

**Roberto Tambini
Chief Executive**

For this Council meeting, please telephone: Trevor Baker on Tel: (01784) 446267 or e-mail him at: t.baker@spelthorne.gov.uk

21 April 2010

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 29 APRIL 2010 beginning at 7.30pm**, for the purpose of transacting the business specified in the Agenda **set out on the next page**.

ROBERTO TAMBINI
Chief Executive

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, Staines. 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 [For this Council meeting, please telephone Trevor Baker on Tel: (01784) 446267 or e-mail him at: t.baker@spelthorne.gov.uk]

(1) Asking a Public Question; (2) Presenting a Petition; (3) Representations on Recommendations

(1) Public "Question Time" is near the start of Council meetings and is an opportunity for any person to ask the Leader of the Council, or his nominee, a question about a matter in which the Council has powers or duties or an issue that affects the Borough.

(2) The Council has a procedure to enable any person to present a petition at a Council meeting and for the presenter to address the Council for a maximum of three minutes.

(3) Before the Council considers a recommendation from the Cabinet or a Committee and before it makes a decision on that recommendation, any person can put forward views on the issues involved by making representations to the Council for a maximum of three minutes.

Persons wishing to (1) ask a public question, (2) present a petition or (3) make representations on a recommendation **must** notify the Chief Executive [CX] in writing by letter, FAX or e-mail before **12 Noon, five working days prior to the day of the Council meeting [i.e. before 12 noon on the preceding Thursday for a Council meeting on the following Thursday]** and at the same time **must** deliver to CX (1) their written question, (2) the original of their petition or (3) their written statement of representations.

IMPORTANT PUBLIC NOTICE

MOBILE TECHNOLOGY – ACCEPTABLE USE

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

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

PLEASE:

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

THANK YOU FOR YOUR CO-OPERATION IN THIS MATTER.

**Roberto Tambini
Chief Executive**

A G E N D A

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

To note apologies received from the Mayor, Councillor Caroline Spencer and from Councillor Miss M.M. Bain and to receive any other apologies for non-attendance.

2. MINUTES – COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON 25 FEBRUARY 2010
[pages 5 to 32]

To confirm as a correct record the Minutes of the Council Meeting held on 25 February 2010.

3. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

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

4. ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE MAYOR

- (1) The Mayor to present the Civic Pride Environmental Awards.
- (2) The Mayor to announce details of any planned Mayoral events

5. ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE LEADER

To receive any announcements from the Leader.

6. ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE

To receive any announcements from the Chief Executive.

7. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

The Leader or his nominee to answer questions raised by members of the public *[where proper notice has been given in accordance with the procedures laid down in the Council's Constitution]*.

8. PETITIONS

To receive petitions submitted to the Council *[where proper notice of the petitions and the persons wishing to speak to them has been given in accordance with the procedures laid down in the Council's Constitution]*.

9. RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE CABINET
[pages 33 to 34]

To consider the recommendations from the Cabinet on the following matters:-

- (1) Street Trading Policy Revisions**
- (2) Surrey First Initiative – Joint Committee for the Oversight of Delivery of Surrey Public Authority Services**
- (3) Updates to the Council's Constitution**
- (4) The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 [To Follow].**

(5) Changes to Overview and Scrutiny [To Follow].

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

10. RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
[pages 35 to 36]

To consider the recommendations from the Planning Committee seeking approval on the making of an Article 4 Direction to withdraw permitted development rights in respect of land at The Nutshells, Abbey Road, Shepperton.

11. RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE STANDARDS COMMITTEE
[pages 37 to 38]

To consider the recommendations from the Standards Committee on Political Restrictions on Local Government Employees.

12. REPORT FROM THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL
[pages 39 to 40]

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

13. REPORT FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE
[pages 41 to 42]

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

14. REPORT FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE AUDIT COMMITTEE
[pages 43 to 44]

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

15. REPORT FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE IMPROVEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
[pages 45 to 46]

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

16. REPORT FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE LICENSING COMMITTEE
[pages 47 to 48]

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

17. REPORT FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT AND REVIEW COMMITTEE
[pages 49 to 50]

To receive the report from the Chairman of the Performance Management and Review Committee on the work of her Committee.

18. REPORT FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
[pages 51 to 52]

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

19. REPORT FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE STANDARDS COMMITTEE
[pages 53 to 54]

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

20. QUESTIONS ON WARD ISSUES

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

21. 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, *[where proper notice has been given in accordance with the procedures laid down in the Council's Constitution]*.

22. APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES

Re-appointment of a Representative Trustee to the Ashford Relief in Need Charities

To consider the re-appointment of Mrs. Brenda Ann Bartlett of 21 Clifford Grove, Ashford as a Council Representative Trustee to the Ashford Relief in Need Charities, for a four year term of office until 28 April 2014.

23. URGENT BUSINESS

To consider any urgent business.

MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON 25 FEBRUARY 2010

BOROUGH OF SPELTHORNE

AT THE MEETING OF THE SPELTHORNE BOROUGH COUNCIL HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, COUNCIL OFFICES, KNOWLE GREEN, STAINES ON THURSDAY 25 FEBRUARY 2010

Amos Mrs P.C.	Forsbrey G.E.	Pinkerton Mrs J.M.
Bain Miss M.M.	Grant Mrs D.L.	Pinkerton Jack D.
Beardsmore I.J.	Hirst A.P.	Rough Mrs M.W.
Bell Mrs E.M.	Hyams Ms N.A.	Rough S.J.
Bhadye S.	Jaffer H.R.	Royer M.T.
Broom Ms P.A.	Leighton Mrs V.J.	Sider R.W.
Budd S.E.W.	McShane D.L.	Smith-Ainsley R.A. (Deputy Leader)
Colison-Crawford R.B.	Napper Mrs I.	Spencer Caroline (Mayor)
Crabb T.W.	Nichols Mrs C.E.	Strong C.V.
Dunn Mrs S.A.	Nichols L.E.	Thomson H.A.
Fairfax S.J.	O'Hara E. (Deputy Mayor)	Trussler G.F.
Flurry K.E.	Packman J.D. (Leader)	

Councillor Caroline Spencer, The Mayor, in the Chair

37/10 COUNCIL AWARDED THE INVESTORS IN PEOPLE [IIP] - 15 YEAR AWARD

The Mayor, Councillor Caroline Spencer, informed the Council that she would now invite the Leader, Councillor John Packman, to make a very special announcement about the prestigious Investors in People - 15 Year Award received by Spelthorne Borough Council.

The Leader advised Members that the Borough Council had recently received a '15 Year Award' from Investors in People UK to celebrate the fact that the Council had been continuously recognised as an Investors in People [IIP] organisation for more than 15 years. This was a fantastic achievement demonstrating an ongoing dedication to people and a commitment to continuous business improvement. The Council now joined a select group of businesses to achieve such a significant milestone.

Spelthorne was the first business in Surrey and only the second Local Authority in England and Wales to be accredited with IIP. Spelthorne recognised at the time that working to the IIP Standard could help the Council to attract and retain good people and improve overall performance. The Council's accreditation covers all Spelthorne's people who contribute to the delivery of the Council's priorities and services - both Members and Staff - and reinforces the good practice on Members' Development which was also recognised by Spelthorne's commitment to the Members' Development Charter.

Over the years the IIP standard had been reviewed regularly to ensure it continued to be relevant and reflected good practice, and it remained relevant for Spelthorne as the Council strived for continuous improvement in changing and challenging times. Spelthorne's next IIP review was due in March 2010.

The Mayor presented the Investors in People - 15 Year Award to Jan Hunt, the Council's Head of Human Resources, who received it on behalf of the Borough Council.

38/10 PROCEDURE FOR MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

The Mayor outlined the Members' Questions procedure, which was circulated at the meeting, and advised that all questions and answers would, where appropriate, be read aloud [see also Minutes 52/10, 53/10 and 54/10 below]. In view of the number of questions received, the Mayor advised that she would not allow any supplementary questions to be asked at this meeting.

39/10 APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors F. Ayers, M.L. Bouquet and C.A. Davis and from Sue Faulkner, Vice-Chairman of the Standards Committee.

40/10 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 17 December 2009 were approved as a correct record.

41/10 ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE MAYOR

Planned Mayoral Events

The Mayor advised Members of the following forthcoming events:

Staines Brass Band Concert – 28th February 2010 at St. Peters Church, Staines
Charity Ball – 20th March 2010 at the Orangery, Shepperton Studios
Staines Brass Band Concert – 28th March 2010 at St. Peters Church, Staines
St. Georges Day Lunch – 23rd April 2010 at the Thames Lodge Hotel, Staines
Civic Community Reception 13th May 2010 at the Orangery, Shepperton Studios

42/10 ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE LEADER

The Leader informed the Council that a Special Planning Committee meeting would be held at Kempton Park in April 2010 [actual date still to be confirmed] to consider the London Irish planning application.

43/10 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

First question from Mr. Don Cunningham:

"Following a lengthy Examination in Public, The Government appointed Inspector, satisfied herself as to the Council's plans to meet its housing targets until 2026 by confirming the 'soundness' of the Allocations Development Plan Document; and, in recently published correspondence, the deputy Leader Cllr. Smith-Ainsley stated that the Council, quote; "has no intention of exceeding the Government's housing figure."

Will the Leader re-confirm his commitment to the Allocations Development Plan Document and endorse the comments of his Deputy Leader? Further, will he also commit to standing against any attempt by developers to encourage this Borough to exceed its targets in order to alleviate development pressures that may exist within other districts in the South East Region?"

Second question from Mr. John Hirsh:

"At the time of the Primary held to select the Conservative candidate, Cllr. Philippa Broom was asked whether she supported any plans which might put this Borough at risk of suffering a net loss of its protected urban open space to development. She was unequivocal in her reply, that she was emphatically opposed to any such plans.

Would the Leader, on behalf of the Council, add his unqualified endorsement to the views expressed by Cllr. Broom; and, like her, signal his clear opposition to the prospect of such development, especially as it would reduce the 'absolute minimum provision standard' of 2.37 hectares per 1000 population?"

Third question from Mr. Ron Pettifor:

"Clause 2.10 of the Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document, adopted on 26 February 2009, states that over the next 20 years the Borough's population in the age groups 0-14 years and 24-44 years will fall and that all age groups over 50 will rise. The Council's objective 8 set out in clause 3.3 of the same document is to ensure provision is made for the needs of all sections of the community.

