

## **Council - 14 December 2006**

### **AGENDA**

Time: 7.30pm

**Place: Council Chamber**

#### **1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

To report apologies received from Councillor P.R. James and to receive any other apologies for non-attendance.

#### **2. MINUTES – 19 OCTOBER 2006 (pdf 41kb)**

#### **3. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST**

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

#### **4. PRESENTATIONS**

##### **South East Employers Charter for Member Development**

The Mayor to receive, on behalf of the Borough Council, the South East Employers Charter for Member Development to be presented by Mark Palmer, Head of Improvement and Development at the South East Employers.

#### **5. ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE MAYOR**

To receive any announcements from the Mayor.

#### **6. ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE LEADER**

To receive any announcements from the Leader.

#### **7. ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

To receive any announcements from the Chief Executive.

#### **8. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

The Leader or his nominee to answer any 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).

#### **9. PETITIONS**

To receive any petitions submitted to the Council *[providing notice has been given in accordance with the procedures laid down in the Council's Constitution]*.

#### **10. RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE**

To consider the recommendations of the Executive on the following matters: -

1. Outline Budget 2007/2008 To 2010/2011 (Word document 34kb)
2. The Gambling Act 2005 – Adoption of Statement of Gambling Policy 2007-2010  
**[To Follow]**

**Note: Members of the public may make representations in person not exceeding 3 minutes on individual recommendations before they are discussed [providing notice has been given in accordance with the procedures laid down in the Council's Constitution].**

**11. CHANGE TO STANDING ORDERS IN THE COUNCIL'S CONSTITUTION – PUBLIC QUESTION TIME** (Word document 38kb)

To consider the report of the Strategic Director (Support) on Change to Standing Orders in the Council's Constitution - Public Question Time.

**12. REPORT FROM THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL** (Word document 32kb)

To receive the report from the Leader of the Council on the work of the Executive.

**13. REPORT FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE IMPROVEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE** (Word document 26kb)

To receive the report from the Chairman of the Improvement and Development Committee on the work of his Committee.

**14. REPORT FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT AND REVIEW COMMITTEE**

To receive the **report from the Chairman of the Performance Management and Review Committee** (Word 38kb) on the work of his Committee.

**15. REPORT FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE LICENSING COMMITTEE** (Word document 32kb)

To receive the report from the Chairman of the Licensing Committee on the work of his Committee.

**16. REPORT FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE** (Word document 30kb)

To receive the report from the Chairman of the Planning Committee on the work of his Committee.

**17. MOTIONS**

Under Standing Order 14 the Council has received Notice of the following

Motion:

“This Council notes the threat to the Accident & Emergency Department at St. Peter's Hospital and other A&Es across Surrey.

### **Spelthorne Council resolves**

- a) Council is appalled at the possible loss of the A&E department at St. Peter's Hospital. Such a loss, given the further downgrading of Ashford Hospital's A&E to a Walk-in Centre, is unacceptable to the residents of Spelthorne.
- b) The loss of other A&E Departments across Surrey would result in greater pressure on the A&E at St. Peter's and such moves must also be resisted.
- c) Council demands that action is taken to make good the fifteen years of underfunding and cuts at Ashford Hospital
- d) Council instructs the Chief Executive to write to The Surrey Primary Care Trust, Ashford & St. Peter's Hospital Trust Board and the Secretary of State for Health voicing the concerns of the Council.”

Proposed by: Councillor Colin Strong  
Seconded By: Councillor Ian Beardsmore

## **18. QUESTIONS ON WARD ISSUES**

The Leader or his nominee to answer any questions from Members on issues in their Ward, [providing notice has been given in accordance with the procedures laid down in the Council's Constitution].

## **19. GENERAL QUESTIONS**

The Leader or his nominee or relevant Committee Chairman to answer any questions from Members on matters affecting the Borough or for which their Committee has responsibility, [providing notice has been given in accordance with the procedures laid down in the Council's Constitution].

## **20. URGENT BUSINESS**

To consider any urgent business.

**MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON 19 OCTOBER 2006  
BOROUGH OF SPELTHORNE**

**AT THE MEETING OF THE SPELTHORNE BOROUGH COUNCIL HELD IN THE COUNCIL  
CHAMBER, COUNCIL OFFICES, KNOWLE GREEN, STAINES ON THURSDAY 19  
OCTOBER AT 7.30PM**

Ayers F.	Fullbrook J.M.	Packman J.D.
Bain Miss M.M.	Grant Mrs. D.L.	Paton J.M.
Beardsmore I.J.	Hirst A.P. (Deputy Mayor)	Pinkerton Mrs. J.M.
Bhadye S.	Hyams Mrs. M.	Pinkerton J.D.
Bouquet M.L.	Jaffer H.R.	Ponton Mrs. J.E.
Ceaser G.S. (Leader)	James P.R.	Royer M.T (Mayor)
Chouhan K.	Langridge-John Mrs J.B.	Sider R.W.
Colison-Crawford R.B.	Leighton Mrs. V.J.	Spencer Mrs. C.L.
Culnane E.K. (Deputy Leader)	Lorch S.B.S.	Strong C.V.
Davies F.	Madams Mrs. M.	Trussler G.F.
D'Sa R.V.	Napper Mrs. I.	Turner Mrs D.
Forsbrey G.E.	O'Hara E.	Wood-Dow Mrs. J.M.

Co-Opted Member: Mr. M. Litvak

Councillor M.T. Royer, The Mayor, in the Chair

**323/06 APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Mrs. P. Amos, E. J. Searancke and Mrs. P. Weston and from Mr. T. Davies.

**324/06 MINUTES**

**RESOLVED:** that the Minutes of the Meeting of the Council held on 20 July 2006 be approved as a correct record.

**325/06 ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE MAYOR**

The Mayor invited Councillor G.E. Forsbrey, Portfolio Holder for the Environment, to present Green Flag awards for the Lammas and Fordbridge Parks.

Councillor Forsbrey announced that the Council had achieved Green Flag accreditation for two of its parks; Lammas in Staines and Fordbridge Park in Ashford.

The Green Flag Award was the national standard for parks and green spaces in England and Wales. The award scheme began in 1996 as a means of recognising and rewarding the best green spaces in the country. It was also seen as a way of encouraging others to achieve the same high environmental standards and creating a benchmark of excellence in recreational green areas.

There were 423 parks and open spaces in England and Wales which had been awarded a green flag. Winning two flags, at the Council's first attempt underlined its commitment to improving the quality of life for its residents.

