

33 Households	Against
6 Households	Unable to contact
0 Households	In favour

1.

The planning application was approved and, as one Orange phone user observed, what for – reception is good around here.

2. The council committee which passed this planning application, together with 5 other masts, did not have a representative of the wards affected.
3. There was a cheaper safer solution to the problem available.
4. The planning department of the council were so secretive and unhelpful.
  - a. Only a fraction of the households affected were notified.
  - b. No notice was put up in our road, only a single miniscule sheet posted on a telegraph pole which is in a cul de sac and never seen by 80% of the households affected.
  - c. The notice failed to give details of what kind of mast Micro, Macro, etc.
  - d. The notice failed to give the energy of the radiation transmitted by the mast.
  - e. The notice failed to give information on the frequency of the radiation emitted by the mast.
  - f. The notice of the actual power output of the mast now or its possible power in the future.
  - g. The notice gave no warning of possible risks to residents from radiation emitted by the mast.
  - h. No indication whatever was given that there were to be 5 additional masts to be erected.

Trying to get additional information from the planning department was difficult leaving me with the feeling that every detail had to be levered out of them.

Phone calls to the council offices to attempt to speak to Mr Peters were ignored. Mr Peters' secretary when questioned said that she had informed him and that she could not explain why he had not spoken to me.

The one officer of the council that I spoke to referred me to the STEWART REPORT saying that there was no danger from the mobile phone masts.

I have read the Stewart Report and I was looking for the words No Risks, No Danger, Absolutely Safe and I did not find them in a single paragraph. But then having spent a large part of my working life working on radiological safety, I knew that no-one would be that positive.

At this moment in time the damage that radiation can do from mobile phone mast is unknown and it will take 10 to 15 years to have any idea of the risks involved, until such time we should avoid them at all cost where possible. Remember using a mobile phone is a personal choice. A mobile phone mast is like passive smoking, you know it is harmful but its difficult to avoid.

Another problem is that the council could have opened the floodgates and have to let other mobile phone companies have the same rights. There are only 8 houses in our street, we could end up with one outside each house.

The Hounslow council had the same problem and they held meetings with the public and with representatives of Orange present and then voted against the planning application. Why did the Spelthorne Council react in the same way?

The mobile phone company Orange spend a great deal of money and effort advertising their products. So if there was nothing to hide why did they not send all

of Spelthorne's residents leaflets saying how lucky we are that they have selected our area to erect mobile phone masts.

Orange even used a subsidiary company, Waycom, so that in years to come it will be more difficult to sue them for damaging the health of people.

The cigarette companies and asbestos manufacturers suppressed information on the effects their products were having on their health for as long as possible in pursuit of profits.

Orange and other mobile phone companies do seem to be acting in a similar manner.

Finally, I would like the council to explain why in writing that they cannot reverse their decision and get the mobile phone masts moved and replaced up by one of the reservoirs by a single macro mast with a Orange of 22 miles where it will be of no danger whatsoever to the residents of Spelthorne."

Councillor Ceaser replied as follows:

"I acknowledge receipt of the concerns set out in the letter from Mr Brotherton and I have instigated a full response from the Council's Head of Planning Services. Many of the points of concern raised by Mr Brotherton, especially those relating to health matters, fall entirely outside the control of the Council. When dealing with any telecommunication developments less than 15 metres in height only siting and appearance can be considered - nothing else at all. From the report I have instigated I am satisfied that all relevant issues were properly taken into account. For the record however I would add that the mast was 8 metres in height and the application had to be decided with in 42 days and was therefore delegated to Officers and did not come before Committee. The pole is designed as a brown telephone pole and the siting and appearance could only be considered. There are other poles in the vicinity and it was considered suitable. There are no grounds to rescind or revoke the decision once made and we can only consider the application as submitted to us.

However in order to deal with Mr Brotherton's concerns in detail I have asked the Head of Planning to forward a copy of the report on the investigations undertaken direct to Mr Brotherton which I hope gives a more satisfactory answer but if not please let me know."

Due to the number of questions being asked (under standing order 12) of the Leader of the Council on the closure of Clarence Street Bridge works in Staines the Leader indicated that he would listen to all questions first then he would make his response.

Under Standing Order 12, the following questions relating to the closure off Clarence Street Bridge works in Staines was asked of the Leader of the Council, Councillor Davies.

Barbara Hunt representing the Staines Town Society asked the following questions:

"We are very concerned to hear that east bound traffic is to be diverted along Church Street for at least nine months, with the consequent loss of trade to small businesses in the Conservation Area and the potential for structural damage being caused to the older buildings by very heavy lorries, once the existing 7.5 ton limit is removed.

Whilst appreciating that it may be necessary for vehicles servicing some High Street shops to be diverted along this route, Two Rivers (or Staines by-pass) should be the preferred route for any other heavy traffic heading east. No vehicles over the 7.5 ton limit should be coming into Staines over Staines Bridge and it is unlikely that lorries going west along Clarence Street should want to double-back along Church Street. Therefore, the majority of large vehicles approaching Staines and heading east would be coming along Wraysbury Road, from M25, making the Hale Street entrance to Two Rivers the nearest, widest and most suitable route. There would be less threat of physical damage to either pedestrians or buildings from heavy lorries and less traffic pollution would be caused. Therefore we wish to raise the following questions:

Will the 7.5 ton limit on Staines Bridge be rigorously enforced to reduce the number of heavy lorries going through the Church Street/Bridge Street junction? (Why not with CCTV?)

What steps are to be taken to monitor any movement caused by subsidence and vibration to the old Church Street buildings, which have very shallow foundations on unstable sub-soil? The County Council should at least carry out a structural survey of the listed buildings and apply 'tell-tale' monitoring?"

Mr Ray Blowers of Blowers Hairdressers, 21 Church Street, Staines asked the following question:

"Why has it taken so long for Spelthorne Council to do anything about the problems Church Street and Clarence Street will encounter with reference to the repair of the Clarence Street bridge and diversion of traffic through Church Street?"

