

**ROBERTO TAMBINI
CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

Please reply to:

Contact: Liz Phillis
Service: Corporate Governance
Direct line: 01784 446276
Fax: 01784 446333
E-mail: l.phillis@spelthorne.gov.uk
Our ref: LP/OSCTTEE
Date: 21 January 2011

NOTICE OF MEETING

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

DATE: TUESDAY 1 FEBRUARY 2011

TIME: 7.30PM

PLACE: COUNCIL CHAMBER, COUNCIL OFFICES, KNOWLE GREEN, STAINES

TO: ALL MEMBERS OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Ms P.A. Broom (Chairman)
S.J. Rough (Vice-Chairman)
Miss M.M. Bain
Mrs E.M. Bell
S.E.W. Budd

K. Chouhan
A.P. Hirst
H.R. Jaffer
D.L. McShane
Mrs I. Napper

Mrs C.E. Nichols
L.E. Nichols
Jack D. Pinkerton
Mrs M.W. Rough
G.F. Trussler

EMERGENCY PROCEDURE

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

THE LIFT MUST NOT BE USED

If you would like a copy of this agenda or the attached reports in a larger print please contact Liz Phillis (01784) 446276 or Email l.phillis@spelthorne.gov.uk

IMPORTANT PUBLIC NOTICE

MOBILE TECHNOLOGY – ACCEPTABLE USE

Use of mobile technology (e.g. mobile telephones, Blackberries, XDA's etc.) at this Committee can:

- Interfere with the Public Address [PA] 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, Blackberry, XDA 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

A G E N D A

Timing		Agenda item	Lead
7.30pm	1.	APOLOGIES To receive any apologies for non attendance	Chairman
	2.	DISCLOSURES OF INTERESTS To receive any disclosure of interests from members in accordance with the Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules.	Chairman
	3.	MINUTES Page Nos. 6 - 36 To confirm the minutes of the following meetings (a) Special Overview and Scrutiny Committee - 20 October 2010 (b) Overview and Scrutiny Committee - 2 November 2010 (c) Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Committee – 2 November 2010 <i>If any member of the committee has any issues arising from the minutes of these meetings that they wish to raise at the meeting please inform Brian Harris the Assistant Chief Executive 24 hours in advance of the meeting.</i>	Chairman
	4.	MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES Crime and Disorder Committee Minutes – 2 November 2010 - Update on the review being undertaken by the safer stronger board. At the Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Committee meeting when consideration was given to the review being undertaken by the County Safer, Stronger Board on community safety services across the county. It was indicated that the findings of the review would be circulated to all committee members in December 2010 (or as soon as completed). However the review is taking longer than anticipated and it looks like the findings will now not be available until February/March 2011	Chairman
7.45pm	5.	PROGRESS REPORTS (a) Business Improvement Programme Update as of January 2011 Page Nos. 37 - 38 A briefing paper providing an update on the Council's Business Transformation Programme is attached	Diksha Vyas Business Improvement Manager

		<p>(b) Ordinary Water Courses Project Update Page No. 39</p> <p>A briefing paper providing an update on water courses in the Borough that will be managed to maximise flood reduction is attached</p>	<p>Dr Sandy Muirhead Head of Sustainability and Leisure</p>
	6.	<p>CALL IN OF CABINET DECISIONS</p> <p>No decisions have been called in for review.</p>	<p>Chairman</p>
8.05pm	7.	<p>2010 – 11 REVENUE MONITORING REPORT</p> <p>To consider the report of the Chief Finance Officer - Report to follow</p>	<p>Adrian Flynn, Chief Accountant</p>
8.35pm	8.	<p>2010 – 11 CAPITAL MONITORING AND PROJECTED OUTTURN REPORT</p> <p>To consider the report of the Chief Finance Officer – Report to follow</p>	<p>Adrian Flynn Chief Accountant</p>
9.05pm	9.	<p>SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY – UPDATE</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page Nos. 40 - 49</p> <p>To receive a presentation from the officers providing an update on the sustainable development strategy action plan (SDAPs)</p> <p>In support of the presentation a report of the Assistant Chief Executive is attached</p>	<p>Liz Borthwick Assistant Chief Executive &</p> <p>Lucy McSherry Sustainability & Waste Officer</p>
9.25pm	10.	<p>PARKS AND OPEN SPACE STRATEGY</p> <p>To receive a presentation from the officers on a revised parks and open space strategy.</p> <p>In support of the presentation a report of the Assistant Chief Executive is attached – Report to follow</p>	<p>Liz Borthwick Assistant Chief Executive &</p> <p>Sabena Sims Parks Strategy Officer</p>
9.55pm	11.	<p>PLAY PITCH STRATEGY UPDATE Page Nos. 50 - 62</p> <p>The report of the Assistant Chief Executive is attached for information only</p> <p>If any member would like to discuss any particular aspect prior to or after the meeting please notify Brian Harris the Lead Officer to scrutiny on 01784 446249 or email b.harris@spelthorne.gov.uk</p>	<p>Liz Borthwick Assistant Chief Executive</p> <p>Brian Harris, Assistant Chief Executive</p>
	12.	<p>CABINET FORWARD PLAN Page Nos. 63 - 64</p> <p>A Copy of the latest Forward Plan is attached for consideration</p> <p>If any members of the committee have any issues contained in the Cabinet Forward Plan they wish to look at please inform Brian Harris, the Assistant Chief Executive 24 hours in advance of the meeting with reasons for the request.</p>	<p>Brian Harris Assistant Chief Executive</p>

	13.	WORK PROGRAMME 2011 A draft work programme is attached	Page No. 65 Chairman
10.05pm	14.	ANY OTHER BUSINESS If any member wishes to raise an issue at the meeting could you please notify Brian Harris, Assistant Chief Executive on 01784 446249 or email b.harris@spelthorne.gov.uk 24 hours prior to the meeting otherwise the request may not be accepted	Brian Harris Assistant Chief Executive
	15.	EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC To consider passing the following resolution: To move the exclusion of the press and public for the following item of business in view of the likely disclosure of exempt information within the meaning of paragraph 3 of schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 and by the Local Government (Access to Information)(Variation) order 2006 Whilst generally encouraging the press and public to attend our meetings, there are certain items which we consider in private because of their personal, confidential or contractual nature. The item set out below comes into one of these categories.	Chairman
10.10pm	16.	STANWELL NEW START PROJECT – UPDATE ON DECISIONS AND NEGOTIATIONS (Paragraph 3) Page Nos 66 - 77 The confidential report of the Deputy Chief Executive attached	Nigel Lynn Deputy Chief Executive

MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

20 OCTOBER 2010

Present:

Councillor Philippa Broom (Chairman)

Councillor S.J Rough (Vice-Chairman)

Councillors:

Miss M.M. Bain

D.L. McShane

Jack D. Pinkerton

Mrs E.M. Bell

Mrs I. Napper

Mrs M.W. Rough

A.P. Hirst

Mrs C.E. Nichols

G.F. Trussler

H.R. Jaffer

L.E. Nichols

Apologies: Councillors S.E.W. Budd and K. Chouhan

Attendance:

Surrey County Council

Councillor Lynne Hack – Cabinet Member for the Environment

Trevor Pugh – Director for Environment and Infrastructure

Richard Parkinson - Waste Operations Manager

Ian Boast – Head of Waste and Sustainability

SITA

Emma Beal - Project Manager

Alison Bennett – Communications Manager

Gareth Phillips – Planning Manager

Gareth Swain – Regional Manager

Tina Wolter –Technology Specialist

Jean Claude Sartenaer – Advanced Thermal Treatment Technology Specialist

Consultants

Stephen Othen - Fichtner

Matthew Colledge – Studio E

Nick Roberts - Axis

Andrew Bell – Axis

Independent Expert Witnesses

Dean Hodson – Director of Transport

Dr Mark Broomfield – Technical Director

Professor Adam Read – Chartered Waste Manager

Spelthorne Borough Council

Roberto Tambini – Chief Executive

262/10 DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

The Chairman, Councillor Philippa Broom, reported that some members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee were also members of the Borough Council's Planning Committee which at some point would be consulted on the planning application from Surrey County Council. Advice had been obtained from the Council's Head of Legal Services who had confirmed that there was no reason why members of the Planning Committee could not participate in the proceedings provided that they take into account the advice set out in the Borough Council's Planning Code and kept an open mind.

No disclosures of interest were made. However Councillor Mrs C.E. Nichols reported that she was also a Surrey County Councillor.

263/10 ECO PARK PROPOSALS FOR CHARLTON LANE, SHEPPERTON

The Chairman, Councillor Philippa Broom, opened the meeting by explaining that she had called this formal meeting due to the high level of interest from residents and other interested parties on the proposed Eco Park Development at Charlton Lane, Shepperton. This proposal was from Surrey County Council and its partner Surrey Waste Management Limited.

The Chairman confirmed that this was a meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny committee in public but not a public meeting and therefore only members of the committee and those invited to give a presentation would be able to speak at this meeting. The questions that would be raised by the committee members would be based on the questions/concerns received from residents.

The Chairman expressed her thanks and appreciation to those residents who had submitted questions and had taken the time to attend the meeting. Over 200 questions had been submitted to date.

The Chairman confirmed that the scrutiny committee had a broad remit to consider all matters which affected the borough and the well being of residents. Therefore it would be looking at all aspects of the proposed development including issues relating to waste management generally, the County Council's strategy for dealing with waste, the technologies involved in the processes and the wider issues about the effects on the borough environmentally and economically.

The Chairman invited County Councillor Lynne Hack to introduce those Officers and representatives from Surrey County Council, SITA and their consultants.

To assist Committee members, residents and other interested parties to have a clearer understanding about the plans for a proposed Eco Park at Charlton Lane, Shepperton Ian Boast, Head of Waste and Sustainability at Surrey County Council gave a powerpoint presentation summarising the proposal and outlining the benefits of the proposed development. A Copy of the presentation is **attached**.

The proposed Eco Park would include

A batch oxidation gasification facility that would treat 60,000 tonnes of household waste each year.

An anaerobic digestion facility that would treat 40,000 tonnes of Surrey's food waste.

Facilities to manage recyclable waste such as paper, glass and plastics.

A community recycling centre (retain existing facility)

A visitor education centre

Additional land around the site had been obtained for landscaping and to encourage biodiversity.

Establish a fund for local environment projects

During the discussion and to help understand the complex waste technology it was explained that the batch oxidation gasification system enabled waste to be heated to produce a gas, which could then be burned cleanly at high temperatures to provide energy. Anaerobic digestion was a treatment by which food waste was broken down in the absence of oxygen to produce a biogas which is used to produce energy.

At the conclusion of the presentation the Chairman invited members of the Committee to introduce themselves. The Chairman advised the meeting that three independent expert witnesses were in attendance with a role to give independent advice to the committee on technical matters. The three experts were invited to introduce themselves and the meeting was reminded of the background information on the three witnesses which had been circulated with the agenda. During the introduction Dr Mark Broomfield reported that he had in the past worked for Enviro Consultants, who had undertaken work for Surrey CC. Dr Broomfield now worked for AEA a completely separate company.

At the conclusion of the presentation the Committee asked questions based on the questions/concerns received from residents. To enable a focus to be given to the questions these had been divided into six categories as follows:

Site Selection and Planning Policy

Visual Impact and Scale

Traffic

Waste Disposal Authority Cost and Contractual Issues

Pollution, Health and Technology

Others

1. Site Selection and Planning Policy

Question. *Please can you tell us the justification for the selection of Charlton Lane site versus alternatives in Surrey? Is it correct that Charlton Lane was not the first choice?*

Answer:

It is understood that the selection of the Charlton Lane site for the proposed Eco Park is a matter of public concern. Therefore I have addressed this issue at some length to ensure that councillors and the public understand how the

decision was taken and that there has been, and will continue to be, substantial provision for consultation with local residents.

In January 2006, the county council's Executive approved a draft Waste Disposal Authority Action Plan. The Council subsequently adopted this plan later that year. At that time the Waste Disposal Authority's preferred method of dealing with residual waste was through energy from waste incineration technology.

The Action Plan identified the preferred sites for energy from waste technology as Clockhouse Brickworks, Capel; land at Trumps Farm, Longcross and Charlton Lane, Shepperton. The report to the Executive in January 2006, went on to recommend that two energy from waste plants be developed to deal with residual municipal waste. The smaller of the two plants, some 100,000 tonnes per annum capacity, should be developed at Capel in the south of the county. A larger plant of 160,000 tonnes capacity should be developed in the north of the county at either Trumps Farm or Charlton Lane.

At the time the preference was to site the northern energy from waste incineration plant at Trumps Farm. Both the Charlton Lane and Trumps Farm sites had planning considerations. In addition, as the Executive report of January 2006 states, there were also 'some clear operational benefits in choosing the Trumps Farm site over the Charlton Lane site'. Those 'clear operational benefits' related to the existing operational use of the Charlton Lane waste transfer station and community recycling centre and the fact that if a 160,000 tonne per year energy from waste facility were to be developed on the Charlton Lane site, it would be necessary to close the site to the public and to local authority and trade customers for the duration of the building works.

The council's World Class Waste Solution proposes further reduction of waste arising as well as increased levels of recycling. This means that there will be less residual waste to be disposed of than was anticipated when the Waste Disposal Authority Action Plan was first drawn up in 2006. Some 160,000 tonnes per year instead of the 270,000 tonnes per year originally proposed.

The emergence of batch oxidation system gasification technology as a viable alternative to energy from waste incineration enables plant to be constructed on a much smaller scale. The plant proposed for Charlton Lane will deal with only 60,000 tonnes of waste per year rather than the 160,000 tonnes proposed for the energy from waste plant at Trumps Farm. The configuration of the plant also allows for a much smaller building to house the process. The maximum building height proposed for the Eco Park is just over 18 metres, compared with a height of around 40 metres that would be required for an energy from waste incineration plant. The height of the stack is also significantly less, 49 metres as compared to 80 to 90 metres for an energy from waste incineration plant.

The reduced scale of the buildings also means that it would be possible to continue to operate the Charlton Lane facility during the construction of both the gasification plant and anaerobic digestion plant. In addition the council has managed to secure short-term capacity for Spelthorne's residual waste at the

Lakeside energy from waste facility at Colnbrook and therefore the operational pressure on the Charlton Lane site, during construction, is reduced.

Since the scale of the buildings, types of processes and footprint of the proposed Eco Park are very different to that of a 160,000 tonne per year energy from waste incineration facility and since there had been significant changes to the adopted Waste Plan as a result of the removal of Capel as an allocated site, Waste Disposal Authority officers considered that it was necessary to undertake a new planning assessment for the proposed Eco Park. A firm of planning consultants, Enviros were therefore commissioned to undertake this assessment and this was used to inform the report to cabinet on the 'World Class Waste Solution' in February this year. The report, which was produced in November 2009 has been published on the council's website.

As a result of this detailed analysis, the Waste Disposal Authority believes that the Charlton Lane site is the most appropriate site for the development of an Eco Park. The principle of using the Charlton Lane site for waste processing, including thermal treatment, was subject to extensive public consultation during the development of Surrey Waste Plan.

The council adopted the Waste Plan in May 2008 following an examination in public, with the inclusion of Charlton Lane as an allocated site. The planning application that is being developed by Surrey Waste Management will include a thorough and up to date alternative site assessment. The planning application will be subject to public consultation and residents will be able to make their views known with regard to all aspects of the application, including the suitability of the Charlton Lane site for the Eco Park.

The demonstration of the suitability of the site is a material consideration for the council's Planning and Regulatory Committee when they consider the planning application. Therefore there has been and will continue to be further consultation with residents in relation to the principle of a waste processing facility at Charlton Lane

Question: *Will this mean that all of Spelthorne's waste will be dealt with locally?*

Answer:

All of Spelthorne Borough Council's residual waste would be dealt with at the proposed Eco Park, together with any kitchen waste that is collected separately by the borough council in the future. Spelthorne Borough Council make their own arrangements for other recyclable material and it is likely that recyclable material collected in door to door collections will continue to be taken to the Grundon materials recycling facility at Colnbrook. Spelthorne's garden waste is currently being taken to a composting site near Virginia Water. Any future decision about a destination for green waste will be a matter for Spelthorne Borough Council. The Community Recycling Centre element of the Eco Park will continue to deal with waste brought into the site by Surrey residents, the majority of whom are from Spelthorne.

Question: *We understand that it is proposed that 40,000 tonnes of Surrey's food waste out of an estimated 100,000 tonnes will be dealt with in the Eco*

Park, is the 100,000 tonnes a realistic figure and, if so, where will the balance of 60,000 tonnes be dealt with?

Answer:

A household waste analysis undertaken in November 2007 and March 2008 identified that kitchen waste comprised 40% of the weight of residual municipal waste. In 2007/8, district and borough councils collected 271,000 tonnes of residual waste and therefore if kitchen waste comprised 40% of this then there would be about 108,000 tonnes of kitchen waste in the household waste stream. Initially it is estimated that about 40 % of the 100,000 tonnes of kitchen waste will be captured by separate kerbside collections. However if capture rates and participation rates increase, then there may be the need for additional facilities to deal with this waste in which case the council and SITA Surrey would consider the appropriate sizing and location of such a facility.

***Question:** If there is capacity at other nearby energy for waste sites such as the Veolia plant in Hampshire - Why do we need to build one in Surrey? Has Surrey County Council looked at other options for sharing waste facilities with other local authorities?*

Answer:

The Surrey Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy (Policy 1) states that Surrey authorities will plan for net self sufficiency for dealing with waste in Surrey, through the provision of waste management capacity equivalent to the amount of municipal waste arising. The WCWS projects the need for 160,000 residual waste treatment capacity even after reducing waste further and recycling at 70%. In the short term SCC is sending 20,000 waste to the Lakeside facility at Colnbrook, but this capacity is only available for two more years. SCC also has an interim contract in place for 100,000 at Allington EFW in Kent which can last until 2019. The only other reasonably local option is Hampshire and we have been told in very clear terms that they have no capacity available for Surrey's waste. Therefore long term capacity at nearby facilities cannot be relied on and the Eco Park is the first step in addressing this issue. The WDA will continue to assess need and capacity and will bring recommendations to members in the future. The fall back position would be reliance on landfill which may not be available locally, is environmentally unsustainable, and would cost Surrey taxpayers around £11m a year in landfill tax alone within four years if we did not develop new solutions.

***Question:** If the Eco Park goes ahead what are the plans for other waste collection sites in Surrey?*

Answer:

The proposed Eco Park is just one of a number of developments across Surrey that will be needed to handle Surrey's municipal waste. Waste is currently collected at fifteen community recycling centres and four waste transfer stations across Surrey and this number will increase as we develop more facilities to treat waste in Surrey.

We are currently sending our green garden waste out of county for treatment and we have identified in our plans that we require a site or sites to compost up to 80,000 tonnes of green waste. We also have plans to develop new

facilities at Guildford including a new community recycling centre, waste transfer station and a materials recycling facility for the dry recyclables currently delivered to the site. We are also looking to develop the existing site at Earlswood, Redhill to incorporate a new waste transfer station and bulking facility. We will also continue with our programme of refurbishment and improvements to the existing community recycling centres across the county to improve the service provided to customers and increase the recycling potential.

Question: *If this Eco Park development does not go ahead what is Plan B? What are the implications for waste disposal in Surrey?*

Answer:

If the Eco Park development does not proceed then the waste disposal authority would need to reassess how it will deal with the waste that will continue to be produced by Surrey residents. It is very likely that we would have to continue to rely on landfill, which has both environmental impacts and cost implications. Within four years, this would lead to £11m per year in landfill tax alone.

At the conclusion of this section of questions covering site selection and planning policy the Chairman invited the Independent experts to comment in particular why Charlton Village was a suitable place for the Eco Park. Professor Read indicated that with 228 sites looked at a very thorough investigation had been undertaken and Charlton Lane was already a waste facility. In his view everything had been done in line with 'best practice' to show that Charlton Lane was the most appropriate place to develop. However, it would be the Planning Committee to assess and determine if mitigation measures were appropriate.

2. Visual Impact and Scale

Question: *The Charlton Lane site was originally rejected from the Waste Disposal Authority plans for Energy from waste site due to visual impact, why is it suitable for an Eco Park?*

Answer:

The emergence of batch oxidation system gasification technology as a viable alternative to energy from waste incineration enables plant to be constructed on a much smaller scale.

The plant proposed for Charlton Lane will deal with only 60,000 tonnes of waste per year rather than the 160,000 tonnes proposed for the energy from waste plant at Trumps Farm. The configuration of the plant also allows for a much smaller building to house the process. The maximum building height proposed for the Eco Park is just over 18 metres, compared with a height of around 40 metres that would be required for an energy from waste incineration plant. The height of the stack is also significantly less, 49 metres as compared to 80 to 90 metres for an energy from waste incineration plant.

The overall visual impact of the Eco Park is therefore substantially less than that of an energy from waste incineration plant.

The reduced scale of the buildings also means that it would be possible to continue to operate the Charlton Lane facility during the construction of both the gasification plant and anaerobic digestion plant. In addition the council has managed to secure short-term capacity for Spelthorne's residual waste at the Lakeside energy from waste facility at Colnbrook and therefore the operational pressure on the Charlton Lane site, during construction, is reduced.

Since the scale of the buildings, types of processes and footprint of the proposed Eco Park are very different to that of a 160,000 tonne per year energy from waste facility and since there had been significant changes to the adopted Waste Plan as a result of the removal of Capel as an allocated site, Waste Disposal Authority officers considered that it was necessary to undertake a new planning assessment for the proposed Eco Park. A firm of planning consultants, Enviros were therefore commissioned to undertake this assessment and this was used to inform the report to cabinet on the 'World Class Waste Solution' in February this year.

The report, which was produced in November 2009 has been published on the council's website.

As a result of this detailed analysis, the Waste Disposal Authority believes that the Charlton Lane site is the most appropriate site for the development of an Eco Park. The principle of using the Charlton Lane site for waste processing, including thermal treatment, was subject to extensive public consultation during the development of Surrey Waste Plan.

Question: *What is the justification for the scale of the building and height of the stack?*

Answer:

The height of the eastern elevation of the gasification building is 13.5m, rising to the highest western elevation of 18.5m and the proposed stack is 49m.

The height of the process buildings and the stack are determined by technical assessments and the technology infrastructure inside the buildings.

The height of the stack is a balance between the visual impact (a taller stack has more impact) and the air quality impact (a taller stack leads to lower ground level concentrations of pollutants). The stack needs to be a certain minimum height to ensure that the dispersion of emissions is not affected excessively by the disturbance of the air caused by the facility buildings. Above this height, we modelled the impact of a number of different stack heights.

Due to the high levels of nitrogen dioxide which have been recorded in some parts of Spelthorne, the whole of the Spelthorne borough area has been declared an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). This is an area where the air quality objective (which is set in the National Air Quality Strategy and European Directives) is at risk of being exceeded. Because of this, we aimed to reduce the impact of nitrogen dioxide so that the concentrations at ground level due to the facility would be no more than 1% of the air quality objective within the AQMA, and so would be defined as "insignificant" by the Environment Agency.

Initially, we modelled the impact based on the gasifiers operating at the maximum permissible level under the Waste Incineration Directive. This led to a stack height of 70 metres, which was not considered to be acceptable. Therefore, we discussed the design of the facility with the technology providers and agreed that the emissions of nitrogen dioxide would be limited to 100mg/Nm³, which is half the permitted level.

We also reduced the emissions of nitrogen dioxide from the gas engines. As a result of these changes, the required target of 1% of the air quality objective will be achieved with a 49m stack.

The length of the building is determined by the primary BOS gasification compartments, which sit in a long line. In this case there will be twelve compartments in which the waste is heated in a batch system. Behind these are the three secondary compartments where the syngas is ignited and towards the back of the building and the centre of the site are the boilers. The boiler is the piece of equipment that sits tallest in the building bringing the height to 18.5 metres.

The BOS gasification process enables us to keep the building low in height in comparison to traditional energy from waste and makes it suitable in a setting such as Charlton Lane where minimising the visual impact is important.

Question: *What measures will be put in place to mitigate the visual impact?*

Answer:

Because the Eco Park buildings are proposed to be higher than the existing buildings on the site and because this is a green belt setting, we have deliberately designed the site structure and the buildings on site to mitigate the visual impact of the proposal from surrounding views. We wanted to produce a design which reflects the function and importance of the site as a world class facility but one which does not draw undue attention to itself by:

- Positioning the tallest piece of process equipment in the centre of the site away from the boundary to reduce its visual impact
- Making the buildings as small as they can be, given the size of the equipment inside.
- Positioning the lowest building elevation facing the most sensitive eastern boundary
- Curved eaves to the roof which slope up away from the eastern boundary to avoid shadows created by overhangs. As the roof slopes away towards the sky it will reflect the sky colour and merge with its backdrop
- One simple, un-fussy, slim stack finished in polished/bright annealed stainless steel to reflect surroundings and sky. It will reflect the sky colour and merge with its backdrop
- An Eco Park which is a single entity within its setting. The buildings and structures complement each other and fit the landscape
- A building form which favours soft edges over hard lines

- Increased landscaping and a 3.5m bund to the east to break up views towards the main process buildings
- The eastern length of the building screens site activities to the west
- Positioning solar panels on the buildings on the west side of the site so they have no additional effect on the visual impact

During the design stage we considered many different architectural forms and different site layouts. To give you an idea of the work that went into finding the current design, we considered stepping the main process building up to its height but the visual impact assessments showed that this created shadow and drew attention to the building. We considered a different layout with the buildings positioned in reverse but this drew attention to the highest roofline when placed in a different part of the site. We considered green roofs to the buildings but found that this made the buildings taller, which is not appropriate in this setting.

The architectural design of the Eco Park was consulted upon with the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE). In their formal consultation response dated 19th August CABE stated that they “applaud the commitment to commission a well designed building. This scheme strikes us as a successful piece of architecture. It has the potential to become an exemplary facility and to offer an interesting visitor experience”. CABE also stated that, “This site seems appropriate for a waste management facility”.