The two parks had undergone a programme of improvements funded by the Liveability Scheme.

Councillor G.E. Forsbrey then presented the Green Flag Status Awards for Fordbridge Park, Ashford and The Lammas, Staines, respectively, to the Mayor who accepted them on behalf of the Borough Council.

## **326/06 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

The Mayor reported that under Standing Order 12, six questions had been received from four members of the public. He invited each person to put their question in turn, and for responses to be given by either the Leader or the responsible Executive Portfolio Holder. He confirmed that a written response would also be sent to the questioners.

The Mayor explained that the Council had introduced a change to the public speaking arrangements at Council meetings with effect from this meeting. Members of the public asking questions would now be able to do so from the front of the Council Chamber, with the benefit of addressing the Councillors "face to face" and would receive replies from appropriate Members who would also be facing them directly.

### **(1) Question from: Mr. T. Crabb: -**

"The Council agreed on April 28th 2005 the proposals for disposing the lease of the land at Kempton Park.

The proposals, previously exempt but now in the public domain, included:

"Kempton Park to allow free access to the area of land shown on the plan as DP4 for educational visits, by prior arrangement, 12 times a year. Also, there will be a positive covenant on Kempton Park to maintain DP4 in accordance with an agreed management programme."

Can the Council please tell me

- a) how many educational visits have occurred in the past year?
- b) the duration of the visits?
- c) who visited the site i.e. schoolchildren or local residents?
- d) how has the Council promoted such educational visits among local residents and local schools?"

Thank you in anticipation of your help with this."

**The Portfolio Holder for Children and Young People Services, Councillor Mrs. D.L. Grant responded as follows:**

Thank you Mr Crabb for your question.

You are probably aware that Kempton Park was closed for about a year for the re-development.

Since it re-opened, it has had a school visit of about 60 children on 1 May 2006 and will have another booking for about 60 children on 6 November 2006. I am not aware of the duration of each visit because we are not the Education Authority (that is a County Responsibility).

The Council regularly meets with school cluster groups and we believe they are well aware of the availability of these educational visits, as the two visits I have mentioned confirm.

However, I will ensure that the next time we meet with schools we will re-iterate this educational opportunity.

I can therefore confirm that under the agreement, Kempton Park must allow free access to the area of land (you have referred to as DP4) for educational visits, by prior arrangement, up to 12 times a year. There is also a positive covenant on Kempton Park to maintain this area (that is DP4) in accordance with an agreed management programme.

**(2) Question from: Mrs. C. Nichols: -**

“Kempton Park

I refer you to Item 26 of the minutes of the last Sunbury Area Forum on 28th March 2006. It says “the money that the Council received [from giving up a lease] on Kempton was £250k on completion and £10k plus cumulative RPI for the next 25 years.” It also says “the money was designated for use on open spaces”.

Can the Council confirm that the money is solely for use on open spaces; who was responsible for this decision - the Executive or Full Council; and which open spaces will receive the investment and when?”

**The Portfolio Holder for Children and Young People Services, Councillor Mrs D.L. Grant responded as follows: -**

“Because the agreement with Kempton Park concerned public access, it has always been the Council’s intention to use the funds from the agreement for public open spaces within Spelthorne. The value of the surrender of the Council’s lease was £250,000 plus an annual payment of £10,000, agreed by the full Council on 28 April 2005.

The Council has, and will continue to make, great improvements to its parks and open spaces, utilising the Kempton funds, plus its own. Some examples of expenditure totaling over £200,000 in the last year are:-

Playground in Oaks Road, Stanwell	£50,000
Playground equipment at Laleham Park Shepperton Road, Laleham	£12,000
Extra BMX/goals in Town Lane, Stanwell	£15,000
Meeting Point, Cedars Park, Sunbury	£4,000
Playground Equipment Halliford Park Shepperton	£5,000
Playground Equipment Woodthorpe Road, Ashford	£6,000
Refurbishment at Greenfield Recreation Ground, Laleham	£60,000
Refurbishment and a new playground surface Feltham Hill Road, Ashford	£60,000

These are in addition to the £2m plus we have spent through the Liveability project.

Thank you, Mrs Nichols, for your question and I trust this information answers it.

**(3) Question from: Mrs. C. Nichols: -**

**“Improving Older People’s Services - request for an updated financial statement.”**

“One of the difficulties with the consultation process has been the failure by Spelthorne Council to produce a detailed comprehensive financial statement showing all the short and long term costs and savings of the proposed changes.

Spelthorne Council must now have a clearer idea of the costs of the changes (including any redundancy payments, fees to outside bodies and capital investment in the remaining day centres) as well as a forecast for the income to be received from reinvesting the sale proceeds of the two day centres.”

“Please would the Council now provide complete and detailed financial statements for the years 2005/6, 2006/7, and 2007/8 broken down to show the costs and receipts for each of the following change programmes:

Benwell Day Centre

Stanwell Day Centre

Spelride

(Note: a comprehensive statement should show clearly the same three year capital investment, revenue and cost profile of the meals-on-wheels services, Span, expansion of the remaining day centres -including the temporary occupation of Churchill Hall - and any other older people’s services.)”

**The Leader of the Council, Councillor G.S. Ceaser responded as follows: -**

The detailed financial data is available identifying the short and long-term costs and savings. As you will appreciate the financial statements are complex. If Mrs Nichols would like to contact the Strategic Director (Support), Ms Sue Sturgeon or the Head of Financial Services, Terry Collier they would be happy to arrange a meeting to explain the financial statement in depth”.

**(4) Question from: Ms. L. Parramore**

"Joint Waste Plan notes that some partner authorities agree with Surrey and favour Energy from Waste (incineration) and some do not. As a partner authority does Spelthorne support or oppose Incineration in general and at Charlton in particular?

**The Portfolio Holder for Environment, Councillor G.E. Forsbrey responded as follows: -**

“The Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy, produced jointly by the Surrey districts and County provides a long term strategy for waste management in Surrey (To 2025). As waste is a major environmental issue, the strategy is heavily focused on reduction, reuse and recycling of waste, before looking at final disposal.

The aim of the strategy is to minimise what has to be finally disposed of. However, landfill sites, which have their own environmental issues, are running out of space and one possible alternative is energy from waste. Out of the 12 local authorities involved in production of the strategy, only three authorities have commented/caveated their response in relation to energy from waste. Spelthorne has appreciated that there has to be some form of final disposal and considers all options should be explored thoroughly, but has not made any comment directly on energy from waste plants.