Would the Leader, on behalf of the Council, agree that in order to meet this objective it is important to retain all existing sports facilities, specifically those which meet the recreational needs of an aging population in Spelthorne?"

Combined reply by the Leader of the Council, Councillor John Packman, to the questions from Mr. Don Cunningham, Mr. John Hirsh and Mr. Ron Pettifor:

"The Council is required by the South East Plan to build 3320 dwellings between 2006 and 2026 and, through its Core Strategy and Policies and Allocations DPDs, has demonstrated how this and various other needs in the Borough can be met without developing any "inappropriate sites". Such inappropriate sites include protected urban open space as well as, for example, the green belt, flood risk areas and land used for open space sport and recreation.

I can assure you we have very clear policies to protect all such areas and it is vital to do so to meet the needs of all residents in both this and future generations.

Having spent a lot of time in getting our Core Strategy and Policies DPD and Allocations DPDs found 'sound' and adopted, I can assure you of my unequivocal commitment to see they are applied in a consistent and firm manner. Such commitment also equally applies to the six Local Plan policies we "saved" in 2007, which includes our Green Belt policy.

There is no requirement for this Council to consider providing housing for other parts of the South East Region over and above the allocation it has been given and any proposal suggesting this as reason to set aside any of our planning policies would, in my view, be fundamentally flawed.

However in giving this commitment you are seeking I would ask that you do not hold me accountable for any "misdeeds!" that might come down from Westminster in the future my authority does not extend that far."

Fourth question from Mr. Jim Kampta:

"In 9th February edition of the Evening Standard, Professor Kelly, an environmental health expert from Kings College, London, whilst giving evidence at the Commons Environmental Audit Committee, said that an estimated 3-5000 people were dying in the Capital each year, (in the worst cases 10 years prematurely) due to nitrogen dioxide particulates. He wanted action on cleaner air and urged a reduction in vehicles by at least 20-30%.

The Introduction to the Core Strategy and Policies DPD, para. 2.7 describes the whole of the Borough as an Air Quality Management Area because of poor air quality; and

para. 2.31 recognises that there is a particular concentration of poorer air quality around the Sunbury Cross junction. Local policies EN3 and CC2 provide for community protection against inappropriate development which may result in an increase in nitrogen dioxide emissions.

Will the Leader take this opportunity to re-affirm these policies and to denounce any development proposals which may result in an increase in such emissions?"

Reply by Councillor Simon Bhadye:

"The Council's Core Strategy sets out its very clear policy to improve air quality in the Borough and minimise its harmful effects and Policy EN3, to which you refer, identifies a number of ways in which this will be achieved. This includes requiring an air quality assessment, where new developments are likely to worsen air quality, and refusing them if their impact proves to be harmful.

We wish to assure Mr Kampta and all of our residents that we take this issue very seriously and undertake extensive and regular monitoring of air quality across the whole Borough to ensure our work is always informed by the latest available information. This enables us to carefully assess the significance of any potential air quality impacts on local people arising from proposed new development.

We should not forget that ultimately it is the responsibility of central government to determine the future policies on air quality."

Fifth question from Mr. George Rushbrook:

"Following concerns expressed in Parliament and elsewhere over the problem of "garden grabbing" by developers, the Government commissioned Kingston University to research and report on the problem.

In the course of their enquiries the University contacted every local Council planning authority in England requesting assistance.

This Borough's neighbouring Councils – Runnymede, Elmbridge, Hillingdon, Richmond upon Thames and Mole Valley responded to assist. Spelthorne Borough Council did not respond.

The extensive detailed University report has recently been published and resulting from this Government has seen fit to amend PPS 3 saying "*There is no presumption that that previously developed land is necessarily suitable for housing nor that all of the cartilage should be developed.*"

The Department for Communities and Local Government has written to all Councils and the Planning Inspectorate on 19 January 2010 to make this clear. They have added that these are local problems and the local authorities have the powers to enact policies to prevent or resist development of existing gardens. The existences of clear consistent local policies are essential when resisting such types of development."

"My Questions are:

"Why did Spelthorne Borough Council not respond to the enquiry?"

"In the light of the amendment to PPS 3, what steps will the Council be taking to introduce policies to deal with garden development and in what time scale?"

Reply by Councillor Richard Smith-Ainsley:

"The threat of any inappropriate development is always a matter of concern especially when it involves existing residential areas. That is why we included in our recently adopted Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document Policy HO1 which only encourages housing on suitable sites. Policy EN1 gives specific guidance on the 'Design of New Development'. It sets out the Council's policy to secure a high standard of design and layout and identifies a number of important requirements that must be met to ensure a development is acceptable.

These policies provide the basis on which poor proposals can be refused. For your information we often do refuse development and are generally well supported where cases are taken to appeal.

The recent research and subsequent guidance from the Department of Communities and Local Government to all authorities has highlighted the powers authorities have to control inappropriate development by creating the right local policies. This advice is particularly pertinent to the 85% of local authorities who, unlike Spelthorne, have yet to adopt Core Strategies. Runnymede, Elmbridge and Hillingdon have not adopted Core Strategy to guide backland developments. Whilst Richmond has an adopted Core Strategy, this only dealt with broad strategic principles and they are only now just going out to public consultation on their pre-submission Development Management DPD, which will consider such issues. Finally, Mole Valley Council do have an adopted Core Strategy, but again the issue of backland development will be covered in a subsequent Core Development Management DPD, which has yet to be timetabled into their LDF programme. The Government Department also advised that it was amending its guidance in PPS 3 by repositioning one sentence from the Annex to the main part of the text. This has otherwise added nothing new.

Therefore, as we had already established our policy approach it was not considered expedient to respond to the Department on this particular matter.

There is, therefore, no need to amend our policies, but I am pleased to take this opportunity to announce that, as part of a longstanding commitment, we will be preparing a Supplementary Planning Document to support Policy EN1 and will be writing to all local groups shortly to advise them how and when they will be able to contribute to the process. We will also send Mr. Rushbrook a personal invitation."

44/10 PETITIONS

The Mayor advised that under Standing Order 15.2, a petition had been received objecting to Surrey County Council's proposal that Shortwood Infant School, Staines would close on 31 August 2010. Mr. Charles Doherty, for the petitioners, addressed the Council about the petition.

RESOLVED that the Council notes the petition and forwards it to Surrey County Council as the Local Education Authority.

45/10 DETAILED BUDGET 2010/2011

The Council considered the recommendation of the Cabinet on the detailed Budget for 2010/2011 and on a formal proposal on a Council Tax for 2010/2011.

The Mayor referred Members to the Budget Book [green cover] reflecting the decisions and recommendations made by the Executive on 16 February 2010 and the precepts being levied by Surrey County Council and the Surrey Police which had been previously circulated to all Members.

At the invitation of the Mayor, the Council gave consent under Standing Order 18.4 for the budget speech of each of the Group Leaders to exceed 10 minutes.

The Leader of the Council, Councillor John Packman, made a statement on the Budget and Council Tax and moved the recommendations set out in the Budget Book (green cover). This was seconded by Councillor Mrs. Vivienne Leighton. The Leader of the Opposition Group, Councillor Colin Strong, also made a statement.

A copy of the Council Leader's and the Opposition Leader's statements were made available for other Members, the press and the public at the meeting. In addition, copies of the statements are **attached to these Minutes at Appendices A and B, respectively.**

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Packman moved and Councillor Mrs. Leighton seconded the recommendations on the detailed Budget for 2010/2011, as set out in the Budget Book (green cover).

Councillor Packman requested, under Standing Order 21.4, that the voting on the recommendations be recorded.

The voting was as follows:

FOR (26)	Councillors Mrs. P.C. Amos, Miss M.M. Bain, S. Bhadye, Miss P.A. Broom, S.E.W. Budd, S.J. Fairfax, G.E. Forsbrey, Mrs D.L. Grant, A.P. Hirst, Ms N.A. Hyams, H.R. Jaffer, Mrs V.J. Leighton, D.L. McShane, Mrs I. Napper, E. O'Hara, J.D. Packman, Mrs J.M. Pinkerton, Jack D. Pinkerton, Mrs M.W. Rough, S.J. Rough, M.T. Royer, R.W. Sider, R.A. Smith-Ainsley, Mrs C.L. Spencer, H.A. Thomson and G.F. Trussler
AGAINST (8)	Councillors I.J. Beardsmore, Mrs E.M. Bell, R.B. Colison-Crawford, T.W. Crabb, Mrs S.A. Dunn, Mrs C.E. Nichols, L.E. Nichols and C.V. Strong

RESOLVED:

1. To approve the growth and savings items as set out in the report of the Chief Finance Officer.
2. To approve a 0% increase in the Spelthorne element of the Council Tax for 2010/2011 and the following proposals:
 - a) That the Revenue Estimates as set out in the report of the Chief Finance Officer be approved.
 - b) That no money, as set out in the report of the Chief Finance Officer, is appropriated from General Reserves in support of Spelthorne's local Council Tax for 2010/2011.

COUNCIL, 25 February 2010 - Continued

- c) To agree that the Council Tax base for the year 2010/2011 is 40,388.20 calculated in accordance with Regulation 3 of the Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) Regulations 1992, as amended, made under Section 35(5) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992.

3. That the following sums be now calculated by the Council for the year 2010/2011 in accordance with Sections 32 and 33 of the Local Government Act 1992.

(a)	£55,300,800	Being the aggregate of the amount which the council estimates for the items set out in Section 32 (2)(a) to (e) of the Act.
(b)	£42,920,422	Being the aggregate for the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 32 (3)(a) to (c) of the Act.
(c)	£12,380,378	Being the amount by which the aggregate at (a) above exceeds the aggregate at (b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 32(4) of the Act, as its budget requirement for the year.
(d)	£5,623,432	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 th February 1994 (Community Charge surplus).
(e)	£167.30	Being the sum (c) above less the amount at (d) above, all divided by the amount at (c) 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.

4. That the following amounts be now calculated by the Council for the year 2010/2011, in accordance with section 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992.

VALUATION BANDS

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
111.53	130.12	148.71	167.30	204.48	241.66	278.83	334.60

Being the amounts given by multiplying the amount at (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 sum 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.

5. That it be noted that for the year 2010/2011 that the Surrey County Council and the Surrey Police Authority 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.