Mr R. King of 15/17 Church Street, Staines on behalf of the forty plus businesses operating in Church Street asked the following questions:

Can the Council confirm what other diversion routes were considered, the reason these were turned down and why only Church Street has been proposed?

Can the Council explain why in 1987 a 7.5 ton weight limit was applied to Church Street and now at the stroke of a pen it has been cancelled?

Can the Council guarantee that the bridge in Church Street is able to withstand an increase in vehicle weight from 7.5 ton to up to 44 tons?

Will the Council undertake to carefully and strictly monitor the levels of air pollution/vibration and noise disturbance in Church Street for the duration of the diversion?

Can the Council confirm there will be no alteration to the current number of parking bays in Church Street and the waiting time restriction on these bays?

Can the Council confirm that the facility to deliver/load and unload by both public and delivery carriers to businesses in Church Street will be unaffected by the diversion?

What form of compensation will be paid to businesses in Church Street who may find that their turnover is seriously reduced owing to the diversion?

What contingency plans have been produced in the event of traffic gridlock at this end of the town caused by the diversion?



Will the Council confirm that the £50,000 given to them by the Developers of Two Rivers for environmental improvements to Church Street is being held in a separate account? That the balance of that money not already spent will be used to provide the improvements promised nearly two years ago?"

Councillor E. O'Hara, ward councillor for Staines Town, asked the following questions to the Leader of the Council:

"Would the Leader report on any further matters arising out of bridge repair works in Clarence Street, and would he also please ensure that a report is presented to the Executive to investigate assisting with the resurfacing of Gorings Square in view of its de facto use as a right of way and bearing in mind the Church Street traders ability to contribute to the costs?"

Prior to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Davies, responding to the above questions he outlined the importance of members of the public sticking to the questions they had submitted and read out the second question submitted by the Staines Town Society and confirmed that he would investigate whether the buildings in Church Street were listed.

The Leader of the Council replied as follows:

"The work being carried out to strengthen the Clarence Street Bridge is being managed by Surrey County Council. The Borough Councils only involvement with this scheme was to draft and advertise the necessary traffic orders as instructed by the County Council who were responsible for designing the diversionary routes being proposed. Similarly the Borough Council have had no involvement in consultation with the local community or advising them of the proposed works. Again this is the responsibility of the County Council. As I understand it the works are essential as the Clarence Street Bridge has failed its strength assessment and without this work being carried out would have to have a weight limit imposed on it. This would mean large vehicles which could not pass under the Iron Bridge in London Road would have no other means of accessing Staines Town Centre.

The weight limit imposed on the bridge in Church Street is an environmental restriction and not a restriction based on the condition of the bridge. It is therefore perfectly capable of carrying all highway traffic.

As a result of discussions with Surrey County Council last week the County have reassured us that the 7.5 tonne weight limit on Staines Bridge will remain in place, temporary traffic lights will be installed to replace the existing traffic light system at the junction of Clarence Street with Bridge Street and these temporary lights together with all the other traffic lights around the Town Centre will be closely monitored by the County's traffic signal engineers to ensure disruption and congestion is minimized.

The County have agreed to fund a traffic warden who will be employed by the Police to ensure that the parking restrictions in the area are strictly enforced once again to ensure that any disruption which could be caused by illegal parking is kept to a minimum. This should also help with the loading and unloading to the businesses in Church Street and the surrounding area.

Recognizing the additional traffic being diverted along Church Street dedicated noise and vibration engineers will regularly monitor Church Street during the works.

I am now satisfied that the County Council are taking the concerns of local businesses and residents seriously and will work with the local community to minimize the inconvenience caused by these essential works. I understand that last Friday County Councillor Carruthers met with traders and the County Council have written to all the residents and businesses in the area explaining the need for the works and providing them with a contact telephone number which should be used in the event of problems arising.

Whilst the Borough Council has done everything possible to protect the interests of the local community it must be remembered that this project is a Surrey County Council project and any issues arising from it should be directed to the County Council."

With reference to the question raised by Councillor O'Hara I will ask the Director of Community Services to investigate the status and cost of resurfacing works and to report to the Executive at the earliest opportunity.

A copy of the response will be available to all concerned."

#### **41/02 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor A.P. Hirst declared an interest in minute number 46/02 (Planning Appeal – Chelsea Village Plc).

#### **42/02 ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Mayor, Councillor H.V. Drinkwater, reminded members of the following events with details and tickets being obtained from the Mayor's Secretary, Pam Cross.

Quiz Night – 28<sup>th</sup> February 2002

Mayor's Ball – 9<sup>th</sup> March 2002

He also gave notice of his Music Concert to be held at Echelford School, Ashford, with full details of the arrangements being announced shortly.

#### **43/02 REVIEW OF INCOME AND FEES AND CHARGES 2002/2003 – KEY DECISION**

The Council considered the recommendations of the Executive on a proposed schedule of fees and charges to be operational from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2002.

#### **RESOLVED:**

1. That subject to 2 below, and inclusion of the amendments to electoral registration (statutory fees) and fees for commercial refuse collection, the proposed fees and charges for 2002/2003 as set out in [Appendix A](#) of the Director of Resources report to the Executive on 12<sup>th</sup> February, 2002 be approved;
2. That in respect of car parking charges in Staines Town Centre, the charge for over 4 hours parking in short stay car parks be increased from £3.50 to £10 and that the charge for over 4 hours parking in long stay car parks be increased from £1.50 to £3.50;

3. That a Notice of Intent to increase car-parking charges in Staines Town Centre car parks be published;
4. That subject to there being no objection, the Order be made; and
5. The charges be reviewed once the Best Value Review on Car Parking Services has been completed.

#### **44/02 TOTAL BORROWING REQUIREMENT 2002/2003 – KEY DECISION**

The Council considered the recommendation of the Executive based on the statutory requirement of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989, for the Borough Council to authorise the total borrowing requirement for the financial year 2002/2003.

**RESOLVED** that the Council approve the maximum borrowing for the year 2002/2003 of £7,000,000 all of which would be short-term, with 100% of interest payable at variable rates.