However, actual sites for such schemes are identified through the Surrey Waste Plan and Spelthorne responded to the consultation on this Plan when it was submitted to the Secretary of State in June.

Spelthorne Borough Council has expressed the view that thermal treatment development at any of the identified sites would only be acceptable where the size and form of development is limited, having regard to the environmental impact.

With regard to the site at Charlton Lane we have argued that any development at this site which would give rise to landscape, amenity and traffic impacts greater than the current operations would not be acceptable. Therefore, Spelthorne has objected to the site being used for any large scale development, such as energy from waste”.

**(5) Question from: Mr. K. Johnson**

**“Areas of Special Advertisement Control**

“I attended the public hearing on the 30th August 2006 and represented the public voice against Spelthorne’s application to the Government to remove all its areas of Special Advertisement Control. It transpired that Spelthorne is the only local authority in the country to seek such total revocation of these control areas. The Local Borough Plan was produced, subject to extensive public consultation and includes Areas of Special Advertisement Control enshrined in Policy BE18(a).

I should like to ask how this Authority can make a change to a Borough Plan Policy without public consultation and contrary to the requirements of PPS12 for public involvement?”

**The Leader of the Council, Councillor G.S. Ceaser responded as follows: -**

“Areas of Special Advertisement Control give additional control over adverts, and have to be agreed by the Secretary of State. Only some 45% of authorities in the Country have such orders – most of our neighbour authorities do not. ASAC can only in the main apply to non-urban areas – in Spelthorne, this is the Green Belt. Spelthorne has had one since the 1960’s.

In essence ASAC reduce the size of adverts that can be erected without permission. However, the permitted limit is very low anyway, and because in practice most adverts applied for nowadays are many times larger than this limit, the provision no longer has any practical benefit for Spelthorne.

We are required to review the order every five years and the Secretary of State will only approve an order where there is clear evidence for it being retained. A review of the value of the order over the past 20 years has shown it to have no additional benefit in controlling adverts and therefore the Council concluded its continued retention could not be justified.

The review of ASAC is subject to a separate statutory process from the preparation and review for the Local Plan and new LDF process. Whilst the current Local Plan cross refers to it, review of the current ASAC cannot be part of a review of the Local Plan or LDF.

The review of the ASAC has been subject to public consultation in accordance with statutory requirements and, as a result of objections, a recent inquiry was held. The Secretary of State decision is awaited.



Whilst we are the first authority to revoke an ASAC, it is understood most authorities fail to regularly review them and therefore assess their continued justification.

The basis of the objections put at the enquiry was concern about unauthorised advertisements that are put up from time to time. These have to be dealt with under existing enforcement powers and the ASAC does not provide any additional benefits when taking enforcement action. These points were debated fully at the recent inquiry”.

**(6) Question from: Mr. K. Johnson**

**“Changes to Waste Recycling and Collection**

“This is the subject of Agenda Item 7.3 tonight.

It would appear that this is going to cost the taxpayer money for their waste to be collected less frequently.

I should like to ask:

- a) Is it the intention to consult the public about this apparent reduction in service at greater expense?
- b) Has the Council considered getting a grant from the £140 million waste minimisation and recycling fund?
- c) Has the Council taken note that the biggest culprit to landfill waste is the construction industry involved with demolition waste - which according to Surrey County Council accounts for 42% of landfill? Is Spelthorne going to change its policy of allowing perfectly habitable dwellings to be demolished in order to reduce waste at source?
- d) Has the Council sought advice from the top performing councils in the country for recycling? (St.Edmundsbury 50.64%; Forest Heath DC 48.59%; South Cambridge DC 46.8%; Lichfield DC 46.35%; and Harborough 46%)
- e) It would appear the top councils supply containers free to collect compostible waste. Will Spelthorne do the same?

**The Portfolio Holder for Environment, Councillor G.E. Forsbrey responded as follows.**

- “a) It is intended to run pilots on the proposed service. It is expected that extra costs will be limited and some are "one offs" in terms of the scheme's implementation. We are also hoping that glass will be included by next year in the dry recyclables wheeled bin rather than having to be collected separately under the new scheme, thus keeping costs under control.
- b) The Council considers obtaining grants wherever possible. There was a pot of money of about £140M that was available in 2002/03 and 2003/04 to help Local Authorities with their waste and recycling schemes. Such funds are no longer available. More recently, much more targeted schemes have arisen and we do apply for these.
- c) The Council is fully aware of contribution that the construction industry makes to landfill waste. The Government, Surrey County Council and the industry itself are looking at ways

to increase recycling of such waste. In the UK, encouragement of diversion of biodegradable waste from landfill is implemented via the Landfill Allowance Trading Scheme. If targets under the scheme are not achieved in terms of reducing the amount of biodegradable waste to landfill, Surrey County Council will be fined, with potential consequences for Surrey council tax payers.

- d) Yes, the Council has sought advice and information from many Councils and also looked at the top performing Councils. However, a number of top performers only achieve such levels because they have a free garden waste collection or have been funded by Government grants. Their recycling rates for dry recyclables (paper, card etc) are often not that high. With regards to garden waste, Spelthorne is currently able to offer a limited cost effective service as the Surrey district closest to a composting site, but more facilities are required. Surrey County Council is intending to build such facilities in Surrey within the next two years.
- e) As a result of discussions in Surrey around the sustainability issues of garden waste collection, it is unlikely that Surrey will implement free garden waste collections services, as it only results in greater tonnages of waste to dispose of, rather than encouraging local composting in the garden and reduced carbon emissions”.

#### **327/06 LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK – ADOPTION OF THE STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY**

The Council considered the recommendation of the Executive on the proposed adoption by the Council of the Statement of Community Involvement.

**RESOLVED** that the Council approve the Statement of Community Involvement, subject to the Inspector’s recommendations.

#### **328/06 LICENSING COMMITTEE - PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE SCHEME OF DELEGATION TO OFFICERS**

The Council considered the recommendations of the Executive on proposed changes to the Council’s Scheme of Delegation to Officers.

**RESOLVED** that the Council agree that the Scheme of Delegation to Officers, in the Council’s Constitution, be amended to read as follows:

“To issue permits under Section 34 of the Gaming Act 1968: where:

- (a) In the case of a new application, there are no more than two amusements with prizes machines; and
- (b) In the case of an application for renewal and after consultation with the Chairman of the Licensing Committee and subject to Ward Members being notified, the number of machines does not exceed that which already exists and provided that no complaints have been received about the premises in respect of the machines.”