Valuation Bands	A £	B £	C £	D £	E £	F £	G £	H £
Precepting Authority: Surrey County Council	744.24	868.28	992.32	1116.36	1364.44	1612.52	1860.60	2232.72
Surrey Police Authority	132.36	154.42	176.48	198.54	242.66	286.78	330.90	397.08

6. That, having calculated the aggregate in each case of the amounts at 4. and 5. above the Council, in accordance with Section 30 (2) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets out the following amounts as the amounts of Council Tax for the year 2010/2011 for each of the categories of dwellings shown below.

A £	B £	C £	D £	E £	F £	G £	H £
988.13	1152.82	1317.51	1482.20	1811.58	2140.96	2470.33	2964.40

46/10 TREASURY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY STATEMENT AND ANNUAL INVESTMENTS STRATEGY 2010/2011

The Council considered the recommendation of the Cabinet on the Treasury Management Strategy Statement and Annual Investments Strategy 2010/2011.

RESOLVED to:

1. Approve the Treasury Management Strategy and Annual Investment Strategy for 2010/11 as set out in the report by the Chief Finance Officer to the Cabinet.
2. Formally adopt the CIPFA publication "Treasury Management in the Public Services Code of Practice and Cross-Sectional Guidance Notes" (The Code), published in 2009.

47/10 REPORT FROM THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

The Leader of the Council, Councillor John Packman, presented his report, which outlined the various matters the Cabinet had decided since the last Council meeting.

48/10 IMPROVEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

The Chairman of the Improvement and Development Committee, Councillor Mrs Jean Pinkerton, presented her report, which outlined the matters the Committee had scrutinised since the last Council meeting.

49/10 LICENSING COMMITTEE

The Chairman of the Licensing Committee, Councillor Robin Sider, presented his report, which outlined the matters the Committee had decided since the last Council meeting. The Chairman placed on record his thanks to the Members and Officers involved for all their hard work on the various Licensing Sub-Committee meetings referred to in his report.

50/10 PLANNING COMMITTEE

The Chairman of the Planning Committee, Councillor Howard Thomson, presented his report, which outlined the matters the Committee had decided since the last Council meeting.

51/10 MOTIONS

Under Standing Order 16.3, a Notice of Motion had been received concerning Planning Infrastructure Contributions.

Councillor Colin Strong proposed and Councillor Tony Crabb seconded the following motion:

“Council notes that seven of the eleven Borough Councils in Surrey, supported by the County Council, have introduced Planning Infrastructure Contributions that are levied on small scale new builds.

These contributions generate extra money for the County Council to spend on highways, education and libraries, and for the Borough to go towards extra community facilities, recycling and environmental improvements.

Council further notes that the Government is finalising regulations (that stem from the Planning Act 2008) to allow Councils to introduce a Community Infrastructure Levy, with similar but wider objectives.

Council acknowledges the burden on the local infrastructure by the proliferation of small scale developments that fall outside the scope of Section 106 Agreements.

Council RESOLVES that, in principle, it supports Planning Infrastructure Contributions and will work to introduce such a levy as soon as practicable.”

An amendment to the motion was moved by Councillor Richard Smith-Ainsley and seconded by Councillor Philippa Broom, as follows:

“In paragraph 2 after the word “money” insert the words “based on demographic changes”.

In paragraph 4 after the word “infrastructure” insert the words “in those seven Surrey Districts”.

In paragraph 5 delete all words after the word “that” and insert the words “This Council will continue to employ the most effective and justifiable means that are available for extracting Developer Contributions and other section 106 monies for infrastructure improvements.”

Copies of the amendment to the motion were circulated to all Members at the meeting.

Councillor Strong requested, under Standing Order 21.4, that the voting on the amendment to the motion be recorded.

Councillor Mrs C.E. Nichols left the Chamber in advance of the vote on the amendment.

The voting was as follows:

FOR (26)	Councillors Mrs. P.C. Amos, Miss M.M. Bain, S. Bhadye, Miss P.A. Broom, S.E.W. Budd, S.J. Fairfax, K.E. Flurry, G.E. Forsbrey, Mrs D.L. Grant, A.P. Hirst, Ms N.A. Hyams, Mrs V.J. Leighton, D.L. McShane, Mrs I. Napper, E. O'Hara, J.D. Packman, Mrs J.M. Pinkerton, Jack D. Pinkerton, Mrs M.W. Rough, S.J. Rough, M.T. Royer, R.W. Sider, R.A. Smith-Ainsley, Mrs C.L. Spencer, H.A. Thomson and G.F. Trussler
AGAINST (7)	Councillors I.J. Beardsmore, Mrs E.M. Bell, R.B. Colison-Crawford, T.W. Crabb, Mrs S.A. Dunn, L.E. Nichols and C.V. Strong

The amendment was carried and the motion, as amended, became the substantive motion.

Councillor Strong requested, under Standing Order 21.4, that the voting on the substantive motion be recorded.

The voting was as follows:

FOR (26)	Councillors Mrs. P.C. Amos, Miss M.M. Bain, S. Bhadye, Miss P.A. Broom, S.E.W. Budd, S.J. Fairfax, K.E. Flurry, G.E. Forsbrey, Mrs D.L. Grant, A.P. Hirst, Ms N.A. Hyams, Mrs V.J. Leighton, D.L. McShane, Mrs I. Napper, E. O'Hara, J.D. Packman, Mrs J.M. Pinkerton, Jack D. Pinkerton, Mrs M.W. Rough, S.J. Rough, M.T. Royer, R.W. Sider, R.A. Smith-Ainsley, Mrs C.L. Spencer, H.A. Thomson and G.F. Trussler
AGAINST (7)	Councillors I.J. Beardsmore, Mrs E.M. Bell, R.B. Colison-Crawford, T.W. Crabb, Mrs S.A. Dunn, L.E. Nichols and C.V. Strong

The substantive motion was carried and it was **RESOLVED**, as follows:

Council notes that seven of the eleven Borough Councils in Surrey, supported by the County Council, have introduced Planning Infrastructure Contributions that are levied on small scale new builds.

These contributions generate extra money based on demographic changes for the County Council to spend on highways, education and libraries, and for the Borough to go towards extra community facilities, recycling and environmental improvements.

Council further notes that the Government is finalising regulations (that stem from the Planning Act 2008) to allow Councils to introduce a Community Infrastructure Levy, with similar but wider objectives.

Council acknowledges the burden on the local infrastructure in those seven Surrey Districts by the proliferation of small scale developments that fall outside the scope of Section 106 Agreements.

Council RESOLVES that this Council will continue to employ the most effective and justifiable means that are available for extracting Developer Contributions and other section 106 monies for infrastructure improvements.

52/10 DURATION OF MEETING

As the meeting had lasted for nearly 3 hours and as there was still business to be transacted, at the request of the Mayor, the Council gave consent under Standing Order 5.1 for the meeting to continue until 10.45pm.

53/10 QUESTIONS ON WARD ISSUES

In light of Minute 52/10 above and in order to expedite the business of the Council meeting, the Mayor asked the Member who had submitted a Ward Issues question whether or not they wished the question and the answer to be read aloud. The Mayor indicated that if the Member concerned wished to receive a more detailed written answer to their question this would, where applicable, be passed to them after the meeting and would be recorded in full in the Council Minutes.

Under Standing Order 14, Councillor Mrs Sandra Dunn submitted the following question:

'What is the position of Spelthorne Borough Council with regard to the proposed energy from waste plant at Charlton? Does it support or oppose the proposal?'

Reply by Councillor Gerry Forsbrey:

"To date the outline proposals have only been described to the Council and residents. Surrey, we understand, are now working on a detailed proposal to be submitted in late summer as a planning application. Until the Council see these detailed proposals and understand fully particular issues, such as potential impact on transport and air quality, it would not be appropriate for the Council to make a statement along the lines suggested."

Written response by Councillor Gerry Forsbrey:

"Thank you for your question regarding proposals for Charlton Lane.

As you may well know, Surrey is rapidly running out of landfill sites for rubbish, and considerable emphasis is now being placed on minimising waste in the first place, followed by reuse and recycling. It is hoped this will greatly reduce levels of residual waste across the County. Authorities are also increasingly looking at food waste collection, which also requires processing.

Surrey is aiming to move away from the traditional approach of several large energy from waste plants, towards a cleaner and more advanced thermal treatment technology called gasification.

The proposed Eco Park at Charlton Lane will provide an opportunity for a number of advanced processing technologies (including gasification) to co-locate, alongside an innovation education centre. The aim of these technologies is to harness as effectively as possible the beneficial by products of waste.

For example anaerobic digestion of food waste will produce heat and gas which can make electricity of bio fuel. Gasification on the other hand, thermally heats waste and

turns it into gas, which is then burnt producing heat and electricity. The plant at Charlton would have a capacity of 60,000 tonnes of waste per year rather than the original energy from waste plants proposals of 140,000 tonnes per year.

To date, the Council and local residents have only seen outline proposals for the Eco Park. I understand Surrey are now in the process of working up detailed proposals, with the intention of submitting a planning application to the County in late summer. We will obviously be a key consultee in this process, and the local community will have the opportunity to give their views on the proposal.

At this stage, the Council have not seen sufficiently detailed proposals to enable it to fully understand the possible implications of the proposal on a number of very important local issues such as the impact on transport and air quality. Until we do so, it would not be appropriate to indicate support or opposition."

54/10 GENERAL QUESTIONS

In light of Minute 52/10 above and in order to expedite the business of the Council meeting, the Mayor asked the Members who had submitted General questions whether or not they wished their question(s) and the answer(s) to be read aloud. The Mayor indicated that if any of the Members concerned wished to receive a more detailed written answer to their question this would, where applicable, be passed to them after the meeting and would be recorded in full in the Council Minutes.

Under Standing Order 14, Councillor Ian Beardsmore submitted the following question:

"Why is there such a large mis-match between projected housing numbers on a site quoted in the Allocations DPD and the numbers which are actually achieved?"

Reply by Councillor Richard Smith-Ainsley:

"The primary purpose of the Allocations DPD is to identify the appropriate future use of 10 larger sites in the Borough. Where housing is proposed an approximate number of dwellings is also indicated.

The Councillor should NOT need it explained to him that the precise number of dwellings that may be appropriate for a site will of course depend on detailed design and in particular the size of dwellings that are eventually proposed. For this reason the Allocations DPD makes quite clear that the reason only an approximate number is indicated is because the precise form of development and exact number of dwellings is best determined at the detailed planning stage taking into account all relevant factors.