#### **45/02 SPELTHORNE PAY AWARD 2002 – KEY DECISION**

The Council considered the recommendation of the Executive on proposals for a Spelthorne Pay award for 2002.

**RESOLVED** that the local Spelthorne pay award for 2002 be 4% with effect from 1<sup>st</sup> April, subject to a review if the national 2002 pay award is settled at a higher rate.

#### **46/02 PLANNING APPEAL – CHELSEA VILLAGE PLC – KEY DECISION**

**RESOLVED** that the Council approve the inclusion of £120,000 in the Council's Revenue Budget 2002/2003 in order to meet the costs of engaging a planning consultant/planning solicitor and barrister 'team' to represent the Council's case at the forthcoming planning appeal by Chelsea Village plc.

#### **47/02 GRAFFITI STRATEGY**

The Council considered the recommendation of the Executive on proposals to establish a policy to deal with graffiti and its removal, including the setting up of a Graffiti Removal Response Team.

#### **RESOLVED:**

1. That the principle of introducing an immediate graffiti clean up scheme at a cost of £50,000 be agreed; and
2. That the level of provision be included in next year's Budget, subject to a report on the detail and guidelines of such a scheme being submitted to the Executive meeting in March 2002.

#### **48/02 MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES – REPORT OF THE INDEPENDENT REMUNERATION PANEL**

The Council considered the recommendation of the Executive to support the recommendation of the Independent Remuneration Panel appointed to consider Member's Allowances. The report from the Independent Panel had been circulated to all members of the Council.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That a Special Responsibility Allowance be paid to the Chairman of the Licensing Committee at the same level as the allowance paid to the Chairmen of the Overview and Scrutiny Committees and the Planning Committee;
2. That a Childcare and Dependent Carers Allowance be made available to those Councillors who incur expenditure for the care of dependent relatives or children while they are undertaking approved Council duties with the actual costs being reimbursed;
3. That in respect of 2 above no specific limits for such payments be proposed at this time but be considered in light of experience of claims received; and
4. That no other changes be made to the Council's current Scheme for Allowances, but that a further review take place later this year in the context of the Council's review of the Executive arrangements which have operated since 1<sup>st</sup> September, 2001.

**49/02 REVENUE BUDGET AND COUNCIL TAX 2002/2003 – KEY DECISION**

The Council considered the report of the Director of Resources on the Revenue expenditure budget for 2002/2003 and Revenue Budget summaries for the year ending 31<sup>st</sup> March 2003.

The Mayor, Councillor Drinkwater, gave his consent under Standing Order 16.4 for the budget speech of each of the Group Leaders to exceed five minutes but not to exceed 10 minutes.

The Leader of the Council, Councillor F. Davies, made a statement on the Budget and Council Tax. The Leaders of the opposition Groups, Councillors M.A. Appleyard and I.J. Beardsmore also made statements.

A copy of the Leader's statement was made available for other Members, the press and public at the meeting and is **attached at [Appendix A](#)**.

An amendment was moved by Councillor Beardsmore and seconded by Councillor Fisher to make a reduction of £10,000 in the proposed budget for the Chief Executive's Directorate, so that the overall service expenditure for 2002/2003 was reduced from £15,460,190 to £15,450,190 and the net expenditure was reduced from £13,152,720 to £13,142,720 and the maximum amount to be transferred from reserves was reduced from £2,345,310 to 2,335,310. The amendment was lost.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That in accordance with decisions taken earlier in the meeting the 2002/2003 Revenue Budget should include £50,000 for graffiti removal, £2,370 Special Responsibility Allowance for the Chairman of the Licensing Committee, an adjusted amount of £136,000 for additional Pension Fund contributions and 4% for Spelthorne Local Pay.
2. That in support of an increase of 6% in the Spelthorne element of the Council Tax for 2002/2003 the following proposals be agreed: -

- (i) The Revenue Estimates as set out in the report of the Director of Resources be approved;
  - (ii) An amount not exceeding £2,345,310 as set out in the report of the Director of Resources, be appropriated from Reserves in aid of Spelthorne's local Council Tax for 2002/2003;
  - (iii) To note that the council tax base for the year 2002/2003 is 38,633.8, calculated in accordance with regulation 3 of the Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) Regulations 1992, as amended, made under Section 33(5) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992;
- (iv) That the following amounts be now calculated by the Council for the year 2002/2003 in accordance with Sections 32 and 33 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992;

	£	
(a)	33,230,800	Being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 32(2)(a) to (e) of the Act.
(b)	23,408,390	Being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 32(3)(a) to (c) of the Act
(c)	9,822,410	Being the amount by which the aggregate at 4(a) above exceeds the aggregate at 4(b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 32(4) of the Act, as its budget requirement for the year.
(d)	5,499,290	Being the aggregate sums which the Council estimates will be payable for the year into its general fund in respect of redistributed non-domestic rates, revenue support grant or additional grant, increased by the sum which the Council estimates will be transferred in the year from its Collection Fund to its General Fund in accordance with Section 97(3) of the Local Government Finance Act 1988 (Council Tax surplus) and increased by the sum which the Council estimates will be transferred from its Collection Fund to its General Fund pursuant to the Collection Fund (Community Charges) Directions under Section 98(4) of the Local Government Finance Act 1988 made on 7 <sup>th</sup> February 1994 (Community Charge surplus)
(e)	£111.90	Being the sum 4(c) above less the amount at 4(d) above, all divided by the amount at 3 above, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 33(1) of the Act, as the basic amount of its council tax for the year.

- (v) That the following amounts be now calculated by the Council for the year 2002/2003 in accordance with Section 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992.

Valuation Bands

A £	B £	C £	D £	E £	F £	G £	H £
74.60	87.03	99.47	111.90	136.77	161.63	186.50	223.80

Being the amounts given by multiplying the amount at 4(e) above by the number which, in the proportion set out in Section 5(1) of the Act, is applicable to dwellings listed in a particular valuation band divided by the number which in that proportion is applicable to dwellings listed in valuation band 'D', calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 36(1) of the Act, as the amounts to be taken into account for the year in respect of categories of dwellings listed in different band.