#### **329/06 RECYCLING AND WASTE COLLECTIONS**

The Council considered the recommendations of the Executive on proposals for future arrangements for Recycling and Waste Collections in the Borough.

It was moved by Councillor G.S. Ceaser and seconded by Councillor G.E. Forsbrey: -

- “1. That the alternate weekly collection system is based on co-mingled plus (flexibility to include add-ons), consisting of a two wheelie bin system with one bin for refuse and one for co-mingled dry recyclables, with flexibility to deal with difficult localities [including the provision of an appropriate stock of [180 litre] wheeled bins, for those properties unable to accommodate 240 litre bins].
2. That the 240 litre wheeled bin is the most appropriate container for an alternate weekly collection of residual waste.
3. That the 240 litre wheeled bin is the most appropriate container for alternate weekly collection of dry recyclable material.
4. That when the scheme comes into operation, refuse side waste will not be collected.
5. That when the scheme comes into operation, recycling side waste will be collected.
6. That one of the 240 litre bins is coloured entirely British Racing Green [including the lid], subject to advice being sought from the National Disability Discrimination forum on whether the colour is distinguishable by partially sighted persons.
7. That the other 240 litre bin is coloured entirely Light Green [including the lid], subject to advice being sought from the National Disability Discrimination forum on whether the colour is distinguishable by partially sighted persons.
8. That chip technology is fitted at the point of purchase and that the Officers shall not use such technology in any way without bringing the matter before the Council to determine the grounds for usage.
9. That branding is by way of “hot branding” and kept simple with the words “Spelthorne Borough Council” plus “the year”, on the top of each bin, and either the word “refuse” or “recycling”.
10. That the Council will continue to maintain the present chargeable garden waste service.
11. That the Officers are authorised to procure containers and vehicles (on contract hire and maintenance) appropriate for the service recommended in recommendations 1 to 3 and 6 to 9 above.
12. That the funding of the scheme be agreed with £1.1M capital provision for the purchase of wheeled bins, and, for inclusion in the outline budget, additional ongoing revenue of £286,000 or £556,000, if the Council require a separate glass collection.
13. That the implementation costs, as identified in paragraph 6.5 of the report of the Strategic Director (Community), be specifically funded from reserves.
14. That the Council places on record its thanks to the Improvement and Development Committee’s Waste Management Task Group for its work to date in considering the options for changes in the refuse and recycling system and for its advice to the Executive.

15. That the Waste Management Task Group continues, in order to address detailed issues under Phases 2 and 3 of the terms of reference, such as operational policies”.

An amendment was moved by Councillor C.V. Strong, seconded by Councillor I.J. Beardsmore that: -

“in line one of recommendation 2, the number ‘240’ be deleted and substituted by the number ‘180’;

That in line one of recommendation 6, the words ‘one of the 240 litre bins ‘ be deleted and the words ‘the 180 litre bin’ be substituted therefor; and

That in line one of recommendation 7, the word ‘other’ be deleted”

The amendment was lost.

**RESOLVED** that the Council agree, as follows:

1. That the alternate weekly collection system is based on co-mingled plus (flexibility to include add-ons), consisting of a two wheelie bin system with one bin for refuse and one for co-mingled dry recyclables, with flexibility to deal with difficult localities [including the provision of an appropriate stock of [180 litre] wheeled bins, for those properties unable to accommodate 240 litre bins].
2. That the 240 litre wheeled bin is the most appropriate container for an alternate weekly collection of residual waste.
3. That the 240 litre wheeled bin is the most appropriate container for alternate weekly collection of dry recyclable material.
4. That when the scheme comes into operation, refuse side waste will not be collected.
5. That when the scheme comes into operation, recycling side waste will be collected.
6. That one of the 240 litre bins is coloured entirely British Racing Green [including the lid], subject to advice being sought from the National Disability Discrimination forum on whether the colour is distinguishable by partially sighted persons.
7. That the other 240 litre bin is coloured entirely Light Green [including the lid], subject to advice being sought from the National Disability Discrimination forum on whether the colour is distinguishable by partially sighted persons.
8. That chip technology is fitted at the point of purchase and that the Officers shall not use such technology in any way without bringing the matter before the Council to determine the grounds for usage.
9. That branding is by way of “hot branding” and kept simple with the words “Spelthorne Borough Council” plus “the year”, on the top of each bin, and either the word “refuse” or “recycling”.
10. That the Council will continue to maintain the present chargeable garden waste service.

11. That the Officers are authorised to procure containers and vehicles (on contract hire and maintenance) appropriate for the service recommended in recommendations 1 to 3 and 6 to 9 above.
12. That the funding of the scheme be agreed with £1.1M capital provision for the purchase of wheeled bins, and, for inclusion in the outline budget, additional ongoing revenue of £286,000 or £556,000, if the Council require a separate glass collection.
13. That the implementation costs, as identified in paragraph 6.5 of the report of the Strategic Director (Community), be specifically funded from reserves.
14. That the Council places on record its thanks to the Improvement and Development Committee's Waste Management Task Group for its work to date in considering the options for changes in the refuse and recycling system and for its advice to the Executive.
15. That the Waste Management Task Group continues, in order to address detailed issues under Phases 2 and 3 of the terms of reference, such as operational policies.

#### **330/06 FORMAL ADOPTION OF THE SURREY JOINT MUNICIPAL WASTE MANAGEMENT STRATEGY**

The Council considered the recommendation of the Executive to formally adopt the Surrey Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy.

**RESOLVED** that the Council approve and adopt the Surrey Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy.

(Councillor I.J. Beardsmore indicated at the commencement of this item that he wished to have his abstention recorded in the Minutes)

#### **331/06 REVISED FINANCIAL REGULATIONS**

The Council considered the recommendation of the Executive on draft revised Financial Regulations.

**RESOLVED** that the Council approve the Revised Financial Regulations, as set out in the Appendix to the Report of the Strategic Director (Support) to the Executive.

#### **332/06 REVIEW OF THE PLANNING CODE**

The Council considered the recommendations of the Standards Committee on a revised Planning Code.

It was moved by Mr M. Litvak and seconded by Councillor E. O'Hara: -

“that the amendments to the Planning Code, as set out in the Annex to the report of the Monitoring Officer, be approved.”

Mr. Keith Johnson had given notice that he wished to present a Statement to the Council on the Review of the Planning Code before the Council made any decisions on Agenda Items 8 [a] and 8 [b] as follows: -

## **“Review of the Planning Code**

As a member of the public I am led to believe that the planning code is about the public’s perception of probity yet the public has no right to be consulted on its acceptability. I wish to comment on two of the clauses.