Developments will need to comply with a number of different planning policies and requirements. Where a proposal is unacceptable, for what ever reason, the Planning Committee can refuse planning permission.

In this way we ensure we get the right uses on sites through the Allocations DPD and the detailed planning stage and ensure the right form of development is delivered."

Under Standing Order 14, Councillor Colin Strong submitted the following question:

"Please could you answer the following three questions regarding house building numbers using the latest 2009 Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) and older AMRs for those past years not covered by the 2009 AMR.

Please provide the aggregate house building numbers for:

(1) Target build from 1st April 2001 to 31st March 2009 Actual (net) build from 1st April 2001 to 31st March 2009 Excess of Actual (net) over Target from 1st April 2001 to 31st March 2009?

(2) Target build from 1st April 2009 to 31st March 2016 Projected build from 1st April 2009 to 31st March 2016 Excess of Projected over Target from 1st April 2009 to 31st March 2016?

(3) Target build from 1st April 2009 to 31st March 2026 Projected build from 1st April 2009 to 31st March 2026 Excess of Projected over Target from 1st April 2009 to 31st March 2026?"

Reply by Councillor Richard Smith-Ainsley:

"I am advised that Councillor Strong wrote to the Head of Planning and Housing Strategy as recently as the 11th January 2010 with exactly the same question and received a detailed reply. I am therefore, I feel, entitled to suggest to Council that asking the question a second time is an abuse of this Council's normal operating procedures, if not in writing then in spirit. I would further suggest that the group sitting opposite abuse their position by taking advantage of this administration's open and transparent policies.

In drafting the questions in the way they have been presented, is I feel a deliberate attempt to confuse and mislead the residents of Spelthorne. Being aware that residents would be in attendance tonight and to assist them in understand the complexity of the matter I have arranged for copies of both the questions and the answers to be distributed. I do not, therefore, have anything further to say on the matter."

Written response by Councillor Smith-Ainsley:

"Email response to Councillor Strong dated 13 January 2010 from Heather Morgan, Head of Planning and Housing Strategy:

The following information responds to the three questions and sets out the sources of data as well as any important qualifications to the use of the figures.

Inevitably there are a large number of factors which are taken into account in preparing the housing figures in the AMR and from which the figures for future building are drawn. The following provides answers to the questions as presented and also sets out qualifications you will need to bear in mind in using the figures.

1. Target build from 1st April 2001 to 31st March 2009. Actual (net) build from 1st April 2001 to 31st March 2009. Excess of actual (net) over target from 1st April 2001 to 31st March 2009
 - a. The target build for the period April 2001 to March 2009 was 1358 and comprised two elements:
 - i. 2001 to 2006 was set by the Surrey Structure Plan 2004. Policy LO6 (page 41) required Spelthorne to build 2580 in the period 2001 to 2016.

This represented a pro-rata rate of 172 per annum which for 2001 – 2006 was 860 (172 x 5yrs).

ii.2006 to 2009 was set by the Regional Spatial Strategy for the South East. Policy H1b (page 55) which requires Spelthorne to provide 3320 for the period 2006 – 2026. This produces a pro-rata rate of 166 per annum which for 2006 – 2009 was 498 (166x3).

b. Net completions for the period 2001 to 2009 was 1843 (1292 for 2001 - 2006 and 551 for 2006 - 2009). This is the sum of the net completions in Table A1 (page 55) of the recently published 2009 AMR where net completion figures for all years from 1991 to 2009 are given. This gives a mathematical surplus of 485 for the period 2001 to 2009 (1843 minus 1358). The term 'surplus' for the period 2001 to 2009 however needs qualification. For the purposes of meeting the new South East Plan figure from 2006 any surplus for previous years cannot be counted. Therefore as at 2009 only such surplus as may have arisen from 2006 can be counted for the purposes of meeting the latest South East Plan figures. At 2006 the surplus over requirements was 432. At 2009 the surplus over requirements since 2006 is just 53.

2. Target build from 1st April 2009 to 31st March 2016. Projected build from 1st April 2009 to 31st March 2016. Excess of Projected over Target from 1st April 2009 to 31st March 2016.

a. The target build for 2009 to 2016 is 1140. (This is calculated by taking the total SEP figure of 3320 deducting build so far (minus 551) to produce a residual pro-rata rate of 163 (rounded) per annum which for 7 years = 1141).

b. The 'projected' build figure for 2009 – 2016 is 1988.

i. It is made up of a combination of existing planning permissions, sites in the Allocations DPD and other larger sites identified in the Housing Land Availability Update – July 2008, and the extrapolation of trends for small sites under 0.4 ha and conversions. Each of these components for each year from 2009 to 2026 is shown in the Housing Trajectory on page 18 of the AMR in lines 7-9. Line 6 (coloured mid blue) shows the total - 'Projected annual completions (net)'. (Please note that due to rounding some figures in the trajectory will not add up exactly)

ii. Qualification is required on this figure and its use. The total represents a 'potential' or 'capacity' and is not intended as a guarantee of the total that will be built or a target. The government has required authorities to have a 'surplus' so that they can demonstrate 'flexibility' to ensure the figures they have to meet are delivered. It is recognized that some planned sites do not always come forward or at least when expected. Each year the AMR will review the 'potential' via an updated trajectory so the figures quoted are likely to change over time.

c. The surplus over requirement is 'projected' at 847 for this period. In part this reflects an expected front loading of housing completions generally toward the first half of the 2006 – 2026 period.

3. Target build from 1st April 2009 to 31st March 2026 Projected build from 1st April 2009 to 31st March 2026 Excess of Projected over Target from 1st April 2009 to 31st March 2026.
 - a. The target build from 2009 to 2026 is 2769 (residual annual requirement of 162.88 x 17 years)
 - b. Projected build from 2009 to 2026 is 3747 (1988 from 2009-March 2016 + 1765 from April 2016 to 2026). As above, figures are taken from the Housing Trajectory in the 2009 AMR.
 - c. The 'surplus' is 978. (This 'surplus' is the total surplus over the whole period 2006 to 2026. (It should not be added to the surplus for 2006 – 2009 as this would represent double counting. The requirement for 2009 – 2026 of 163 per annum takes account of the surplus of 53 in the first 3 years of the plan period)."

Under Standing Order 14, Councillor Mrs Elizabeth Bell submitted the following question:

"When will the Council be making audio recordings of Council meetings available on the website? In addition to the Full Council meetings, which meetings does the Council intend to make available to the public? Will the proceedings of the meetings be edited?"

Reply by Councillor Howard Thomson:

"The Council has used sound recording equipment for a number of months now, principally in Council and Planning Committee meetings. Occasionally, licensing sub-committee meetings are also recorded. The purpose of recording meetings was to have a record of events in cases where there was a dispute about proceedings. A copy of the recording of Council and Planning Committee meetings is placed in the member's room as a matter of course so that councillors can access the information. It is not made available for the public unless there is a specific request.

The Council has investigated the use of sound recordings on its website, but there are a number of issues which need to be overcome. These are mainly around staff resources to ensure that the recording that is placed on the web is sufficiently "user friendly" so that residents can find the item they are looking for without frustration. As a matter of principle, I am happy that recordings should be made available, but only if it can be done within current resources. I would also add that, to date we have only had two requests, from one member of the public and one Councillor (who has made 3 separate requests), to listen to the sound recordings made. Further investigations are ongoing to look at the technical and staffing issues, but, because of the resource implications, no guarantee can be made about making the recordings available on the website at this time."

Under Standing Order 14, Councillor Mrs. Caroline Nichols had submitted the following question:

"I refer you to the question I asked at the Council Meeting 26th February 2009.

Please would you give an update on the staffing vacancies and output performance of the Environmental Health and Building Control Departments for the financial year 2009/2010?

In last year's reply, it was reported that the priority areas such as food safety inspections, health and safety inspections and pollution control inspections were on track for 2009/2010. Were staff levels maintained as predicted, what staff turnover was there over the last twelve months, and has output performance been maintained in these areas?

For 2010/2011 are service levels in Environmental Health and Building Control expected to be maintained at the levels budgeted for 2009/2010?"

Reply by Councillor Gerry Forsbrey:

"The team have 3 vacancies currently, whilst the performance continues to be good with 95% of food hygiene inspections completed, 80% of health and safety inspections and 100% of pollution control inspections.

The building control team has consistently performed well over the last year and income from their fee-earning work has remained robust, despite the economic downturn.

Service levels will be maintained for 2010/2011."

Written response by Councillor Gerry Forsbrey:

"The Environmental Health and Building Control Service has experienced some staff turnover in the last year.

The service currently has vacancies for a Senior Environmental Health Officer, a Pollution Control Officer and an Environmental Health Technical Officer. The full-time Technical Officer post is a new position, which was created as a result of savings made by agreeing to two requests for part-time working from existing officers. We are currently in the process of recruiting to these posts and have received a good response from applicants. It is anticipated that the service will be fully staffed within the next two months.

The volume of service requests received has remained high and there has been an increase in the number of businesses requiring food hygiene and health and safety inspections. The temporary loss of two members of staff has affected performance in the short-term and has required the reprioritisation and reallocation of work.

The Head of Environmental Health and Building Control is currently estimating that by the end of March 2010 the service will have undertaken 95% of programmed food hygiene inspections and 80% of programmed health and safety inspections, with more inspections being completed in 2009/10 than in the previous year. The service will also complete 100% of programmed pollution control inspections this year.

However, the success of Spelthorne's 'Scores on the Doors' scheme has led to a significant improvement in the hygiene standards of many food premises in the Borough, which should lead to a reduction in the frequency of inspections required for these businesses, freeing up time for officers to undertake other work.

The building control team has consistently performed well over the last year and income from their fee-earning work has remained robust, despite the economic downturn."

Under Standing Order 14, Councillor Lawrence Nichols submitted the following question:

"For each Car Park in Lower Sunbury, what has been the income received to date compared to the original budget?"

In each case what has been the cost of setting up the charging system?

What are the expected annual costs of running the charging mechanisms including enforcement costs and any attributable business rates?"

Reply by Councillor Andrew Hirst:

"The question that you ask is quite detailed in the breakdown of income and expenses you have asked for by each car park.

I have a full written answer to all of your questions, which I will pass to you, but, in summary the costs of installing the necessary equipment in the five Lower Sunbury Car Parks has been about £18,500 in total. Based on income received so far we anticipate annual income in excess of £12,500. Ongoing costs associated with charges in the car parks (machine maintenance, cash collection) amount to less than £2000 per annum.