There are three ways in which the visual impact of a development can be addressed, the design of the site, the architecture of the buildings on the site and the use of landscaping and geography to shield the site from view. Charlton Lane is quite an open site that has mature landscaping around it. We carried out a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment to understand how visible the development would be and to identify the sensitive viewpoints. The result of this assessment enabled us to draft a mitigation scheme and consult upon it with Surrey and Spelthorne Landscape and Biodiversity Officers. The purpose of the landscape mitigation scheme, which will form part of the planning application, is not to try and hide the proposed Eco Park but to break up the views to minimise the visual impact. A diagram of this was shown during the presentation.

Question: *Will there be light pollution given the site will operate overnight? and If so how will it be managed so that residents' lives are not affected?*

Answer:

The offices and visitor centre are designed to make the best possible use of natural light. All overnight operations will be undertaken solely within the gasification and anaerobic digestion (AD) building. There is no need for vehicular access in and out of these buildings during the night. Therefore external lighting will only be standard safety and security lighting with lights being standard down lights fitted with cowls to prevent light spill.

At the conclusion of this section of questions relating to visual impact and scale the Chairman invited the independent experts to comments. Dr Mark Broomfield who specialised in air quality and health issues responded. He indicated that the procedures being discussed were well established. With

regard to the height of the stack (49m) he confirmed that the taller the stack the lower the impact on air quality due to disposition although the flue gas cleaning equipment did meet EU standards and more.

3. Traffic

Question: *Please can you confirm what the operating hours for the new Eco Park are?*

Answer:

The community recycling centre will be open:

Mon-Fri 07:30 – 1800

Sat 07:30 – 18:00

Sun 08:00 – 17:00

The refuse bulking facility will be open:

Mon-Fri 07:30-18:00

Sat 07:30-18:00

Sun 07:30 – 17:00 (for CRC waste only)

Bank Holidays 07:30 – 18:00

Gasification facility will be open:

Mon-Fri 07:30-18:00

Sat 07:30-18:00

Sun 07:30-17:00

Bank holidays 07:30 18:00

NB Gates will be opened to HGVs at 07:00 to ensure no off-site queuing but they will not be allowed to enter the building until 07:30

The anaerobic digestion facility will be open:

Mon-Fri 07:00 – 17:30

Sat 07:00-12:00

Sun No deliveries

Bank Holiday 07:00 – 17:30

There will be no deliveries Christmas Day / Boxing Day / New Year's Day

The opening hours of the site are different to when the site is open to the public. This is to enable site staff to ensure the site is safe before customers and the public enter the site in the morning as well as to ensure that the final daily checks are completed before the site closes for the evening.

The processes on site do run 24 hours a day but waste reception and processing only takes place during allowed operational hours.

Question: *Currently heavy lorries are a big area of concern for residents - can you explain how the Eco Park will lead to reduced lorry movements?*

Answer:

At present Charlton Lane is used as a bulking facility. This means that waste is taken into the site on one vehicle and deposited in a holding area. This vehicle then leave the site empty. The waste is bulked and a bigger, empty vehicle comes to the site and is loaded with this waste before leaving again. This means that all waste received at the Charlton Lane site at present is ultimately exported from the facility by road. i.e. 100% of what comes to the site, will go back out again.

The proposed Eco Park scheme will include for waste processing on site in future, which will break down the received waste inputs and therefore deliver a reduction in the amount of final end product waste materials required to be exported from the facility. Just over two thirds of all waste to be received at the Eco Park will be subject to waste processing activities.

The proposed BOS gasification and anaerobic digestion facilities at the Eco Park will process waste and reduce received waste mass by 77% and 50% respectively. Therefore only 54% of all waste mass received at the site will be required to be exported, with a consequent reduction in vehicle movements.

In addition to the effects of waste processing, the Eco Park proposals are also anticipated to result in a further reduction in heavy good vehicle movements as a result of:

- i) a reduction in trade waste levels received at the site, and;
- ii) ceasing the receipt of waste associated with the Hounslow kerbside recycling fleet, which is currently using the site as a temporary waste reception area.

The reduction / removal of these existing waste streams from Charlton Lane as part of the Eco Park proposals will further help to reduce overall lorry movements.

The planning application for the Eco Park proposal scheme will be supported by a detailed Transport Assessment report, which has been prepared to accord with Department of Transport guidelines and which was scoped with both the Local Highway Authority (Surrey County Council) and the Trunk Road Authority (Highways Agency). The results of these assessments suggest that the development of the Eco Park scheme is anticipated to lead to a 49% reduction in the number of lorries travelling to / from the Charlton Lane site on weekdays.

At weekends, it is predicted that there will likely be a slight decrease in overall lorry movements on Saturdays and a slight increase in lorries on Sundays, when compared to current site operation. Any such weekend increases would be very low, being of the order of less than 20 a day, or equivalent to two additional lorry movements per hour (in+out).

Question: *With the increased drive to recycling, What are the expected increases in private vehicle movements?*

Answer:

The modelling of private vehicle movements for the Eco Park scheme has included for the following additional elements over and above current operation of the Charlton Lane site:

- Additional staff vehicle movements reflecting the increased staffing levels proposed at the Eco Park;
- Visitor movements associated with the visitor / educational facility at the Eco Park;
- 3% growth in observed public community recycling centre movements between 2010 – 2016;

In fact, over the past few years the number of private vehicles accessing the existing Charlton Lane community recycling centre has actually been falling, reflecting the impact of the Surrey County Council's resident scheme and van permit initiatives in discouraging unauthorised use of the site and the effects of greater kerbside recycling in reducing the need for residents to regularly visit community recycling centres. We would anticipate this trend to continue. Notwithstanding this, in order to ensure a 'worst case' appraisal of highway network impact and capacity within the formal Transport Assessment report, we have included a small level of growth in our traffic modelling of the community recycling centre.

Question: *Can you guarantee to local residents that waste vehicles going to and from the facility will not go through Upper Halliford or Charlton Lane?*

Answer:

Waste management activities have been taking place at the Charlton Lane site since the 1950's, with associated levels of heavy goods vehicle traffic movements. Indeed, the existing waste management facility creates of the order of 350 heavy good vehicle (HGV) movements per day (weekday) with much lower levels of HGV traffic at weekends. Some of the current HGV traffic movements are known to route via Charlton Road through Charlton Village (of the order of 20-30% of total site HGV traffic, based on our surveys of May / June 2010). Very little waste related traffic is anticipated to route via Upper Halliford Village except when serving local frontage properties.

The development of the Eco Park proposals will result in a substantive reduction in HGV movements to / from the Charlton Lane site, which will in turn result in a reduction in HGV movements on the immediate local network including through Charlton Village. The Transport Assessment report identifies that the development of the Charlton Lane Eco Park scheme would likely result in a 10.5% reduction in total HGV movements (including other non-waste related HGV traffic) through Charlton Village on weekdays.

As the Eco Park scheme will be operated to serve Surrey County Council municipal waste inputs it is anticipated that there will potentially be greater opportunities for the control of vehicle routing in future. Furthermore, the existing large vehicle routing strategy at the Charlton Lane site would be

retained and strictly enforced to ensure that no large (bulk) transfer vehicles use Charlton Road / New Road to the west of the site.

Question: *Have the proposed plans been examined in conjunction with Surrey's Minerals Plan to ensure that the said waste traffic reductions are not offset by increases in minerals traffic?*

Answer:

The Eco Park proposal is supported by a detailed Transport Assessment report, the scope of which was discussed and agreed with both the Local Highway Authority (Surrey County Council) and the Trunk Road Authority (Highways Agency). These scoping negotiations identified that the Transport Assessment should follow best practice and therefore directly include for the traffic effects of the following as part of network traffic modelling:

- 'Committed' major local development projects i.e. those schemes that have either received planning permission, but have yet to be constructed;
- Those schemes that are currently the subject of a formal planning submission, but yet to be determined.

Under this approach, the Transport Assessment for the Eco Park scheme has directly incorporated the predicted traffic effects of the approved Shepperton Studios re-development scheme.

In addition to the direct modelling of this local major committed development scheme, the Transport Assessment for the Eco Park development also includes for increases in total observed background traffic levels in order to model predicted future network traffic growth. The methodology adopted within the Transport Assessment for the modelling of such growth is highly robust, using growth factors in excess of typical growth levels to ensure a 'worst case' capacity assessment.

Given the above, the Transport Assessment does not directly include for the traffic effects of local 'allocated' sites (including minerals site). Scoping discussions with the formal highways consultees identified that direct modeling of allocated sites would be inappropriate, as they did not represent permitted sites and there could be no certainty as to when, or indeed if, such sites would ultimately be brought forward. Furthermore, little information is available as to how such facilities might operate in future, if permitted, and what planning or highways related restrictions would be placed upon such schemes.

It is important to note that traffic volumes associated with the operation of waste management facilities at the Charlton Lane proposal site are already part of existing network traffic volumes and therefore inherent within existing observed baseline traffic flows. Given that the proposed Eco Park scheme is predicted to result in a reduction in traffic volumes when compared to current site operation, the proposals will actually result in a general improvement in local traffic conditions and therefore are unlikely to impact on the future viability of any local allocated site.

Ultimately, the assessment of the transport suitability of an allocated site is best undertaken at the planning application stage, when each proposal can be

assessed on its own merits, when viewed against the prevailing highway conditions at the time.

Question: *Is it possible to access the site from the M3? What other options are there to transport the waste? Rail?*

Answer:

SITA UK wrote to the Highways Agency requesting permission to build a slip road off the M3 to the site. However, they replied refusing us permission as it goes against national Government policy.

The Highways Agency's letter stated: "There is a general presumption that there will be no additional accesses to motorways and other routes of strategic national importance, other than the provision of service areas, facilities for the travelling public, maintenance compounds and, exceptionally, other major transport interchanges. Access from other types of development to motorways and other routes of strategic national importance will be limited to existing junctions with all-purpose roads. Modifications to existing junctions will be carried out only where traffic flows and safety will not be adversely affected. Connections to slip roads and/or connector roads will not be permitted."

In terms of potential rail access, the railway line near the Charlton Lane facility is a busy commuter route which is highly unlikely to have the capacity to transport waste by rail. Furthermore, an exporting railhead would need to be constructed to load the waste material onto rail in the first place. Rail works well with economies of scale transporting bulk materials over long distances. Those economies of scale would not be available for transporting relatively small quantities of waste within Northern Surrey by rail. The land that sits alongside the railway to the east of the Charlton Lane site is greenfield land within the Green Belt.

At the conclusion of this section of questions relating to traffic the Chairman invited the independent expert to comments. Dean Hodson indicated that a robust and thorough assessment had been made on the levels of traffic including assessments made on the site access, queuing systems and in his view a thorough investigation had been undertaken. The increased capacity to be put in place on the site itself would also lessen the impact of traffic on the public highway.

4. Waste Disposal Authority Cost and Contractual Issues

Question: *What is the updated cost projection for the construction and commissioning of the facility should it be given the appropriate planning permission?*

Answer.

SITA will shortly be going to market for the construction of the Eco Park. The exact cost will be known following completion of the construction tendering process. The Estimated capital cost for the construction of the Eco Park is circa £50 million. It is important to emphasise that the cost of continuing to rely on landfill will far outweigh the cost of developing the Eco Park.

Question: *Are Surrey residents paying for the entire cost of the project from their council tax payments? If not how will it be funded?*

Answer:

The financial responsibility for disposing of municipal waste and providing community recycling centres rests with Surrey County Council.

The contract between Surrey County Council and SITA Surrey requires SITA Surrey to provide and operate infrastructure to deal with municipal waste. The cost of providing and operating these waste facilities is recharged to Surrey County Council over the life of the contract. Surrey County Council's sources of funding are the general government grant, PFI grant and council tax

Question: *Who bears responsibility for ensuring the project comes in on budget if approved? Who would pay for any cost overruns?*

Answer:

SITA UK is responsible for ensuring that the project is delivered within the agreed timescale and budget. In general, any cost overruns will be the responsibility of SITA UK or the sub contractor.

Question: *Who will actually own the plant? Surrey County Council?*

Answer:

The plant will be built, owned and operated under lease by SITA until the end of their contract with Surrey County Council in 2024. The facility will then become the property of Surrey County Council.

Question: *Did this go out to tender? If so, why were Sita successful?*

Answer:

In 1999, SITA Surrey, which was then called Surrey Waste Management were awarded a 25 year Public Finance Initiative contract to deal with Surrey's municipal waste. The contract was awarded following an extensive tendering exercise.

Question: *As I understand the process, there are three by products going to be produced that have a commercial value; compost, hardcore ash that can be used by the construction industry, and electricity. Who will get the income (not the profit) generated by these three commercial by products? Surrey County Council or Surrey Waste Management?*

Answer:

Income from sales of electricity, digestate and any value from ash will be collected by SITA Surrey and be used to reduce the operating costs of the plant. This will in turn reduce the amount Surrey County Council has to pay SITA Surrey for operating the plant.

Question: *We keep hearing that similar gasification and anaerobic plants elsewhere in the UK have had problems in their operation, how can we be assured that similar situations will not arise at these plants, and have the relevant detailed risk assessments been completed? Has the Health and Safety Executive granted its approval in respect of the plant proposals?*

Answer:

SITA UK employs industry experienced consultants and contractors to design, project manage and construct its new waste treatment facilities. SCC and SITA recognise that they have a legal duty under the Construction (Design & Management) Regulations 2007 (CDM) to satisfy themselves that any teams that they engage or appoint are competent. This code is produced by the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) and has been approved by the Health and Safety Commission, with the consent of the Secretary of State.

Prior to engaging any contractors SITA UK will rigorously evaluate the tenders to assure itself of their competency in the field for which they will be employed. In order to provide consistency in the way in which competency assessments of companies are carried out "core criteria" have been agreed between the Construction Industry and the HSE.(House and Safety Executive)

In preparing or modifying a design, designers must reduce or eliminate hazards which may cause foreseeable risks to the health and safety of those constructing, maintaining or working in the structure, as far as reasonably practicable. A form of risk assessment should identify what hazards have been created by the change that may affect personal safety, and what action can be implemented to reduce or eliminate the risk.

Hazard and Operability Studies (HAZOP) have been used for many years as a formal means for the review of chemical process designs and are a quantitative risk assessment technique. A HAZOP study is a systematic search for hazards which are defined as deviations within these parameters (Hazard and Operation) that may have dangerous consequences. In the process industry, these deviations concern process parameters such as flow, temperature, pressure etc.

Before construction work begins SITA UK will check to ensure that the construction phase plan has been prepared by the Principle Contractor. The plan should set out the way in which key health and safety issues will be managed (i.e. risk assessments, detailed method statements, etc) and should include the applicable site safety rules.

The Health and Safety Executive (HSE) will be a consultee for the planning application for an Eco Park at Charlton Lane. The Eco Park proposals do not need prior approval from the HSE before being submitted to the planning authority and the HSE do not undertake such as approval process for sites of this type. However, the HSE has stated to Surrey County Council Planning Authority that once the application has been submitted and they are formally consulted that they would normally defer to the comments of the Environment Agency.

At the conclusion of this section of questions relating to cost and contractual issues the Chairman invited the independent experts to comment. Adam Read confirmed that industry best practice had been followed

5) Pollution and Health and Technology

Question: *We have been informed that at another site in Dumfries the plant is not operational; would you propose to open something here that does not work?*

Answer:

SITA UK is not the operator of the Dumfries site but it is the reference site for the BOS gasifier proposed for the Eco Park at Charlton Lane, Shepperton. SITA UK follows the operation at Dumfries very closely and has a good relationship with Scotgen, the plant's operators.

The Scottish plant has been operating successfully but inevitably there will be issues that need to be resolved during the commissioning phase. This is quite common with commissioning of a new plant. The main issue at Dumfries was that the facility did not have the correct type of boiler. The boiler was reconfigured last winter and used as a 'cooler' before a new type of boiler is installed. Since March 2010, Scotgen has been adjusting the plant and processing thousands of tons of waste. The commissioning period ended on 1 November 2010.

SITA UK technical experts consider that there is no concern with the actual gasification process and we are confident that BOS gasification is a sound technology and is the right facility for Surrey.

SITA UK's experts have extensive experience of thermal waste treatment methods and have thoroughly assessed the suitability of the technologies proposed for Surrey

Question: *What other examples are there of putting waste facilities together like this development? How does this benefit Spelthorne?*

Answer:

Although this is the first Eco Park of its kind in the country, the technologies proposed are in use elsewhere. SITA UK has extensive experience of older style Eco Parks with co located facilities of different types. These include:

- SITA Kirklees, which is in an urban setting and co-locates energy from waste and material recovery facility technologies;
- Londonwaste Eco Park (where SITA was a 50% shareholder) is in an urban setting and co-locates energy from waste, in vessel composting and bulky waste recycling;

It is SITA UK's intention to develop other Eco Parks across the country to modernise existing sites as well as at new sites to provide the UK with much needed infrastructure to recycle and recover energy from waste.

The benefits to Spelthorne of developing the Eco Park are that it secures a reduction in heavy goods vehicle traffic in the local area and it also secures the presence of the community recycling centre, which is a very important and busy local asset. Were the Eco Park not to be developed then the waste transfer station and material recovery facility would need to be retained for wastes to be bulked locally and transported somewhere else for recovery and disposal. Therefore there would be no reduction in heavy goods vehicle traffic

Question: *What is an Anaerobic Digester - What does it do?*

Answer:

Anaerobic digestion (AD) has been used in the waste-water industry for decades and almost every big sewage treatment plant in the UK has an AD

plant as part of the water treatment. AD of solid and semi-liquid waste streams (e.g. food waste) is a more recent development, but has been used for around 15 years now. Germany alone has more than 4,000 AD plants and the number of plants in the UK is growing continuously. SITA Surrey Ltd, through SITA UK and Suez Environnement, has considerable technical expertise and our technical experts have thoroughly assessed the suitability of the technologies proposed

Anaerobic digestion is a process in which biodegradable material – e.g. food waste – is broken down by micro organisms in a sealed container in the absence of oxygen. This produces a gas (known as biogas) consisting of methane and CO₂, which can be converted into electricity, heat and digestate.

The process also produces what is known as a “digestate”. This product is dewatered and the solid part is similar to compost and can be used on land to replace artificial fertilisers.

Question: *What exactly is batch oxidation? What does it do and is it safe?*

Answer:

BOS gasification is a process where waste is heated in reduced levels of oxygen to temperatures above 650 degrees but not set on fire, to produce a gas. The gas (known as synthetic gas or syngas) is then used as fuel and burned at high temperatures to provide energy in a similar way to natural gas. A flue gas treatment system cleans the gas before it is released to atmosphere by a chimney or stack. BOS gasification is proven and safe, as is recovering energy from waste. Waste thermal treatment plants are amongst the most strictly regulated industrial processes in Europe and are closely monitored in England by the Environment Agency. SITA UK operates three thermal waste treatment plants safely and efficiently across the UK and Suez Environnement, our parent company, operate 50 in Europe.

Before the Eco Park can operate it must have an Environmental Permit from the Environment Agency (EA), which is the industry regulatory body. This permit will set out conditions of operation and if these are breached the EA can – and does – shut down sites. We would not be issued with an Environmental Permit if this site posed an unacceptable risk to safety.

Question: *There are concerns from residents about potential pollutions Can you tell us what are the emissions and health effects for water – bearing in mind 20% of Spelthorne is water.*

Answer:

The gas engines connected to the anaerobic digestion units will release oxides of nitrogen, carbon monoxide and sulphur dioxide while the batch oxidation system gasifier will release products of combustion (nitrogen dioxide, carbon monoxide, volatile organic compounds), acid gases (sulphur dioxide, hydrogen chloride), particulate matter, heavy metals and trace elements including dioxins and furans.

Gas cleaning systems will be installed to ensure that the levels of any emissions from the plant comply with all the relevant European emissions standards. In addition the Eco Park will have a chimney-stack to effectively disperse emissions and this will be 49 metres tall.

A number of the reservoirs and other water bodies in Spelthorne Borough are protected as part of a Special Protection Area (SPA) and/or as Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs). In order to assess the impact on these sensitive areas, dispersion modelling was used to predict the concentrations of oxides of nitrogen and sulphur dioxide above them and compared this with the air quality objective for the protection of sensitive ecosystems. This showed that the impact would be insignificant.

According to the Environment Agency guidance, the impact can be screened out as insignificant if the concentration is less than 1% of the acceptable level on a long term basis and less than 10% on a short term basis.

As part of the Human Health Risk Assessment, we also considered the potential for pollutants to land on the water, accumulate in the water and contribute to concentrations in drinking water. It was assumed that residents of Spelthorne took all of their drinking water from the closet reservoir. The additional ingestion of pollutants through this route was found to be insignificant.

Both Surrey County Council and SITA UK are committed to ensuring that emissions from the Eco Park are as low as possible. For example, the EU standard for Nitrogen Oxide is 200 mg/Nm³ but the clean up technology for the proposed gasification plant will reduce the emissions of Nitrogen Oxide to 100 mg/Nm³, which is a significantly lower level.

Question: *There are concerns from residents about potential pollutions Can you tell us what are the emissions and health effects for air bearing in mind Heathrow and the motorways impact?*

Answer:

The exhaust gases from the Eco Park will mainly consist of nitrogen, oxygen, carbon dioxide and water vapour, but there will also be small amounts of potential pollutants. The gas engines connected to the anaerobic digestion units will release oxides of nitrogen, carbon monoxide and sulphur dioxide. The BOS gasifier will release products of combustion, (nitrogen dioxide, carbon monoxide, volatile organic compounds), acid gases (sulphur dioxide, hydrogen chloride), particulate matter, heavy metals and trace elements including dioxins and furans. Emissions will be minimised by various flue gas treatment methods.

However, merely stating that pollutants are released is not sufficient. We also need to consider how much is released and how much, if any, reaches humans to have a health effect. This is worked out using dispersion modelling to predict concentrations at ground level, which are then compared with acceptable levels, including air quality objectives.

For those pollutants that are not screened out further detailed assessment, including background concentrations, has been carried out and this confirms that the impact is negligible.

Question: *There are concerns from residents about potential pollutions _ can you tell us what are the emissions and health effects for noise and how will this be managed bearing in mind the proximity of the M3 to the proposed Eco Park.*

Answer:

A detailed noise assessment has been undertaken taking existing background noise levels and adding predicted operational noise levels on top of background levels. This noise assessment has shown compliance of the proposed Eco Park not only with British Standard BS4142 noise levels, but also the much more stringent Surrey County Council noise guidelines.

Question: *Can you categorically confirm there is nothing about operations of the site which will be detrimental to health?*

Answer:

The waste management industry is strictly regulated by the Environment Agency. We would not be allowed to operate any facility that poses a significant risk to human health. The Environment Agency can – and does – shut down non-compliant sites.

The risk to human health has been assessed in detail and has been found to be insignificant. This is worked out using dispersion modelling to predict concentrations at ground level, which are then compared with acceptable levels, including air quality objectives.

For those pollutants that are not screened out, further detailed assessment including background concentrations, has been carried out and this confirms that the impact is negligible.

Question: *How will these emissions be monitored? Will the public have access to the data?*

Answer:

There will be a continuous emissions monitoring system installed for the gasifier, which will monitor nitrogen oxides, sulphur dioxide, hydrogen chloride, volatile organic compounds, carbon monoxide and dust. Other pollutants are released in such low concentrations that continuous monitoring is not practical, so samples are extracted from the exhaust gases every three months for analysis.

The results of the monitoring will be sent to the Environment Agency, where they will be made publically available.

Recent tests at the batch oxidation system gasification plant in Dumfries indicated that dioxin levels were well below that permitted under the environmental permit.

Question: *At the last Area Surrey Councillors meeting at Knowle Green it was stated that the residue from the anaerobic digester process will be 20 K tonnes a year which will be sold onto farmers for soil improvement. I want to know the process envisaged to store and transport this material away from the site as it is likely to have a very strong smell?*

Answer:

All operations at the anaerobic digestion plant will be undertaken within the proposed buildings or within the sealed vessels, to minimise any possibility of odour. There will be air extraction within the buildings to hold them in negative

air pressure, so that air is drawn in rather than any potential odorous air escaping out.

There will also be fast acting roller shutter doors to enable vehicles to go in and out but no air will be able to escape whilst this is taking place. This extracted air is fed through a biofilter to remove odour.

The process also produces what is known as a “digestate”. This product is dewatered and the solid part is similar to compost and can be used on land to replace artificial fertilisers. This will be stored on site inside a building under negative air pressure for a period of two weeks to allow it to mature and to ensure that the organic process has completed and produced a stabilised, processed material.

An odour management plan is being compiled in support of the Environmental Permit application, which will be submitted to the Environment Agency in November 2010. If the permit were granted then the Environment Agency would monitor the site through regular unannounced site inspections.

Digestate from the anaerobic digestion plant would be matured for a period of time within an enclosed building. It would then be transported from the site in covered vehicles.

Question: *Why are you intending to build the facility so close to houses? What are the risks and how will they be managed?*

Answer:

There are examples of thermal treatment plants being installed close to or in the middle of towns. These include:

- SITA Kirklees, which is in an urban setting and co-locates EfW and MRF technologies;
- Londonwaste Eco Park (where SITA was a 50% shareholder) is in an urban setting and co-locates EfW, IVC and bulky waste recycling;
- There is a plant in the centre of Paris on the banks of the river Seine;

Our technical experts have thoroughly assessed the suitability of the technologies proposed and we know that we would not be issued with an Environmental Permit if our facility posed an unacceptable health risk.

Waste treatment plants are amongst the most strictly regulated processes in Europe and are closely monitored in England by the Environment Agency. SITA UK operates three thermal waste treatment plants safely and efficiently across the UK and our parent company Suez Environnement operates approximately 50 in Europe.

Should we receive planning permission for the Eco Park, SITA UK will perform a Hazard and Operability study (HAZOP). This is an in depth assessment that evaluates and identifies possible issues that may arise. This assessment will take place during the detailed design stage of the project and will review all issues in order to guarantee that the facility is safe to operate. Going forward, the plant will be subject to 24 hour monitoring by trained, professional staff.

Question: *Will there be any hazardous materials or by products of the process stored at the site? If so how will this be managed?*

Answer:

The BOS gasification process produces what is known as a fly ash, which is a by-product of the flue gas treatment and is classed as hazardous waste. This is collected in specially designed bags during the gasification process and is removed from site to a specialist disposal facility. The facility at Charlton Lane would generate around 2,500 tonnes of this material per year.