### a) Paragraph 22

From our experience with Kempton Park I request that this clause remains and is not deleted as proposed.

The Executive made decisions in private on the sale of a lease that affected this planning application and had a vested interest in seeing it approved. This was not subject to the Planning Officer’s report.

The public perception is that the Executive Planning Portfolio holder had a prejudicial interest.

### b) Paragraph 23

There is a strong case for members to take part in appeals where planning officers have made recommendations to approve a planning application which the planning committee then rejects because the planning officer has failed to take into account all material facts. Similarly cases where the Council has failed to determine an application by exceeding the time limit.

As a Member has a duty to the public it does not seem right to take advice from the department that failed in its performance.

I therefore suggest that Clause 2.3 be reworded as follows:

“A Member who intends to make representation in any planning appeal whether in writing or by appearing at a hearing or inquiry should advise the Head of Planning and Housing Strategy stating the reasons for such representation”.

Following a discussion by Members on paragraph 23 of the code, the Monitoring Officer stated that the wording of this paragraph was not intended to, and would not, prevent members of the Planning Committee either speaking on behalf of residents or themselves at a Planning enquiry.

**RESOLVED** that the amendments to the Planning Code, as set out in the Annex to the report of the Monitoring Officer, be approved.

## **333/06 REPORT FROM THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL**

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

## **334/06 IMPROVEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

The Chairman of the Improvement and Development Committee, Councillor J.D. Packman, presented his report, which outlined the matters the Committee had dealt with since the last Council meeting.

### **335/06 PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT AND REVIEW COMMITTEE**

The Chairman of the Performance Management and Review Committee, Councillor F. Ayers, presented his report, which outlined the matters the Committee had dealt with since the last Council meeting.

### **336/06 LICENSING COMMITTEE**

The Chairman of the Licensing Committee, Councillor R.W. Sider, presented his report, which outlined the matters the Committee had dealt with since the last Council meeting.

### **337/06 PLANNING COMMITTEE**

The Chairman of the Planning Committee, Councillor E. O'Hara, presented his report, which outlined the matters the Committee had dealt with since the last Council meeting.

### **338/06 STANDARDS COMMITTEE**

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

### **339/06 AUDIT COMMITTEE**

The Chairman of the Audit Committee, Councillor M.L. Bouquet, presented his report, which outlined the matters the Committee had dealt with since the last Council meeting.

**RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE**

**1. OUTLINE BUDGET 2007/2008 TO 2010/2011**

1.1 The Executive have considered a report updating Members on the changes to the Outline Budget 2007/2008 to 2010/2011, since it had been agreed by the Executive on 18 July 2006.

1.2 **The Executive recommends that the Council approve the following: -**

- (1) That the one-off implementation costs relating to the move to alternate weekly refuse/recycling collection (marketing and roll out temporary staff) be funded from reserves in 2007-2008 (funding in the sum of £196,000) and in 2008-2009 (funding in the sum of £44,000).**
- (2) That the target increase in fees and charges be five percent extra, unless a strong case can be argued for a lower or nil increase. Fees to be rounded up appropriately.**
- (3) That a housing options reserve be set up with a fund of £1million to be used to support schemes, together with an appropriate delegated decision making process in relation to the fund which must include the Leader of the Council, the relevant Portfolio Holder and the relevant Strategic Director.**
- (4) That the revised medium term financial strategy set out in the report of the Strategic Director (Support) be approved.**
- (5) That the Executive approve the list of growth items as per Appendix 3 to the report of the Strategic Director (Support), and that relevant staff subsequently revisit the growth items, to see if any reductions can be made, as part of the detailed Budget process of reducing the deficit down to nil.**
- (6) That the target Budget be set as £13,866,275, an increase of £43, 000 on the Outline Budget agreed by the Executive on 18 July 2006, the increase reflecting the higher than anticipated tax-base.**



**RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE**  
*[CONTINUED]*

**2. THE GAMBLING ACT 2005 – ADOPTION OF STATEMENT OF GAMBLING POLICY 2007-2010**

- 2.1 The Executive have considered a report seeking Members' approval to recommend to the full Council the adoption of the Spelthorne Borough Council Statement of Gambling Policy 2007 – 2010.
- 2.2 The draft policy has been submitted for public consultation for a three month period and a number of amendments have been made to the policy following this exercise.
- 2.3 The Executive recommend that the Council: -**
- (1) Endorse the adoption of the Spelthorne Borough Council Statement of Gambling Policy for 2007 – 2010, as shown in Appendix A to the report of the Strategic Director (Community).**
  - (2) Endorse the list of delegations, as shown in Appendix B to the report of the Strategic Director (Community).**

Councillor Gerry Ceaser  
*Leader of the Council*

**14 December 2006**

## **CHANGE TO STANDING ORDERS IN THE COUNCIL'S CONSTITUTION – PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

### **Resolution Required**

### **Report of the Strategic Director (Support)**

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

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

Bringing forward the deadline for written notice of public questions for Council will facilitate the preparation of more comprehensive replies by providing more time for research and will be of benefit to residents seeking responses on matters which affect the Borough.

#### **Purpose of Report**

To seek the approval of Council to revise Standing Orders relating to Public Question Time to bring forward the deadline for written notice of public questions for Council.

#### **Key Issues**

The existing deadline of no later than midday on the day of the Council meeting does not provide sufficient time for research in order to prepare comprehensive replies.

Bringing forward the deadline to no later than 12noon three working days prior to the day of the Council meeting will facilitate the preparation of more comprehensive and robust replies by providing more time for research.

Bringing forward the deadline as proposed will also deal with the issues of Council meetings on working days other than a Thursday and of bank holidays occurring in the weekdays immediately prior to a Council meeting. [e.g. The new deadline proposed will be 12noon on the preceding Monday for a Council meeting on a Thursday. If the preceding Monday is a bank holiday, the deadline will be 12noon on the preceding Friday.]

#### **Financial Implications**

There are none.

#### **Corporate Priority**

All 4 Priorities

#### **Recommendations**

**That the Council approve a revision to the Council's Constitution, in relation to Standing Order 12 - Public Question Time, to amend the wording of Sub-Section 12.3 - Notice of Questions to read *[amended wording shown in bold italics]*:**

"A question may only be asked if notice has been given by delivering it in writing or by electronic mail to the Chief Executive no later than ***12noon three working days prior to the day of the Council meeting***. Each question must give the name and address of the questioner and indicate the member of the Council to whom it is to be put."