A quick calculation shows that the pay back period for this is less than two years after which time the income received will contribute to the maintenance costs and business rates of the car parks (which would have been incurred any way).

In this way the costs of running these car parks will fall upon the users rather than the general Council tax payers."

Written response by Councillor Andrew Hirst:

"There are five car parks in Lower Sunbury where charges are made. Two of these (Thames Street and Old Bathing Station) have been chargeable car parks for the whole of this financial year to date. Charging was only introduced during the financial year for the other three car parks (Walled Garden, Orchard Meadow and Sunbury Park / Green Street).

In answer to your question on income received then from the 1 April 2009 to 9 February 2010 the following income (after tax) has been received:

Old Bathing Station	£ 708.89p
Thames Street	£3,831.70p

The car park machines and signage were installed in the other three car parks in October / November 2009 and enforcement of the new charges commenced in December 2009. From December 2009 to 9 February 2010 income (after tax) was received was as follows:

Walled Garden	£358.13p
Orchard Meadow	£381.45p
Sunbury Park/Green Street	£705.15p

In addition to this, income is received from the sale of business and residents permits. So for this financial year £3340 has been received.

Individual budgets are not allocated for each of our car parks; rather an overall budget is set for car parks income and a budget code allocated for all of our smaller car parks combined. So far as costs are concerned the expenditure this financial year so far has been:

£2835 each for the Pay and Display machines installed in each of the three car parks where charges were introduced this year.

£270 per machine for installation.

£1734.51 for signage for all of the three car parks where charges were introduced this year.

£245 for installation of the signage.

The purchase price of the Pay and Display machines includes the first year's maintenance charge.

The annual costs of operating the charging mechanisms are:

£264 maintenance charge per Pay and Display machine.

There is also a charge for cash collection but it would not be appropriate to give an answer in public that could reveal the frequency or volume of cash collection from our car park machines. I am prepared to give Councillor Lawrence Nichols a private response to that aspect of this question.

There are no other enforcement costs involved as patrolling of these car parks is undertaken by our existing car parks staff. There has been no need to increase our staffing to accommodate enforcement of these car parks.

So far as business rates are concerned then so far this year the following business rates have been paid:

Thames Street	£3492.00
Orchard Meadow	£4365.00

The Old Bathing Station and the Walled Garden are not rated. We are pursuing with the Valuation Office whether or not business rates should be levied on any of these car parks together with the business rate that is levied on Sunbury Park which we are now investigating.

In addition to this there is also the question of maintenance of the car parks and whilst no money has been spent on these car parks so far this financial year, there will undoubtedly be maintenance costs in the future and this should always be kept in mind in support of our policy that in running the car parks the costs should be met by the users rather than fall on the general council tax payers."

APPENDIX A

**LEADER OF THE COUNCIL, COUNCILLOR JOHN PACKMAN
COUNCIL TAX SPEECH 2010**

Madam Mayor – I have great pleasure in presenting the Budget Report for the Municipal Year 2010/11. However, before dealing with the budget proposal I would like to summarise some of the issues that we have dealt with in finally arriving at a balanced budget, and look into the future at the issues that lie ahead.

A solid and firm financial base must underpin everything the Council does. Put simply, if we don't balance the books we cannot continue to provide the full range of services to our residents both now, and in the future, which is always uppermost in my mind. We are constantly reviewing everything we do, how we do it, and whether anything can be done better in partnership with others.

Whilst always seeking to keep the Council's finances on a sustainable basis I don't think there is anybody in the Chamber tonight who hasn't been affected in some way with the impact of the economic downturn on local residents and businesses. That is why we are not increasing our Council tax this year.

In seeking to set a balanced budget for 2010-11 the Council has faced its greatest financial challenge yet. I am proud to say we have tackled and overcome this challenge. This Council like businesses and households has been adversely affected by the credit crunch and the global economic downturn. The Council's various income streams such as planning fees, car parking and land charges have suffered as a result of the recession and I think it adverse when people question why the council takes these into account when finalising the budget. Without the income generated we would simply not be able to maintain the same level of service we provide for our residents. At the same time demand increased for a number of the services the Council provides including housing options, housing and council tax benefits and other services such as council tax and business rates collection are finding their role harder to perform. Some residents are less fortunate than others frequently through no fault of their own and need the support of the council and the understanding of the community in which they live in. We estimate the value of housing and council tax benefits we will pay out in 2010-11 will increase by roughly 25% on 2009-10. Despite these pressures the Government has stuck to its previously announced general grant increase for the Council of a mere additional £28,000 which represents a measly increase of just 0.5% which is equivalent to the Council receiving an additional 31 pence per resident to fund services. This small increase in grant will more than be offset by the £150,000 the Government is reducing our concessionary fares grant for 2010-11.

It has been said before but well worth repeating that the grant funding, we will receive will be just £63.87 per head of population for 2010/11; this is 19% below the national average of £78.40. This means we are losing £1,300,000 against the average district council. Districts continue to do particularly badly in the settlement with 40% limited to a 0.5% grant increase. We have, of course, protested against our harsh treatment and the lack of recognition of the financial pressures we are now facing. Needless to say we have not had a meaningful response!

As we are all acutely aware the credit crunch has seen interest rates fall to historically unprecedented levels. The UK Base rate remains at half of one percent. Just like businesses this has hit the Council's ability to continue to deliver the high levels of investment income which it had been achieving and which has previously helped fund the provision of many of the general services for the public. Currently our portfolio is achieving an average rate of interest of 2.7% i.e. more than 5 times the base rate, and we are beating our benchmark target. However, as some of our investments will mature in the coming year our ability to generate new capital receipts is currently constrained, our budgeted investment income is budgeted to drop by £600,000 for 2010-11. This is why it is justifiable for the Council in the forthcoming year during a period of low interest rates to use a small amount of its interest equalisation reserve, to support the revenue budget, which was built up over recent years from above target investment performance. A fine example of prudent investment. At some point interest rates will start to rise and our investment income will recover.

Some have queried why councils appear to have relatively large reserves? Councils such as ourselves need reserves to enable us to fund an ongoing capital programme, to have contingency monies to cope with unexpected pressures, particularly important in the uncertain times we are now facing. Six years ago the Council were using more than £2million general reserves to support the revenue budget. We could not go on haemorrhaging reserves so we have been gradually reducing use of general reserves so that next year we will not use any general reserves. The next step in our strategy will be to move to making revenue contributions to reserves to replenish them.

Like businesses and households the Council under the impact of the recession has had to tighten its belt and seek out even more savings than the savings it has already delivered over the last few years. From early autumn members of the Cabinet have been working closely with the Council's Management Team and heads of service to scrutinise all services budgets and to identify savings and additional sources of income. No stone has been left unturned. The budget being presented to the Council is underpinned by additional savings of £1.7m. Savings have been found across all services and at every level from Management Team downwards. There will be regular quarterly monitoring throughout the coming year to ensure that we successfully deliver these savings.

Additionally we have had in place the Budget Task Group chaired by Councillor Mrs Jean Pinkerton which has put in long hours reviewing all services' budgets and has made a number of recommendations to help the Council put its finances on a more sustainable basis for future years. I would like to offer my sincere thanks to both Councillor Mrs Jean Pinkerton and the Members of the Task Group and all the staff who have input into the work of the Group. This was a fine example of staff and councillors working in harness for the good of the council and the residents.

The Council is continuing to develop its Business Improvement Programme which by the end of the current financial year will have reviewed every service area and has exceeded its original target of delivering ongoing annual savings of £500,000 per annum – the current figure is £1,100,000 savings per year from now on. The Council has in place its own dedicated business improvement team which will help the Council improve further the efficiency of its services and which will in turn help deliver further savings.

As part of our belt tightening, this Administration is recommending that both Councillors and staff forgo any annual increase in pay or allowances. I must stress this does not in

anyway reflect on the value we place on the dedication and commitment of our staff in delivering services to our residents.

Given the financial pressures the Council is under it has been necessary to modify our approach to our use of general reserves in support of the revenue budget and we are using no general reserves to support the budget. This represents a reduction on the £175,000 used and built into the 2009-10 budget. I am delighted that we have achieved this earlier than we anticipated would be possible.

Whilst we have achieved a balanced budget for 2010-11 we know the future is looking extremely challenging. The Government is running up such high levels of borrowing as its answer to the economic situation that whatever party is in power after the next general election there will be very little left in the cupboard for future funding increases for local authorities. In fact it is highly likely that we will see a significant reduction in public sector spending with much lower levels of Council Tax capping, reductions in National Non Domestic Rates and Grants. We have already undertaken work in relation to identified future financial pressures particularly in 2011-12 when we are likely to face increased employer pension contributions and at the same time the Council will have to pay higher National Insurance contributions. I must stress that the Council is part of a **national** local government pension scheme and we are required to comply with the national regulations determining employer contributions. I am aware of people's distaste of local government pensions but it is a legal requirement and part of the fair conditions of service in place to ensure that Spelthorne can recruit and retain staff to deliver the Council's services.

We are putting in place several strategies to ensure that the Council is able to respond to these future financial challenges. The Business Improvement programme is being refreshed with the Chief Executive to chair the Business Improvement Board. We joined this month a procurement partnership with Elmbridge and Epsom and Ewell councils which we hope will help us achieve greater procurement savings. A clear demonstration of what can be achieved from joint procurement is the £100,000 plus per annum savings we have achieved as a result of procuring in partnership with Elmbridge a new Material Recovery Facility contract. Working in partnership with other authorities is the way forward in the future.

We have been reviewing management structures and have reduced the underlying employees' budget by £600,000 between 2009-10 and 2010-11. The staffing establishment over the last year has been reduced by a net 10.72 FTE. I should remind councillors that here in Spelthorne we have the lowest ratio of staff to residents compared to all the other districts in Surrey that operate Streetscene services in house.

We are putting in place more focused arrangements for driving forward partnership working with other councils and other partners both private and public sector. We are also reviewing our assets to look at those which might be under-used or surplus to requirements, and which might have an alternative use. This will include looking at ways of using our assets to generate ongoing income streams. This Council is actively supporting the Surreywide project looking at the use of public sector assets across Surrey. As a step in this direction up to 50 police staff will shortly move into the Council offices in 2010-11 which will generate additional income for the Council and facilitate closer working with the police.