Question: *How will a major fire and consequent toxic gas explosion at the site be prevented? How will you manage health and safety?*

Answer:

Hazard and Operability Studies (HAZOP) have been used for many years as a formal means for the review of chemical process designs and are a quantitative risk assessment technique. A HAZOP study is a systematic search for potential hazards such as flow, temperature and pressure.

The BOS gasification and anaerobic digestion processes will have already been subject to individual HAZOP studies and if we receive planning permission for the Eco Park, SITA UK will perform a HAZOP on the combined operations.

This assessment will take place during the detailed design stage of the project and will review all issues in order to guarantee that the facility is safe to operate. Once operating, the plant will be subject to 24 hour monitoring by trained, professional staff.

Question: *What is the difference between Energy from Waste and BOS Gasification?*

Answer:

Batch Oxidation System (BOS) gasification and energy from waste (EFW) are two different processes. With BOS gasification waste is treated in batches rather than burnt continually. It involves waste being heated with little air in a compartment to produce a gas. This gas is then set alight in a secondary compartment, to produce energy. BOS gasification allows for a lower building height, such as standard low-level industrial use buildings.

Alternatively, energy from waste (EfW) burns waste in the presence of lots of air. This means there is full combustion in only one compartment and the waste is fed continuously on a moving grate. EfW is cost effective on a larger scale than BOS gasification, for example 450,000 tonnes per year as opposed to 60,000 tonnes per year. This means that the facilities tend to be bigger.

Question: *What will be done to mitigate odour?*

Answer:

The Batch Oxidation system (BOS) gasification building will be run under a slight negative air pressure, as a way to mitigate any potential odours. This is a standard operational practice to control odour egress on facilities where odour could be produced. There are also odour suppressant fans spraying odour neutraliser onto the waste during loading operations as and when operations require. These fans can be left to run on timers throughout the night. An odour management plan is being compiled in support of the

Environmental Permit application to be submitted in November and this will then be regulated by the Environment Agency during their regular unannounced site inspections.

Food waste would be delivered to the plant in sealed containers which would be emptied inside the enclosed reception building of the anaerobic digestion plant. The anaerobic digestion reception, process and maturation buildings are run under deliberate negative air pressure with three air changes per hour and a biofilter to treat the waste air.

At the conclusion of this section of questions relating to pollution, health and technology the Chairman invited the independent experts to comment in particular was the site going to be detrimental to the health of residents. Reference was made to the issues that occurred at the Dumfries site.

Dr Mark Broomfield confirmed that he believed that all waste materials and gases had been assessed and was satisfied with how these were being dealt with. He did suggest to ensure coverage of all issues further assessments on potential deposition to water and ultra fine particles were covered.

6) Other

Question: *Will the scout hut need to be moved?*

Answer:

The proposed planning application for the Eco Park does not include the area that is currently occupied by the Scout hut. The Scout group can therefore continue to occupy these premises during the construction and operation of the proposed Eco Park.

Question: *Will this affect house prices? If so, what will SCC do about it?*

Answer:

The proposed Eco Park is designed to be an attractive facility, including a carefully designed stack, which would reduce its visual impact. There would also be benefits of enhancements to the local landscape and a reduction in heavy goods vehicle traffic compared with the existing operation.

We therefore do not believe that the Eco Park will affect house prices in the area.

Question: *What will be the benefits for Spelthorne Residents?*

Answer:

Spelthorne residents will benefit from the following:

- A reduction in Heavy Goods Vehicle traffic associated with the site
- Access to an attractive landscaped area adjacent to the eco Park
- Improvements to the community recycling centre access to reduce queuing
- Improved recycling facilities including a reuse centre on the site
- Attractively designed iconic buildings to replace those currently on site

1. **The committee resolved:**
 - a. To note the main concerns expressed by residents via the questions submitted on the proposed development of an Eco Park at Charlton Lane, Shepperton; and
 - b. To note the advice provided by the three independent expert witnesses.
2. **The Committee recommended that** the County Council should provide accurate baseline assumptions for both air and water-borne pollutants, and to establish satisfactory monitoring procedures with publically available results, if, the facility is developed.
3. **The Committee further:**
 - a. Identified the need to ensure that a rigorous process was established to monitor traffic/vehicle movements against assumptions made at the time of the Planning application;
 - b. Arrange for written answers to be obtained for all questions submitted by the residents and be published via the Borough Council's website - Questions submitted after the meeting to be processed in the same way;
 - c. Consider that appropriate penalties for non compliance to achieving environmental contributions should be established and enforced; and
 - d. That Surrey County Council hold a further open forum for all members of the public to attend.

The findings were agreed by the majority of committee members with Councillor Mrs E.M. Bell abstaining and Councillors Mrs C.E. Nichols and L.E. Nichols voting against.

At the conclusion of the meeting the Chairman placed on record her thanks and appreciation to all concerned including Councillors, residents of the Borough who attended the meeting and submitted questions, representatives from the Surrey County Council, Sita, the Independent expert witnesses and Halliford School for hosting the meeting

The Chairman also confirmed that the views already submitted by residents and any late submissions would be forwarded to Surrey County Council for a response. These together with the answers received to date would be placed on the Council's website with any other relevant information and sent to the residents concerned.

MINUTES OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

TUESDAY 02 NOVEMBER 2010

Present:

Councillor Ms P.A. Broom (Chairman)

Councillor S.J. Rough (Vice-Chairman)

Councillors:

Miss M.M. Bain

H.R. Jaffer

L.E. Nichols

A.P. Hirst

Mrs I. Napper

G. F Trussler

Apologies: Councillors Mrs E.M. Bell, S.E.W. Budd, K. Chouhan, Mrs C.E. Nichols and Mrs M.W. Rough

331/10 DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

None reported.

332/10 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 09 September 2010 were approved as a correct record.

It was noted that the Minutes of the Special Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting held on 20 October 2010 would be submitted to the next committee meeting.

333/10 MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

The Committee discussed the outcome of the Special Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting held to consider the proposed development of an Eco Park at Charlton Lane and what further involvement the Scrutiny Committee could have. Dr Sandy Muirhead, Head of Sustainability and Leisure Services confirmed that the planning application had been submitted and as statutory consultees the Planning Committee at its meeting in January 2011 would scrutinise the application.

Members of the Committee voiced concerns about handing over the Eco Park proposals to the Planning Committee and required specific details about their remits and whether the Committee could continue scrutinising the proposals of the Eco Park. The Chairman mentioned that residents had another chance to have their questions answered by Surrey County Council at an event held by the Shepperton Residents Association taking place on 02 November 2010.

RESOLVED that the Head of Corporate Governance be asked to confirm in writing whether the Overview and Scrutiny Committee could continue to scrutinise the Eco Park proposals as requested in the meeting.

334/10 CALL IN AT CABINET DECISIONS

No decisions had been called in for review

335/10 2010-11 REVENUE MONITORING REPORT

The Committee discussed with Adrian Flynn, Senior Accountant, the revenue monitoring report outlining the current spending and income figures for the period April to September 2010, which revealed that £4.816m had been spent against the full year budget of £13.851m. The Committee discussed with the officer the need for further information to be provided to clarify the statistics, data and the general layout of the report.

RESOLVED that:

1. The Revenue Monitoring report of the Chief Finance Officer for the period April to September 2010 be noted; and
2. A revised report as indicated at the meeting be circulated to all members of the Committee to include the significant factors that had an impact on the overall projection.

336/10 2010-11 CAPITAL MONITORING REPORTS

The Committee discussed with Adrian Flynn, the Senior Accountant the capital monitoring report which covered the period April to September 2010

He reported that £742k had been spent to date against an original budget of £2,204k and a revised budget of £2767k

During the discussion the officers responded to numerous questions raised by members of the Committee and agreed to provide additional information in relation to the 5 a-side pitches as well as on Surrey County Council's match funding.

RESOLVED that the report of the Chief Finance Officer outlining the Capital Monitoring position for the period April to September 2010 be noted.

337/10 RECYCLING UPDATE

A short presentation was given to the Committee by Dr Sandy Muirhead, Head of Sustainability and Leisure Services which provided details about the waste facilities that are currently being used in the borough including the waste and compost bins. A copy of the presentation is **attached**.

An update was also given about current projects that focused on reducing side waste. Such projects included developing greater awareness of recycling waste for younger residents within the borough by having an increased presence of recycling facilities within schools.

A discussion took place about the feasibility of using kitchen and food waste bins that residents in the borough could use within their homes. Members of the Committee raised concerns about the size of food waste bins and the

practicality of using them within homes. The Committee discussed other current projects proposed by the Sustainability and Leisure Services and raised issues of marketing and promotion to residents. A discussion had also taken place about the effectiveness of current recycling facilities.

The Committee discussed the opportunity to approach major supermarkets within the borough to ascertain information about what they were currently doing about handling waste and packaging and what could be done to improve sustaining recycling within the borough.

RESOLVED that the report by the Head of Sustainability and Leisure Services on recycling progress be noted.

338/10 CORPORATE DEBT POLICY

The Committee were presented with information and updates about the corporate approach to debt management and collection by the Assistant Chief Executive, Terry Collier. A discussion took place about the recovery of debts and the current strategies that had been put in place; including setting clear targets to improve the recovery of debts. The Committee raised concerns about the recovery of overdue tax payments from residents and the tracing methods to track absconders.

RESOLVED to support the adoption of the corporate debt policy as attached to the report of the Chief Finance Officer for implementation from 01 December 2010.

339/10 CABINET FORWARD PLAN

The Committee received the Cabinet forward plan covering the period up to 15 February 2012.

340/10 WORK PROGRAMME 2010/11

The Chairman reported on the request received from Councillor L.E. Nichols for the Committee to look at the future funding of the Stanwell New Start Scheme and the potential financial impact on the Council.

The Committee noted that the Chairman would continue to review the work programme and identify issues for the committee to look at.

RESOLVED that the Stanwell New Start Scheme be added to the work programme.

341/10 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

No notification of further business was received.

**MINUTES OF THE CRIME AND DISORDER COMMITTEE SCRUTINY
COMMITTEE**

TUESDAY 2 NOVEMBER 2010

Present:

Councillor Philippa A. Broom (Chairman)

Councillor S.J Rough (Vice-Chairman)

Councillors:

Miss M.M. Bain

H.R. Jaffer

L.E. Nichols

A.P. Hirst

Mrs I. Napper

G. F. Trussler

Apologies: Councillors Mrs E.M. Bell, S.E.W. Budd, K. Chouhan and Mrs C.E. Nichols.

An apology was also received from Sarah Haywood from Surrey Police Authority.

In Attendance:

Councillor Ernest Mallett - Spelthorne Member for the Surrey Police Authority
Inspector Sarah Greenhalgh – Surrey Police.

328/10 DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

None reported.

329/10 THE SPELTHORNE STRONGER, SAFER PARTNERSHIP

The Committee was given a short presentation by Tim Kita, Head of Community Safety and Corporate Services. The presentation provided information about the work undertaken by the Stronger and Safer Partnership and outlined the targets for the years between 2010 and 2013 for reduction in crime. The presentation also provided statistics and data for current crime levels within Spelthorne and identified crime projections. It also highlighted issues and challenges facing the Partnership as well as opportunities. A copy of the presentation is **attached**.

The Committee considered the report and following on from the presentation a discussion took place about the statistics and data showing the increase and decrease in crime levels within Spelthorne. Inspector Sarah Greenhalgh provided specific details about particular crimes taking place in the Borough.

During the discussion, Ernest Mallett, Spelthorne Member for the Surrey Police Authority and Inspector Sarah Greenhalgh provided details about the possibility of using proceeds of crime for community based projects.

The Committee considered the impact of local sponsorship and external agencies to support projects that bring greater awareness of the dangers of

drugs and crime. It was noted that limited sponsorship was already in place and was being pursued for certain schemes.

The Committee noted that the National Performance Indicators had been abolished which would enable both the County and the Borough Councils to set their own targets, which was felt more suited to accommodate local challenges and the needs of the local community.

Arising from the recent spending cuts, the County Safer, Stronger Board was currently undertaking a comprehensive review of community safety services across the county to be completed in December 2010. The main aim of the review was to:

- achieve maximum performance at a reduced cost;
- review existing delivery structures; and
- review funding for Partnership posts, and the role of partners.

The Committee, in discussing the current action plan noted that out of the 50 action points, 38 were on target and 4 had been completed.

Overall crime in the Borough had continued to reduce with the exception of drugs (up by 6%) and theft (up by 7%). Members discussed whether this was due to the current economic climate and rising unemployment or whether this was due to more offences being detected. It was suggested that the NHS could be encouraged to be more influential in the work of the Partnership by continuing to raise awareness of alcohol and drug abuse, but it was recognised that they had become more involved in Partnership work generally during the last few years.

The Committee considered the current funding streams available to the Partnership and the possible changes that would occur under the spending review. It was noted that:

- 1) The pooled budget was funded by key stakeholders such as the Borough Council, County Council, Surrey Police and the [NHS Surrey](#)
- 2) The Basic Command Unit Fund would cease at the end of the financial year as part of the spending review.
- 3) The Area Based Grant was allocated via the County Council but was likely to be effected by the spending review and had already faced a 50% reduction in the capital allocation and 20% reduction in the revenue allocation.

Full details of the current budget together with projections were also submitted.

The Committee in acknowledging that under the spending review funding would be reduced received an assurance that a robust monitoring system was in place to ensure that the budget balanced and all external funding was spent.

The Committee discussed the numerous projects and initiatives organised by the Partnership and made particular reference to the success of PAD's (Partnership Action Days), Junior Citizen and the Neighbourhood Watch Scheme.

It was noted that the Police Neighbourhood Teams would be co-located in the Council Offices which would enhance the Partnership working arrangements.

RESOLVED:

- 1) To note the report of the Head of Community Safety and Corporate Services and to support the action being taken to progress the work of the Partnership; and
- 2) That the findings of the review being undertaken by the County Safer, Stronger Board be circulated to all Committee Members in December 2010 (or as soon as complete) together with details of the final reductions in the Area Based Grant, following which the Chairman in liaison with Officers decide whether there is a need for the matter to be reported back to the Committee in February 2011.

330/10 WORK PROGRAMME

No additional issues had been identified at this stage apart from circulating the findings of the County Safer, Stronger Board on the review of Community Safety Services in December 2010.

**BUSINESS TRANSFORMATION PROGRAMME
UPDATE AS OF JANUARY 2011**

**BRIEFING PAPER FOR INFORMATION-
Report of Chief Finance Officer**

1. Document Management – SharePoint

- 1.1 This project on completion will generate a minimum cashable saving of £35k p.a. and will considerably reduce office and server space. This project is also a key enabler to other projects identified in the Transformation Programme such as the Website design and Remote Working both of which will generate additional cashable savings and/or income opportunities.
- 1.2 Our Suppliers Adeopoint have been busy developing our specified version of SharePoint over the Christmas break. The first phase of the project is to include General Filing, Document Management, Room Bookings, Project Management & Reporting. Steria are currently arranging the hardware platform in readiness for the installation to take place over the next few days.
- 1.3 The system is now in an acceptable state and therefore we can commence some 'show and tell' sessions to all staff in order to obtain early feedback. Sessions for demonstration of the system have been booked for Tuesday 8 and Wednesday 9 February 2011 with a special session booked for the Managers Briefing on the morning of Wednesday 9 February 2011. It is envisaged that a session will be set up for councillors alike during February 2011.
- 1.4 The first phase of the project is currently scheduled for a go live date of 28 February (pending any major change requests during the staff demonstrations). The first phase will provide the foundation and savings will start to accrue although the full savings will not be realised until project completion.

2. Project Management

- 2.1 Interviews have been conducted with major internal stakeholders and project managers to determine current issues etc. Based on the information received, a new matrix has been developed and will be presented to MAT within the next couple of weeks. The classification aims to map all the Council's current projects dependant on value and impact to our residents in order for them to be properly monitored against business cases, budgets and time. Once the SharePoint system is ready the templates will be migrated and our current project management system 'Work.Together' will be disbanded. Staff will be fully briefed/trained prior to the change.

3. Website

- 3.1 As previously agreed, the website project will commence in April 2011. In preparation for this the content is currently being reviewed by individual Services and the Communications Department. Prior to initiating the development on the website, it is important to understand the current failure points and therefore during February and March, the Business Improvement

Team will ensure the website is monitored and produce the necessary analytics. This will provide a solid baseline and will form part of our requirements for the website. Whilst the metrics will tell us everything about what is happening it will not provide the answers to why it's happening. It is therefore equally important that we follow up the analysis with engagement with our residents, councillors and staff. This is planned to commence in April 2011.

4. Customer Relationship Management (CRM)

- 4.1 It is planned that the analysis and requirements will commence mid March 2011. This will involve engagement with all front line services initially to establish call volumes which could be transferred to Customer Services together with redesigning processes and introducing or consolidating IT systems.

5. Remote Working

- 5.1 A 'proof of concept' has commenced in the Environmental Health and Building Control areas. This will test connectivity and process and an issue list has been devised to ensure all information is captured. A project team meeting has been scheduled for 13 January 2011 to agree roles responsibilities and work streams. A report containing some proposals with estimated costs/benefits to move this project forward will be submitted to MAT for the 1 February 2011. Following approval by MAT a demonstration will be provided to councillors.

Report Author: Diksha Vyas, 01784 446487
January 2010

**ORDINARY WATER COURSES PROJECT UPDATE
BRIEFING PAPER FOR INFORMATION-
Report of Assistant Chief Executive**

1. UPDATE JANUARY 2011

- 1.1 Capital funding was allocated to clearing overgrown ditches within the borough that could pose a risk to flooding during heavy rainfall. The highest priority ditches were cleared during 2009:
- Shortwood Common (off Priory Green) – lower section
 - 2 ditches along Moor Lane
 - Part of Sweeps Ditch – (separate budget)
- 1.2 Further clearance work was conducted during March/April 2010:
- London Road Allotments
 - Spout Lane
 - Moor Lane (by Annie Brookes Close)
 - Feltham Hill Brook (by Kenyngton Park)
 - Sweeps Ditch (by Health Centre) – (separate budget)
- 1.3 In November 2010 clearance of lower risk areas was conducted:
- Moor Lane (by Moor Lane allotments)
 - Shortwood Common (off Priory Green) – upper section
 - Feltham Hill Brook (where it borders Groveley Park)
 - Spout Lane
- 1.4 Further work is being planned in February 2011 for the following:
- Long Lane Recreation Ground
- 1.5 Continued monitoring of the critical ditches that border our land is required to ensure they are kept in an appropriate condition, and clearance/maintenance work conducted when necessary.
- 1.6 Budget spent to date in 2010/2011 is £10,550 on a capital budget for 2010/2011 of £22,500 reduced from a £73k original budget. This original budget factored in a large contingency in case of emergencies but this is better dealt with on a case by case basis.

2. SWEEP DITCH

- 2.1 There has been a reduced flow in Sweeps Ditch since Autumn 2010. The pump has been checked, pump chambers cleared out and clearance work conducted along overgrown sections on Drakes Avenue and Staines Park. Work is due to be carried out in January to survey the culvert that runs from the pump chamber to its outlet at Drakes Avenue and clear/fix any blockages/damage to the culvert pipe.
- 2.2 There is also a yearly separate budget (£26k) for the maintenance of Sweeps Ditch. Sweeps Ditch spend 10/11 £7,621 (including commitments). However, until CCTV work is completed we are unable to evaluate costs of any remedial work required (or not) on culverts and therefore further spend required.

Report Author: Dr Sandy Muirhead, 01784 446318

2010-11 Revenue Monitoring

Resolution Required

Report of the Chief Finance Officer

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

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

This report shows the Authority's revenue spend figures and how resources were spent on providing services for residents for the nine month period, April to December 2010.

Purpose of Report

To provide Members with the revenue spend figures

Key Issues

- The actual spend to date, at net expenditure at service level, shows that we have spent £8.909m against the year to date budget of £10.691m and the full year budget of £13.851m.
- The percentage actual spend to date against the full year is 64%
- Loss of Government grants totalling £149,000, affecting planning development control and economic development.
- The interest earnings for the period amounted to £313k and the full year earning's forecast is £391k.
- Despite the loss of the above grants, the forecast projected outturn variance at service level, is £414k underspend and taking account of anticipated use of reserves there is currently a net estimated underspend of £36k which will be available to bolster general reserves.

Financial Implications

As set out within the report and appendices.

Corporate Priority

All 12 Priorities.

Officer Recommendations

Contact: Terry Collier, Chief Finance Officer (01784 446296)

Cabinet Member: Cllr Vivienne Leighton

MAIN REPORT

1. BACKGROUND

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

2. KEY ISSUES

- 2.1 In [Appendix A](#) the actual spend is £8.909m against the full year budget of £13.851m (64%).
- 2.2 In [Appendices B1](#) to [B9](#) the major areas causing the year to date budget to be higher than the Actual spend to date are detailed.
- 2.3 Where there is a large year end variance projected against the original budget this will obviously impact on the spend to date versus year to date budget position.
- 2.4 Budgets are profiled where there is a normal expected payment date e.g. NNDR payments are profiled to be paid in May, salaries in 12^{ths}, grants on the month they were received previously, contracts on the payment frequency agreed, rentals on a quarterly basis etc. This still means however that the majority of expenditure, profiled in 12ths to be spent, is reliant upon Service Heads ordering goods and services on a regular basis. In reality the major proportion of spend is generally made in the second half of the year. Within the limited resources we have available, we are working to continue improve the profiling of the budgets. There will always be some timing differences, which do not reflect underlying budget variances Last year the underlying underspend was about £164k or 1%.
- 2.5 The major area of spend relates to Housing Benefit payments which are made 4 weekly at varying levels from £1.7m max to £20k minimum. However the grant income received comes in monthly based on estimates agreed at the start of the year so there could be timing differences in excess of £1.5m if one month includes 2 large benefit payment runs
- 2.6 [Appendices B1](#) to [B9](#) gives a summarised breakdown of the revenue spend by portfolio Area, firstly in overall terms and then breaking each portfolio down by cost centres
- 2.7 Major provisional outturn variances, to the original budget together with officer comments on more significant expenditure/income variances are as follows:

(a) Planning and Housing.

Cost Centre	Comment	Significant Variance
Homelessness	One off receipt of court costs for Homelessness Initiatives	£32.9k favourable
Housing Benefit payments	Increased recovery of overpayments made plus prior year adjustments	£189k favourable
PSL	Return of £30K float money plus no activity in 10/11	£76k favourable
Land Charges	Higher income due to more activity.	£76.2k favourable

Planning	Mainly reduced Housing Planning Delivery Grant (£100k) and fees income (£89k) plus increased public inquiry and appeals costs (£42K)	£229.6k adverse
Planning Policy	Underspend on airtrack inquiry costs plus vacant post savings	£25.4k favourable
ICT	A credit of £43k is expected to be received from BT for incorrect charge, offset by expected higher actual costs for Steria Contract by £13k.	£30.4k favourable

(b) Health and Independent Living

Cost Centre	Comment	Significant Variance
Day Centres	Includes increased catering income £6k and reduced expenditure £17k employee savings £6k	£30k favourable
EH Admin	Predominantly vacant post savings	£56.3k favourable

(c) Environment

Cost Centre	Comment	Significant Variance
Streetscene Management and Support	Staff vacancies. Contribution from A2D towards Stanwell community warden costs (see community safety).	£49k favourable £18k favourable
Refuse Collection	Staff Vacancies. Lower consultant, leasing and hired transport costs. Increased hire of green waste bins.	£25k favourable £61k favourable £95k favourable
Waste Recycling	Lower collection costs. Higher recycling credits.	£54k favourable £14k favourable

(d) Young People and Cultural Services

Cost Centre	Comment	Significant Variance
Grounds Maintenance	Staff vacancies – restructuring of arrangements for managing the nursery. Savings on verges, lifebelts and non-contract works costs. Lower Income – due to nursery changes.	£60k favourable £138k favourable £40k adverse

(e) Economic Development

Cost Centre	Comment	Significant Variance
Economic Development	Loss of Local Authority Business Grant Initiative grant	£49k adverse
Car Parks	Costs of temporary staff to cover vacant permanent positions exceed vacant post savings. However this is anticipated to be offset by increased income and savings with overall outturn anticipated to be within budget.	£85k adverse

(f) Communications and Engagement

Cost Centre	Comment	Significant Variance
Corporate Publicity	Savings on borough newspaper and marketing to be confirmed.	£92.5k favourable

(g) Resources

Cost Centre	Comment	Significant Variance
Asst Chief Executives	Redundancy payment	£30.4k adverse
Corporate Management	£46k Valuation fees paid re: updating Property Asset Register and Stanwell New Start with no budget and higher bank charges.	£53.4k adverse
Accountancy	£16k savings taken out at the beginning of the year is not expected to be achieved and one member of staff is paid on higher grade than the budget	£26.3k adverse

- 2.8 Taking into account the above variances the projected outturn at net service level (see Appendix A) is projected to be an underspend of £414k.
- 2.9 Investment income to date is £313k, with projected outturn income of £391k, an adverse variance of £24k.
- 2.10 Given the anticipated underspend at service level there is not a need to run down the interest equalisation reserve to ensure a balanced outturn. Equally as the airtrack enquiry has been deferred to next financial year there will not be a need to use reserve in this financial year to offset the airtrack enquiry. Taking account of reduced need to use reserves, it is anticipated that there will be a small surplus of approximately £36k which could be used to bolster general reserves.

3. PROPOSALS

- 3.1 Overview and Scrutiny are asked to note the current revenue spend and projected outturn position.

4. BENEFITS AND SUSTAINABILITY

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

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 As set out within the report and appendices.

6. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS / OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

6.1 There are none

7. RISKS AND HOW THEY WILL BE MITIGATED

7.1 A projected balanced outturn depends on Management Team (MAT), Heads of Service and all Budget Managers, managing their budgets within the parameters that were originally agreed and achieving, where necessary, corresponding growth and savings within those budgets. Careful monitoring of the budgets on a monthly basis ensures that any problems or anomalies are identified and investigated at an early stage.