**Contact: Sue Sturgeon, Strategic Director (Support), (01784) 446225  
Portfolio Holder: Councillor Ed Searancke**



## **MAIN REPORT**

### **1. BACKGROUND**

- 1.1 Experience to date is that the majority of public questions for Council are received just before midday on the day of the Council meeting, which is the current deadline for notice of public questions as set out in Standing Orders.
- 1.2 Although the wording of Standing Order 12 currently states that written notice of public questions must be given no later than midday on the day of the Council meeting, in practice only a few public questions have ever been received prior to the day of the Council meeting.
- 1.3 This timescale is far too short and does not provide the Council with sufficient time for research in order to prepare comprehensive and robust replies to public questions from local residents, seeking responses on matters which affect the Borough.

### **2. KEY ISSUES**

- 2.1 The existing deadline clearly does not provide sufficient time for research in order to prepare comprehensive and robust replies to local residents.
- 2.2 In light of experience to date in the Council rushing to reply to public questions, which in the main are received just prior to midday on Council day itself, there is a very good case to bring forward the deadline.
- 2.3 The proposal is to amend Standing Orders to introduce a revised deadline of no later than 12noon three working days prior to the day of the Council meeting.
- 2.4 The revised deadline will also deal with the issues of Council meetings on working days other than a Thursday and of bank holidays occurring in the weekdays immediately prior to a Council meeting. [e.g. The new deadline proposed will be 12noon on the preceding Monday for a Council meeting on a Thursday. If the preceding Monday is a bank holiday, the deadline will be 12noon on the preceding Friday.]

### **3. OPTIONS ANALYSIS**

- 3.1 The option of making no change to the current deadline is not favoured as there is a clear case to bring it forward to provide more time for preparing proper replies.
- 3.2 The option being recommended is a revision to Standing Orders to bring forward the deadline for written notice of public questions for Council to no later than 12noon three working days prior to the day of the Council meeting. [e.g. The new deadline proposed will be 12noon on the preceding Monday for a Council meeting on a Thursday. If the preceding Monday is a bank holiday, the deadline will be 12noon on the preceding Friday.]
- 3.3 It is felt that this improved deadline will facilitate the preparation by the Council of more comprehensive and robust replies to public questions from local residents by providing more time for research.

### **4. PROPOSALS**

- 4.1 To seek the approval of Council to revise Standing Order 12 – Public Question Time, to bring forward the deadline for written notice of public questions for Council to no later than 12noon three working days prior to the day of the

Council meeting. [e.g. The new deadline proposed will be 12noon on the preceding Monday for a Council meeting on a Thursday. If the preceding Monday is a bank holiday, the deadline will be 12noon on the preceding Friday.]

## **5. BENEFITS AND SUSTAINABILITY**

- 5.1 Bringing forward the deadline will facilitate the preparation by the Council of more comprehensive and robust replies to questions by providing more time for research.
- 5.2 This will be of benefit to those local residents who ask questions at Council and who are seeking responses on matters which affect the Borough, as they will receive more comprehensive and robust replies to their questions.
- 5.3 A further benefit will be that the revised deadline proposed will deal with the issues of Council meetings on working days other than a Thursday and of bank holidays occurring in the weekdays immediately prior to a Council meeting.

## **6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 6.1 There are none.

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

- 7.1 There are no direct legal or other implications from a decision by the Council on a change to Standing Orders to bring forward the deadline for written notice of public questions for a Council meeting to no later than 12noon three working days prior to the day of the Council meeting.
- 7.2 This is on the basis, that it is considered reasonable for the Council to require written notice of public questions at least three working days before the day of the Council meeting itself, in order to prepare comprehensive and robust replies.

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

- 8.1 The Council must be given written notice of public questions in sufficient time in order to be able to research and prepare comprehensive and robust replies.
- 8.2 Failure to receive written notice in sufficient time may potentially result in the non-delivery of a reply to a public question in time for the intended Council meeting. Also, this short timescale may potentially result in a lowering of the required standard for a reply to a public question.
- 8.3 Risks will be mitigated by the Council revising the deadline to no later than 12noon three working days prior to the day of the Council meeting to provide more time for research and for preparation of replies to questions. This revision will also deal with the issues of Council meetings on working days other than a Thursday and of bank holidays occurring in the weekdays immediately prior to a Council meeting.

## **9. TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION**

- 9.1 Subject to approval by Council, the proposed revision to Standing Order 12 – Public Question Time will take immediate effect from 15 December 2006.

### **Report Author:**

**Richard Powell, Principal Committee Manager, (01784) 446240**

### **Background Papers:**

**Standing Orders within the Council's Constitution.**



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

Since the last meeting of the Council the Executive has met twice. This report is an overview of some of the more significant issues we have discussed at our meetings on 16 October and 7 November 2006.

We have made recommendations to the Council on two matters that appear separately on this Agenda.

### **ISSUES INCORPORATING ALL 4 CORPORATE PRIORITIES**

#### **BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMME 2006/2009**

We have agreed a Best Value Review Programme over the next two years, which consists of a continuation of the current Business Improvement Review to cover other Council Services.

#### **DISABILITY AND EQUALITY SCHEME**

We have adopted the Spelthorne Disability Equality Scheme and associated Action Plan. This Scheme will enable the Council to meet its statutory requirements in relation to Disability Equality in the Borough.

#### **PEOPLE STRATEGY 2007–2010**

We have adopted the new People Strategy 2007 to 2010 and the Workforce Development Plan, with effect from 1 January 2007. The implementation of this Strategy and Workforce Plan will ensure that Spelthorne has the right people, with the right skills, in the right place doing the right things. By having good calibre staff, the Council will be in a better position to provide improved services for the community.

#### **MID YEAR ANNUAL EFFICIENCY STATEMENT**

We have approved the Council's Mid-Year Annual Efficiency Statement return for submission to the Department of Communities and Local Government [DCLG] by 30 November 2006. The information provided in this DCLG Efficiency Statement Return is very important, because the Council, by delivering services more efficiently, can then redirect resources towards enhancing other services provided to residents.