In determining our spending priorities, we have taken into account the views of local people alongside our legal obligations, in order to provide a clearer focus on delivering what our residents require. The Budget Task Group has reviewed how our current priorities inform budget allocation decisions and have recommended that we review our corporate priorities. We will address this during 2010-11.

I would now like to briefly touch on the progress we have made on delivering some of our key projects.

The Council successfully launched in November 2009 the Choice Based Lettings scheme giving more choice for tenants. The Council successfully led a partnership of three Councils and two housing associations on the implementation of Choice Based Lettings which will offer a choice of properties across Borough boundaries for which tenants will be able to 'bid' for.

We are on track for construction of the high quality, state of the art Stanwell Health and Community Centre to commence later this year. The deal has been signed and work will commence shortly.

Benwell Community Centre, and the Extra Care housing is coming to fruition and we anticipated completion day is late summer, which will provide the first mixed tenure scheme with a community facility in Surrey. I am delighted to highlight that phase 1 of the Stanwell Newstart project has commenced construction.

2009-10 saw further consolidation on the successful bedding in of alternate weekly collection with our recycling rate rising to 33.7% and a significant reduction in the number of remaining difficult to collect properties. 2009-10 saw the successful implementation of an improved garden waste collection with the introduction of brown wheelie bins. This was so well received that we are now introducing a second round and with Spring around the corner and orders coming in daily this will soon be full.

Over a three year period we are investing £300,000 of the Council's money in our area regeneration programme for Ashford, Shepperton and Sunbury. I am delighted to say that we have been successful in leveraging in matched funding from Surrey County to increase the programme to £600,000. Residents have and are being given the opportunity to shape those proposals. The three project teams are making good progress working up proposals which will be implemented in the coming year. By improving the environment and the local scene hopefully this will encourage residents to shop and to support their local shops.

In 2009-10 in partnership with SLM we introduced free swimming for the under 16s and over 60s using the Government funding. This resulted in a 34% increase in the number of swimming sessions. Unfortunately the funding is for a limited period only.

Whilst the national statistics may suggest the UK economy is technically out of recession the economic situation remains bleak with a risk that it could deteriorate even further. This Council with its limited resources is doing what it can to help its community cope with the economic downturn. We have reduced the average time it takes the Council to pay suppliers down to just over 12 and half days and we are accredited to the Prompt Payment scheme. The Revenues Team have by pro-actively going out to businesses to increase the take up of small business rate relief (no additional cost to the Council) by 30% over the last year.

Despite the efficiencies we have delivered we have maintained our capacity to deliver frontline services. For example during the cold snap in January we continued to provide our core services such as refuse collection, meals on wheels, and running Spelride, which many of our residents recognised and complimented us on.

I would like now to return to the detail of our Budget and the Council Tax proposals for 2010/11.

Our net expenditure next year is projected to be £13.5 million. Grants of approximately £0.7m and Business rates of approx. £5.0m produces around £5.7 million and we plan to use £1.1 million from interest earnings and reserves. This leaves £6.701 million to be met from the Council Tax, which, after taking account of £55,510 from this year's collection and a tax base of 40,388 properties at Band D, will require a Band D Council Tax of £167.30 to be levied. This is a nil increase. Spelthorne Borough Council is one of only four local authorities in Surrey who have managed to set a nil increase for 2010-2011. It is perhaps interesting to note that if we still kept all of the business rate collected in the borough, we could levy a nil absolute Council Tax and still have lots of money left over!

To our own part of the Band D Council Tax will be added the precept from Surrey County Council and the Surrey Police, which are £1,116.36 and £198.54, respectively, which gives a total Band D Council tax of £1,482.20 – an overall increase of 2.2 %, which equates to an increase of £31.86 p.a. This increase is entirely due to the Surrey County Council and the Surrey Police Authority precept increases.

In conclusion, I would like to place on record my thanks to Councillor Mrs Vivienne Leighton for her valued support and all other Cabinet Members as well as the Chief Executive and his Management Team and all the staff for their support and assistance in preparing this budget.

I now formally move the adoption of Minute No. 1575 – Draft Detailed Budget 2010/2011 - of the Cabinet meeting of 16 February 2010, as amended by the Budget Book [green book] and the separate paper previously circulated detailing the precepts by the Surrey County Council and the Surrey Police Authority and the Band D Council Tax levy for the year circulated to all Members.

APPENDIX B

SPEECH BY COUNCILLOR COLIN STRONG, LIBERAL DEMOCRAT - LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION

BUDGET RESPONSE – 25TH FEBRUARY 2010

Madam Mayor,

I have pleasure in responding to the Leader's speech formally moving the motion to set the Council Tax for the year 2010/2011.

It has been an eventful 12 months and, as usual, before dealing with the finance proposals I shall summarise the past year as well as looking ahead at forthcoming challenges.

There are unsung heroes around us all the time: people who stay in the background, yet who enable our community to function. Penny and Ron Jones from Sunbury are such heroes but unsung no longer.

For more than 30 years Penny and Ron have taken care of many vulnerable children through the County Council's fostering service. I congratulate them for being honoured with MBEs for their excellent work. They are a special couple who thoroughly deserve their honours.

Speaking of heroes congratulations to Team Spelthorne who for the second year running came top in the Surrey Youth games. Unlike the 2008 event 2009 saw Team Spelthorne share the Overall Borough Trophy with Guildford.

Let us send our good wishes for a hat-trick of wins for the games in June.

Twinning links are not usually controversial but, as we say, Spelthorne is different.

In late 2008 the ruling group announced they wished to twin the Council with Grand Port Savanne on the island of Mauritius.

Last May the Conservatives pressed ahead and voted to formally sign the twinning link. The Liberal Democrats voted against. The truth is that Spelthorne has little in common with a tropical island situated in the Indian Ocean some 6,000 miles away.

Today, I can reaffirm the pledge that an incoming Liberal Democrat administration would scrap the Mauritius twinning link.

Madam Mayor,

Spelthorne residents have been badly treated by this Labour government. None more so than with the appalling decision to cap the Surrey Police Council Tax.

The Surrey Police capping order was voted through Parliament last July. The Conservative MP for Spelthorne failed to vote against the order. In fact not one Conservative MP voted against Labour's cuts. It was left to Liberal Democrat MPs to oppose this discredited Labour government.

What was the result of this capping?

It cost Surrey Police £75,000 to reimburse the Council's cost of processing the £130,000 Council Tax refund to local residents. A refund that amounted to just £3.24 for a Band D property.

This is a prime example of economic madness under Labour. First they take money away. Then you have to pay extra for the privilege.

Just imagine how £205,000 could be spent on policing within our Borough. Now remove that sum and you will understand how Spelthorne is suffering under a Labour government.

To add insult to injury when 2 Conservative Councillors tabled a motion last July in support of our police force we expected a lively debate on the police cuts affecting our Borough. We did not expect for the motion to be withdrawn at the last moment.

Actions speak louder than words – Labour imposed cuts on our Borough and the Conservatives did nothing.

Planning has had a high profile in recent years but for all the wrong reasons.

Last August we had a meeting with the Chief Executive where we presented a number of cases where it was clear to us that there were serious issues with the way those planning applications had been dealt with.

At that meeting we called for a thorough investigation into Spelthorne's planning system. As a group we are appreciative that our call was followed through and we now await the final report.

The Lib Dems are a pro-active group. Last October we led a debate on climate change asking the Council to sign-up to the national 10:10 campaign. This would have resulted in the Borough committing itself to reducing its CO2 emissions by 10% in 2010.

The purpose of this campaign is to get people to make immediate energy savings and to focus attention on reducing energy usage permanently. To date over 100 local authorities have signed up.

Faced with a comprehensive Lib Dem motion Conservative Councillors ducked the issue, referring it to the nine members of the Cabinet who ultimately rejected the chance to join the 10:10 campaign.

Such a decision was not unexpected from those who support expansion at Heathrow.

Ashford College and its uncertain future continues to be at the top of the Liberal Democrat agenda.

The closure announcement last October was a shock to residents and students across our Borough. More shocking was the Conservative response. Sensing a re-development opportunity the Council moved very swiftly to produce a Planning Brief that would steer the type of development for the college site.

The Liberal Democrat view then, and now, is that our priority is to safeguard the College and not to tout the site to developers.

The Conservative leadership were in such a rush to approve the Planning Brief that they scheduled a Special cabinet for late November just 8 days before the usual monthly meeting.

As a former student at the College I was appalled by this turn of events. At the special meeting I spoke against the Planning Brief and was pleased when the Conservative cabinet members performed a spectacular U-turn.

Looking ahead we have other challenges that face us.

Airtrack still threatens Staines and Stanwell Moor. As a Borough we suffer pain but no gain from the current scheme. If Airtrack is to proceed we want the best possible outcome for our residents.

The London Irish proposals in Lower Sunbury are well known. As I am not a member of the Planning committee I can freely state that I back the residents 100% in their opposition to both plans.

As Councillors we must make a stand against any loss of open space. These green areas help to protect our Borough from urban sprawl, enhance our environment and offer leisure activities to our residents. All this could be lost forever.

Finally, the so-called "Eco-park". This is the County Council's grand plan for a dual energy-from-waste plant at Charlton tip.

At this time there are more questions than answers. Consequently we have serious concerns that Charlton is not a suitable site for importing waste from across the county and exporting electricity.

Budget 2010/2011

I turn now to the finance proposals as shown in the Green Book.

The financial position we, as a Council, find ourselves in is due to four contributing factors.

Firstly, the Labour government has steadily under-funded the amount of grant that is paid to Spelthorne.

Secondly, the Conservative administration has consistently run a budget deficit for many years. In order to balance the books they bridge the deficit by selling off assets and running down the reserves. Just like Gordon Brown's government they too have failed to tackle their budget deficit.

Thirdly, the recession has led to historically low interest rates. Given that the Council is so reliant on the use of reserves, falls in interest rates greatly affect the ability to generate investment income and thus balance the books.

The final factor is the political call from Conservative Central Office asking all Conservative-run Councils to work towards a Council Tax freeze.

These four factors combine to explain why the Conservatives are proposing cuts to front-line services that we, as Liberal Democrats, will oppose.

It didn't have to be like this. We warned for years that being deep in the red was not sustainable.

In 2007 with reserves melting away the ruling group voted for a policy that set the minimum target level of reserves at £31 million. This was the figure that was deemed necessary. Today, total revenue reserves stand at around £12 million.