7.2 Any necessary corrective action on major budget variations, which cannot be remedied within the Service, are reported to MAT immediately in order to ensure that as much time and opportunity is had to enable the position to be rectified quickly within the current financial year.

8. TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

8.1 Bi-monthly reports are produced for Management Team.

Report Author: David Lawrence 01784 446471

Background Papers: There are none

2010/11 Revenue Budget Monitoring										
	10/11	10/11	10/11	10/11	10/11	10/11	10/11	09/10	09/10	09/10
	Budget		Actual	Commitments	Total	Forecast	Variance	Original	Actual	Actuals
	Original	YTD			Actuals	Outturn	to Original	Budget	Outturn	YTD
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Economic Development	(719,100)	(343,651)	(462,188)	116,569	(345,619)	(707,900)	11,200	(629,800)	(599,395)	(354,306)
Planning and Housing	2,095,800	1,821,500	1,260,678	236,866	1,497,544	1,889,600	(206,200)	2,454,700	1,710,369	1,970,979
Health and Independent Living	1,626,700	959,825	862,040	96,619	958,660	1,551,600	(75,100)	1,678,700	1,638,251	1,028,554
Environment	3,293,300	2,377,000	2,117,426	169,407	2,286,832	2,995,200	(298,100)	3,716,100	3,627,883	2,419,786
Young People and Cultural Services	1,488,200	1,125,900	685,259	202,393	887,652	1,313,900	(174,300)	1,680,000	1,722,446	1,116,059
Communications and Engagement	1,027,400	792,200	688,574	5,627	694,201	927,900	(99,500)	999,400	909,231	719,758
Community Safety	1,041,200	766,305	753,811	138,232	892,043	1,011,100	(30,100)	1,080,200	1,249,771	788,748
Resources	3,997,500	2,909,101	3,003,554	205,980	3,209,534	4,156,000	158,500	4,316,100	3,391,475	2,960,771
NET EXPENDITURE AT SERVICE LEVEL	13,851,000	10,408,180	8,909,154	1,171,694	10,080,848	13,137,400	(713,600)	15,295,400	13,650,032	10,650,350
Salary expenditure - vacancy monitoring	(300,000)				-	0	300,000	(300,000)		
Salary Savings efficiencies					-	0	-	(200,000)		
Business Improvement Target Savings					-	0	-	(242,000)		
Less Support not charged to revenue	(50,000)				-	(50,000)	-	(135,000)		
NET EXPENDITURE	13,501,000	10,408,180	8,909,154	1,171,694	10,080,848	13,087,400	-413,600	14,418,400	13,650,032	10,650,350
NET EXPENDITURE	13,501,000	10,408,180	8,909,154	1,171,694	10,080,848	13,087,400	-413,600	14,418,400	13,650,032	10,650,350
Reserves - General					-		-	(175,000)		
Reserves - New Schemes Fund / HIF	(250,000)				-	(250,000)	-	(273,770)		
Area Based Grant	(22,500)				-	(22,500)	-	(45,000)		
Appropriation from Reserves:										
BIP contribution						0	-			
Growth items funded from reserves							-			
Interest Equalisation reserve	(293,122)				-	(293,122)	-	(299,883)		
Air track	(60,000)				-	(60,000)	-	(50,000)		
Transport study					-		-	(65,000)		
LPSA reward grant : general budget	(80,000)				-	(80,000)	-	(100,000)		
LPSA reward grant: waste ring fenced					-		-	(40,000)		
Interest earnings	(415,000)		(313,271)		(313,271)	(391,000)	24,000	(1,020,000)		
BUDGET REQUIREMENT	12,380,378	10,408,180	8,595,883	1,171,694	9,767,577	11,934,778	-413,600	12,349,747	13,650,032	
NNDR	(4,958,868)					(4,958,868)	-	(4,591,021)		
RSG	(720,094)					(720,074)	-	(1,059,667)		
NET BUDGET REQUIREMENT	6,701,416	10,408,180	8,595,883	1,171,694	9,767,577	6,255,836	-413,600	6,699,059	13,650,032	
Collection Fund Surplus/(deficit)	55,510					55,510	-	20,380		
CHARGE TO COLLECTION FUND	6,756,926	10,408,180	8,595,883	1,171,694	9,767,577	6,311,346	-413,600	6,719,439	13,650,032	

**REVENUE MONITORING 2010/11
EXPENDITURE SUMMARY 31 DECEMBER 2010**

Results to 31-Dec-10	Budget		Actual	Commitments	Total Actuals	Forecast Outturn	Variance to Original	09/10 Original Budget	09/10 Actual	
	Original	YTD							Outturn	YTD
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Employees	731,700	546,000	632,125	39,808	671,933	822,300	90,600	948,800	836,227	587,171
Other Expenditure	1,255,900	1,008,575	966,118	76,707	1,042,826	1,239,600	(16,300)	1,156,100	1,115,419	917,954
Income	(2,706,700)	(1,898,226)	(2,060,431)	54	(2,060,377)	(2,769,800)	(63,100)	(2,734,700)	(2,551,040)	(1,859,431)
Economic Development	(719,100)	(343,651)	(462,188)	116,569	(345,619)	(707,900)	11,200	(629,800)	(599,395)	(354,306)
Employees	2,423,900	1,816,250	1,796,773	1,450	1,798,223	2,409,000	(14,900)	2,472,900	2,365,148	1,816,770
Other Expenditure	35,025,900	26,445,950	26,624,156	235,416	26,859,572	35,547,300	521,400	27,188,600	32,889,287	24,733,642
Income	(35,354,000)	(26,440,700)	(27,160,251)	0	(27,160,251)	(36,066,700)	(712,700)	(27,206,800)	(33,544,066)	(24,579,433)
Planning and Housing	2,095,800	1,821,500	1,260,678	236,866	1,497,544	1,889,600	(206,200)	2,454,700	1,710,369	1,970,979
Employees	1,435,800	1,077,100	1,072,065	16,812	1,088,877	1,411,100	(24,700)	1,511,700	1,434,687	1,116,734
Other Expenditure	1,100,600	537,200	455,375	79,501	534,876	1,095,700	(4,900)	1,102,400	1,151,408	656,866
Income	(909,700)	(654,475)	(665,399)	306	(665,093)	(955,200)	(45,500)	(935,400)	(947,844)	(745,046)
Health and Independent Living	1,626,700	959,825	862,040	96,619	958,660	1,551,600	(75,100)	1,678,700	1,638,251	1,028,554
Employees	2,423,500	1,819,200	1,692,323	1,318	1,693,641	2,360,000	(63,500)	2,621,300	2,533,201	1,750,978
Other Expenditure	1,796,200	1,283,350	1,165,092	168,089	1,333,181	1,687,300	(108,900)	1,939,300	1,917,230	1,270,105
Income	(926,400)	(725,550)	(739,990)	0	(739,990)	(1,052,100)	(125,700)	(844,500)	(822,548)	(601,296)
Environment	3,293,300	2,377,000	2,117,426	169,407	2,286,832	2,995,200	(298,100)	3,716,100	3,627,883	2,419,786
Employees	413,100	309,500	266,123	899	267,022	364,100	(49,000)	432,400	398,093	312,374
Other Expenditure	2,092,300	1,596,000	1,219,069	186,494	1,405,563	1,919,500	(172,800)	2,088,900	1,967,655	1,255,801
Income	(1,017,200)	(779,600)	(799,933)	15,000	(784,933)	(969,700)	47,500	(841,300)	(643,301)	(452,116)
Young People and Cultural Services	1,488,200	1,125,900	685,259	202,393	887,652	1,313,900	(174,300)	1,680,000	1,722,446	1,116,059
Employees	431,900	322,150	315,452	0	315,452	417,300	(14,600)	426,100	415,548	315,768
Other Expenditure	671,500	527,050	426,834	3,728	430,562	573,600	(97,900)	649,300	569,577	468,293
Income	(76,000)	(57,000)	(53,712)	1,899	(51,813)	(63,000)	13,000	(76,000)	(75,894)	(64,303)
Communications and Engagement	1,027,400	792,200	688,574	5,627	694,201	927,900	(99,500)	999,400	909,231	719,758
Employees	448,500	334,425	328,812	30	328,842	424,200	(24,300)	510,900	497,266	384,365
Other Expenditure	1,014,200	791,300	834,670	138,176	972,846	1,069,300	55,100	976,800	1,255,603	831,254
Income	(421,500)	(359,420)	(409,671)	26	(409,645)	(482,400)	(60,900)	(407,500)	(503,098)	(426,871)
Community Safety	1,041,200	766,305	753,811	138,232	892,043	1,011,100	(30,100)	1,080,200	1,249,771	788,748
Employees	3,455,200	2,567,238	2,563,359	32,657	2,596,016	3,589,400	134,200	3,624,100	3,030,697	2,586,523
Other Expenditure	999,600	475,463	534,676	173,323	707,999	1,067,600	68,000	1,046,000	1,191,222	564,493
Income	(457,300)	(133,600)	(94,481)	0	(94,481)	(501,000)	(43,700)	(354,000)	(830,443)	(190,245)
Resources	3,997,500	2,909,101	3,003,554	205,980	3,209,534	4,156,000	158,500	4,316,100	3,391,475	2,960,771
NET EXPENDITURE AT SERVICE LEVEL	13,851,000	10,408,180	8,909,154	1,171,694	10,080,848	13,137,400	(713,600)	15,295,400	13,650,032	10,650,350
Total Employees	11,763,600	8,791,863	8,667,032	92,975	8,760,007	11,797,400	33,800	12,548,200	11,510,867	8,870,683
Total Other Expenditure	43,956,200	32,664,888	32,225,991	1,061,434	33,287,425	44,199,900	243,700	36,147,400	42,057,401	30,698,409
Total Income	(41,868,800)	(31,048,571)	(31,983,869)	17,285	(31,966,583)	(42,859,900)	(991,100)	(33,400,200)	(39,918,235)	(28,918,742)
	13,851,000	10,408,180	8,909,154	1,171,694	10,080,848	13,137,400	(713,600)	15,295,400	13,650,032	10,650,350

Communications and Engagement : Cabinet Member - Cllr Jean Pinkerton

Results to 31-Dec-10	Budget		Actual	Commitments	Total	Forecast	Variance	09/10	09/10 Actual		Comments
	Original	YTD			Actuals	Outturn	to Original	Original Budget	Outturn	YTD	
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	
Employees	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	
Other Expenditure	497,600	400,100	397,600	0	397,600	495,100	(2,500)	518,600	508,776	421,250	
Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	(10,000)	
General Grants	497,600	400,100	397,600	0	397,600	495,100	(2,500)	518,600	508,776	411,250	
Employees	109,300	81,400	84,097	0	84,097	112,800	3,500	111,800	104,059	78,875	One Postholder's post upgraded during the year
Other Expenditure	5,300	3,250	2,524	(0)	2,524	4,600	(700)	9,300	2,412	1,436	
Income	0	0	(10)	0	(10)	0	-	0	(95)	(75)	
Corporate Service	114,600	84,650	86,611	0	86,611	117,400	2,800	121,100	106,375	80,236	
Employees	162,900	122,200	123,221	0	123,221	163,000	100	155,200	157,686	119,048	
Other Expenditure	147,600	110,700	20,719	2,303	23,022	55,000	(92,600)	73,400	36,858	27,955	Savings on the borough newspaper and less spend on Marketing
Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	(98)	(67)	
Corporate Publicity	310,500	232,900	143,941	2,303	146,244	218,000	(92,500)	228,600	194,446	146,935	
Employees	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	
Other Expenditure	14,300	10,750	2,599	1,425	4,024	14,300	-	41,300	14,749	13,225	
Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	
Research & Consultation	14,300	10,750	2,599	1,425	4,024	14,300	0	41,300	14,749	13,225	
Employees	159,700	118,550	108,134	0	108,134	141,500	(18,200)	159,100	153,804	116,801	vacant post
Other Expenditure	2,400	1,350	1,138	(0)	1,138	2,000	(400)	2,400	2,212	1,750	
Income	0	0	(300)	0	(300)	0	-	0	(25)	0	
Business Improvement	162,100	119,900	108,972	(0)	108,972	143,500	(18,600)	161,500	155,991	118,551	
Employees	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	1,044	
Other Expenditure	4,300	900	2,254	0	2,254	2,600	(1,700)	4,300	4,571	2,678	
Income	(76,000)	(57,000)	(53,402)	1,899	(51,503)	(63,000)	13,000	(76,000)	(75,676)	(54,161)	
Taxi Licensing	(71,700)	(56,100)	(51,148)	1,899	(49,249)	(60,400)	11,300	(71,700)	(71,105)	(50,439)	
Total Employees	431,900	322,150	315,452	0	315,452	417,300	(14,600)	426,100	415,548	315,768	
Total Other Expenditure	671,500	527,050	426,834	3,728	430,562	573,600	(97,900)	649,300	569,577	468,293	
Total Income	(76,000)	(57,000)	(53,712)	1,899	(51,813)	(63,000)	13,000	(76,000)	(75,894)	(64,303)	
	1,027,400	792,200	688,574	5,627	694,201	927,900	(99,500)	999,400	909,231	719,758	

Community Safety : Cabinet Member - Cllr Frank Ayers

Results to 31-Dec-10	Budget		Actual	Commitments	Total	Forecast	Variance	09/10	09/10 Actual		Comments
	Original	YTD							Actuals	Outturn	
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	
Employees	217,600	163,000	160,380	0	160,380	214,000	(3,600)	245,500	232,177	180,557	
Other Expenditure	62,300	46,300	58,234	25,640	83,874	84,000	21,700	27,100	12,272	16,901	Stock condition survey costs
Income	0	0	(361)	0	(361)	(400)	(400)	0	(207)	(57)	
Asset Mgn Administration	279,900	209,300	218,253	25,640	243,893	297,600	17,700	272,600	244,242	197,401	
Employees	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	
Other Expenditure	56,200	42,100	22,316	314	22,630	26,000	(30,200)	32,400	51,411	14,360	
Income	(16,500)	(12,000)	(19,421)	0	(19,421)	(21,500)	(5,000)	(16,500)	(26,563)	(20,033)	
General Property Expenses	39,700	30,100	2,895	314	3,209	4,500	(35,200)	15,900	24,849	(5,673)	
Employees	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	
Other Expenditure	20,000	8,000	147	0	147	20,000	-	20,000	30,314	12,108	
Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	(4,831)	(4,831)	
Memorial Gardens	20,000	8,000	147	0	147	20,000	0	20,000	25,484	7,278	
Employees	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	
Other Expenditure	1,200	1,200	125	(0)	125	500	(700)	1,200	0	130	
Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	
War Memorials	1,200	1,200	125	(0)	125	500	(700)	1,200	0	130	
Employees	127,400	93,925	100,814	0	100,814	134,300	6,900	152,900	152,921	118,145	Committee attendance payments higher than the budget.
Other Expenditure	166,900	96,000	115,116	0	115,116	174,100	7,200	170,900	224,132	125,685	Additional Expenditure of £3k relating to Accelerated Neighbourhood project under estimated. Telephone maintenance and other maintenance costs for mobile CCTV are higher than the budget off set by additional funding income from S106 and Surrey Police.
Income	(102,900)	(81,100)	(76,725)	0	(76,725)	(114,200)	(11,300)	(128,600)	(166,690)	(130,170)	Contribution of £16k from A2 Dominion relating to Neighbourhood project has been reflected within Street scene where the partly funded post is currently based. CDRP contributions to reflect Salary expenditure. Surrey Police has contributed £5k towards maintenance of mobile CCTV Units with no budget and contribution of £7k through S106 funds towards telephone maintenance costs for CCTV.
Community Safety	191,400	108,825	139,205	0	139,205	194,200	2,800	195,200	210,362	113,660	
Employees	103,500	77,500	66,512	0	66,512	74,800	(28,700)	112,500	111,010	84,658	
Other Expenditure	2,400	1,800	2,031	0	2,031	2,100	(300)	2,200	3,069	2,354	
Income	(101,600)	(81,300)	(84,684)	26	(84,659)	(101,600)	-	(100,200)	(106,523)	(88,682)	
Licensing	4,300	(2,000)	(16,141)	26	(16,115)	(24,700)	(29,000)	14,500	7,556	(1,671)	
Employees	0	0	1,106	30	1,136	1,100	1,100	0	1,159	1,005	Expenditure relating to office moves to create more rental income opportunities
Other Expenditure	429,200	389,000	377,304	25,994	403,298	472,600	43,400	423,000	527,912	395,253	Work carried out re: internal decorations before Police moved in, off set by Recharged income.
Income	(200,500)	(185,020)	(228,153)	0	(228,153)	(244,700)	(44,200)	(162,200)	(190,503)	(175,917)	Airtrack Public Inquiry planned income of £28k will not be achieved in the current year, as the request to hold the meeting at KG has been cancelled, partially off-set by higher rental/ recharged income relating to 3rd Floor accommodation from Surrey Police and SCC Local Director.
Knowle Green	228,700	203,980	150,257	26,024	176,281	229,000	300	260,800	338,568	220,341	

Community Safety : Cabinet Member - Cllr Frank Ayers

Results to 31-Dec-10	Budget		Actual	Commitments	Total	Forecast	Variance	09/10	09/10 Actual		Comments
	Original	YTD			Actuals	Outturn	to Original	Original Budget	Outturn	YTD	
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	
Employees	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	
Other Expenditure	126,000	94,500	66,118	30,898	97,015	120,000	(6,000)	150,000	206,415	125,746	Budget not allocated for 2010/11
Income	0	0	(327)	0	(327)	0	-	0	(7,782)	(7,182)	
Planned Maintenance Programme	126,000	94,500	65,791	30,898	96,688	120,000	(6,000)	150,000	198,633	118,564	
Employees	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	
Other Expenditure	150,000	112,400	193,279	55,330	248,609	170,000	20,000	150,000	200,078	138,718	
Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	
Responsive Maintenance Program	150,000	112,400	193,279	55,330	248,609	170,000	20,000	150,000	200,078	138,718	
Total Employees	448,500	334,425	328,812	30	328,842	424,200	(24,300)	510,900	497,266	384,365	
Total Other Expenditure	1,014,200	791,300	834,670	138,176	972,846	1,069,300	55,100	976,800	1,255,603	831,254	
Total Income	(421,500)	(359,420)	(409,671)	26	(409,645)	(482,400)	(60,900)	(407,500)	(503,098)	(426,871)	
	1,041,200	766,305	753,811	138,232	892,043	1,011,100	(30,100)	1,080,200	1,249,771	788,748	

Resources : Cabinet Member - Cllr Vivienne Leighton

Results to 31-Dec-10	Budget		Actual	Commitments	Total	Forecast	Variance to Original	09/10	09/10 Actual		Comments
	Original	YTD						Original Budget	Outturn	YTD	
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£		
Employees	178,800	127,400	115,195	0	115,195	165,900	(12,900)	195,800	190,956	136,578	Current vacant post of an Auditor
Other Expenditure	5,900	4,850	5,326	4,275	9,601	6,300	400	13,500	5,573	5,291	
Income	(64,200)	(54,700)	(30,802)	0	(30,802)	(32,600)	31,600	(64,200)	(66,157)	(59,857)	Budget includes partnership income from SHBC for £33k, whereas the partnership has already ceased.
Audit	120,500	77,550	89,718	4,275	93,993	139,600	19,100	145,100	130,373	82,013	
Employees	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	
Other Expenditure	88,100	81,475	77,063	51,518	128,581	88,000	(100)	88,100	94,945	91,389	
Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	
Print Unit	88,100	81,475	77,063	51,518	128,581	88,000	(100)	88,100	94,945	91,389	
Employees	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	36	36	
Other Expenditure	32,200	20,863	12,846	2,940	15,786	27,800	(4,400)	30,200	29,083	8,625	Commitment of £2900 re: Car Lease should be on ACX CC.
Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	
People & Partnerships	32,200	20,863	12,846	2,940	15,786	27,800	(4,400)	30,200	29,119	8,661	
Employees	82,900	62,200	67,234	1,508	68,743	82,000	(900)	147,600	159,350	130,057	
Other Expenditure	6,200	4,600	2,217	0	2,217	6,200	-	6,200	6,138	3,329	
Income	0	0	(15)	0	(15)	0	-	0	(15)	(15)	
MaT Secretariat & Support	89,100	66,800	69,436	1,508	70,944	88,200	(900)	153,800	165,473	133,371	
Employees	288,300	216,300	242,550	0	242,550	321,000	32,700	361,200	401,362	270,373	Includes Redundancy payment for Assistant CX
Other Expenditure	23,200	17,500	6,837	5,050	11,887	21,000	(2,200)	23,800	15,003	14,772	
Income	0	0	(106)	0	(106)	(100)	(100)	0	(70)	(50)	
Assistant Chief Executives	311,500	233,800	249,281	5,050	254,331	341,900	30,400	385,000	416,295	285,096	
Employees	326,600	244,800	234,796	5,437	240,233	331,000	4,400	338,500	269,978	205,592	Staff advertising costs for which we have no budget
Other Expenditure	16,600	12,500	7,645	1,505	9,150	10,000	(6,600)	22,400	10,304	8,737	Under spend on Public transport budget
Income	0	0	(178)	0	(178)	(200)	(200)	0	(441)	(366)	
Chief Executive	343,200	257,300	242,264	6,942	249,205	340,800	(2,400)	360,900	279,841	213,963	
Employees	249,200	185,500	187,443	0	187,443	252,800	3,600	297,600	285,862	228,720	Salary costs higher due to one post holder is being paid on higher grade than the budget.
Other Expenditure	22,100	20,275	45,249	6,613	51,862	53,400	31,300	22,100	52,847	38,919	Legal and Court costs are higher than the budget
Income	(1,200)	(900)	(28,504)	0	(28,504)	(28,800)	(27,600)	(1,200)	(39,865)	(34,636)	Income is higher than the budget due to more activity
Legal	270,100	204,875	204,188	6,613	210,801	277,400	7,300	318,500	298,843	233,004	
Employees	204,400	152,100	153,237	0	153,237	204,500	100	206,000	197,598	150,489	
Other Expenditure	9,400	5,800	7,418	0	7,418	9,500	100	10,300	9,428	8,638	
Income	0	0	(10,598)	0	(10,598)	(17,600)	(17,600)	0	(65)	(50)	Partnership Income from RBC from Nov.10
HR	213,800	157,900	150,057	0	150,057	196,400	(17,400)	216,300	206,961	159,077	
Employees	50,000	37,100	35,626	0	35,626	50,100	100	50,800	48,279	36,410	
Other Expenditure	2,200	1,925	2,725	0	2,725	3,000	800	5,000	3,728	2,866	
Income	0	0	(10)	0	(10)	0	-	0	(20)	(20)	
Payroll	52,200	39,025	38,341	0	38,341	53,100	900	55,800	51,987	39,256	
Employees	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	
Other Expenditure	0	0	1,424	0	1,424	1,500	1,500	0	1,557	1,557	Payments to consultant
Income	(2,000)	0	0	0	0	(2,000)	-	(2,000)	(428)	0	
Mortgages	(2,000)	0	1,424	0	1,424	(500)	1,500	(2,000)	1,129	1,557	

Resources : Cabinet Member - Cllr Vivienne Leighton

Results to 31-Dec-10	Budget		Actual	Commitments	Total	Forecast	Variance to Original	09/10	09/10 Actual		Comments
	Original	YTD						Original Budget	Outturn	YTD	
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£		
Employees	510,300	376,650	387,217	22	387,239	522,300	12,000	548,400	538,260	409,713	One temporary post (previously funded through BIP funds) made permanent after approved by MAT, not included in the budget.
Other Expenditure	77,000	58,225	55,801	6,358	62,160	76,400	(600)	93,100	74,552	58,000	
Income	0	0	(10)	0	(10)	0	-	0	(80)	(15)	
CServ Management & Support	587,300	434,875	443,009	6,380	449,389	598,700	11,400	641,500	612,732	467,698	
Employees	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	
Other Expenditure	239,400	124,050	236,279	41,390	277,669	307,200	67,800	221,400	361,261	143,224	£72k payment to SCC re: waste Partnership advice and Contribution of £4k to 'tell us once to GBC' with no budget will be funded through Reserves. Expected Higher Bank Charges by £10k, Valuation fees of £12k relating to Stanwell New Start and £34k re: Updated of Property Asset Register and balance relating to Targeted support funding off set by income.
Income	(100,000)	(75,000)	(18,000)	0	(18,000)	(114,400)	(14,400)	0	(311,289)	(3,492)	Venue hire Income for £4k with no budget and £10k targeted support funding from Surrey safer & Stronger Communities Board to off set the costs associated with it. Income of £100k procurement will be reflected within other services.
Corporate Management	139,400	49,050	218,279	41,390	259,669	192,800	53,400	221,400	49,973	139,732	
Employees	0	0	0	(0)	(0)	0	-	0	0	0	
Other Expenditure	10,000	0	1	0	1	10,000	-	12,200	(18,969)	11,153	Year end adjustment re: Write offs untraced Sundry Debtors
Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	
Misc Expenses	10,000	0	1	0	1	10,000	0	12,200	(18,969)	11,153	
Employees	685,100	513,013	398,385	25,690	424,075	698,200	13,100	469,100	5,130	307,380	Various Spelthorne Achievement Awards payments of £3k with no budget. Super added years payments to SCC are expected to be higher by £10k than the budget.
Other Expenditure	53,900	42,100	22,897	40,061	62,959	48,800	(5,100)	63,600	46,456	30,415	Includes commitments for occupational health services (£17k) covering 3 year period - July 10 to June 2013 and for Health & Safety. Actual expenditure on Security Services and Document Exchange is expected to be less than the budget
Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	
Unapportionable CentralO/Heads	739,000	555,113	421,282	65,752	487,034	747,000	8,000	532,700	51,586	337,795	
Employees	286,800	212,700	255,553	0	255,553	313,000	26,200	344,000	293,025	223,260	Redundancy payment of £22k. 16k savings taken out of the salary budget at the start of the year will not be achieved and one member of staff is being paid on higher grade than the budget.
Other Expenditure	12,500	10,375	9,860	629	10,489	12,600	100	15,000	21,466	15,668	
Income	0	0	(5)	0	(5)	0	-	0	(5)	(5)	
Accountancy	299,300	223,075	265,408	629	266,037	325,600	26,300	359,000	314,487	238,923	
Employees	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	
Other Expenditure	0	0	33	0	33	0	-	0	501	396	
Income	(145,600)	0	0	0	0	(134,700)	10,900	(157,600)	(159,282)	0	
Business Rates	(145,600)	0	33	0	33	(134,700)	10,900	(157,600)	(158,781)	396	
Employees	393,300	291,575	328,722	0	328,722	439,600	46,300	432,100	418,424	317,182	Long term sickness of one member of staff covered by existing staff with additional payments. Temporary staff are still employed to assist the increased demand. Also £21k savings taken out of the salary budget at the start of the year.
Other Expenditure	97,700	66,600	32,738	12,812	45,550	77,300	(20,400)	98,100	159,245	114,863	Anticipated savings mainly on Printing, Summons costs, Books & Publications.
Income	(144,300)	(3,000)	(5,322)	0	(5,322)	(169,700)	(25,400)	(129,000)	(251,750)	(90,778)	Higher legal costs reimbursement income anticipated and additional grant income relating to NNDR/ CT legislation changes.
Council Tax	346,700	355,175	356,138	12,812	368,950	347,200	500	401,200	325,919	341,267	