- (vi) That it be noted that for the year 2002/2003 the Surrey County Council and the Surrey Police have stated the following amounts in precepts issued to the Council, in accordance with Section 40 as amended of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, for each of the categories of the dwellings shown below.

Precepting Authority	Valuation Bands							
	A £	B £	C £	D £	E £	F £	G £	H £
Surrey C. C.	481.32	561.54	641.76	721.98	882.42	1042.86	1203.30	1443.96
Surrey Police	64.29	75.01	85.72	96.44	117.87	139.30	160.73	192.88

- (vii) That having calculated the aggregate in each case of the amounts at (vi) above, the Council, in accordance with Section 30(2) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the following amounts as the amounts of Council Tax for the year 2002/2003 for each of the categories of dwellings shown below: -

Valuation Bands

A £	B £	C £	D £	E £	F £	G £	H £
620.21	723.58	826.95	930.32	1137.06	1343.79	1550.53	1860.64

In accordance with Standing Order 18.4 a request was made for the voting on the above matter to be recorded.

The voting was as follows:

- |            |  |
|------------|--|
| For        | Mrs P.C. Amos, F.Ayres, I.J. Beardsmore, G.G. Blampied, L.J.W. Burrell, G.S. Ceaser, T.W. Crabb, E.K. Culnane, F. Davies, H.V. Drinkwater, C. Fisher, G.E. Forsbrey, J.M. Fullbrook, Mrs D.L. Grant, A.W. Hermes, A.P. Hirst, P.R. James, Mrs I.Napper, E. O'Hara, J.D. Packman, J.M. Paton, Mrs J.E. Ponton, E.J. Searancke, R.W. Sider, R.A. Smith Ainsley, T. Stubbs, G.F. Trussler, Mrs P. Weston and Mrs J.M. Wood-Dow. |
| Against    | -  |
| Abstaining | M.A. Appleyard, Mrs M.J. Martin, Mrs G.A. Norcross, E.I.J. Read, J.E.H. Smith, Mrs P.A. Smith and R.Watkins.   |

#### **50/02 50/02 COUNCIL AND STAFF JOINT COMMITTEE**

**RESOLVED** that the establishment of a Council and Staff Joint Committee be not supported.

#### **51/02 CALENDAR OF MEETINGS – 2002/2003**

The Council considered the recommendation of the Executive including the arrangements to set up a Committee to review the practical working arrangements of the Council's Executive arrangements.

#### **RESOLVED:**

1. That the Committee timetable for 2002/2003, as submitted to the Executive on 12<sup>th</sup> February, 2002, be approved;
2. That the specific issues identified in Section 3 of the report of the Chief Executive to the Executive be noted;
3. That a Democracy Committee be convened with the political apportionment of seats being as previously, 6 Conservatives, 2 Labour and 1 Liberal Democrats;
4. That the Terms of Reference of the Committee be:
  - a. To review the practical working of the Council's Executive arrangements, and in particular the operation of overview and scrutiny and its relationship with best value reviews and advise the Council on any changes it considers would be appropriate; and
  - b. To support the continuation of regular Members' Seminars on the type of topics summarised in paragraph 4.2 of the report by the Chief Executive to the Executive at its meeting on 12<sup>th</sup> February 2002.

#### **52/02 BOROUGH OF SPELTHORNE – MEMBERS CODE OF CONDUCT**

The Council considered the recommendation of the Standards Committee on the adoption of a local Code of Conduct for all members and co-opted members. In considering the arrangements for the Code the Council put on record their thanks to both the Chairman and members of the Standards Committee and the Monitoring Officer, Ann Davey.

**RESOLVED** that the local Code of Conduct for Spelthorne, as submitted, be adopted.

### **53/02 REPORT FROM THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL**

The Leader of the Council, Councillor F. Davies, presented his report which outlined the various matters the Executive had dealt with since the last Council meeting.

### **54/02 COMMUNITY COMMITTEE**

The Chairman of the Community Committee, Councillor G.F. Trussler, presented his report which outlined the matters the Committee had dealt with since the last Council meeting.

### **55/02 ECONOMIC COMMITTEE**

In the absence of the Chairman of the Economic Committee the Vice Chairman, Councillor A.W. Hermes, presented a report which outlined the matters the Committee had dealt with since the last Council meeting and gave an undertaking to ensure the question raised by Councillor Mrs Norcross regarding the relocation of the Museum to the Old Town Hall was answered.

### **56/02 ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE**

The Chairman of the Environment Committee, Councillor G.E. Forsbrey, presented his report which outlined the matters the Committee had dealt with since the last Council meeting.

### **57/02 LICENSING COMMITTEE**

The Chairman of the Licensing Committee, Councillor Mrs Weston, presented her report which outlined the matters the Committee had dealt with at its meeting on 16<sup>th</sup> January and gave a verbal update on the outcome of the meeting held on 13<sup>th</sup> February, 2002.

### **58/02 PLANNING COMMITTEE**

The Chairman of the Planning Committee, Councillor G.S. Ceaser, presented his report which outlined the matters the Committee had dealt with since the last Council meeting. During the discussion the issue of funding Hillingdon Borough Council would be receiving from BAA to help process the number of planning applications associated with T5 was raised.

### **59/02 STANDARDS COMMITTEE**

The Chairman of the Standards Committee, Mr Murray Litvak, presented his report which outlined the matters the Committee, had dealt with since the last Council meeting.

### **60/02 QUESTIONS ON WARD ISSUES**

Under Standing Order 13 Councillor E. O'Hara asked the Leader of the Council, Councillor Davies, the following questions:

“Would the Leader please provide an update on progress in relation to the following developments in Staines Town?

Pedestrianisation of the High Street and relocation of the Drinking Fountain from Moore Lane and the Memorial Gardens project?

The Leader of the Council replied as follows

“Work had started on the pedestrianisation of Staines High Street and the local businesses would be kept informed of progress etc. and the drinking fountain would



be relocated to the High Street at the appropriate time. The Memorial Gardens and Riverside Car Park scheme was progressing well.”