The Conservative failure for over 10 years to tackle the budget deficit has meant that the four factors mentioned earlier have hit hard.

Their proposals show they have been forced to cut the budget deficit from an original figure of £2 million in the current financial year to £1.1million for the year 2010/2011.

So, how have they achieved the reduction?

Partly by generating extra income but also by slashing jobs in the following areas: street cleansing, support services, building control, planning policy and planning development control.

The truth is that these front-line jobs that are due to be axed make a real difference to our community.

In my speech 3 years ago I remarked that residents were seeing the effects of years of Conservative mis-management. Since then the situation has got worse.

Residents are angry about our planning system.

Assets such as Day Centres have been sold. In Sunbury: replaced with 5-storey over-development. In Stanwell: standing idle.

Residents are worried at the loss of much valued open spaces.

Police funding is cut and only the Liberal Democrats stand up for Spelthorne.

And finally we have proposals that will slash Council services further.

This budget is bad for the residents of Spelthorne and we shall oppose the motion.

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE CABINET MEETING HELD ON 30 MARCH 2010

1. STREET TRADING POLICY REVISIONS

1.2 The Cabinet considered a report on Spelthorne's Street Trading Policy 2010 following its revision in the light of a six week consultation process.

1.3 The Street Trading Policy provides a framework to control street trading activities within the borough to ensure the health and safety of its residents and road users.

1.4 The Cabinet recommends to the Council that the revised Street Trading Policy be approved.

2. SURREY FIRST INITIATIVE – JOINT COMMITTEE FOR THE OVERSIGHT OF DELIVERY OF SURREY PUBLIC AUTHORITY SERVICES

2.1 The Cabinet considered a report on the Surrey First Initiative which aimed to provide significant savings, increased resilience, improved efficiency and customer service, foster innovation, improve income generation and help influence the S.E. region.

2.2 The Surrey Local Government Association (SLGA) has taken a lead role in exploring ways of improving collaborative working and has now reached a point where it considers a more formal and empowered structure is needed to take the work forward.

2.3 In January 2010, it approved a Memorandum of Understanding seeking the establishment of a Joint Committee with representatives from the eleven Surrey Boroughs/Districts; the County Council and Surrey Police. The principal aim of the Joint Committee will be to oversee collaborative working arrangements and to possibly develop the concept of a Joint Venture Company (JVC) or other options to provide services at reduced cost whilst achieving greater service resilience and improved customer service.

2.4 The Cabinet recommends to the Council:-

- (a) that the Memorandum of Understanding already signed by the Leader and the Chief Executive be endorsed.**
- (b) that a Joint Committee be established to explore the Surrey First Initiative in line with the Memorandum of Understanding.**
- (c) that the remit of the Joint Committee be as follows:**
 - 1. to oversee the joint working arrangements of the parties;**
 - 2. to promote good joint working practice amongst the parties;**

Agenda Item: 9

3. to appoint such task groups or sub-committees as it considers necessary;
 4. to identify the range of services for inclusion in a joint venture company (JVC);
 5. to approve the draft articles and memorandum of association of the JVC ;
 6. to approve the draft revised terms of reference for the joint committee to provide for governance and oversight of the JVC; and,
 7. to manage the project budget.
- (d) that Councillor J.D. Packman be nominated as the representative of SBC on the Joint Committee for the remainder of this municipal year.
- (e) that the Head of Corporate Governance be delegated to make consequent changes to the Constitution to give effect to these decisions.
- (f) that the Council notes further decisions on participation in any joint venture company will be taken by Cabinet on the advice of the Joint Committee.
- (g) that the Chief Executive be delegated, in consultation with the Leader, to make decisions on spending, as necessary, to assist the progress of this Surrey First Initiative.
- 3. UPDATES TO THE COUNCIL'S CONSTITUTION**
- 3.1 The Cabinet considered a report on updating the Council's Constitution to accommodate structural changes, current practice and legislative changes that had occurred since the last revision to the constitution in April 2009.
- 3.2 The Cabinet recommends to the Council that the revisions to the Council's Constitution as set out in the report of the Deputy Chief Executive be approved.**

Councillor John Packman
Leader of the Council

29 April 2010

**RECOMMENDATION FROM THE PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD ON 31 MARCH 2010**

1. **ARTICLE 4 DIRECTION - 09/00739/CLD – THE NUTSHELLS, ABBEY, SHEPPERTON**
- 1.1 The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive requesting that an Article 4 Direction be made to withdraw permitted development rights in respect of land at The Nutshells, Abbey Road, Shepperton. The Committee discussed whether or not any further development on the site without planning permission may have a potential detrimental and harmful impact on flood risk and the green belt.
- 1.2 **RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL THAT** an Article 4 (1) Direction be issued to remove the permitted development rights relating to Classes A, B, D and E of Part 1, Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995.

Councillor Howard Thomson
Chairman of the Planning Committee

29 April 2010

**RECOMMENDATION FROM THE STANDARDS COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD ON 30 MARCH 2010**

1. POLITICAL RESTRICTIONS ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

- 1.1 The Committee discussed the report on the impact the recent legislation through both the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 and the Local Democracy, Economic Development Construction Act 2009 had on the designation of politically restricted posts.
- 1.2 The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 gave the Standards Committee the responsibility to determine applications for exemption from political restriction by holders of such posts. The Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 had changed the designation of politically restricted posts by removing the requirement for all posts over SCP 44 to be automatically designated as politically restricted, regardless of the post holder's duties.
- 1.3 The Committee discussed the list of proposed political restricted posts and the suggested appeal process through the Standards Committee.
- 1.4 The Committee noted that the Head of Corporate Governance would arrange for the necessary amendments to be made to the Council's Constitution to take into account these changes and the necessary revision to the terms of reference for this Committee.

Recommend to Council:

1. The adoption of the new arrangements for appeals as set out in Appendix A to the joint report of the Monitoring Officer and Head of Human Resources; and
2. To note the updated list of Politically Restricted Posts at Appendix B to the joint report of the Monitoring Officer and Head of Human Resources.

Murray Litvak
Chairman of the Standards Committee

29 April 2010

REPORT FROM THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL ON THE WORK OF THE CABINET

This is my report to the Council as the Leader of the Council on the work of the Cabinet.

This is an overview of some of the more important issues the Cabinet discussed at its meeting on 30 March 2010.

The Cabinet has made recommendations to the Council on five items which appear earlier on this Council Agenda.

1. LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK WORKING PARTY - ROLE OF SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENTS

The Cabinet considered a report on the role of Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD's) and the revised procedures which need to be followed in their preparation.

The Cabinet agreed the preparation of and proposed timescales of the following SPDs as the first tranche of the SPD work:

- (a) Residential Development and Extensions (March 2010-July 2011)
- (b) Size of dwellings (March 2010-July 2011)
- (c) Infrastructure (December 2010-early 2012).

2. ADOPTION OF FOOD AND HEALTH AND SAFETY SERVICE PLANS FOR 2010/2011

The Cabinet considered a report and approved the Council's Food and Health and Safety Service Plans for 2010/2011 detailing the Authority's priorities, aims and objectives for the enforcement of food safety and health and safety locally.

The Cabinet also agreed that the potential for generating income from direct advertising on the "Scores on Doors" Website page be investigated.

3. URGENT ITEM – HAVE YOUR SAY 2010

The Cabinet agreed to consider a report on proposals for the Have Your Say events in June and July 2010 as an urgent item.

The Cabinet agreed the proposals for 2010 Have Your Say events as set out below, subject to the Officers looking at the possibility of bringing forward the Stanwell meeting and arranging a venue for the meeting at Charlton Village:-

Agenda Item: 12

SUNBURY COMMON	10 June
ASHFORD	17 June
SHEPPERTON / CHARLTON / HALLIFORD	22 June
STAINES / LALEHAM	24 June
LOWER SUNBURY	1 July
STANWELL / STANWELL MOOR	25 May

Councillor John Packman
Leader of the Council

29 April 2010

**REPORT OF THE CHAIRMAN ON THE WORK
OF THE APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE**

An Appointments Committee was convened on 25 March 2010 to interview two candidates for the post of Head of Street Scene.

I am pleased to report that the successful candidate, Mrs Jackie Taylor, was appointed as from 1 April 2010.

Councillor John Packman
Leader of the Council and Chairman of the Appointments Committee

29 April 2010

REPORT OF THE CHAIRMAN ON THE WORK OF THE AUDIT COMMITTEE

The Audit Committee held a meeting on 25 March 2010 and considered the following items of business.

1. MATTERS ARISING

Minute 393/09 – Corporate Risk Management - Asset Management – Progress report on Health and Safety in leased properties

The Committee received a report and presentation from the Head of Asset Management on Health and Safety in leased properties. It summarised the background to Spelthorne's responsibilities and set out the reasons for the long delay in completing the actions identified in the Corporate Risk Register. In addition, it covered the current position and the planned programme by Asset Management for dealing with the way forward to progress all the outstanding Health and Safety matters relating to leased properties.

The Committee also received a report from the Corporate Safety Officer on Spelthorne's new electronic Safety Management System [SMS] which held essential information on safety requirements in Council leased properties. It explained how SMS was being used to assess hazards and risks in relation to the Council's leased assets and what actions were being taken to minimise the hazards and risks identified.

The Committee asked the Head of Asset Management and the Corporate Safety Officer to jointly prepare a checklist for completion by all leaseholders of Council Assets. The completed checklists would confirm what Health and Safety measures were in place at leased properties and what regular tests were being carried out to validate the safety of the equipment and systems being used at those properties. The Committee also asked the Head of Asset Management to submit to the next meeting a list of the outstanding matters in relation to Health and Safety in leased properties.

2. CORPORATE RISK MANAGEMENT

Corporate Risk Register

The Committee considered and approved the quarterly update on the Corporate Risk Register presented by the Senior Auditor. The revised Register was considered to be an accurate reflection of the high level risks affecting the Authority.

3. AUDIT SERVICES ANNUAL PLAN 2010/2011

The Committee considered and approved the Audit Services Annual Work Plan for 2010/2011, which also reflected the requirements imposed by External Audit.

4. ANTI-FRAUD AND CORRUPTION STRATEGY

The Committee carried out its regular review of the Anti-Fraud and Corruption Strategy, as contained within the Council's Constitution. The Committee noted and approved the Anti-Fraud and Corruption Strategy, without amendment.

5. COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME FOR 2010/2011

The Committee considered and approved its Work Programme for the Municipal Year 2010/2011 with the addition of one further issue raised at the meeting.

Councillor David McShane
Chairman of the Audit Committee

29 April 2010

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

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

1. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES - ECO PARK PROPOSALS FOR CHARLTON LANE

- 1.1 The Committee had previously given me, as Chairman, authority to establish a task group to look at and evaluate details of the Surrey County Council's proposals for an Eco Park at Charlton Lane. However due to the short time scale and the fact that a report would be submitted to the Cabinet at its June meeting I obtained approval from the Committee to look at the feasibility of this committee considering the report prior to it going to the Cabinet. I am currently in discussions with the officers and will advise members of the outcome in the near future.

2. ICT ARRANGEMENTS

- 2.1 The Committee discussed and noted the information circulated at the meeting on the outcome of the ICT task group meeting held on 23 February 2010. In addition to this the Committee received a presentation from Helen Dunn our ICT Manager on the future direction of ICT. The Committee noted the numerous ICT initiatives being introduced and how the service could be delivered post 2012 contract.

- 2.2 The presentation covered such issues of:

- Implementing infrastructure 'technology roadmap' aimed at improving the efficiency of its hardware and software
- Contract post 2012 including partnerships and shared services.
- Security issues including the installation of two new network switches (which control the flow of data and network traffic) a new firewall as well as the introduction of encryption of hard discs, external media (USB sticks, CDs and DVDs) and the use of dual factor authentication.
- The migration from Microsoft Office 2003 to 2007 and arrangements for members to receive training via workshops once the laptops have been health checked.
- The software being used to update the Intranet (spelnets) and the website.

3. PROGRESS REPORT AND OPTIONS APPRAISAL ON PROVISION OF ASSET MANAGEMENT SERVICES

- 3.1 The Committee discussed a confidential report on the progress of the partnering arrangements for the managing and maintaining our Council's assets. To further assist the Committee, I as Chairman had invited the Cabinet Member responsible for Asset Management, Councillor Ayers, to attend the meeting and take part in the discussion.

3.2 The Committee agreed to recommend to the Cabinet that the decision of the Leader of the Council, Councillor J.D. Packman, the Cabinet Member for Asset Management Councillor F. Ayers and the Chief Executive, Roberto Tambini to proceed with a partnering agreement with Runnymede Borough Council be confirmed.

4. **THANK YOU**

4.1 As this was the last meeting of the Committee in the current Municipal Year I placed on record my thanks and appreciation to my Vice Chairman, Councillor Mrs M.W. Rough, members of the committee and the officers for their support and contributions to the work of the Committee.

Councillor Mrs Jean Pinkerton

29 April 2010

Chairman of the Improvement and Development Committee

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

There have been eight Licensing Sub-Committee meetings since my last report. Details of their work are set out below.

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE 8 MARCH 2010

A Licensing Sub-Committee decided that it was outside their remit to decide whether or not a private hire vehicle could be extended beyond the age limit as prescribed in the licence requirements. The Head of Environmental Health and Building Control Services extended the licence for the vehicle in question to June 2010 under his delegated powers, to enable the policy implications to be considered by the Licensing Committee at its meeting on 12 May.

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE 18 MARCH 2010

A Licensing Sub-Committee considered and rejected an application for a Personal Licence under the Licensing Act 2003.

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE 18 MARCH 2010

A Licensing Sub-Committee dispensed with a hearing following the withdrawal of an objection notice from Surrey Police in respect of a DPS variation application made in respect of the Garibaldi Public House, High Street, Staines. This was because the brewery had repossessed the premises and the tenants had left.

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE 18 MARCH 2010

A Licensing Sub-Committee dispensed with a hearing following the withdrawal of an application and an objection by Surrey Police to vary the DPS at Forest and Ocean, High Street, Staines.

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE 23 MARCH 2010

A Licensing Sub-Committee heard an application for review of a Premises Licence from Surrey Police and modified the conditions of the Premises Licence, in respect of the Phoenix Public House, 26-28 Thames Street, Sunbury.

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE 26 MARCH 2010

A Licensing Sub-Committee heard an application for review of a Premises Licence from Surrey Police and took no action with regards to the Premises Licence held by Mitchells & Butlers Leisure Retail Ltd., in respect of the Running Horse Public House, Groveley Road, Sunbury, as the conditions put forward by Surrey Police were unnecessary because the conditions were already in place and being adhered to.

Agenda Item: 16

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE 29 MARCH 2010

A Licensing Sub-Committee heard an application for review of a Premises Licence from Surrey Police and modified the conditions of the Premises Licence in respect of Ashford Wines, 133 Convent Road, Ashford.

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE 30 MARCH 2010

A Licensing Sub-Committee heard an application for review of a Premises Licence from Surrey Police and modified the conditions of the Premises Licence held by Marstons Plc., in respect of Que Pasa, Tillys Lane, Staines.

Councillor Robin Sider
Chairman of the Licensing Committee

29 April 2010

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

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

1. SERVICES FOR OLDER PEOPLE

- 1.1 Supporting older people has always been identified as a key priority for our Council. In response to this I as Chairman arranged for the Committee to consider how we currently provide services to our elderly residents in partnership with other agencies. To assist in the debate representatives from Surrey County Council, Age Concern and Cameo attended the meeting to outline what they do. If members wish to view the presentations these can be viewed on our website at www.spelthorne.gov.uk/your_council/committeemeetings/cou_agendas_minutes/cou_pmr_layout.htm
- 1.2 Demographic statistics paint a clear picture. The population of older people in the borough are increasing and as a result there is a need for a greater focus on older people living independently and enjoying more active and healthy lifestyles.
- 1.3 The Committee noted that not only do we need to continue to support older people in the way we are doing but also need to identify new ways of building on and improving the services provided through our partnership working.

2. ECONOMIC DOWNTURN

- 2.1 The Committee received a briefing paper on progress being made by our Officers to promote awareness of the Small Business Rate Relief Scheme. In support of this the Cabinet Member for Economic Development, Councillor Colin Davis, attended the meeting to outline the work the Spelthorne Business Forum and the Economic Development Partnership were doing to promote the scheme.
- 2.2 The Committee in supporting the work being undertaken agreed that information be sent to all councillors outlining how they can be involved in promoting awareness of the small business rate relief scheme within their ward

3. FINANCIAL REPORTS

- 3.1 The Committee received two financial monitoring reports covering the first ten months of the financial year for both revenue and capital expenditure. In relation to Capital approximately £1.318k had been spent against the revised budget of £2,447k. In respect of the Revenue budget £11.6m had been spent against the year to date budget of £12m.

4. MANAGEMENT OF ORDINARY WATERCOURSES IN SPELTHORNE

- 4.1 The Committee discussed with the Head of Environment Services the management and maintenance responsibilities for watercourses within our borough. The committee noted that clearance work to the highest priority ditches had been undertaken with further clearance work planned. The Committee went on to consider the timetable of implementing the recently approved policy on water course management agreed by the Cabinet in June 2009 and the enforcement of riparian ownership responsibilities.

5. PERFORMANCE REPORT

- 5.1 The Committee discussed the data provided showing progress in the second year on the new National Performance Indicators. It was noted that the information for the waste recycling was provisional and that this could be revised for the year end figures.

6. THANK YOU

- 6.1 As this was the last meeting of the committee in the current Municipal Year I placed on record my thanks and appreciation to my Vice Chairman, Councillor S.E.W. Budd, members of the committee and the officers for their support and contributions to the work of the Committee. I also on behalf of the committee extended all good wishes and thanks to Bob Coe, Assistant Chief Executive and Lead Officer who was retiring shortly. His help and advice has been invaluable to the work of the committee and scrutiny in general

Councillor Philippa Broom

29 April 2010

Chairman of the Performance Management and Review Committee

**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 items considered by the Planning Committee at those meetings.

The meeting on **3 March 2010** dealt with 12 items. Public speaking took place on 5 items with 8 people taking the opportunity to address the Committee.

The most notable items on the agenda were:

- The approval of a 78 bedroom residential care home at the site of the former Christ the King School Falcon Drive Stanwell.
- Permission was also granted for alterations and extensions to St James School (former St David's School) in Church Rd Ashford to provide new classrooms and dining room facilities following demolition of modern out buildings.
- Permission was also granted for two schemes for A2 Dominium Housing Association, in Desford Way Ashford and at Convent Lodge Convent Road, both for 3 and 4 bedroom houses.

The meeting on **31 March 2010** dealt with 20 items. Public speaking took place on 5 items with 6 people taking the opportunity to address the Committee.

The most notable items on the agenda were:

- The approval of a shared pedestrian and cycle route at Hawke Park Sunbury.
- Permission was also granted at the meeting for the redevelopment of existing factory premises at 112 Windmill Rd Sunbury to provide new industrial units.
- An application for a new warehouse, showroom and trade counter at Debmarc House London Road Staines was also approved at the meeting.

Councillor Howard Thomson
Chairman of the Planning Committee

29 April 2010

REPORT OF THE CHAIRMAN ON THE WORK OF THE STANDARDS COMMITTEE

The Standards Committee has met once since the last Council meeting and considered the following items of business.

1. ICT SECURITY POLICY

- 1.1 The Committee discussed with the ICT Manager the Council's ICT security policy and the action taken to ensure it continued to be robust. The Committee noted the arrangements being put in place for the annual health check of all council owned laptops and the new security measures that would be put in place at the same time.

2. REVIEW OF THE PLANNING CODE

- 2.1 The Committee continued its discussions with the Monitoring Officer on the annual review of the Planning Code.
- 2.2 To assist the Committee the Monitoring Officer had circulated with the agenda a copy of the Planning Code identifying the suggested changes made to date. The Committee discussed the document page by page and made comments for the Monitoring Officer to take on board and amend for further consideration.
- 2.3 To assist in the review of the Planning Code the Chairman of the Planning Committee, and the Head of Planning and Housing Strategy had been invited to attend the meeting and take part in the discussion.

3. POLITICAL RESTRICTIONS ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

- 3.1 The Committee discussed the report on the impact the recent legislation through both the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 and the Local Democracy, Economic Development Construction Act 2009 had on the designation of politically restricted posts.
- 3.2 The recommendation of the Committee is being considered separately on the agenda this evening.

Murray Litvak
Chairman of the Standards Committee

29 April 2010