Resources : Cabinet Member - Cllr Vivienne Leighton

Results to 31-Dec-10	Budget		Actual	Commitments	Total	Forecast	Variance	09/10	09/10 Actual		Comments
	Original	YTD			Actuals	Outturn	to Original	Original Budget	Outturn	YTD	
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	
Employees	199,500	147,900	157,401	0	157,401	209,000	9,500	233,000	222,437	170,734	Expected to be higher than the budget due to delayed move of one member of staff than anticipated to Accountancy.
Other Expenditure	6,800	4,325	8,316	172	8,488	12,200	5,400	12,600	9,285	6,649	Additional expenditure on Postage and Printing due to issue of garden waste invoices
Income	0	0	(40)	0	(40)	0	-	0	(87)	(72)	
Financial Support	206,300	152,225	165,677	172	165,849	221,200	14,900	245,600	231,635	177,312	
Employees	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	
Other Expenditure	296,400	0	0	0	0	296,400	-	308,400	308,818	0	
Income	0	0	(891)	0	(891)	(900)	(900)	0	(891)	(891)	
Insurance	296,400	0	(891)	0	(891)	295,500	(900)	308,400	307,927	(891)	
Total Employees	3,455,200	2,567,238	2,563,359	32,657	2,596,016	3,589,400	134,200	3,624,100	3,030,697	2,586,523	
Total Other Expenditure	999,600	475,463	534,676	173,323	707,999	1,067,600	68,000	1,046,000	1,191,222	564,493	
Total Income	(457,300)	(133,600)	(94,481)	0	(94,481)	(501,000)	(43,700)	(354,000)	(830,443)	(190,245)	
	3,997,500	2,909,101	3,003,554	205,980	3,209,534	4,156,000	158,500	4,316,100	3,391,475	2,960,771	

Environment : Cabinet Member - Cllr Gerry Forsbrey

Results to 31-Dec-10	Budget		Actual	Commitments	Total	Forecast	Variance to Original	09/10	09/10 Actual		Comments
	Original	YTD						Original Budget	Outturn	YTD	
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£		
Employees	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	
Other Expenditure	3,000	2,200	0	630	630	1,500	(1,500)	3,000	1,770	1,200	
Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	
Abandoned Vehicles	3,000	2,200	0	630	630	1,500	(1,500)	3,000	1,770	1,200	
Employees	0	0	40	0	40	0	-	0	0	0	
Other Expenditure	45,800	40,950	55,107	2,804	57,910	65,000	19,200	58,700	61,352	44,564	
Income	0	0	(1,440)	0	(1,440)	(1,500)	(1,500)	0	(400)	(400)	Rent of land at commercial road
Depot	45,800	40,950	53,707	2,804	56,510	63,500	17,700	58,700	60,952	44,164	
Employees	599,100	450,300	403,531	0	403,531	550,000	(49,100)	620,900	811,448	440,433	vacant posts
Other Expenditure	43,900	32,700	19,908	10,258	30,166	40,000	(3,900)	36,600	36,789	21,512	
Income	0	0	(18,320)	0	(18,320)	(18,300)	(18,300)	0	(10)	0	
DS Management & Support	643,000	483,000	405,119	10,258	415,377	571,700	(71,300)	657,500	848,227	461,945	
Employees	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	24,200	30,201	26,111	
Other Expenditure	0	0	0	783	783	0	-	20,800	12,228	11,560	Old commitment which is due to be removed from the system in Jan 11 and a electricity invoice that has now been moved to the correct code
Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	(60,000)	(52,685)	(52,742)	
Nursery	0	0	0	783	783	0	0	(15,000)	(10,256)	(15,071)	
Employees	874,600	656,200	587,182	1,318	588,500	850,000	(24,600)	844,100	744,700	543,724	
Other Expenditure	786,300	528,700	499,118	98,957	598,075	725,000	(61,300)	756,100	798,411	504,194	leasing costs less than budget and consultants budget no longer required + lower spend on operational equipment and supplies, offset by higher fuel bills
Income	(250,000)	(232,500)	(315,159)	0	(315,159)	(345,000)	(95,000)	(167,200)	(256,950)	(246,442)	Increased green waste bin income
Refuse Collection	1,410,900	952,400	771,142	100,275	871,416	1,230,000	(180,900)	1,433,000	1,286,161	801,476	
Employees	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	
Other Expenditure	9,500	8,500	3,708	850	4,558	9,500	-	13,800	38,528	32,989	
Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	
Energy Initiatives	9,500	8,500	3,708	850	4,558	9,500	0	13,800	38,528	32,989	
Employees	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	
Other Expenditure	48,000	28,800	23,187	4,675	27,862	46,000	(2,000)	45,200	41,708	29,312	The majority of the spend takes place in the 3rd and 4th Quarters
Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	
Environmental Enhancements	48,000	28,800	23,187	4,675	27,862	46,000	(2,000)	45,200	41,708	29,312	
Employees	330,200	247,700	250,431	0	250,431	340,000	9,800	337,700	297,087	231,910	
Other Expenditure	17,000	12,700	13,757	5,570	19,327	18,000	1,000	81,800	33,006	17,852	Commitment of £4875 removed from the system in Jan 2011
Income	0	0	(865)	0	(865)	(900)	(900)	0	(33,670)	(16,835)	
Enviro Services Administration	347,200	260,400	263,323	5,570	268,893	357,100	9,900	419,500	296,424	232,927	
Employees	619,600	465,000	451,139	0	451,139	620,000	400	729,200	590,440	456,552	Vacant posts, offset by increased overtime
Other Expenditure	298,600	214,800	227,181	41,870	269,051	305,000	6,400	273,600	295,254	222,646	Higher leasing and fuel costs, offset by lower exp on hired transport and plant and maintenance costs
Income	(47,700)	(45,500)	(46,371)	0	(46,371)	(46,400)	1,300	(69,700)	(52,688)	(52,719)	
Street Cleaning	870,500	634,300	631,950	41,870	673,819	878,600	8,100	933,100	833,007	626,478	
Employees	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	65,200	58,474	51,398	
Other Expenditure	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	13,200	3,943	2,502	
Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	(254)	(94)	

Environment : Cabinet Member - Cllr Gerry Forsbrey

Results to 31-Dec-10	Budget		Actual	Commitments	Total	Forecast	Variance	09/10	09/10 Actual		Comments
	Original	YTD			Actuals	Outturn	to Original	Original Budget	Outturn	YTD	
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	
Street Scene Enforcement	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78,400	62,163	53,807	
Employees	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	
Other Expenditure	370,800	278,100	213,415	0	213,415	317,000	(53,800)	410,000	412,560	252,942	Lower contractor costs for Green waste and AWC due to new contracts in place for 1011
Income	(625,700)	(445,450)	(357,835)	0	(357,835)	(640,000)	(14,300)	(530,200)	(425,891)	(232,064)	Actual credit received higher than estimated figure used at the end of the year and the forecast fig is based on the data held at the end of the 2nd QTR
Waste Recycling	(254,900)	(167,350)	(144,420)	0	(144,420)	(323,000)	(68,100)	(120,200)	(13,331)	20,878	
Employees	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	
Other Expenditure	34,100	25,600	32,409	0	32,409	32,500	(1,600)	35,300	31,430	29,190	
Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	(16,400)	0	0	
Technical Projects	34,100	25,600	32,409	0	32,409	32,500	(1,600)	18,900	31,430	29,190	
Employees	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	
Other Expenditure	102,700	79,600	67,495	1,259	68,754	100,000	(2,700)	111,200	102,970	67,420	
Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	
Public Conveniences	102,700	79,600	67,495	1,259	68,754	100,000	(2,700)	111,200	102,970	67,420	
Employees	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	
Other Expenditure	7,400	5,700	5,151	(0)	5,151	7,400	-	7,400	8,327	8,327	
Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	
Emergency Planning	7,400	5,700	5,151	(0)	5,151	7,400	0	7,400	8,327	8,327	
Employees	0	0	0	(0)	(0)	0	-	0	850	850	
Other Expenditure	3,000	2,100	0	(0)	(0)	0	(3,000)	41,000	26,961	12,331	£61 relates to a vat credit, which has been transferred to the central marketing budget In Oct
Income	(3,000)	(2,100)	0	0	0	0	3,000	(1,000)	0	0	
Waste Recycling Marketing	0	0	0	(0)	(0)	0	0	40,000	27,812	13,181	
Employees	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	
Other Expenditure	26,100	22,900	4,656	433	5,089	20,400	(5,700)	31,600	11,993	11,563	£5700 offered up as savings and the Environment services manager states that the remaining budget will be spend in full.
Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	
Water Courses & Land Drainage	26,100	22,900	4,656	433	5,089	20,400	(5,700)	31,600	11,993	11,563	
Employees	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	
Other Expenditure	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	
Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	
Liveability Fund	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Total Employees	2,423,500	1,819,200	1,692,323	1,318	1,693,641	2,360,000	(63,500)	2,621,300	2,533,201	1,750,978	
Total Other Expenditure	1,796,200	1,283,350	1,165,092	168,089	1,333,181	1,687,300	(108,900)	1,939,300	1,917,230	1,270,105	
Total Income	(926,400)	(725,550)	(739,990)	0	(739,990)	(1,052,100)	(125,700)	(844,500)	(822,548)	(601,296)	
	3,293,300	2,377,000	2,117,426	169,407	2,286,832	2,995,200	(298,100)	3,716,100	3,627,883	2,419,786	

Health and Independent Living : Cabinet Member - Cllr Sooryadeo Bhadye

Results to 31-Dec-10	Budget		Actual	Commitments	Total	Forecast	Variance	09/10	09/10 Actual		Comments	
	Original	YTD							Actuals	Outturn		YTD
	£	£							£	£		£
Employees	91,100	68,100	76,412	0	76,412	91,100	-	105,800	83,863	71,274		
Other Expenditure	19,700	14,600	5,217	0	5,217	12,500	(7,200)	35,600	13,559	9,495		
Income	(37,400)	(28,000)	(12,157)	0	(12,157)	(36,500)	900	(37,400)	(3,516)	(15,673)	Outturn Includes PSA and Supporting People grants which are unbudgeted	
Com Care Administration	73,400	54,700	69,473	0	69,473	67,100	(6,300)	104,000	93,906	65,096		
Employees	339,200	254,700	244,608	0	244,608	332,800	(6,400)	345,300	335,056	258,786		
Other Expenditure	237,700	185,600	156,508	32,067	188,575	220,000	(17,700)	233,600	274,067	195,551		
Income	(202,700)	(152,900)	(158,284)	195	(158,089)	(208,600)	(5,900)	(201,200)	(235,894)	(153,412)	Sale of food up on budget	
Day Centres	374,200	287,400	242,832	32,262	275,094	344,200	(30,000)	377,700	373,230	300,925		
Employees	59,900	44,800	51,622	530	52,152	73,000	13,100	68,400	67,017	50,731	OT costs high to cover long term sickness	
Other Expenditure	95,400	71,600	61,989	10,440	72,429	93,300	(2,100)	95,400	91,546	62,945		
Income	(167,000)	(82,900)	(105,220)	0	(105,220)	(167,000)	-	(167,000)	(180,379)	(99,537)	SCC yet to be invoiced for Substantial needs contract	
Meals On Wheels	(11,700)	33,500	8,392	10,970	19,362	(700)	11,000	(3,200)	(21,817)	14,139		
Employees	51,000	38,200	56,616	0	56,616	72,700	21,700	57,800	91,801	73,208	Error in preparing budget, will overspend on salaries	
Other Expenditure	33,200	25,000	31,440	0	31,440	33,000	(200)	37,000	42,935	29,061		
Income	(317,400)	(243,200)	(232,565)	0	(232,565)	(340,000)	(22,600)	(197,100)	(189,904)	(191,338)	Additional Telecare income	
Span	(233,200)	(180,000)	(144,510)	0	(144,510)	(234,300)	(1,100)	(102,300)	(55,168)	(89,068)		
Employees	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0		
Other Expenditure	595,400	153,800	126,558	7,791	134,350	595,400	-	598,200	596,310	286,963	Quarterly payment invoice to SCC is still awaited.	
Income	(102,500)	(76,875)	(77,482)	0	(77,482)	(102,800)	(300)	(250,000)	(250,214)	(188,511)		
Concessionary Fares	492,900	76,925	49,076	7,791	56,868	492,600	(300)	348,200	346,096	98,452		
Employees	123,100	92,500	92,541	0	92,541	123,500	400	138,000	133,356	102,232	Temp staff employed ,as a result of late start up	
Other Expenditure	16,000	11,800	23,721	15,724	39,445	47,000	31,000	16,000	31,628	20,961	Increased Fuel & maintenance costs + Share of Elmbridges running & set up costs	
Income	(64,200)	(53,600)	(66,730)	0	(66,730)	(82,000)	(17,800)	(64,200)	(72,256)	(61,740)	Increased use of the service	
SAT	74,900	50,700	49,531	15,724	65,255	88,500	13,600	89,800	92,728	61,453		
Employees	771,500	578,800	550,264	16,282	566,547	718,000	(53,500)	796,400	722,712	560,504		
Other Expenditure	34,000	25,800	24,925	7,919	32,844	31,500	(2,500)	34,900	34,756	23,844		
Income	0	0	(267)	0	(267)	(300)	(300)	0	(75)	(35)		
Environmental Health Admin	805,500	604,600	574,923	24,201	599,123	749,200	(56,300)	831,300	757,393	584,313		
Employees	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0		
Other Expenditure	39,800	28,400	5,984	180	6,164	35,000	(4,800)	31,800	41,502	8,702	Improvement grants yet to be settled	
Income	(8,600)	(8,600)	(4,313)	0	(4,313)	(6,000)	2,600	(8,600)	(4,608)	(26,420)		
Environmental Protection Act	31,200	19,800	1,671	180	1,851	29,000	(2,200)	23,200	36,894	(17,719)		
Employees	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0		
Other Expenditure	2,500	600	1,748	163	1,911	2,400	(100)	3,500	2,542	2,234		
Income	(4,000)	(3,000)	(3,047)	30	(3,017)	(4,000)	-	(4,000)	(3,922)	(2,892)		
Food Safety	(1,500)	(2,400)	(1,299)	193	(1,106)	(1,600)	(100)	(500)	(1,380)	(658)		
Employees	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	883	0		
Other Expenditure	5,400	3,800	6,971	698	7,669	8,100	2,700	5,400	7,067	4,607	Part of overspend due to corporate H&S expenditure being coded to this budget	
Income	(3,900)	(3,900)	(1,361)	0	(1,361)	(3,000)	900	(3,900)	(3,377)	(2,526)		
Public Health	1,500	(100)	5,610	698	6,308	5,100	3,600	1,500	4,572	2,082		

Health and Independent Living : Cabinet Member - Cllr Sooryadeo Bhadye

Results to	Budget		Actual	Commitments	Total	Forecast	Variance	09/10	09/10 Actual		Comments
	Original	YTD			Actuals	Outturn	to Original	Original Budget	Outturn	YTD	
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	
Employees	0	0	0	0	0		-	0	0	0	
Other Expenditure	21,500	16,200	10,314	4,518	14,832	17,500	(4,000)	11,000	14,371	11,376	
Income	(2,000)	(1,500)	(3,973)	81	(3,891)	(5,000)	(3,000)	(2,000)	(3,700)	(2,962)	
Rodent & Pest Control	19,500	14,700	6,341	4,600	10,941	12,500	(7,000)	9,000	10,671	8,414	
Employees	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	
Other Expenditure	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	1,126	1,126	
Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	
Gypsy Sites	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,126	1,126	
Total Employees	1,435,800	1,077,100	1,072,065	16,812	1,088,877	1,411,100	(24,700)	1,511,700	1,434,687	1,116,734	
Total Other Expenditure	1,100,600	537,200	455,375	79,501	534,876	1,095,700	(4,900)	1,102,400	1,151,408	656,866	
Total Income	(909,700)	(654,475)	(665,399)	306	(665,093)	(955,200)	(45,500)	(935,400)	(947,844)	(745,046)	
	1,626,700	959,825	862,040	96,619	958,660	1,551,600	(75,100)	1,678,700	1,638,251	1,028,554	

Planning and Housing : Cabinet Member - Cllr Richard Smith-Ainsley

Results to 31-Dec-10	Budget		Actual	Commitments	Total	Forecast	Variance	09/10	09/10 Actual		Comments
	Original	YTD			Actuals	Outturn	to Original	Original Budget	Outturn	YTD	
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	
Employees	274,000	205,800	219,966	0	219,966	292,100	18,100	304,600	302,041	233,105	Employee regraded and no temp budget
Other Expenditure	28,800	22,600	9,149	9	9,158	14,000	(14,800)	28,600	19,710	16,792	
Income	(300,000)	(225,000)	(228,284)	0	(228,284)	(300,000)	-	(260,000)	(283,227)	(219,039)	Income likely to be on target
Building Control	2,800	3,400	831	9	841	6,100	3,300	73,200	38,524	30,858	
Employees	0	0	0	1,450	1,450	0	-	0	734	0	
Other Expenditure	275,300	206,300	167,725	9,665	177,390	270,000	(5,300)	275,300	370,070	177,019	
Income	(74,400)	(63,200)	(71,389)	0	(71,389)	(102,000)	(27,600)	(74,400)	(147,542)	(61,573)	B&B write offs of £40K affecting income
Homelessness	200,900	143,100	96,336	11,115	107,451	168,000	(32,900)	200,900	223,262	115,446	
Employees	596,300	446,900	416,741	0	416,741	578,000	(18,300)	578,300	537,366	405,736	Current under spend on salaries due to vacancies earlier in the year
Other Expenditure	40,900	30,800	25,462	4,947	30,409	40,900	-	41,000	61,483	27,098	
Income	(619,300)	(464,600)	(444,611)	0	(444,611)	(600,300)	19,000	(624,900)	(669,301)	(533,132)	Prior year adjustments for 2000-2010 reduced inc by £34K
Housing Benefits Admin	17,900	13,100	(2,408)	4,947	2,539	18,600	700	(5,600)	(70,452)	(100,297)	
Employees	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	0	0	
Other Expenditure	33,469,500	25,102,200	25,603,783	0	25,603,783	34,135,000	665,500	25,396,700	31,177,247	23,648,628	
Income	(33,669,500)	(25,252,300)	(25,983,344)	0	(25,983,344)	(34,524,000)	(854,500)	(25,561,700)	(31,516,714)	(23,250,864)	£50K has been offered up in savings and will still hopefully be achieved. Additional £70K found through prior year adjustments for 2000-2010
Housing Benefits Payments	(200,000)	(150,100)	(379,561)	0	(379,561)	(389,000)	(189,000)	(165,000)	(339,466)	397,764	
Employees	435,100	326,000	338,784	0	338,784	436,100	1,000	433,000	435,467	331,298	
Other Expenditure	28,200	18,500	14,107	408	14,515	24,000	(4,200)	29,200	25,085	12,961	Saving to be expected from unspent print budget for 10/11 only
Income	(10,300)	0	(672)	0	(672)	(10,300)	-	(10,300)	(10,362)	(52)	
Housing Needs	453,000	344,500	352,219	408	352,627	449,800	(3,200)	451,900	450,190	344,208	
Employees	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	0	0	
Other Expenditure	126,000	94,500	(40)	0	(40)	0	(126,000)	176,000	63,079	42,499	
Income	(80,000)	(60,000)	(29,901)	0	(29,901)	(30,000)	50,000	(80,000)	(13,472)	(9,764)	We received some float money from Orchard & Shipman. £25K has been offered in savings. More will be achieved as no spend is predicted for 10/11. Spend is expected to resume in 11/12
PSL	46,000	34,500	(29,941)	0	(29,941)	(30,000)	(76,000)	96,000	49,606	32,735	
Employees	57,800	42,900	40,906	0	40,906	54,800	(3,000)	58,800	55,856	47,030	
Other Expenditure	2,400	1,350	908	5	913	2,000	(400)	2,400	4,330	2,390	
Income	(110,000)	(82,500)	(138,301)	0	(138,301)	(182,800)	(72,800)	(110,000)	(156,851)	(110,382)	Income higher due to increased activity
Land Charges	(49,800)	(38,250)	(96,488)	5	(96,483)	(126,000)	(76,200)	(48,800)	(96,666)	(60,961)	
Employees	641,600	481,100	477,512	0	477,512	639,400	(2,200)	697,100	621,641	484,458	
Other Expenditure	72,700	55,200	96,995	10,943	107,938	115,000	42,300	78,200	120,023	66,137	This is higher than anticipated due to work which has been undertaken for several informal hearings and in preparation for a public inquiry for Riverside Work, Sunbury in November. London Irish appealed at the end of September 2010.
Income	(489,500)	(292,100)	(246,466)	0	(246,466)	(300,000)	189,500	(484,500)	(739,190)	(387,231)	£100k HPDG retracted by Coalition Gov. Also very unlikely to achieve Planning App income target due to external elements.
Planning Development Control	224,800	244,200	328,041	10,943	338,984	454,400	229,600	290,800	2,474	163,364	
Employees	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	
Other Expenditure	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	
Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	
Planning Management	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Employees	215,600	161,700	152,440	0	152,440	206,500	(9,100)	199,200	220,014	169,257	Employee savings since May
Other Expenditure	56,300	44,000	17,599	10,450	28,049	56,300	-	123,800	102,289	86,554	Airtrack under spend to be allocated towards London Irish costs.
Income	(1,000)	(1,000)	(17,281)	0	(17,281)	(17,300)	(16,300)	(1,000)	(2,199)	(2,199)	
Planning Policy	270,900	204,700	152,758	10,450	163,208	245,500	(25,400)	322,000	320,103	253,612	

Planning and Housing : Cabinet Member - Cllr Richard Smith-Ainsley

Results to	Budget		Actual	Commitments	Total	Forecast	Variance	09/10	09/10 Actual		Comments
	Original	YTD			Actuals	Outturn	to Original	Original Budget	Outturn	YTD	
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	
Employees	203,500	151,850	150,424	0	150,424	202,100	(1,400)	201,900	192,031	145,886	
Other Expenditure	925,800	870,500	688,468	198,989	887,457	890,100	(29,000)	1,037,400	945,971	653,564	Steria contract actual costs are expected to be higher than the budget off set by a credit of £50k expected against the payments made to BT for the last 6 years which should not be made.
Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	(5,208)	(5,198)	
E Government Services	1,129,300	1,022,350	838,892	198,989	1,037,881	1,092,200	(30,400)	1,239,300	1,132,794	794,251	
Total Employees	2,423,900	1,816,250	1,796,773	1,450	1,798,223	2,409,000	(14,900)	2,472,900	2,365,148	1,816,770	
Total Other Expenditure	35,025,900	26,445,950	26,624,156	235,416	26,859,572	35,547,300	528,100	27,188,600	32,889,287	24,733,642	
Total Income	(35,354,000)	(26,440,700)	(27,160,251)	0	(27,160,251)	(36,066,700)	(712,700)	(27,206,800)	(33,544,066)	(24,579,433)	
	2,095,800	1,821,500	1,260,678	236,866	1,497,544	1,889,600	(199,500)	2,454,700	1,710,369	1,970,979	