## **61/02 GENERAL QUESTIONS**

Under Standing Order 13 Councillor Fisher asked the Leader of the Council the following question:

“The Minutes of the Executive Meeting held on 12<sup>th</sup> February 2002 record the attendance of Councillors Appleyard and O’Hara but of no other non-executive Councillors. The Minutes also record Councillor O’Hara speaking under item 101, which is the last item to be minuted.

These Minutes therefore give the impression that Councillor O’Hara was present for the entire meeting and that no Liberal Democrat councillor was present. This impression is wrong on two points. Firstly, item 101 was dealt with at the beginning of the Agenda and Councillor O’Hara left the meeting soon after – he should therefore be recorded as present part-time. Conversely, I attended the meeting as a representative of the Liberal Democrat Group from a very early stage, having signed the Attendance Book and I remained to the end of the meeting, therefore I should be recorded as having been in attendance.

Will the Leader assure me that these points, particularly the omission of my name as being in attendance, are simple errors which will be corrected before the Minutes are signed, and are not the result of minuting policy?”

Councillor Davies replied as follows:

“Under our normal minuting policy, items are recorded in the order they appear on the Agenda and not the order they are dealt with at the meeting. In this way, there should be no confusion for persons who were not present at the meeting, who wish at a later date to read the minutes in conjunction with the order of items shown on the Agenda.

Minute 101 does indicate that Councillor O’Hara was present as Ward Member and that he spoke on that item, having given prior notice to the Chairman. However, in the interests of clarity, I will arrange for the attendance list to be corrected to indicate that Councillor O’Hara was only present for Minute 101.

With reference to your own attendance, our practice is only to record Members who can participate in the business of the meeting, such as the Ward Member for a particular item or the Leaders of the Opposition Groups who can speak on Key Decisions.”

## **62/02 APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES**

### **(a) St Mary’s C of E Junior School, Clare Road, Stanwell**

**RESOLVED** that:

1. St Mary’s School be advised that the Council is unable to fill the appointment, at this time; and
2. the matter only be submitted to Council in the future if nominations to fill the appointment have been received in advance of the meeting.

### **(b) Shortwood Infants School, Stanwell New Road, Staines**

**RESOLVED** that:

1. Shortwood Infant School be advised that the Council is unable to fill the appointment at this time; and

2. the matter only be reported to future meetings of the Council if nominations to fill the appointment have been received in advance of the meeting.

(c) **Buckland Junior School Berryscroft Road, Laleham**

**RESOLVED** that the previous representative Mrs Varndell of 78 Brightside Avenue, Staines be appointed to serve as a Council representative on the Governing Body of Buckland Junior School, Laleham, until 19th April, 2006.

## **BEST VALUE PERFORMANCE PLAN 2001/02**

### (RECOMMENDATION REQUIRED)

#### **Report of the Chief Executive**

##### Purpose of the report

1. To consider and approve the summary version of the draft Best Value Performance Plan(BVPP) 2001/02 and to consider and approve the following documents which form part of the full version of the BVPP:
  - (a) Draft Corporate Targets 2001/02
  - (b) Performance Indicators 2000/01 and 2001/02
  - (c) Results of the General Household survey and the surveys for Planning and Housing Benefits.

##### Background

2. Members will be aware of the statutory requirement to publish a BVPP by the 31<sup>st</sup> March of each year. We are required to prepare two versions: a full copy, which complies with the statutory requirements set out in the government's circular 10/99 and a smaller summary version. The full version must include the following:
  - (a) A summary of the authority's objectives in relation to its functions
  - (b) A summary of current performance
  - (c) A comparison with performance in previous years
  - (d) A summary of the authorities approach to efficiency improvements
  - (e) A statement describing the Council's Best Value review programme
  - (f) The key results of completed reviews
  - (g) The performance targets set for future years
  - (h) A response to audit and Best Value inspection reports
  - (i) A consultation Statement
  - (j) Financial Information
3. We are required to supplement the full version by sending a summary version to all households, which should offer a fair and accurate reflection of the information contained in the full plan.

##### Draft Summary Best Value Performance Plan

4. The typescript of the draft summary plan is attached at Appendix A. A colour typeset version will be tabled at the meeting. The style and format of the plan will be similar to last year, -a 16 page A4 document on good quality paper. It will include photographs to break up the text and some of the financial information will be presented in pie charts. The service themes will be exactly as they were last year. The main changes are that there is much more detail on the results of Best Value reviews, there is a section on the IDEA visit and I have moved the performance indicator data into the centre of the document to give it more profile. In the finished version there will be an indication of how we are performing on each indicator-green/red traffic light or tick/cross. In response to the feedback from the public that we received in respect of last years plan I will include a" Who to contact " list on the back page.
5. As far as the performance indicator information is concerned, I have selected a number of the statutory indicators, but no local indicators are included. A full list of all the indicators will be included in the full plan, as set out at Appendix C.

##### Draft Corporate Targets 2001/02

6. A full list of the proposed Corporate Targets for 2001/02 are included at Appendix B. These will be included in the full version of the BVPP, along with details of the councils vision and values and key priorities. A separate Corporate Plan will not be published.