#### **MAKING SPELTHORNE SAFER**

#### **SPELTHORNE HEALTH AND SAFETY AT WORK SERVICE PLAN ADOPTION 2006-2007**

We have approved the [adoption of the](#) Spelthorne Health and Safety at Work Service Plan for 2006/2007 for immediate implementation. The Plan for 2006/2007 sets out how our Environmental Health Officers intend to ensure that the local business they visit safeguard the health, safety and welfare of their employees and visitors. We have

placed on record our thanks to the staff involved for their excellent performance in delivering and achieving the targets within the current Plan.

## **MAKING SPELTHORNE A BETTER PLACE / IMPROVING CUSTOMER SATISFACTION WITH SPELTHORNE'S SERVICES**

### **KINGSTON ROAD CAR PARK, STAINES**

We have authorised the Head of Corporate Governance to commence proceedings to renew the lease of the Kingston Road Car Park, Staines with Surrey County Council for a further period of five years, at the best possible rent. This Car Park is an important site for public car parking, and the renewal of the lease will enable local residents to continue parking at that location, which has the benefit of convenient access to Staines Town Centre.

### **DEPARTMENT FOR COMMUNITIES AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT CONSULTATION PAPER ON HOUSING AND PLANNING DELIVERY GRANT**

We have agreed that the formal response to the Department of Communities and Local Government is to advise them that Spelthorne Borough Council is totally opposed to the proposals contained in their consultation paper on Housing and Planning Delivery Grant. [The consultation paper sought greater provision of housing in the borough to meet local and national needs.](#) It proposed that [Councils might consider the need to accept more infill schemes in return for additional funding.](#)

### **HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT AND STOCK CONDITION SURVEY**

We have endorsed the findings of the 2006 Housing Needs Assessment and Stock Condition Survey, undertaken by Consultants commissioned by the Council, which will form the basis of the forthcoming Housing Strategy (2007-2009). The findings of the Housing Needs Assessment, when implemented over time, will provide an increase in affordable housing in the Borough of good quality design, creating mixed and sustainable communities in places where people want to live.

Councillor Gerry Ceaser  
*Leader of the Council*

**14 December 2006**



## **REPORT OF THE CHAIRMAN ON THE WORK OF THE IMPROVEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

The Improvement and Development Committee held a Special meeting on 4 December 2006 to consider the following items of business:

### **REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE WASTE MANAGEMENT TASK GROUP**

The minutes and recommendations of the Waste Management Task Group were presented to the Committee.

Following consideration of these the Committee made recommendations to Executive covering outline staffing proposals, the outline communication strategy and the “right message” for the publicity campaign.

The Committee also considered and agreed to move the April meeting of the Improvement and Development Committee from 18 to 5 April 2007.

The Waste Management Task Group would be considering difficult properties such as blocks of flats, terraced and small houses at its next meeting on 9 January 2007.

### **REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ICT OUTSOURCING CONTRACT TASK GROUP**

The ICT outsourcing contract Task Group presented an exempt report and recommendations on the future of the ICT outsourcing contract to the Committee, which then agreed and recommended them to Executive for consideration.

Councillor John Packman  
*Chairman of the Improvement and Development Committee*

**14 December 2006**

## **REPORT OF THE CHAIRMAN ON THE WORK OF THE PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT AND REVIEW COMMITTEE**

The Performance Management and Review Committee met once since the last Council meeting and this report gives an overview of the issues considered.

### **1. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES - Reconfiguration of Services between Ashford and St Peter's Hospitals**

- 1.1. The Committee received an update on the reconfiguration of services between Ashford and St Peter's Hospitals NHS Trust since the scrutiny review had been undertaken.

### **2. OUTCOME OF THE COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE EXECUTIVE**

- 2.1. The Committee noted how the Executive at its meeting on 12 September 2006 had responded to the committee's recommendations as follows:
- a Re-Configuration of Services between Ashford and St Peter's Hospitals – *Supported the recommendations of the Committee*
  - b Capital Budget Monitoring - *Supported the recommendations of the Committee*
  - c Revised Financial Regulations - *Supported the recommendations of the Committee including consulting neighbouring authorities on the draft document*
  - d Executive Forward Plan – *Supported the two areas where pre decision scrutiny approach could be undertaken.*

### **3. PEOPLE STRATEGY 2003 -2006**

- 3.1. The Committee discussed a report and received a presentation analysing the progress made towards the People Strategy 2003 – 2006 and noted how well it had performed against the agreed actions not only for this year but over the lifetime of the Strategy. In addition the Executive have recently approved a new Strategy for 2007 – 2010 with the following four main priorities (1) Developing the organisation, (2) Developing leadership and workforce skills capacity, (3) Resource the organisation and (4) Pay and Reward.

### **4. EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY MONITORING 2005/2006**

- 4.1. The Committee discussed an equality and diversity monitoring report which provided information on the make up of the current work force by gender, disability, ethnicity and age as well as the Council's performance on the Best Value Performance indicators on staff development and diversity. To assist members in their discussion the Head of Human Resources gave a presentation outlining the key trends and actions being taken.

## **5. FINANCIAL REPORTS**

- 5.1. The Committee discussed three financial related reports. The first covered the current budget monitoring position for both revenue and capital expenditure for the first six months of the year. The Committee were pleased to note that a £28k bottom line under spend had been identified as the current projected difference to the original budget. However the committee expressed concerns and have recommended to the Executive that greater care was needed in monitoring some areas including the arrangements for backdated car parking charges. The Committee have asked the Head of Financial Services to submit a report to the next meeting explaining how such contracts/agreements are processed and monitored.
- 5.2. The second report was the Treasury Management report providing details of the Council's activities in the borrowing and investment markets for the first six months of this financial year. The third financial report covered the New Schemes Fund, which provided an update on the progress and costs of schemes being financed from the fund. The report covered the fund's opening and closing balances, expenditure incurred and interest earned for the financial year 2006/2007 to the end of March 2007.
- 5.3. As Chairman I will be discussing with the Head of Financial Services different ways to present the financial information to the Committee in the future.

## **6. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT BEST VALUE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

- 6.1. The Committee discussed a report providing an update on progress on the Community Engagement Best Value review and noted that the majority of the actions had been successfully completed. For example the establishment of the neighbourhood grants scheme which provides each borough councillor with a budget of £1,000 to spend in their ward in 2006/2007.