Economic Development : Cabinet Member - Cllr Colin Davis

Results to 31-Dec-10	Budget		Actual	Commitments	Total	Forecast	Variance	09/10	09/10 Actual		Comments
	Original	YTD			Actuals	Outturn	to Original	Original Budget	Outturn	YTD	
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	
Employees	0	0	0	0	0		-	0	0	0	
Other Expenditure	23,500	22,300	24,112	426	24,538	25,000	1,500	25,800	3,689	25,498	
Income	0	0	0	0	0		-	0	0	0	
Bus Station	23,500	22,300	24,112	426	24,538	25,000	1,500	25,800	3,689	25,498	
Employees	334,900	251,300	320,648	39,808	360,456	420,000	85,100	513,400	414,192	246,604	Temp staff used to cover vacant posts
Other Expenditure	747,100	623,200	571,222	57,624	628,846	702,000	(45,100)	750,000	762,292	630,015	Electricity costs reduced due to new energy efficient lighting in some car parks
Income	(1,949,700)	(1,448,126)	(1,472,596)	0	(1,472,596)	(1,990,000)	(40,300)	(2,022,700)	(1,774,010)	(1,270,021)	Season ticket sales, PCN and park& phone income up on budget, offset by reduced rental income
Car Parks	(867,700)	(573,626)	(580,726)	97,432	(483,294)	(868,000)	(300)	(759,300)	(597,527)	(393,403)	
Employees	0	0	13,786	0	13,786	18,400	18,400	0	0	0	Staisafe coordinator taken on from the Staines Partnership
Other Expenditure	120,000	90,000	122,536	11,506	134,042	177,000	57,000	0	15,053	10,037	Consultants costs for the town centre included - £16500
Income	(520,000)	(260,000)	(440,312)	0	(440,312)	(594,000)	(74,000)	(520,000)	(560,000)	(420,000)	Extra income from the Staisafe Scheme to cover employee costs
Staines Town Centre Management	(400,000)	(170,000)	(303,990)	11,506	(292,484)	(398,600)	1,400	(520,000)	(544,947)	(409,963)	
Employees	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	
Other Expenditure	35,800	30,700	11,122	6,961	18,083	12,000	(23,800)	34,500	17,280	16,846	Budget for Staines Partnership no longer required
Income	(177,000)	(132,800)	(129,414)	54	(129,360)	(168,000)	9,000	(132,000)	(146,488)	(102,874)	
Staines Market	(141,200)	(102,100)	(118,292)	7,015	(111,277)	(156,000)	(14,800)	(97,500)	(129,209)	(86,028)	
Employees	163,600	121,200	113,475	(0)	113,475	145,400	(18,200)	195,200	177,843	140,721	Current two vacant posts
Other Expenditure	22,600	11,300	7,075	82	7,157	16,800	(5,800)	27,400	8,029	5,438	Savings anticipated on Internal Printing
Income	(10,000)	(7,500)	(5,866)	0	(5,866)	(5,900)	4,100	(10,000)	(9,642)	(6,453)	Reimbursement income from 'Access to work' will be decreased
Committee Services	176,200	125,000	114,684	82	114,766	156,300	(19,900)	212,600	176,230	139,705	
Employees	88,500	66,100	66,391	0	66,391	88,800	300	86,700	84,294	64,454	
Other Expenditure	200	100	66	0	66	200	-	200	383	334	
Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	
Corporate Governance	88,700	66,200	66,457	0	66,457	89,000	300	86,900	84,676	64,787	
Employees	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	
Other Expenditure	5,000	3,800	2,485	1	2,486	5,000	-	0	0	0	
Income	(49,000)	(49,000)	(500)	0	(500)	0	49,000	(49,000)	(50,010)	(50,010)	LABGI cut by Coalition Gov.
Economic Development	(44,000)	(45,200)	1,985	1	1,986	5,000	49,000	(49,000)	(50,010)	(50,010)	
Employees	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	14,536	14,676	
Other Expenditure	11,000	8,150	3,030	0	3,030	11,000	-	11,000	6,171	5,520	Expenditure expected on replacing Polling booths
Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	
Elections	11,000	8,150	3,030	0	3,030	11,000	0	11,000	20,707	20,196	
Employees	109,000	81,000	84,290	0	84,290	105,900	(3,100)	110,100	107,986	89,261	Actual expenditure is expected to be less than the budget for Temporary staff.
Other Expenditure	32,900	23,425	24,532	0	24,532	28,800	(4,100)	45,400	42,218	23,937	Savings anticipated mainly on Register Elector Phone response Budget
Income	(1,000)	(800)	(2,272)	0	(2,272)	(2,400)	(1,400)	(1,000)	(2,910)	(2,232)	Higher income due to more activity
Electoral Registration	140,900	103,625	106,549	0	106,549	132,300	(8,600)	154,500	147,294	110,967	

Economic Development : Cabinet Member - Cllr Colin Davis

Results to	Budget		Actual	Commitments	Total	Forecast	Variance	09/10	09/10 Actual		Comments
	Original	YTD			Actuals	Outturn	to Original	Original Budget	Outturn	YTD	
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	
Employees	35,700	26,400	33,536	(0)	33,536	43,800	8,100	43,400	37,376	31,456	Salary costs for Mayor's secretary are expected to be higher due to actual hours worked are more than the budget.
Other Expenditure	257,800	195,600	199,939	107	200,046	261,800	4,000	261,800	260,303	200,329	Additional twinning costs off set by additional income reimbursements.
Income	0	0	(9,472)	0	(9,472)	(9,500)	(9,500)	0	(7,980)	(7,841)	Income reimbursements to off set above additional costs.
Democratic Rep & Management	293,500	222,000	224,003	107	224,110	296,100	2,600	305,200	289,700	223,945	
Total Employees	731,700	546,000	632,125	39,808	671,933	822,300	90,600	948,800	836,227	587,171	
Total Other Expenditure	1,255,900	1,008,575	966,118	76,707	1,042,826	1,239,600	(16,300)	1,156,100	1,115,419	917,954	
Total Income	(2,706,700)	(1,898,226)	(2,060,431)	54	(2,060,377)	(2,769,800)	(63,100)	(2,734,700)	(2,551,040)	(1,859,431)	
	(719,100)	(343,651)	(462,188)	116,569	(345,619)	(707,900)	11,200	(629,800)	(599,395)	(354,306)	

Young People and Cultural Services : Cabinet Member - Cllr Denise Grant

Results to 31-Dec-10	Budget		Actual	Commitments	Total	Forecast	Variance	09/10	09/10 Actual		Comments
	Original	YTD							Outturn	YTD	
	£	£	£	£	£	£					
Employees	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0		
Other Expenditure	6,500	5,400	8,008	0	8,008	6,500	-	6,500	9,448	7,188	
Income	(22,700)	(22,700)	(30,992)	0	(30,992)	(31,300)	(8,600)	(22,200)	(23,913)	(24,502)	Increased usage
Allotments	(16,200)	(17,300)	(22,984)	0	(22,984)	(24,800)	(8,600)	(15,700)	(14,464)	(17,314)	
Employees	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	
Other Expenditure	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	41,200	42,250	42,250	
Income	0	0	0	15,000	15,000	0	-	(24,600)	(21,304)	(18,208)	Commitment to be cleared
Spelthorne in Bloom	0	0	0	15,000	15,000	0	0	16,600	20,946	24,042	
Employees	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	
Other Expenditure	35,900	32,100	23,185	2,280	25,465	35,900	-	26,800	21,908	9,050	
Income	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	
Staines Metro Commons	35,900	32,100	23,185	2,280	25,465	35,900	0	26,800	21,908	9,050	
Employees	159,700	119,600	73,576	0	73,576	100,000	(59,700)	168,000	130,690	108,402	Vacant posts within highway verges and changes to the structure of the nursery
Other Expenditure	1,638,400	1,228,600	1,031,731	148,287	1,180,018	1,500,000	(138,400)	1,619,400	1,608,113	1,116,970	Savings on Highway verges, lifebelts, parks non contract work
Income	(228,000)	(162,600)	(186,362)	0	(186,362)	(188,000)	40,000	(130,000)	(145,468)	(112,573)	
Grounds Maintenance	1,570,100	1,185,600	918,944	148,287	1,067,231	1,412,000	(158,100)	1,657,400	1,593,335	1,112,798	
Employees	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	
Other Expenditure	141,300	109,300	44,650	5,240	49,890	111,000	(30,300)	141,300	166,593	118,193	Reduced electricity spend which is being investigated
Income	(132,800)	(99,900)	(68,231)	0	(68,231)	(95,000)	37,800	(149,500)	(102,944)	(71,953)	Lettings, Licences Football income and contribution from Lamas car park income below budget.
Parks Strategy	8,500	9,400	(23,581)	5,240	(18,341)	16,000	7,500	(8,200)	63,649	46,241	
Employees	2,600	1,900	4,208	0	4,208	4,500	1,900	2,600	3,093	2,730	Casual staff coding being looked into
Other Expenditure	21,400	16,200	11,315	116	11,431	20,000	(1,400)	21,400	19,972	18,104	
Income	(44,000)	(44,000)	(47,544)	0	(47,544)	(48,000)	(4,000)	(44,000)	(47,718)	(47,163)	
Arts Development	(20,000)	(25,900)	(32,022)	116	(31,906)	(23,500)	(3,500)	(20,000)	(24,653)	(26,329)	
Employees	5,000	3,800	3,446	194	3,640	3,900	(1,100)	5,000	7,019	6,106	Casual staff coding being looked into
Other Expenditure	2,800	2,300	4,544	303	4,847	5,000	2,200	8,800	7,991	8,209	
Income	0	0	(1,267)	0	(1,267)	(100)	(100)	0	(1,017)	(1,017)	
Festivals	7,800	6,100	6,724	497	7,220	8,800	1,000	13,800	13,993	13,298	
Employees	213,000	159,600	163,723	0	163,723	219,500	6,500	222,500	211,829	162,024	No budget for temp staff
Other Expenditure	15,400	11,500	9,626	230	9,856	13,600	(1,800)	19,900	23,268	18,452	
Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	
Leisure Administration	228,400	171,100	173,349	230	173,579	233,100	4,700	242,400	235,097	180,477	
Employees	14,600	10,900	1,373	705	2,078	14,500	(100)	15,800	21,119	15,385	
Other Expenditure	24,500	18,600	28,177	20,268	48,445	33,000	8,500	25,800	23,426	14,663	
Income	(11,600)	(8,700)	(12,878)	0	(12,878)	(12,900)	(1,300)	(11,600)	(14,552)	(12,027)	
Leisure Development	27,500	20,800	16,672	20,973	37,645	34,600	7,100	30,000	29,993	18,021	
Employees	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	
Other Expenditure	29,300	25,900	18,805	0	18,805	29,300	-	34,700	25,990	20,440	Grant transferred for Museum Business Rates
Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	
Leisure Grants	29,300	25,900	18,805	0	18,805	29,300	0	34,700	25,990	20,440	
Employees	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	
Other Expenditure	5,400	4,000	0	0	0	5,400	-	5,600	750	750	Expect to spend near to budget by year end.
Income	(40,500)	(7,400)	(7,400)	0	(7,400)	(43,200)	(2,700)	(36,100)	(40,484)	(7,400)	Sunbury Golf ground rates £2400 more than budget, Profit Share of circa £32k due Feb 2011
Leisure Promotions	(35,100)	(3,400)	(7,400)	0	(7,400)	(37,800)	(2,700)	(30,500)	(39,734)	(6,650)	

Young People and Cultural Services : Cabinet Member - Cllr Denise Grant

Results to 31-Dec-10	Budget		Actual	Commitments	Total	Forecast	Variance	09/10	09/10 Actual		Comments
	Original	YTD			Actuals	Outturn	to Original	Original Budget	Outturn	YTD	
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	
Employees	0	0	0	0	0		-	0	0	0	
Other Expenditure	1,200	900	(8,259)	2,302	(5,958)	8,500	7,300	1,200	8,908	(9,345)	
Income	0	0	0	0	0		-	0	(15,000)	0	
Museum	1,200	900	(8,259)	2,302	(5,958)	8,500	7,300	1,200	(6,092)	(9,345)	
Employees	18,200	13,700	15,993	0	15,993	18,200	-	18,500	20,870	14,774	
Other Expenditure	24,700	21,600	8,071	371	8,442	9,200	(15,500)	26,700	10,956	7,605	
Income	(42,500)	(36,700)	(37,253)	0	(37,253)	(35,000)	7,500	(42,500)	(30,121)	(26,455)	St. Martins lease terminated with former leasee, new leasee in pipeline
Public Halls	400	(1,400)	(13,189)	371	(12,818)	(7,600)	(8,000)	2,700	1,705	(4,076)	
Employees	0	0	0	0	0		-	0	0	0	
Other Expenditure	61,000	48,500	(339)	339	0	61,000	-	11,000	(109,240)	(201,407)	Energy costs awaited from SLM
Income	(222,600)	(195,400)	(200,823)	0	(200,823)	(226,000)	(3,400)	(196,400)	(8,813)	(6,610)	
Spelthorne Leisure Centre	(161,600)	(146,900)	(201,162)	339	(200,823)	(165,000)	(3,400)	(185,400)	(118,053)	(208,016)	
Employees	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	
Other Expenditure	12,100	12,100	0	(0)	(0)	12,100	-	12,100	13,758	13,758	Awaiting SLM invoice re NNDR
Income	(3,000)	0	0	0	0	0	3,000	(3,000)	0	0	
Sunbury Leisure Centre	9,100	12,100	0	(0)	(0)	12,100	3,000	9,100	13,758	13,758	
Employees	0	0	3,805	0	3,805	3,500	3,500	0	3,472	2,953	
Other Expenditure	52,500	39,600	18,725	3,969	22,694	49,000	(3,500)	45,400	50,849	37,658	
Income	(8,100)	(6,100)	(20,182)	0	(20,182)	(15,200)	(7,100)	0	(8,585)	(6,850)	
Youth	44,400	33,500	2,348	3,969	6,317	37,300	(7,100)	45,400	45,736	33,760	
Employees	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	
Other Expenditure	19,900	19,400	20,832	2,789	23,621	20,000	100	41,100	42,715	33,264	
Income	(261,400)	(196,100)	(187,002)	0	(187,002)	(275,000)	(13,600)	(181,400)	(183,382)	(117,358)	
Cemeteries	(241,500)	(176,700)	(166,170)	2,789	(163,381)	(255,000)	(13,500)	(140,300)	(140,667)	(84,094)	
Total Employees	413,100	309,500	266,123	899	267,022	364,100	(49,000)	432,400	398,093	312,374	
Total Other Expenditure	2,092,300	1,596,000	1,219,069	186,494	1,405,563	1,919,500	(172,800)	2,088,900	1,967,655	1,255,801	
Total Income	(1,017,200)	(779,600)	(799,933)	15,000	(784,933)	(969,700)	47,500	(841,300)	(643,301)	(452,116)	
	1,488,200	1,125,900	685,259	202,393	887,652	1,313,900	(174,300)	1,680,000	1,722,446	1,116,059	

2010/11 Capital Monitoring and Projected Outturn Report

Resolution Required Report of the Chief Finance Officer EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

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

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

Purpose of Report

To provide Overview and Scrutiny with the spend figures, for the period April to December 2010 on the Capital Programme.

Key Issues

- The current position shows that we have spent £1,305 k to date against an original budget of £2,004k and against a revised budget of £2,767k.
- The spend for the period of £1,305k is 65% of the original budget and 47% of the revised budget. The corresponding figures for the same period last year was a spend of £1,193k, which was 59% of the original budget and 48% of the revised budget.
- The projected spend is £2,454k which equates to 89% of the revised budget

Financial Implications

As set out within the report and appendices

Corporate Priority

All six priorities.

Officer Recommendations

Overview and Scrutiny Committee are asked to note the report.

Report Author: David Lawrence Chief Accountant (01784 446471)

Contact: Terry Collier, Chief Finance Officer (01784 446296)

Cabinet Member: Cllr Vivienne Leighton

MAIN REPORT

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to update Cabinet on the capital spend against the budget position of schemes which have been included in the capital programme.
- 1.2 To inform Cabinet of the reasons for variances.

2. KEY ISSUES

2.1 Capital

- (a) Attached, as **Appendix A and B**, is the current spend to date on capital covering the period April to December 2010.
 - (b) For the period ending 31 December 2010, capital expenditure £1.305m (65%) of the original budget and (47%) of the revised budget.
 - (c) The equivalent spend in the corresponding period of the previous year was £1.193m.
- 2.2 The projected spend in 2010/11 is £2,454k against the revised budget of £2,767k which equates to an 89% spend.
- 2.3 The following significant variances are worth noting:
- (a) Housing Enabling Fund – increased spend £20k due to early completion of works at one site budgeted to be spent in 2011/12
 - (b) Disabled Facilities Grant – increased number of applications. Additional funding received £35k from DCLG offsets the increased spend
 - (c) Home Repair Assistance Grant – reduced spend £39k due to lower number of applications than originally budgeted
 - (d) Improvement Projects – the anticipated spend in total over the 2 year period is £600k funded equally by SBC and SCC .
 - (e) Hawke Park (TP26 Cycle Route) – monies received from SCC to fund the works
 - (f) 5 a side pitches – payment made in 2010/11 that related to spend in previous year which wasn't accrued for at year end
 - (g) Resource constraints have meant that the CRM solution (£160k) and the GOSS system (£50k) have been rescheduled for 2011-12 and the monies allocated this year will be carried forward to fund the works in the next financial year.
 - (h) The HR/Payroll system £60k will not be spent in 2010/11, due to ongoing investigations into joint working with other authorities for either payroll services or joint working

3. PROPOSALS

- 3.1 Overview and Scrutiny to note the current spend position.

4. BENEFITS AND SUSTAINABILITY

- 4.1 Careful monitoring of the budgets enables greater information on the likely outturn position which enables improved treasury management interest forecasts

as predicted underspends or slippages can be incorporated when calculating the likely outturn position for investment income.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

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

6. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS/OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

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

7. RISKS AND HOW THEY WILL BE MITIGATED

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

8. TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

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

Report Author: David Lawrence Chief Accountant (01784 446471).

Background Papers: There are none.

DECEMBER 2010

CAPITAL BUDGET MONITORING 2010/2011

SCHEME	ORIGINAL BUDGET	CARRY FORWARDS FROM 09/10	REVISED BUDGET	ACTUAL TO DATE	COMMITMENTS	PROJECTED OUTTURN
	£	£	£	£	£	£
Housing Investment Programme	560,900	25,000	585,900	497,510	85,079	542,400
New Schemes Fund - Capital Projects	300,000	99,200	399,200	233,270	307,914	556,700
Other Services Programme	1,143,500	438,400	1,581,900	573,974	159,716	1,355,300
CAPITAL PROGRAMME TOTAL	2,004,400	562,600	2,567,000	1,304,755	552,709	2,454,400

Capital Monitoring Report Up to Period December 1011

<u>Cost Centre</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Full Yr Original</u>	<u>Full Yr Revised</u>	<u>Actuals YTD</u>	<u>Commitment</u>	<u>Total YTD</u>	<u>Mgr Proj</u>	<u>Comments</u>
HIP								
40114	Housing Enabling Fund	105,000	105,000	85,000	40,000	125,000	125,000	Earlier than expected completion at one site
Heather Morgan		105,000	105,000	85,000	40,000	125,000	125,000	
40601	Wall/Loft Insulation	25,000	50,000	1,686	23,776	25,463	25,500	A new contractor was taken on and resource issues are restricting the amount of work that can be carried out in the 1st year
Catherine Munro		25,000	50,000	1,686	23,776	25,463	25,500	
40203	Disabled Facilities Mandatory DCLG grant funding	452,000	452,000	304,121	0	304,121	452,000	£285k grant from DCLG awarded
		-285,000	-285,000				-285,000	
40204	Disabled Facilities Discretion	29,600	29,600	0	0	0	29,600	Will continue to be managed to ensure against significant overspend.
40205	Home Repair Assistance Grants	189,000	189,000	82,657	16,303	98,960	150,000	£4200 Carry Forward in budget
40207	Equity Release Scheme	10,000	10,000	0	5,000	5,000	10,000	No comment received from Manager, therefore assumed to be on budget
40209	Home Improvement Agency Grant	35,300	35,300	24,046	0	24,046	35,300	No comment received from Manager, therefore assumed to be on budget
Lee O'Neil		430,900	430,900	410,824	21,303	432,127	391,900	
Total For	HIP	560,900	585,900	497,510	85,079	582,589	542,400	

<u>Cost Centre</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Full Yr Original</u>	<u>Full Yr Revised</u>	<u>Actuals YTD</u>	<u>Commitment</u>	<u>Total YTD</u>	<u>Mgr Proj</u>	<u>Comments</u>
NSF								
41326	Sunbury Improvement Project	166,600	199,800	11,095	199,399	210,494	211,000	Total over these three should amount to circa £600k in 10/11 against current capital of £500k
41327	Shepperton Improvement Projec	166,700	194,900	135,416	78,952	214,368	215,000	Total over these three should amount to circa £600k in 10/11 against current capital of £500k
41328	Ashford Improvement Project	166,700	200,100	19,705	27,304	47,009	50,000	Total over these three should amount to circa £600k in 10/11 against current capital of £500k
	SCC Match Funding	-200,000	-200,000	0		0	-300,000	
Nigel Lynn		300,000	394,800	166,216	305,655	471,872	476,000	
42049	Hawke Park	0	200	67,054	1,591	68,645	80,000	Construction costs to be offset by income already received from SCC
42052	Shortwood South Footpath	0	0	0	667	667	700	Funded by income from SCC
42505	Playground Upgrade Unallocated	0	4,200	0	0	0	0	0
Sandy Muirhead		0	4,400	67,054	2,258	69,312	80,700	
Total For	NSF	300,000	399,200	233,270	307,914	541,184	556,700	

<u>Cost Centre</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Full Yr Original</u>	<u>Full Yr Revised</u>	<u>Actuals YTD</u>	<u>Commitment</u>	<u>Total YTD</u>	<u>Mgr Proj</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Other								
41024	5 a-side-pitches	0	20,800	38,400	0	38,400	38,400	A special creditor was not raised for a invoice paid in May, that should have being included in the previous years accounts. - £20800 Carry Forward in addition to budget

41624	Power Perfector Project	0	0	8,791	0	8,791	8,800	Funded by Salix fund
Cathy Munro		0	20,800	47,191	0	47,191	47,200	
41319	Lammas Park	0	0	6,200	2,320	8,520	9,000	Feasibility Studies, over spend to be covered by Sea Cadets underspend
41325	Lammas Sea Cadets Relocation	0	10,800	0	1,594	1,594	2,000	Full budget will be used - £10800 Carry Forward in addition to budget
41612	Clockhouse Lane	50,000	50,000	1,870	2,000	3,870	50,000	Expected to be completed by the end of this year
41618	Esso Site Stanwell	0	6,900	0	6,881	6,881	6,900	Consultants costs re site investigation.
41020	Leisure Centres - Major Works	0	11,400	0	0	0	0	No comment received from Manager, therefore assumed to be on budget - £11400 Carry Forward in addition to budget
42011	BENWELL DAY CENTRE	0	0	26	0	26	0	No comment received from Manager, therefore assumed to be on budget
Dave Phillips		50,000	79,100	8,096	12,795	20,892	67,900	
43304	GOSS - Website Upgrade	50,000	50,000	0	0	0	50,000	No comment received from Manager, therefore assumed to be on budget
43305	Document Management System	100,000	100,000	37,850	0	37,850	100,000	No comment received from Manager, therefore assumed to be on budget
43307	EHBC Mobile Working	40,000	40,000	0	0	0	40,000	Resources unavailable, defer until 11/12
43505	CRM Solution	160,000	160,000	0	0	0	0	Resources unavailable, defer until 11/12
43601	Remote & Mobile Working	0	0	0	590	590	0	No comment received from Manager
Diksha Vyas		350,000	350,000	37,850	590	38,440	190,000	
43001	Web & Intranet General	10,000	10,000	2,400	3,405	5,805	10,000	Total IT budget to be spent
43002	Website Enhancement	10,000	10,000	1,953	753	2,706	5,000	Total IT budget to be spent
43101	Contract/Doc Mangmt	10,000	10,000	0	0	0	8,000	Total IT budget to be spent
43201	Payments	0	0	7,593	9,938	17,531	20,000	Total IT budget to be spent
43301	Finance Suite	10,000	10,000	1,750	2,025	3,775	10,000	Total IT budget to be spent
43302	Payroll/HR	10,000	10,000	0	0	0	0	Total IT budget to be spent
43306	Geographical Info System	0	0	500	0	500	500	Total IT budget to be spent
43501	Revenues & Benefits	30,000	30,000	28,324	26,765	55,088	56,000	Total IT budget to be spent
43502	Housing Support	30,000	30,000	11,700	0	11,700	15,000	Total IT budget to be spent
43506	TLC	0	0	500	0	500	500	Total IT budget to be spent
43508	Elections	0	0	897	210	1,107	2,000	Total IT budget to be spent
43514	LILA	0	0	0	0	0	500	
43602	Secure Networking	30,000	30,000	18,320	1,110	19,430	25,000	Total IT budget to be spent
43603	Server Updates	30,000	30,000	809	0	809	10,000	Total IT budget to be spent
43604	Desktop Upgrades	50,000	50,000	32,937	142	33,079	45,000	Total IT budget to be spent
43605	Telephone/Data Communications	0	0	2,980	6,039	9,019	10,000	Total IT budget to be spent
43606	Misc software	20,000	20,000	11,231	4,683	15,914	18,000	Total IT budget to be spent
43607	Printing	10,000	10,000	67	11,185	11,252	15,000	Total IT budget to be spent
Helen Dunn		250,000	250,000	121,961	66,255	188,215	250,500	
41609	VERGE MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT	60,000	60,000	63,434	0	63,434	63,400	Overspend to come from 41620 budget
41620	Wheelie Bins	100,000	100,000	83,631	2,880	86,511	96,600	Will be spent on Wheelie bins this year once the new ESPO framework contract has been agreed by legal
42041	Recreation/Playground Fencing	0	0	9,951	169	10,120	10,100	Carry forward request from last year for Sunbury Cem fencing
Jackie Taylor		160,000	160,000	157,016	3,049	160,065	170,100	
41608	HR and Payroll system	0	60,000	0	0	0	60,000	Deferred until 2011/12 - £60000 Carry Forward in addition to budget
Jan Hunt		0	60,000	0	0	0	60,000	
41315	Cont Land Investigation	57,500	57,500	-3,786	30,347	26,561	57,500	Not yet in a position to anticipate making a payback to DEFRA of any underspend, carry forward expected.
Lee O'Neil		57,500	57,500	-3,786	30,347	26,561	57,500	