## Performance Indicators

7. A full copy of the Performance Indicators is included at Appendix C. Each year we are required to collect and publish our performance in respect of various performance indicators. The government's intention for the BVPP is to look both backwards and forwards. In order to achieve this we have quoted the out turn performance figures for the Audit Commission Indicators, which existed for the year 1999/2000. In order to put this information into context I have included the performance figures for the top 25% of all districts. It is this group of authorities who the government would expect us to compare ourselves with. However clearly in terms of the cost of providing services, there are significant differences between the south east and the rest of the country, and therefore our own test is to make sure we are comparable with the south-east which we do in each Best Value Review.
8. In order to give a summary of current performance we have set out the projected out turn on the performance indicators for 2000/01 as well as the target we set ourselves for this year. With the introduction of Best Value the indicators changed, they became Best Value Performance Indicators (BVPIs). In order to drive up performance the government designated certain BVPIs as top quartile. This meant that the government expects all authorities to set targets for these indicators which are consistent with reaching the top quartile of current performers by the 31 March 2005. The areas where the government has set top quartile targets are as follows:

	Target	Current Performance
Proportion of Council Tax Collected	98.2%	already exceeded
Proportion of Business Rates collected	98.7%	already exceeded
The number of working day lost to sickness Per FTE	6.8 days	8.89 days
Early retirements as a % of staff in post	.45%	1.40%
Ill health retirements as % of staff in post	.35%	.28%

9. The government is also proposing to introduce statutory performance standards for waste recycling, the impact of which will be to increase national recycling rates to at least 17% in 2003/04 and at least 25% in 2005/06. I have asterisked against all the indicators where a top quartile target applies.
10. For the year 2001/02 the government have once again reviewed the Best Value Performance Indicators. There are now two types of BVPIs, corporate health indicators which are intended to provide a snapshot of how well an authority is performing overall and secondly, the service delivery indicators which reflect the national interest in the delivery of local services. The total number of indicators has been reduced. For 2001/02 we are required to set out our targets for the performance for next year consistent with continuous improvement and the top quartile target, if there is one.
11. The targets, which appear in black type on Appendix C, are local indicators, all others are statutory indicators. In last years performance plan we were required to set a number of Local Indicators which we believed would be of public interest, or which would help us drive up standards of service delivery.

## General Household Survey and Planning/Benefit Surveys.

12. The BVPIs now include indicators on the levels of satisfaction with certain services. In order to achieve this the government specified a minimum amount of survey detail an authority had to collect, a time frame in which to collect data and guidance on how to conduct the survey. To this end we conducted the General Household survey during October and November 2000. 4200 questionnaires were sent out to randomly selected properties and 2020 valid responses were received. We were required to get a minimum return of 1100 to get statistical accuracy. The results are presented at Appendix D at two levels. Firstly at a summary level for each service which is then compared to the results achieved from the pilot survey conducted by MORI. MORI conducted a pilot survey of 2800 properties in the country to use as an indicative benchmark. Secondly the

detailed results for each question are set out, with a net score at the end of each line (the net score is the difference between the sum of the satisfied less the sum of the dissatisfied. The neither satisfied nor dissatisfied are ignored). The results are all unweighted at this stage, whilst the MORI results have been weighted. In order to weight them we have to check that they are representative of gender, age and post code residence.

13. Members will note that in most area the results are very good demonstrating a high level of satisfaction with council services. One area where the results are poorer than expected is in Leisure/Parks and Open spaces. These results may warrant further investigation.

Planning Survey

14. Due to the government's and public interest in the planning service we were also required to survey the users of the planning service. This had to be done in four sampling windows (the period of time people are surveyed) and at this stage we have the results of the first two. There are no national figures to compare with at this stage. The results of this survey are attached at Appendix E.

Housing Benefit Survey

15. This area was also subjected to separate survey which is attached at Appendix F. This survey has two sampling windows, and I have included the first at this stage. The second survey is being carried out at the moment.

**Recommendation**

16. **Members are requested to recommend the Council to approve the following:**

- (i) The draft summary Best Value Performance Plan.**
- (ii) The draft Corporate Targets 2001/2002.**
- (iii) The targets set for the Performance Indicators 2001/02.**

17. **Members are asked to note the following:**

- (i) The Performance Indicators for 1999/2000 and the projected results for 2000/01.**
- (ii) The results of the General Household Survey and the Surveys relating to Planning and Housing Benefits.**

Contact: Sue Sturgeon (01784) 446324

Background Papers

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

The Executive has met twice since the last Council meeting. This report is an overview of the main items considered and includes those matters resolved by the Executive on 12th February 2002 which were not covered in the report to the last Council meeting. 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.

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

**Arts and Heritage Development Plan – Key Decision** – We have agreed the adoption of the Spelthorne Arts and Heritage Development Plan, following substantial consultation with the local community on their needs in relation to arts and heritage in the Borough. We have also agreed that individual Arts and Heritage organisations will be consulted on the benefits of direct consultation rather than through the Spelthorne Arts and Civics Association and on the suggestion of grants being allocated directly by the Borough Council.

**Security of Tenure - Spelthorne Museum** – We have authorised negotiations with the Spelthorne Archaeological Field Group for a lease of the Museum Premises for 21 years, including the Group being considered for the award of an annual revenue grant of £9,610 to cover rent, electricity, rates, water and insurance in relation to a lease of the premises.

### **COMMUNITY ISSUES**

**Community Legal Service Partnership** – We have agreed to seek the establishment of a joint Community Legal Services Partnership for Spelthorne and Runnymede comprising the Community Legal Service, the two Councils, providers of advice such as local solicitors and the statutory and voluntary advice organizations such as the Spelthorne Citizens Advice Bureau.

**Spelthorne Twinning Link** – We have confirmed the Borough Council's continuing commitment to its twinning link with Melun, France. We have agreed that Council representatives will attend the meeting in Melun from 24th to 26th May 2002, when discussions will include the possibility of future friendship links with Crema in Italy and Stuggart-Vaihingen in Germany. The Executive will, in due course, give further consideration to the future of the Spelthorne/Melun Twinning Committee.

### **CORPORATE ISSUES**

**Corporate Targets 2002/2003** – We have agreed specific corporate targets for 2002/2003 in a slightly different format from previous years. As suggested by the External Auditors, a number of "medium term" Strategic Corporate targets have been approved, as several of the Council's strategies relating to Housing, Leisure and Crime and Disorder cover periods of 3 or 5 years.

**Economic Strategy for Spelthorne – Key Decision** – We have adopted the draft strategic objectives for the development of an Economic Strategy for Spelthorne as a basis for discussion with organisations in the local strategic partnership.

**Future of Area Forums** – We have agreed various changes to Area Forums, including a separate period to enable residents to discuss “local issues” with Ward Councillors, all meetings will be held on weekday evenings and dates included in the Calendar of Meetings to ensure Members are available to attend, and topics will be selected carefully to stimulate interest.