## **7. ANNUAL REVIEW OF CORPORATE GOVERNANCE**

- 7.1. The Committee considered the report on the annual review of corporate governance as well as setting out a proposal for members to be involved in the 2007 review. The Committee felt that the current framework remains an appropriate method by which to assess the Council's arrangements for Corporate Governance and made no changes to the Code itself. The Committee went onto consider the proposed new framework coming into being sometime in the autumn and which would probably offer specific guidance on:
  - The role of Standards and Audit Committees
  - Partnership arrangements
  - Risk Management
  - The relationship of the framework to the Statement on Internal Control
  - The relationship of the framework to the Good Governance Standard of Public Services drawn up by the Independent Commission on Good Governance in Public Services.
- 7.2. The Committee agreed to approve this years review but deferred consideration of how the 2007 review would be undertaken until the next meeting.

## **8. REVIEW OF BYELAWS**

- 8.1. The Committee discussed the report on the review of the 1992 byelaws which would be considered by the Executive on 12 December 2006. The committee endorsed the report including the consultation process proposed, which would include consulting with residents' associations, friends of the parks, neighbourhood watch co-ordinators, sports associations, youth clubs and schools. In supporting the report the committee agreed to ask the Executive to add fireworks and moorings to the byelaws prior to consultation being undertaken.
- 8.2. The committee have also asked that at the appropriate time the project and communication plan be submit to the committee for their consideration.

## **9. TASK GROUPS**

- 9.1. The Committee noted the progress being made by the Task Group set up to look at those Area Profiles relevant to the Borough in particular those relating to activities for teenagers and vandalism, graffiti and other deliberate damage to property and vehicles. The Committee also noted the progress being made by the joint Task Group set up to look at the Outline Budget Strategy

## **10. PERFORMANCE INDICATORS**

- 10.1. The Committee received a presentation from the Assistant Chief Executive (Policy and Performance) on an analysis of the Councils' Performance against Corporate Targets and Performance Indicators for the first six months of the year. He went on to explain the new format being used to present such information which was now available on the council's website at [http://www.spelthorne.gov.uk/your\\_council/cou\\_about\\_spelthorne/policy\\_and\\_perfor\\_mance.htm/quarterly\\_performance\\_information.htm](http://www.spelthorne.gov.uk/your_council/cou_about_spelthorne/policy_and_perfor_mance.htm/quarterly_performance_information.htm)
- 10.2. This new format will give members the opportunity to submit questions either to myself or the Assistant Chief Executive (Policy and Performance) prior to committee meetings.

## **11. EXECUTIVE FORWARD PLAN**

- 11.1. The Committee discussed the Executive Forward Plan covering the period 1 November 2006 through to 30 April 2008.

## **12. COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME**

- 12.1. The Committee discussed and agreed their work programme for the remainder of the municipal year and in doing so agreed that the meeting arranged for 13 February 2007 be postponed until 8 March 2007.

Councillor Frank Ayers  
*Chairman of the Performance Management and Review Committee*

**14 December 2006**

## **REPORT OF THE CHAIRMAN ON THE WORK OF THE LICENSING COMMITTEE AND LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEES**

There have been two Licensing Sub-Committee meetings on 1 and 22 November and one meeting of the Licensing Committee on 15 November 2006, which considered the following items of business:

### **LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE – 1 November 2006**

A Licensing Sub-Committee heard and refused an application for a Private Hire Vehicle Driver Licence.

### **LICENSING COMMITTEE – 15 November 2006**

#### **Gambling Act 2005 – Adoption of Statement of Gambling Policy 2007 – 2010**

The Committee considered the Draft Statement of Gambling Policy 2007 – 2010 and recommended its adoption to Executive, as well as the adoption of proposed delegations, a further consultation exercise to specifically gauge public opinion as to whether the Council should pass a 'no casino' resolution and that funding for the estimated additional 25% of a full-time equivalent post be found from within existing staffing structures.

### **LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE – 22 November 2006**

A Licensing Sub-Committee heard and granted an application for a Premises License, subject to modification and conditions, in respect of Eales News, 136 Chesterfield Road, Ashford.

Councillor Robin Sider  
*Chairman of the Licensing Committee*

**14 December 2006**

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

The Planning Committee has met twice since the previous report was prepared for the Council meeting. This report therefore gives an overview of the key applications considered by the Planning Committee at its meetings on 11<sup>th</sup> October 2006 and 8<sup>th</sup> November 2006.

1. The Planning Committee meeting on **11th October 2006** dealt with six items in total.

Public speaking took place on two items with 4 people taking the opportunity to address the Committee.

The most notable items on the agenda were:

- (a) The approval of planning permission for the demolition of existing building, and erection of a block of 7 flats at Fairacre, Feltham Hill Road, Ashford
- (b) The refusal of planning permission for the demolition of existing building and erection of new retail unit and six 2 bedroom and 1 one bedroom flats above at 173 Staines Road West, Sunbury on Thames.

2. The Planning Committee meeting was held on **8th November 2006** and dealt with nine items. Public speaking took place on three items with five people taking the opportunity to address the Committee.

The most notable items on the agenda were:

- (a) The approval of planning permission for the demolition of the existing building and the erection of 24 flats at the Crooked Billet PH, London Road, Staines.
- (b) The refusal of planning permission for erection of 46 dwellings (28 flats and 18 houses) within 2 and 3 storey buildings at Former Lex Transfleet Depot, Charlton Road, Charlton Village.
- (c) The approval of planning permission for the demolition of existing buildings and erection of a part 2.5 storey part 3.5 storey building to provide 11 flats at No. 14 and part of former Dairy site, Church Road, Ashford.
- (d) The approval of planning permission for the rebuilding of existing garden centre and concessionary buildings at Squires Garden Centre, Halliford Road, Shepperton.

5. **Other matters of interest**

- (a) Performance figures for speed of determining planning applications:

	<b>Major applications (BVPI Target) (60% in 13 wks)</b>	<b>Minor applications (BVPI Target) (70% in 8 wks)</b>	<b>Other applications (BVPI Target) (85% in 8 wks)</b>
<b>2005</b>			
November	None	29%	80%
December	None	58%	77%
<b>2006</b>			
January	None	68%	75%
February	33%	62%	91%
March	50%	87%	87%
April	100%	80%	86%
May	100%	78%	86%
June	100%	71%	84%
July	0%	73%	89%
August	50%	81%	83%
September	71%	46%	84%
October	100%	71%	86%
November	80%	77%	86%

- (b) The Planning and Housing Strategy Service has recently begun to implement its Business Process Improvement Plan. The four projects in the overall plan cover customer services, validation, charging and ICT. This phase will take up to six months to implement in full. The aim is to provide efficiency savings of up to £50k as well as maintain/improve the customer experience.

Councillor John O'Hara  
*Chairman of the Planning Committee*

**14 December 2006**