40103	Community Alarm System	20,000	31,000	19,227	0	19,227	31,000	No comment received from Manager, therefore assumed to be on budget - £11000 Carry Forward in addition to budget
41025	Pavillion Conversion	0	0	92	0	92	0	No comment received from Manager, therefore assumed to be on budget
41035	Bowls Club self management	50,000	90,800	49,403	963	50,366	90,800	No comment received from Manager, therefore assumed to be on budget - £40800 Carry Forward in addition to budget
41036	Soft Play Area (BLF)	0	0	15,200	0	15,200	0	BLF income received to cover expenditure
41037	Long Lane Play Area (BLF)	0	0	299	0	299	0	BLF income received to cover expenditure
42010	Stanwell Day Centre	0	0	792	792	1,585	1,600	Legal costs associated with sale of Stanwell Centre
Liz Borthwick		70,000	121,800	85,013	1,755	86,769	123,400	
41203	Tennis Courts	30,000	67,800	37,797	0	37,797	67,800	No comment received from Manager, therefore assumed to be on budget - £37800 Carry Forward in addition to budget
41309	Critical Ditches	30,000	73,500	10,550	0	10,550	73,500	No comment received from Manager, therefore assumed to be on budget - £43500 Carry Forward in addition to budget
41317	Car Park Improvements	20,000	43,200	0	0	0	43,200	No comment received from Manager, therefore assumed to be on budget - £23200 Carry Forward in addition to budget
41321	Solar P&D Machines	0	2,000	0	0	0	2,000	No comment received from Manager, therefore assumed to be on budget - £1900 Carry Forward in addition to budget
41625	Tothill Car Park Lighting	0	0	21,812	0	21,812	21,800	Funded by Salix fund
41626	Quattro Seal	0	0	0	43,000	43,000	43,000	Funded by Salix fund
41627	Salix Low Carbon M'ment Prog	40,900	40,900	0	0	0	0	Funded by Salix fund
41628	Day Centre TRVs	0	0	2,250	0	2,250	2,300	Funded by Salix fund
41629	Day Centre EE Lighting	0	0	7,277	0	7,277	7,300	Funded by Salix fund
42037	Biffa Award Match Funding	25,000	72,300	13,190	0	13,190	25,000	No comment received from Manager, therefore assumed to be on budget - £47300 Carry Forward in addition to budget
42040	Allotments	10,000	25,000	0	1,925	1,925	25,000	No comment received from Manager, therefore assumed to be on budget - £15000 Carry Forward in addition to budget
42044	Compost Bins	0	40,000	0	0	0	0	No Longer needed for 1011 as we have sufficient stock of bins - £40000 Carry Forward in addition to budget
Sandy Muirhead		155,900	364,700	92,875	44,925	137,800	310,900	
45002	Capital Salaries	50,000	50,000	0	0	0	50,000	
Terry Collier		50,000	50,000	0	0	0	50,000	
41604	Stanwell CCTV	0	68,000	0	0	0	0	0 Scheme defered until 2012/12 by Stanwell New Start - £68000 Carry Forward in addition to budget
41616	Safer Stronger Community fund	0	0	27,757	0	27,757	27,800	No comment received from Manager
Tim Kita		0	68,000	27,757	0	27,757	27,800	
Total For	Other	1,143,400	1,581,900	573,974	159,716	733,691	1,355,300	
Grand Total		2,004,300	2,567,000	1,304,755	552,709	1,857,464	2,454,400	

Capital Monitoring Report Up to Period December 1011

<u>Cost Centre</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Full Yr Original</u>	<u>Full Yr Revised</u>	<u>Actuals YTD</u>	<u>Commitment</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Mgr Proj</u>	<u>Comments</u>
HIP								
40114	Housing Enabling Fund	105,000	105,000	85,000	40,000	125,000	125,000	Earlier than expected completion at one site
Heather Morgan		105,000	105,000	85,000	40,000	125,000	125,000	
40601	Wall/Loft Insulation	25,000	50,000	1,686	23,776	25,463	25,500	A new contractor was taken on and resource issues are restricting the amount of work that can be carried out in the 1st year
Catherine Munro		25,000	50,000	1,686	23,776	25,463	25,500	
40203	Disabled Facilities Mandatory	167,000	167,000	304,121	0	304,121	167,000	£285k grant from DCLG awarded
40204	Disabled Facilities Discretion	29,600	29,600	0	0	0	29,600	Will continue to be managed to ensure against significant overspend.
40205	Home Repair Assistance Grants	189,000	189,000	82,657	16,303	98,960	150,000	
40207	Equity Release Scheme	10,000	10,000	0	5,000	5,000	10,000	No comment received from Manager, therefore assumed to be on budget
40209	Home Improvement Agency Grant	35,300	35,300	24,046	0	24,046	35,300	No comment received from Manager, therefore assumed to be on budget
Lee O'Neil		430,900	430,900	410,824	21,303	432,127	391,900	
Total For	HIP	560,900	585,900	497,510	85,079	582,589	542,400	

Capital Monitoring Report Up to Period December 1011

<u>Cost Centre</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Full Yr</u> <u>Original</u>	<u>Full Yr</u> <u>Revised</u>	<u>Actuals</u> <u>YTD</u>	<u>Commitment</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Mgr Proj</u>	<u>Comments</u>
NSF								
41326	Sunbury Improvement Project	166,600	199,800	11,095	199,399	210,494	211,000	Total over these three should amount to circa £600k in 10/11 against current capital of £500k
41327	Shepperton Improvement Projec	166,700	194,900	135,416	78,952	214,368	215,000	Total over these three should amount to circa £600k in 10/11 against current capital of £500k
41328	Ashford Improvement Project	166,700	200,100	19,705	27,304	47,009	50,000	Total over these three should amount to circa £600k in 10/11 against current capital of £500k
	SCC Match Funding	-200,000	-200,000	0		0	-300,000	
Nigel Lynn		300,000	394,800	166,216	305,655	471,872	476,000	
42049	Hawke Park	0	200	67,054	1,591	68,645	80,000	Construction costs to be offset by income already received from SCC
42052	Shortwood South Footpath	0	0	0	667	667	700	Funded by income from SCC
42505	Playground Upgrade Unallocated	0	4,200	0	0	0	0	0
Sandy Muirhead		0	4,400	67,054	2,258	69,312	80,700	
Total For	NSF	300,000	399,200	233,270	307,914	541,184	556,700	

Capital Monitoring Report Up to Period December 1011

<u>Cost Centre</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Full Yr</u> <u>Original</u>	<u>Full Yr</u> <u>Revised</u>	<u>Actuals</u> <u>YTD</u>	<u>Commitment</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Mgr Proj</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Other								
41024	5 a-side-pitches	0	20,800	38,400	0	38,400	38,400	A special creditor was not raised for a invoice paid in May, that should have being included in the previous years accounts.
41624	Power Perfector Project	0	0	8,791	0	8,791	8,800	Funded by Salix fund
Cathy Munro		0	20,800	47,191	0	47,191	47,200	
41319	Lammas Park	0	0	6,200	2,320	8,520	9,000	Feasibility Studies, over spend to be covered by Sea Cadets underspend
41325	Lammas Sea Cadets Relocation	0	10,800	0	1,594	1,594	2,000	Full budget will be used
41612	Clockhouse Lane	50,000	50,000	1,870	2,000	3,870	50,000	Expected to be completed by the end of this year
41618	Esso Site Stanwell	0	6,900	0	6,881	6,881	6,900	Consultants costs re site investigation as agreed by NL in 2008
41020	Leisure Centres - Major Works	0	11,400	0	0	0	0	No comment received from Manager, therefore assumed to be on budget
42011	BENWELL DAY CENTRE	0	0	26	0	26	0	No comment received from Manager, therefore assumed to be on budget
Dave Phillips		50,000	79,100	8,096	12,795	20,892	67,900	
43304	GOSS - Website Upgrade	50,000	50,000	0	0	0	50,000	No comment received from Manager, therefore assumed to be on budget
43305	Document Management System	100,000	100,000	37,850	0	37,850	100,000	No comment received from Manager, therefore assumed to be on budget
43307	EHBC Mobile Working	40,000	40,000	0	0	0	40,000	Resources unavailable, defer until 11/12
43505	CRM Solution	160,000	160,000	0	0	0	0	Resources unavailable, defer until 11/12
43601	Remote & Mobile Working	0	0	0	590	590	0	No comment received from Manager
Diksha Vyas		350,000	350,000	37,850	590	38,440	190,000	

Capital Monitoring Report Up to Period December 1011

Cost Centre	Description	Full Yr	Full Yr	Actuals	Commitment	Total	Mgr Proj	Comments
		Original	Revised	YTD				
43001	Web & Intranet General	10,000	10,000	2,400	3,405	5,805	10,000	Total IT budget on target to be spent
43002	Website Enhancement	10,000	10,000	1,953	753	2,706	5,000	
43101	Contract/Doc Mangmt	10,000	10,000	0	0	0	8,000	
43201	Payments	0	0	7,593	9,938	17,531	20,000	
43301	Finance Suite	10,000	10,000	1,750	2,025	3,775	10,000	
43302	Payroll/HR	10,000	10,000	0	0	0	0	
43306	Geographical Info System	0	0	500	0	500	500	
43501	Revenues & Benefits	30,000	30,000	28,324	26,765	55,088	56,000	
43502	Housing Support	30,000	30,000	11,700	0	11,700	15,000	
43506	TLC	0	0	500	0	500	500	
43508	Elections	0	0	897	210	1,107	2,000	
43514	LILA	0	0	0	0	0	500	
43602	Secure Networking	30,000	30,000	18,320	1,110	19,430	25,000	
43603	Server Updates	30,000	30,000	809	0	809	10,000	
43604	Desktop Upgrades	50,000	50,000	32,937	142	33,079	45,000	
43605	Telephone/Data Communications	0	0	2,980	6,039	9,019	10,000	
43606	Misc software	20,000	20,000	11,231	4,683	15,914	18,000	
43607	Printing	10,000	10,000	67	11,185	11,252	15,000	
Helen Dunn		250,000	250,000	121,961	66,255	188,215	250,500	
41609	VERGE MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT	60,000	60,000	63,434	0	63,434	63,400	Overspend to come from 41620 budget
41620	Wheelie Bins	100,000	100,000	83,631	2,880	86,511	96,600	Will be spent on Wheelie bins this year once the new ESPO framework contract has been agreed by legal
42041	Recreation/Playground Fencing	0	0	9,951	169	10,120	10,100	Carry forward request from last year for Sunbury Cem fencing
Jackie Taylor		160,000	160,000	157,016	3,049	160,065	170,100	
41608	HR and Payroll system	0	60,000	0	0	0	60,000	Deferred until 2011/12
Jan Hunt		0	60,000	0	0	0	60,000	
41315	Cont Land Investigation	57,500	57,500	-3,786	30,347	26,561	57,500	Not yet in a position to anticipate making a payback to DEFRA of any underspend, carry forward expected.
Lee O'Neil		57,500	57,500	-3,786	30,347	26,561	57,500	

Capital Monitoring Report Up to Period December 1011

<u>Cost Centre</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Full Yr Original</u>	<u>Full Yr Revised</u>	<u>Actuals YTD</u>	<u>Commitment</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Mgr Proj</u>	<u>Comments</u>
40103	Community Alarm System	20,000	31,000	19,227	0	19,227	31,000	No comment received from Manager, therefore assumed to be on budget
41025	Pavillion Conversion	0	0	92	0	92	0	No comment received from Manager, therefore assumed to be on budget
41035	Bowls Club self management	50,000	90,800	49,403	963	50,366	90,800	No comment received from Manager, therefore assumed to be on budget
41036	Soft Play Area (BLF)	0	0	15,200	0	15,200	0	BLF income received to cover expenditure
41037	Long Lane Play Area (BLF)	0	0	299	0	299	0	BLF income received to cover expenditure
42010	Stanwell Day Centre	0	0	792	792	1,585	1,600	Legal costs associated with sale of Stanwell Centre
Liz Borthwick		70,000	121,800	85,013	1,755	86,769	123,400	
41203	Tennis Courts	30,000	67,800	37,797	0	37,797	67,800	No comment received from Manager, therefore assumed to be on budget
41309	Critical Ditches	30,000	73,500	10,550	0	10,550	73,500	No comment received from Manager, therefore assumed to be on budget
41317	Car Park Improvements	20,000	43,200	0	0	0	43,200	No comment received from Manager, therefore assumed to be on budget
41321	Solar P&D Machines	0	2,000	0	0	0	2,000	No comment received from Manager, therefore assumed to be on budget
41625	Tothill Car Park Lighting	0	0	21,812	0	21,812	21,800	Funded by Salix fund
41626	Quattro Seal	0	0	0	43,000	43,000	43,000	Funded by Salix fund
41627	Salix Low Carbon M'ment Prog	40,900	40,900	0	0	0	0	Funded by Salix fund
41628	Day Centre TRVs	0	0	2,250	0	2,250	2,300	Funded by Salix fund
41629	Day Centre EE Lighting	0	0	7,277	0	7,277	7,300	Funded by Salix fund
42037	Biffa Award Match Funding	25,000	72,300	13,190	0	13,190	25,000	No comment received from Manager, therefore assumed to be on budget
42040	Allotments	10,000	25,000	0	1,925	1,925	25,000	No comment received from Manager, therefore assumed to be on budget
42044	Compost Bins	0	40,000	0	0	0	0	No longer needed for 1011 as we have sufficient stock of bins
Sandy Muirhead		155,900	364,700	92,875	44,925	137,800	310,900	

Capital Monitoring Report Up to Period December 1011

<u>Cost Centre</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Full Yr</u> <u>Original</u>	<u>Full Yr</u> <u>Revised</u>	<u>Actuals</u> <u>YTD</u>	<u>Commitment</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Mgr Proj</u>	<u>Comments</u>
45002	Capital Salaries	50,000	50,000	0	0	0	50,000	
Terry Collier		50,000	50,000	0	0	0	50,000	
41604	Stanwell CCTV	0	68,000	0	0	0		0 Scheme defered until 2012/12 by Stanwell New Start
41616	Safer Stronger Community fund	0	0	27,757	0	27,757	27,800	No comment received from Manager
Tim Kita		0	68,000	27,757	0	27,757	27,800	
Total For	Other	1,143,500	1,581,900	573,974	159,716	733,691	1,355,300	

Sustainable Development Strategy Update

Overview and Scrutiny: 1 February 2011

Reesolution Required

Report of the Deputy Chief Executive

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

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

The Sustainable Development Strategy (SDS) aims to enable all people living and working within the borough to enjoy the best quality of life without compromising the needs of future generations.

Purpose of Report

This report is to update members on the progress made on the Sustainable Development Action Plans (SDAPs).

Key Issues

Identification of projects progression against the Sustainable Development Action Plans. This will include the energy savings made, progress of sustainable procurement tools and increases in recycling rates.

Financial Implications

Further savings are anticipated through the ongoing work of delivering the SDS and the savings made so far are identified in this report.

Corporate Priority

Environment, Housing, Healthy Community, Community Engagement, and Sustainable Financial Future.

Officer Recommendations

***The Overview and Scrutiny Committee is asked to recommend to the Cabinet that the update be accepted as an accurate record of progress against the Sustainable Development Strategy and ask that a further update be provided in [6] months.**

**Contact: Lucy McSherry, 01784 444279
Portfolio Holder: Councillor Gerry Forsbrey**

MAIN REPORT

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 The Sustainable Development Strategy was adopted by the Cabinet in the Spring 2009 and the SDS Delivery Board was established to monitor, review and steer the actions within the Sustainable Development Action Plans (appendix 1)
- 1.2 The aims of the SDS are encapsulated in the integrated approach to a wide variety of projects that aim to improve the standard of living of our residents whilst not jeopardising the needs of future generations.
- 1.3 The primary aim of the Sustainability agenda is to ensure that all areas of the council's work and service delivery are taking account of the longer term implications.

2. KEY ISSUES

- 2.1 In these difficult economic times improving the sustainability of our work makes financial sense. Reducing energy costs and wastage across the council's work and in our borough will have both environmental and financial benefits.
- 2.2 The Sustainable Development Action Plans (SDAP – Appendix 1) that were derived from the SDS are divided into 8 areas; Energy and Climate Change, Water, Biodiversity and Green Spaces, Transport, Waste, Sustainable Procurement, Planning and Awareness Raising.
- 2.3 Progress has been made against all of these action plans. A summary of which is included (appendix 2).
- 2.4 The headlines projects can be summarised as –
 - (a) Salix Energy Efficiency projects such as the Tothill Car Park which had saved ~£12,000 in the first four months after the schemes were implemented. Similar projects are planned at both the Elmsleigh and Bridge St car parks.
 - (b) Combined Heat and Power (CHP) project in partnership with SLM which will locally generate electricity and heat for the Leisure Centre and Council Offices whilst reducing energy usage and financial spend
 - (c) Reducing waste and increasing recycling rates – both in-house and within the borough.
 - (d) On-going activities within the community, raising awareness of environmental issues amongst students, residents and businesses.
 - (e) Development of a Sustainable Procurement Strategy which aims to target and influence the supply chain to ensure sustainability is being accounted for.
 - (f) On-going awareness raising amongst Council employees outlining benefits of reducing energy usage and waste.

3. OPTIONS ANALYSIS

- 3.1 Receive this report and the associated Update of Action Areas as an accurate and acceptable summary of progression made against the actions of the SDS
- 3.2 Provide suggestions and feedback and ask questions regarding any of the projects/initiatives in the SDAPs.

4. PROPOSALS

- 4.1 Proposals of projects included within the SDAP are largely actioned by the SDS Delivery Board and where specific projects need Cabinet approval they are reported on.

5. BENEFITS AND SUSTAINABILITY

- 5.1 All proposals, projects and initiatives within the SDAP have sustainability benefits aiming to enable a longer term view of the councils' business and the lives of our residents.

6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 The Tothill Project was a prime example of how sustainability has financial implications. It has created significant savings and the work of the Sustainability Team continues to identify and deliver on these areas of opportunity.
- 6.2 Examples of a selection of projects already delivered and planned and their financial implications are highlighted below.

Project	Costs	Savings / Outcomes	Payback
Tothill Car Park	£63,567	£13,285 pa 67 tonnes CO2 pa	4.7 yrs
Knowle Green projects	£140,627	£35,490 pa 222 tonnes CO2 pa	~3.9 yrs
CHP	Still tendering	Electricity and heat of Leisure Centre and KG to be provided	Over life of contract

- 6.3 Reduction of waste and increases in efficiency will have an impact on reducing costs, such as printing costs, electricity costs, unnecessary stationary orders etc.

6.4 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS / OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- 6.5 No legal implications
- 6.6 Other strategies and departments are being worked with to increase the understanding of sustainability and ensuring that services are taking account of their wider impacts.

7. RISKS AND HOW THEY WILL BE MITIGATED

- 7.1 Reduction in resource will decrease the delivery capability of the SDS and the associated cost savings that the work generates.

8. TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

- 8.1 Work to achieve the SDAPs is ongoing, however;
- (a) the CHP project will be completed by Winter 2011
 - (b) work on Bridge St and Elmsleigh Car Park will begin in Spring 2011
 - (c) Developers and Planning Officers Guide will be finalised by Spring 2011

- (d) Sustainable Procurement progress will be formalised through the Flexible Framework by April 2011
- (e) Increasing recycling rates is on-going

Report Author: Lucy McSherry, Sustainability and Waste Policy Officer, 01784 444279

Background Papers:

Appendix 1 - Sustainable Development Action Plans

Appendix 2 – SDS Update Action Areas

Appendix 1 - SDS Update on Action Plans

Action Area	Achieved	Planned – deliverables	Officer responsible
Energy and Climate Change	<p>Council estate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Energy audit of all council buildings carried out and top 10 users targeted • Salix funding invest-to-save measures maximum payback time of 5 years including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Tothill Car Park energy bills reduced by >50% saving ~£20,000 (Apr-Nov 2010) lighting and Powerperfector installation b) Knowle Green £23,000 saved including Powerperfector, energy efficient lighting, improved insulation and Powerdown boards c) Anticipated further £8,000 a yr saving from Draught-proofing windows • 6 Solar PV sites – to be reviewed and extended • Combined Heat and Power (CHP) project in partnership with SLM, generate electricity and heat for LC and Council Offices. (Currently out to tender) <p>Borough:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Events with Council staff, local schools, businesses and residents to encourage them to reduce their energy use in their homes/schools/places of business • Heat Project, Home Fit schemes to subsidise the installation of loft and cavity wall insulation for both vulnerable people and those with young children (EST survey 189 households had insulation installed 	<p>Knowle Green: Targeting high areas of usage to minimise energy usage and wastage</p> <p>KG and Leisure Centre: CHP – significant reduced spend (elec and gas) at KG and the Leisure Centre</p> <p>Car Parks: Improvements similar to Tothill project – financial and CO2 savings</p> <p>Solar: Review to be carried out to identify other sites – reduce energy usage, potential income generation lease roof space</p> <p>Borough: Further events, in partnership where possible</p>	<p>Project Manager: Francesca Nesbitt (Climate Change Officer)</p> <p>Monitoring: Mark Rachwal</p> <p>Project Manager: Lucy McSherry (Sustainability Policy Officer)</p>

Appendix 1 - SDS Update on Action Plans

	<p>April-December 2010)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensured Fuel Poverty was included as a priority in the Housing Strategy <p>Policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Member of the Surrey Climate Change Partnership and involved in Surrey-wide initiatives – including the Adaptation Work-stream of the SIP funded programme to address the risks posed to our county by predicted impacts of Climate Change Continue to promote and assist with the installation of renewable technologies in new developments in the borough Energy Policy currently being written 	<p>Policy – Surrey Climate Change Strategy, Renewable requirement of the LDF</p> <p>Vantage Point study identified areas of potential CO2 savings – these need to be realised</p> <p>Training for SPOA</p>	<p>FN and LM</p> <p>LM and FN</p> <p>LM</p>
<p>Water</p>	<p>Council estate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Investigated rain-water harvesting in a number of sites including Lammas Park it was not suitable in this case but will be considered in the future Eco-kettles in place, reduce over boiling and over filling <p>Borough:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Events with Council staff, local schools, businesses and residents to encourage them to reduce their water use in their homes/schools/places of business On-going increasing links with water providers Flood plan and Emergency Plan developed and implemented, in association with the work of critical 	<p>Council – Improve monitoring of water usage across our estate Decrease the water use – e.g. Waterless urinals investigated as part of toilet refurbishment, reduce capacity of cisterns</p>	<p>LM, Asset Mgmt</p> <p>LM, John Foggo</p> <p>LM, FN, NM</p>

Appendix 1 - SDS Update on Action Plans

	ditch clearance and adaptation to climate change work to minimise the risk of flooding		
Biodiversity and Green Spaces	<p>Council estate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Open Spaces and Allotment Strategies have been written and currently being consulted on <p>Borough:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue and increase work with local community groups and schools to develop knowledge and protection of local biodiversity 	<p>Implementation of two strategies</p> <p>Currently working toward a Higher Level Stewardship scheme</p>	<p>Sabena Sims</p> <p>Cynthia Bendickson</p> <p>CB and LM</p>
Transport	<p>Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff Survey carried out to assess travel to work patterns - evidence base for Green Travel Plan Green Fleet Review carried out by the Energy Saving Trust – potential savings need to be reviewed <p>Borough:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue and increase work with the schools publicising their School Travel Plans and promoting the safety aspects of alternative forms of travel to school Discuss with residents the air quality impacts of high levels of car transport. <p>Policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contributed to the Surrey LTP3 – ensuring local requirements incorporated and climate change concerns fed in. 	<p>Green Travel Plan:</p> <p>Reduce car commuter journeys and reduce business mileage - possibly introduce pool cars, car sharing, and better bike storage</p>	<p>LM, HR and Nigel Lynn</p> <p>LM</p> <p>LM, FN</p>

Appendix 1 - SDS Update on Action Plans

<p>Waste</p>	<p>Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Linked with Planning department promotion of composters and/or food digesters in new developments that can be implementing • In-house developments include better battery collection points which last year diverted 70kg of batteries from landfill. <p>Borough:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased recycling rate to 37% partly due to extension of Garden waste collection scheme. • Overall decrease in rubbish generated • Increase in reuse portion <p>Policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contributed to the recent review of the Joint Municipal Waste Strategy • Work with the SLGA and Surrey Waste Partnership on numerous Surrey-wide projects such as Love Food Hate Waste, and Furniture Reuse initiatives 	<p>Improved in-house recycling bins and more education of staff what can be recycled – increase in tonnage to be monitored</p> <p>Further work includes; diversion of bulky waste for reuse away from and conversion of difficult properties onto AWC</p> <p>Continual education in-house, with schools, businesses and residents</p>	<p>LM</p> <p>LM, MR Depot</p> <p>LM, MR</p>
<p>Sustainable Procurement</p>	<p>Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adopted a Sustainable Procurement Policy • Training being delivered for key procurement officers • Incorporating Sustainability elements into template PQQs and supplier questionnaires <p>Borough:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attended Spelthorne Business Forum and provide on-going advice for local businesses including 	<p>Engaging suppliers and business Adopted Flexible Framework Level 1 by the end of the financial year 10/11</p> <p>Review large contracts, suppliers, expenditures and highlight areas of opportunity</p>	<p>LM</p> <p>LM, NY, TC</p>

Appendix 1 - SDS Update on Action Plans

	Shepperton Studios.		
Planning	<p>Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training for Planning officers • Continue increase links with the planning department and developers to assist with general sustainability requirements 	Developing guidance document to help planners and developers understand the renewable requirements of the LDF	LM, Panning dept
Awareness Raising	Across Council staff and work, and throughout the borough and at all possible opportunities raise awareness of Sustainable Development and the three pillars of influence: the environment, the economy and society.		FN, LM, MR

Sustainable Development Action Plans

Sustainable Development Action Plans (SDAPs) should tackle challenges for SD in four organisational areas – Action Area are suggested by Sustainable Development Commission:

1. Policy – core remit of organisation
2. Operations – management of our estate and other activities supporting our work such as travel and procurement – Sustainable Operations on the Government Estate (SOGE)
3. Procurement – achieving a low carbon more resource efficient public sector – Sustainable Procurement Action Plan
4. People – promote and support SD approach in terms of staff and communities

Sustainability Priority (outlined in National Strategy):

1. Sustainable Consumption and Production
2. Climate Change and Energy
3. Natural Resource Protection
4. Sustainable Communities

**Parks and Open Spaces Strategy 2010
Resolution Required
Report Assistant Chief Executive
REPORT SUMMARY**

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

Parks and Open Spaces are essential to health, well-being and a sustainable environment if it is well used and maintained. A strategy on Parks and Open Spaces contributes to the quality of life of the community and wider stakeholder's network.

Purpose of Report

To present a ten year strategy (2010-2020) that sets out Spelthorne Borough Council's approach to conserving, managing and enhancing Parks and Open Spaces for the local community and visitors. The strategy sets out a framework for the future management and development of Spelthorne Borough's Parks and Open Spaces, which will allow costed proposals to be developed for individual's parks to support the strategic aims.

Key Issues

Spelthorne Borough Council's vision is to provide high quality, accessible parks and open spaces and associated facilities for the use of the Boroughs residents and visitors, for a variety of purposes, taking into account the resources which are available to provide and maintain the parks and open spaces.

Financial Implications

Council Financial and staff resources.

Applications for external funding are necessary to take forward potential projects from the strategy.

Corporate Priority:

A Cleaner and Greener Environment.

Supporting Younger People.

Officer Recommendations

The Cabinet is asked to adopt Option 1 of the attached Strategy for implementation.