## **CRIME AND DISORDER ISSUES**

**Graffiti Strategy** – We have approved a Graffiti Strategy based around the Graffiti Response Team/Cleaning Squad, including the Spelthorne Student Council being used to convey the anti-graffiti message and the Director of Community Services installing a dedicated telephone “hot-line” within his Department to enable residents to report incidents of Graffiti in the Borough.

## **ENVIRONMENT ISSUES**

**Enhancement of Orchard Meadow** – We have noted the acceptance by the Director of Community Services of the tender from Wyevale Landscapes Limited, in the sum of £137,849.59 the lowest received, for undertaking the enhancement of Orchard Meadow.

**River Bank Refurbishment, Russell Road, Shepperton** – We have agreed a river bank refurbishment scheme at Russell Road, Shepperton costing £14,423 for advance inclusion in the Council’s Environmental Projects Programme 2002/2003. The Environment Agency will be asked to approve the final scheme and French Brothers have been engaged as the contractors who will undertake the refurbishment work.

## **FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO LOCAL ORGANISATIONS**

**Grant Application – Surrey Law Centre** – We have approved a grant of £2,500 per annum for 3 years to the Surrey Law Centre as the Citizens Advice Bureaux, which is the main local advice organisation, needs more specialist legal support, which the Law Centre can help to provide.

**Grant Application – Good Causes Fund** – We have made a grant of £10,000 to Laleham Village Hall from this Fund towards the cost of purchasing and installing replacement windows.

## **FINANCIAL ISSUES**

**Members’ Working Group on Insurance** – We have agreed the Group’s recommendations including the Group looking at specific areas which might help to minimise future increases in insurance premiums such as risk management, self insurance, excess levels, etc.

## **HIGHWAYS AND PLANNING ISSUES**

**Goring Square, Staines** – We have considered the ownership and safety implications relevant to a proposal to provide a pedestrian access across Goring Square, from Church Street to Two Rivers, in relation to Surrey County Council’s Clarence Street Bridge works. We have agreed that no work be undertaken to refurbish part of Goring Square.

**The Planning Green Paper** – We have made a detailed response to the key proposals in the recent DTLR Planning Green Paper, based on the recommendations in the report of the Director of Community Services and the additions agreed by Members.

**Proposed Conservation Area at 97 – 207 (odd) Manygate Lane and 2 – 48 (even) Grove Road, Shepperton** – We have approved the draft preservation and enhancement plan covering certain properties in Manygate Lane and Grove Road, Shepperton for the purpose of consultation with local residents.

## **MODERNISATION ISSUES**

### **Best Value Reviews:-**

- (1) *Best Value Review of Leisure Services – Leisure Centres – Key Decision***  
– We have endorsed the recommendations of the Panel reviewing Leisure Services – Leisure Centres, including the short, medium and long term actions set out in the Action Plan, and have added to the Plan the additional matters raised by Executive Members including IT support and swimming schedules.
- (2) *Best Value Performance Plan – Summary*** – We have approved the content and format of both the financial and the Best Value Performance Plan summary information, which has been combined into a single leaflet and will accompany the Council Tax demands to be circulated to all local households.

**Surrey County Council Local Committee** – We have agreed at this stage that the Borough Council will not participate in the Surrey County Council's Local Committee for Spelthorne, as it does not appear at present to offer any real benefits to the local community, but the development of the initiative by the County will be monitored.

Councillor Frank Davies  
*Leader of the Council*  
**2002**

**25th April**



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

The Community Committee met on 14th March 2002 and considered the following matters-

### **Day Centre Visits**

At the Committee's January meeting, held at the Greeno Centre an invitation was issued to all Members of the Committee to visit the other Centres in Spelthorne. I accepted this invitation and together with my Vice-Chairman, visited and reported on our visits to the Ashford, Staines, Stanwell and Sunbury Centres.

### **Review Of Spelthorne Meals On Wheels Service**

At its March meeting the Committee reviewed the Spelthorne Meals on Wheels Service.

The meeting was held at the Benwell Centre where Members saw how the meals were prepared and later chose and sampled a two course hot meal cooked in the Service vehicles.

Members met representatives of Spelthorne Meals customers, Day Centre Managers, their Deputies, Drivers and Runners of Spelthorne Meals service and Borough Officers involved with Community Care.

The Committee considered the Key Issues facing the Meals Service and listened to and noted the responses of those attending the meeting.

### **Special Meeting**

The Committee agreed to a Special Meeting to be held on 18<sup>th</sup> April, 2002 at the Riverside Arts Centre (RAC) to consider the proposals by RAC for development of the recently purchased 57 Thames Street, Sunbury on Thames, formally Barclays Bank. I will report on the work of the Committee at the Council meeting.

Councillor George Trussler  
*Chairman of the Community Committee*  
**2002**

**25th April**

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

The Economic Committee has met once since the last Council meeting and at this meeting presentations were made by the officers on two customer-orientated services provided by the Council. The first was from John Foggo the Head of Administration Services, and the second was by Steve Connor the Head of Direct and Ancillary Services.

### **ADMINISTRATION SERVICES**

The Head of Administration Services outlined the work provided by Printing Services, Office Services and Customer Services. The first two services provide a direct internal support service to all departments of the Council as well as consolidating a range of associated duties.

Customer Services is the first point of call for the general public for enquiries and many for service requests. My Committee noted that rather than referring them to other sections the Customer Services section deal with many straight forward service enquires direct, such as pest control complaints, allotment administration, issuing of skip licenses, events in parks, general planning and building control matters, hall/day centre bookings and charitable collections, which we feel is a very effective and efficient way of dealing with such matters.

One of the main ways the public contact the Council is by telephone and we were interested to note that the number of incoming calls received last year was 382,662 with 274,635 being answered within the corporate target of 5 rings (approximately 72%).

The second part of the presentation was on progress on developing a new customer services strategy with the aim of further enhancing the Councils performance to meet resident's needs and ensure customer services were more interlinked with the strategies for e-government and communications.

To obtain views on the way we currently work and to receive ideas on how to improve the service for the future, various surveys have been undertaken. The relevant information had yet to be analysed but we noted that the initial results indicated a high level of public satisfaction with current arrangements. However once the information had been evaluated the relevant information would be used to progress the customer services strategy.

The Committee agreed that to reduce envelope use the Head of Administration Services would investigate the practicalities of introducing the use of plastic zip wallets for the hand delivery of members mail and if cost effective would introduce.

The Committee also suggested that the Spelthorne in Bloom certificates should be on public display in the main reception area and interview rooms situated on the ground floor of the Council Offices and this would be undertaken in the near future.

### **DIRECT AND ANICILLARY SERVICES**

Steve Connor, the Head of Direct and Ancillary Services outlined the work of his service areas and the effectiveness of the working arrangements at the depot.

The service areas covered Refuse Collection, Street Cleansing, Ground Maintenance, Emergency call out for Day Centres and Village Halls, Depot Management, Laleham Nursery, Spelthorne Accessible Transport and Meals on Wheels and various individual issues relating to these were highlighted.

My committee noted that the move to the new depot approximately 15 months ago had gone well. The only practical difficulty encountered was the shortage of space for the parking of vehicles because of the Spelride vehicles now being based at the depot.

Councillor Mrs Martine Hyams  
*Chairman of the Economic Committee*

**25th April 2002**

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

The Environment Committee met on the 21st March, 2002, and considered the following matters: -

### **Progress Report On Corporate Targets 98 And 99 Local Plan/Environment Budget**

In accordance with Corporate Targets 98 and 99, the Committee considered a report on details of the budget position on the Environment/Local Plans budget and progress on meeting the targets on individual schemes.

### **Dogs**

The Committee received a presentation on the control of dogs in the Environment, including such issues as how strays were dealt with and dog fouling on the highways and in parks.

Councillor Gerry Forsbrey  
*Chairman of the Environment Committee*  
**2002**

**25th April**

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

The Licensing Committee met on 10th April, 2002, when it considered an application for a Provisional Public Entertainment Licence in respect of the Blue Anchor, 13-15 High Street, Staines. The application was granted subject to conditions.

Councillor Mrs Pat Weston  
*Chairman of the Licensing Committee*  
**2002**

**25th April**

## **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 21<sup>st</sup> February 2002. This report therefore gives an overview of the key applications considered by the Planning Committee at its meetings on 27<sup>th</sup> February and 27<sup>th</sup> March 2002. It also gives a brief update on other related matters.

1. **The Planning Committee meeting on 27th February 2002** dealt with 19 items in total, including one enforcement matter.

Public speaking took place on nine of the items with a total of eleven 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 the details for the 450 place female prison on the site of the former HM Remand Centre site in Woodthorpe Road, Ashford.
- (b) The approval of the demolition of existing buildings and erection of 4 detached houses at New Farm, 121 Ashford Road, Laleham.
- (c) The refusal of 9 no. 4-bed terraced houses at The Orchard, Leacroft, Staines.
- (d) The Committee agreed to vary the terms of a Section 106 Legal Agreement relating to the sizes of plots at the development of 5 detached houses at Reed Place, Towpath, Shepperton.

2. **The Planning Committee report on 27th March 2002** dealt with 12 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.

The most notable items on the agenda related to:-

- (a) The refusal of two detached dwellings on land at the rear of 53 Wrens Avenue, Ashford.
- (b) The approval of the demolition of the Day Centre at the rear of The Old Town Hall, Staines plus associated works. This matter has now to be referred to the Secretary of State, because it involves demolition works to a listed building under the ownership of the local authority.
- (c) The raising of strong objections to the County Council's proposed alterations to the listed bridge in Clarence Street that passes over the River Colne, albeit that amendments have been promised by the County.
- (d) The enforcement item related to the unauthorised use of garages at the rear of Andy's Stores, Garrick Close, Staines. The Committee agreed that enforcement action should be pursued.

### 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
January 2002	94%	82%
February 2002	87%	85%
March 2002	87%	75%

- (ii) In terms of the four separate quarters for 2001/2002 the figures show as follows:-

	Householder	Overall
April – June 2001	84%	75%
July – Sept 2001	84%	75%
Oct – Dec 2001	81%	70%
Jan – March 2002	89%	80%

In overall terms therefore the performance for 2001/2002 is:-

	Householder	Overall
April 01– Mar 02	84.5%	75%

This compares with recent years as follows:-

	Householder	Overall
April '99 – Mar '00	86%	76%
April '00 – Mar '01	85.5%	73.5%

- (iii) Chelsea FC Appeal

Council is advised that the Public Inquiry into the appeal by Chelsea Village plc will commence on Tuesday 23<sup>rd</sup> April at 10am in the Council Chamber. It is scheduled to run for 4 days (ie until Friday 26<sup>th</sup> April) and then recommence for a further 4 days running from Tuesday 28<sup>th</sup> May 2002 to Friday 31<sup>st</sup> May 2002.

Members may also wish to note that the Secretary of State has notified all parties that the decision in this appeal case will be taken by himself. Consequently, the Inspector will conduct the Public Inquiry and thereafter submit his report to the Secretary of State for the formal decision.

As this is the last report I shall be making to Council after four years as Chairman of the Planning Committee, I would like to place on record my thanks to my Vice-Chairman, Councillor Tom Stubbs for his help, assistance and advice over that time and also my appreciation for the contributions and support of the members of the committee during those four years.

It is also relevant to record my thanks to Mr. Peters as the Head of Planning and the Officer team that services and supports the Planning Committee. Their help and assistance to me during my term as Chairman has been to the highest professional standard, a fact I believe acknowledged by the Planning Professionals that have dealings with them. It is of course thanks to their efforts that Spelthorne is consistently at the top of the Surrey Planning performance tables and we should consider ourselves fortunate to have such a dedicated and professional team in the Planning Department.

It has been a privilege and a pleasure to be part of such a team and I wish my successor well in the forthcoming municipal year.

Councillor Gerry Ceaser  
*Chairman of the Planning Committee*  
**2002**

**25th April**