Report Author: Sabena Sims – Parks Strategy Officer
Area of Responsibility: Liz Borthwick – Assistant Chief Executive
Cabinet member: Councillor Denise Grant

MAIN REPORT

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 This strategy replaces the Spelthorne Parks and Open Spaces Strategy 2003 - 2008. The strategy provides a clear and shared vision between the Community and Spelthorne Borough Council.
- 1.2 The strategy has evolved from feedback from a variety of internal stakeholders and concluded from discussions about the value and contribution that parks and open spaces make to the community.
- 1.3 Maximising outputs from existing resources and budgets to support the continual development and maintenance of parks and open space and is a key criteria in assessing future management.
- 1.4 Parks and open spaces are important in assisting with social inclusion and health and well-being, as well as promoting biological and ecological conservation and species diversity.

2. KEY ISSUES

- 2.1 Ensure the value for money that the service provides in delivering Spelthorne Borough Council policy.
- 2.2 To establish the value of open space in achieving corporate, strategic, community and stakeholders objectives.

3. OPTIONS ANALYSIS

3.1 Option 1

To adopt the parks and open spaces strategy and to implement the Action Plan as attached in Appendix 1.

3.2 Option 2

Not to adopt the strategy which will result in little strategic direction for parks and open spaces.

4. PROPOSALS

- 4.1 It is proposed that the cabinet adopt the parks and open space strategy.

5. BENEFITS AND SUSTAINABILITY

- 5.1 Well maintained and used parks and open spaces plays an important role in delivering a wide range of social, economic, climatic and environmental benefits to local communities and stakeholders.
- 5.2 The reduction of childhood obesity and other health issues.
- 5.3 Providing safe and exciting opportunity for play for younger children.
- 5.4 Dedicated teenage shelters and games areas.
- 5.5 Ecological, natural and semi-natural spaces and amenity grassland.

6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 A possible reduction in parks budgets could result in some non responsive works not taking place.

6.2 It is essential that Environment Services explore opportunities and apply for external funding for both parks and play. Previous success includes Liveability and Playbuilder - 50K

7. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS / OTHER CONSIDERATIONS [

7.1 There are none.

8. RISKS AND HOW THEY WILL BE MITIGATED

There is a risk that there is little budget available to implement the Action Plan. This will be mitigated by applying for external funding for projects.

9. TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

9.1 If adopted, the strategy will be sent out to all stakeholders in February 2011.

Report Author: Sabena Sims, Parks Strategy Officer
Background Papers: Appendix One



**10 Year
(2010-2020)
Parks and Open Space
Strategy**

For

Spelthorne Borough Council

Contents		Page
1.0	Executive Summary	4
2.0	Introduction and Methodology	5
3.0	Planning Policy Guidance (PPG17)	6
4.0	Benefits and Value of Open Space	6
5.0	What is the Purpose of an Open Space Strategy?	8
6.0	A Vision for Spelthorne’s Open Spaces linked to Stakeholder Engagement	9
7.0	Local Context, Policy and Open Space Needs and Priorities	9
8.0	Objectives of the Open Space Strategy	14
9.0	Development of an Open Space Hierarchy	14
10.0	Management and Operational Delivery of the Ground Maintenance Service	15
11.0	Typology and Taxonomy	16
12.0	Proposed Quality Assessment Standard	25
13.0	Recommendations, Action Plan and Next Steps	28
14.0	Policy Framework	28
15.0	Review of the Open Space Strategy	28
16.0	Quality Assessment	29

17.0	Proposed Action Plan and Next Steps	30
-------------	--	-----------

Appendices

1.	Council Priorities	31
2.	Green Flag Award Standard	32

1.0 Executive Summary

Parks and Open spaces are essential to health, well-being and a sustainable environment; this is particularly the case when it is also well-used and maintained and contributes to the quality of life of the community and the wider stakeholder networks they serve. Recent survey evidence produced by Cabe Space shows how much the public values well designed and managed Parks and Open Spaces.

This strategy supersedes the previous strategy 2003 – 2008 and sets out Spelthorne Borough Council's approach to preserving, managing and enhancing parks and open spaces for the local community and visitors alike. Crucial to achieving valued parks and open spaces is investment in their infrastructure and the skill base of the staff that manages and maintains them. Spelthorne Borough Council recognises that encouraging a realistic, proactive, strategic approach to the provision and care of parks and open spaces will result in raising their profile and ensure they meet the needs of the community.

This Parks and Open Space Strategy will achieve this by developing a clear and shared vision amongst its variety of stakeholders that demonstrates the contribution that parks and open spaces makes to the wider health and environmental agendas. The strategy will also focus on promoting a sense of 'Civic Pride' whilst maximising the outcomes from existing resources and spending, and through leveraging-in external funding.

The strategy has been developed to complement the council's community and other strategic plans, ensuring that there is a joined up focus that will contribute to the borough-wide planning policy and defence of its valued open spaces.

The strategy will guide the council's policy and operational work by:

- Providing a clear and shared vision between the community, and other stakeholders.
- Establish the value of parks and open spaces in achieving corporate, strategic, community and stakeholders' objectives and its role in delivering a sustainable Playing and Sports Pitch strategy.
- Enhance the quality of life of local communities and the environment by promoting a sense of Civic Pride in their parks and open spaces.
- Developing biodiversity action plans, and open space park plans.
- Maximising outputs from existing resources and budgets to support the continual development and maintenance of parks and open spaces.
- Establish clear criteria for prioritisation and the allocation of revenue and capital budgets and for bidding for external funding.
- Establish the Value for Money that the service provides in delivering council wide policy.
- Ensure that a Quality Assessment system and methodology is applied to continually monitor the delivery of Ground Maintenance services and the wider application of council policy imperatives.
- Provide a strong Branding and Marketing rationale.

At the core of this strategy is the Action Plan, which combines a series of recommendations, and targeted enhancements to existing Parks and Open Spaces.

2.0 Introduction and Methodology

2.1 Scope of the Strategy

This strategy embraces park and open spaces but excludes allotments, burial grounds, the nursery, and rural common land, though these do provide important open spaces for major activities. In all, the borough's open space provision totals 80 parks and open spaces within Spelthorne.

Planning Policy Guidance note 17 (Planning for Open Spaces, Sport and Recreation (2002) advises that an open space strategy should set local standards based on assessments of need and audits of existing facilities. Spelthorne Borough Council has previously commissioned several assessments of the supply and demand of open space within Spelthorne, e.g. by PMP in 2005, with much of the data still relevant to the current situation.

The Spelthorne Parks and Open Space Strategy (2010) builds on this work and seeks to integrate it within a local, regional and national context which defines the value and role of parks and open space within Spelthorne and sets out a framework for the boroughs future approach to the management and development of parks and open spaces. Importantly, this strategy provides a concise action plan and operationally affordable solutions to current dilemmas of resource availability and operational capability within the context of a flexible strategic approach.

2.3 Definition of Open Space:

PPG17 defines open space as:

“All open space of public value, including not just land, but also areas of water such as rivers, canals, lakes and reservoirs which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation and can also act as a visual amenity”. This strategy is aimed at opens space recreational land specifically.

2.4 The Urban Green Spaces Task Force

This Task Force was established to develop proposals to improve urban parks, play areas and green spaces. Its report contained 52 ground breaking recommendations to Government. In essence the report emphasises the diverse value of urban open spaces, and the potential for them to make a major contribution to urban regeneration, by;

- enhancing the environment, through the powers of regeneration;
- facilitating social inclusion;
- contributing to healthy living;
- providing interpretation and educational opportunities;

The Task Force's view was that it is essential to have what it describes as a 'Master Plan', what is now more usually referred to as a strategy. In this way green space planning must be at the heart of urban regeneration and spatial planning.

3.0 Planning Policy Guidance on Open Space, Sport and Recreation (PPG 17)

This policy was up-dated by a publication by the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) in July 2002 revising the Planning Policy Guidance Note (PPG 17) on Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation. At the present time there are proposals to review this guidance further. The note emphasised the role Open Space plays in people's quality of life, assisting urban recovery and promoting social inclusion, contributing to health and well being. All these matters remain relevant to current political and public policy.

PPG 17 provides guidance to local planning authorities in respect of planning policies that will be appropriate to protect existing open spaces and to secure adequate provision of high quality, well managed public Open Spaces. Although for many planning authorities, this arrangement is considered to have reached the limits of its influence, and that it requires refining and modifying, however, it is still the most convincing approach currently available.

3.1 Living Places, Cleaner, Safer, Greener

Although published in 2002, it is still very much appropriate to current dilemmas and policy making, setting out four challenges for local councils:

- the adoption of an holistic approach to planning, and implementation of its network of policies and responsibilities;
- ending the lack of action that leads to a decline in the quality of open spaces;
- engaging with all members of the community.
- the need to base policy making on known and forecast patterns of demography;

It goes on to list five means to achieve the ends it regards as crucial:

1. leadership;
2. partnership;
3. community engagement and involvement;
4. quality and innovation;
5. effective communication of ideas, marketing (and Branding) of the service and its contribution to the above.

4.0 Benefits and Value of Parks and Open Spaces

Well maintained and used parks and open space plays an important role in delivering a wide range of social, economic, climatic, and environmental benefits to local communities and stakeholders. Their impact within the borough of Spelthorne is achieved at a number of different but complimentary levels:

- i. parks and formal recreation facilities.
- ii. children's play facilities.
- iii. dedicated teenage shelters and games areas.
- iv. well designed and maintained civic spaces.
- v. ecological, natural and semi-natural spaces and amenity grassland.

Furthermore, the contribution of open space to the regeneration of neighbourhoods and as a focus for renewal projects and attracting investment is unparalleled. For example, in recent years the impact of quality open space on house prices, tourism, and places to live and work is well recorded. For town centres, a well maintained environment is acknowledged as a vital ingredient to attract inward investment, new businesses and to increase visitor numbers. Parks and open spaces also play a role in attracting children and young people to visit, thereby contributing to their health and creating the habit of using parks and open spaces which in all probability will remain with them into their teens and beyond.

4.1. Value of Parks and Open Space

Standards of provision have been developed for the following categories of open space where it is important that local needs are provided for locally on a consistent basis:

- Parks and Open Spaces.
- Provision for children and teenagers.
- Outdoor sports fields and playing field needs.
- Natural or semi-natural greenspace.

The following, locally applied, methodology and standards are proposed:

- The context of the open space including local open space needs, park deficiencies, site access arrangements and barriers to access to and within the open space;
- The recreational function performed by the open space, particularly the provision of sports areas, informal and formal;
- The structural role of open space in separating and defining communities;
- The amenity value of space;
- Historical / Heritage value of spaces;
- The ecological and environmental roles performed by spaces;
- The existing and potential educational value of spaces to the community;
- The cultural roles spaces perform (e.g. community venues, performance spaces, etc)

See 11.8 for the status of each park listed in the Borough.

4.2 Ecological Role

Spelthorne Borough Council's Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) 2008–2011 & Habitat Action Plans, including references to Historic Parkland and the management plan for Sunbury Park, with a commitment to improving biodiversity in the park through this biodiversity Action Plan, provides significant policy process. In essence the Spelthorne Borough Council's BAP provides the following targets:

- i. Enhance the biodiversity at Sunbury Park.
- ii. Investigate opportunities to improve the biodiversity and range of species at Laleham Park.
- iii. Enhancing and improving biodiversity across the range of Open Space over time.

4.3 Urban Areas

There is a great potential to increase biodiversity and wildlife value in urban areas. The need for local authorities to cut costs has resulted in a reduction in the intensity of the management of open spaces. Heightened interest in the natural environment has led to a growth in the number of community groups actively involved in its protection and enhancement and that seek land management regimes as a solution to financial shortages. It is with this in mind that the following targets are proposed:

- Co-ordinate with Spelthorne Borough Council contractors to enhance biodiversity/wildlife value on council Open Space by adjusting maintenance regimes
- Seek a net increase in wildlife amenity in Open Spaces by providing areas of natural grass, bird/bat boxes, tree-planting, hedges, habitat piles, etc.
- Adopt the Natural England standards relating to natural greenspace provision known as the Accessible Natural Greenspace Standard (ANGSt). No person should be located more than 300m from their nearest area of natural greenspace of at least 2ha in size, furthermore:
 - Provision of at least 1ha of Local Nature Reserve per 1,000 population;
 - That there should be at least one accessible 20ha site within 2km from home;
 - That there should be one accessible 100ha site within 5km; and
 - That there should be one accessible 500ha site within 10km.

5.0 What is the Purpose of a Parks and Open Space Strategy?

Open Space is important in assisting social inclusion and health and well-being, promoting biological & ecological conservation, and promoting sustainable development. This is particularly the case when the strategy is considered to be a partnership between stakeholder organisations and the council in a strategic partnership.

Spelthorne has well managed sites of important individual environmental quality. The Open Space Strategy aims to safeguard and enhance these assets by ensuring that their quality and preservation is an integral function of the council's stewardship of the natural environment.

The provision of connected open spaces provides routes across the towns into the countryside. It is by providing a diverse and valued open space strategy that positively contributes to the prosperity and quality of life of local people that the needs of the local population are seen to be met and often exceeded. In essence this strategy will achieve the following aims:

- a. Provide a consultation and continuing reference point for stakeholders.
- b. Provide a basis on which to respond to spatial planning policy.
- c. A gateway to a health environment.
- d. Promoting recycling and a concern for environmental excellence.
- e. A landscape that celebrates its cultural legacy and ability to deliver sustainable living.
- f. Providing a contribution to the council's continuing drive for regeneration and economic sustainability.

6.0 A Vision for Spelthorne's Parks and Open Spaces

Spelthorne's park and open spaces has evolved from feedback from a variety of internal stakeholders and discussions about the value and contribution that parks and open spaces makes to the community and their policy agenda.

6.1 The Proposed Vision

“Provide high quality, accessible parks and open spaces and associated facilities for the use of the Borough's residents and visitors, for a variety of purposes, taking into account the resources which are available to provide and maintain these parks and open spaces”

7.0 Local Context, Policy and Open Space Needs and Priorities

7.1 Geography

The borough of Spelthorne is situated in the North of Surrey, boarding two other Surrey boroughs, three London boroughs and two Berkshire unitary councils. Located 15 miles south west of central London, Spelthorne is a compact urban area with approximately 41,000 households and covers 20 square miles, bordered by the M25 to the west, the River Thames to the south and west, the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames to the east and Heathrow Airport to the north. The major centres are Ashford, Shepperton, Stanwell, Sunbury and Staines all having their own distinctive characteristics with no physical boundaries between them.

Spelthorne is a relatively small borough with 65% of the area being designated green belt. The remainder of the Borough is designated as urban landscape. A high proportion of the surface of the Borough is occupied by water and this geography intensifies the concentration of the population in the borough, which is jointly the most densely populated in Surrey.

7.2 Economy

A relatively high proportion of the population is “economically active” (either in work or seeking work). The unemployment rate is 2.1% (November 2010). There are some relatively small areas of deprivation based in parts of Stanwell, Ashford and Sunbury Common. For these small pockets of deprivation the main issues are low income, lack of or poor employment, poor education and skills and crime and disorder.

7.3 Education

Spelthorne has twenty seven infant/primary schools and one private school for children eleven and under. It has six secondary schools, two private schools and one further education college. Young people are a priority group identified within the Community Strategy and the Leisure and Culture Strategy.

7.4 Ethnicity

The ethnic profile of Spelthorne Borough council's citizens must also be considered as it is likely to have an influence on sport participation levels in the Borough and more generally the use made of Parks and Open Spaces.

7.5 Population

Spelthorne is a relatively small but quite densely populated borough with a population of approx. 90,900¹. The population is slightly older with an average household size slightly smaller than the national average. There is a predicted rise in the number of people in the age groups over 50, particularly for the 85+ age group, over the forthcoming 10 years. The ethnic minority population is relatively small, with a non-white population in Spelthorne of 5.7%.

Demographic Profile²

Age Cohort	% Spelthorne BC ³	% London ⁴	% England ⁵
0 – 4	2.2	6.7	6.0
5 – 7	1.8	3.8	3.7
8 – 9	1.1	2.5	2.6
10 – 14	5.7	6.1	6.6
15	1.1	1.2	1.3
16 – 17	2.1	2.4	2.5
Total Under 18	14	22.6	22.7
18 – 19	2.2	2.3	2.4
20 – 24	5.4	7.4	6.0
25 – 29	6.7	9.7	6.7
30 – 44	27.2	25.7	22.6
Total 18-44	41.5	45.0	37.7
45 – 59	19.1	16.1	18.9
60 – 64	6.2	3.9	4.9
65 – 74	10.1	6.5	8.3
Total 45-74	35.4	26.5	32.1
75 – 84	6.2	4.3	5.6
85 – 89	2.1	1.1	1.3
90 & Over	0.8	0.5	0.6
Total 75+	9.1	5.9	7.5
Total	100	100	100

¹ Source, census data.

² The contemporaneous accuracy of this data is still under review

³ Source, Spelthorne Borough Council (unaudited).

⁴ Source, census data.

⁵ Source, census data.

7.6 Spelthorne Development Plan

Land outside the urban area covers about 65% of the Borough and is designated as Green belt. There is overall a good provision for open space, sport and recreation in the Borough as a whole. A study of open space, sport and recreation in 2005, has shown there are no sites surpluses to requirements.

7.7 Policy Objectives

To safeguard valuable urban open space and provide for open recreational uses. Quality open space has an important role in defining the character of areas and meeting recreational needs.

Providing for Open Space in New Development

Policy CO3 deals with provision of parks and open space in new developments and Policy EN4 deals with protection of existing open space.

Open space and play areas are important facilities and the first part of the policy requires all larger developments of family housing to include an element of on-site public open space including funding for its on-going maintenance. Family housing is potentially any housing, with two or more bedrooms but excluding accommodation designed specifically for the elderly.

If provision for open space within the development is not possible or appropriate, either because the site is too small or because it is not a good location for providing communal open space, then a commuted payment will be required towards improving provision off site either in the form of a new site or, where it is agreed that is not possible, improving an existing one so as to increase its usability.

Where development includes provision of open space to serve a wider area, the open space should be accessible to the wider area and not just occupants of the new development.

Policy CO3: Provision of Open Space for New Development

In new housing developments of thirty family dwellings and above Spelthorne Borough Council will require the inclusion of a minimum of 0.1 ha of public open space increased proportionally according to the size of the scheme.

Where any new housing is proposed in areas of the Borough with inadequate public open space provision or where provision would become inadequate because of the development, Spelthorne Borough Council will require the provision of new open space on site or by financial contribution toward the cost of new off-site provision. If this is not feasible a contribution will be required to improve existing sites to enhance their recreational value and capacity.

Strategic Policy SP6: Maintaining and Improving the Environment

The Council will seek to maintain and improve the quality of the environment of the Borough. It will:

- a) Ensure the design and layout of new development incorporates principles of sustainable development, and creates an environment that is inclusive, safe and secure, is attractive with its own distinct identity and respects the environment of the area in which it is situated.
- b) Contribute to improving air quality in the Borough.
- c) Protect and enhance areas of existing environmental character including sites of nature conservation value, areas of landscape value, the Borough's historic and cultural heritage (including historic buildings and Conservation Areas) and open space of amenity and recreation value.

7.8 Provision of Open Space, Sport and Recreation Facilities

Open space and sport and recreational facilities have an important part to play in the well being and quality of life of people. These facilities include pedestrian and cycle routes. Sport England has a target to increase participation in sport and physical activity generally from the current 30% to 50% by 2020. This has an important role to play in generally improving the health of the nation to which the government attaches importance. In this context the protection and improvement of existing space and expansion of facilities necessary to meet needs is important. We also need to be aware of possibilities for increased use/demand as a result of the 2012 Olympics.

There are significant areas of open space within the Borough that perform a valuable role in providing facilities for sport and recreation also in breaking up the continuity of built up areas and visually contributing to the character of the Borough's different communities. Green Infrastructure which is a strategically planned and delivered network of high quality green spaces and other environmental features.

Policy EN4: Provision of Open Space, Sport and Recreation Facilities

Policy EN4 sets out the approach to the provision, maintenance and improvement of open space, sport and recreation facilities and also the particular approach to maintaining designated open space in urban areas to ensure that open space of amenity or recreational value is retained.

The Council will seek to ensure there is sufficient open space which is well located and suitable to meet a wide range of outdoor sport, recreation and open space needs by:

- maintaining and improving provision and access to open space through the design and layout of new development, encouraging owners and users of private sites to make improvements, and also improving provision on Council owned land.
- seeking to maintain, improve and where appropriate expand networks of green space and pedestrian and cycle routes with a recreational role.

Exceptionally, development may be allowed on part of a site within the urban area which should otherwise be maintained for the above reasons where:

- i. The remainder of the site is enhanced so its public value in visual and functional terms is equivalent to the original site or better, or
- ii. Essential ancillary facilities are proposed to support outdoor recreational use of the site, or
- iii. The sport or recreational use is relocated to an alternative site of equivalent or greater value in terms of quantity, quality and accessibility to users of the original site, and other factors do not justify retention.

7.10 Local Development Framework (LDF) Policies

The LDF provides policies on open spaces and this strategy links into such policies. If at any stage there needs to be any reconsideration of the LDF policies clear evidence needs to be provided and this strategy can assist with this process.

7.11 Local Indicators for supply

The most quoted and applied standard relates playing space provision to population and recommends that there should be a minimum of 6 acres (2.43 hectares) of outdoor playing/recreational space per 1000 people (NPA standard). The standard recommends that the 6 acre provision is broken down to take account of the different needs of different age groups.

However, it is believed that local authorities should develop their own open space classification to reflect local characteristics, demographics, existing facilities and the recreational and non-recreational functions of open spaces. An understanding of the types of open space, in these contexts, will provide a more rigorous basis for analysing the results of the site audits and enable an assessment of whether the range and types of open space functions in the local area meet the needs of local people.

7.13 Housing Type

Housing type is another form of indicator of open space need as, like density, it provides an indication of access to private open space in the form of gardens or yards.

7.14 Child Densities

Child densities provide an indication of the need for children's play provision within the Borough and is a useful indicator of a changing need across the demographic age profile.

7.15 Health

With a great deal of current public policy directed towards guidance that identifies the contribution of open space towards healthy living, it is an obvious indicator for supply. Open spaces have a well acknowledged preventative effect on ill health and a contributory impact on public well-being. Recent evidence provided by Cabe Space and Greenspace Scotland

underpins their ability to reduce stress, provide formal and informal opportunities for physical activity and sport, and provide environments for relaxation.

8.0 Objectives of the Open Space Strategy

The purpose of this strategy is to set out a framework for the future management and development of our Spelthorne's open spaces. The council's vision is to:

“Provide high quality, accessible open space and associated facilities for the use of the Borough's residents and visitors, for a variety of purposes, taking into account the resources which are available to provide and maintain these open spaces.

Therefore, the main objectives of this strategy are to:

- Establish a clear overall approach to the provision of adequate parks & open spaces to meet the current and future needs of the community.
- Develop a vision for the parks and open spaces.
- Provide a basis for consultation with stakeholders.
- Identify issues and problems.
- Ensure that the delivery of parks and open space services achieve corporate and community needs.
- Create a policy framework for the enhancement and accessibility and use of parks and open spaces
- Ensure an effective link between the strategic and operational delivery of the Landscape Maintenance contract, and the work of the contractor.
- Determine priorities for action and the resources and timescale necessary for implementation.
- The LDF provides policy framework for protection of Open Parks and Spaces.

9.0 Development of an Open Space Hierarchy

There are no statutory requirements for the provision of open space and no legally enforced minimum levels of provision. Traditionally, levels of provision have been based on a target area of open space per capita. This gives a very broad picture for a whole town and does not take account of local variations within a town or city. The National Playing Fields Association (NPFA) standard relates open space provision to population, and recommends that there should be a minimum 2.43 hectares of outdoor playing/recreational space per 1000 people.

Spelthorne has 179 hectares of operational parks/recreation grounds, 72 hectares of additional land leased out, together with 144 hectares of common land, a total of 395 hectares. This equates to 4.3 hectares per 1000 population. This is greater than the recommended level and shows that the Borough as a whole is well-provided for, but it should be noted that it does not take into consideration the distribution of open space, the quality of it, people's access to it or non-recreational roles and uses of open space.

There have been many debates about how parks and open spaces are categorised. Many types of council subscribe to the principles of a size based open space hierarchy, which was

first defined, some time ago, in the Greater London Development Plan. The hierarchy acknowledges that large 'district' parks will have larger catchment areas than small 'neighbourhood' parks.

10.0 Management and Operational Delivery of the Ground Maintenance Service

Environment Services, is responsible for the strategic content of the implementation plans and maintenance standards. The operational focus managed by Streetscene is on delivering a contract specification, as written, for the duration of the contract term and results in the achievement of those objectives, through a continuing process of meetings and consultation with officers from Environment Services and the contractor.

The implementation and development of an Open Space Strategy assumes further innovative development of current practice thus;

- establish an engaging collaborative, strategic, partnership with the contractor, stakeholder and policy officer that is responsive to changing strategic themes and stakeholder requirements.
- extend the service and contracting process so that it responds to changing needs and engages with stakeholders and their aspirations, by harnessing the experience and expertise of the contractor and officers to ensure that both practical and financial resources are maximised.
- Ensure that management authority has the ability to take and implement policy changes and the associated operational practice with the minimum of delay and bureaucracy.

This change in emphasis is the effective coordination of the aims, objectives, expertise, flexibility and actions of contractor, stakeholders and the Council's strategic planners. The adoption of a ten year Open Space Strategy creates an opportunity to ensure that current levels of achievement and environmental excellence are enhanced and that stakeholder aspirations and views are enshrined in a collaborative partnership. We foresee that such an approach would retain the 'cash limited' cap on spending, but crucially enable the Council to:

- fully realise the partnering potential with its experienced contractor, by directly accessing their grounds maintenance expertise and knowledge of best sector practice, and value for money.
- enhanced stakeholder engagement, policy and practice.
- protecting the Council's overriding policy and focus for service delivery into the inevitable continually changing economic climate through the most effective application of resources, people, expertise and innovation.

11.0 A Typology and Taxonomy of Open Space

Type of Open Space	Definition
Amenity Green Space	Includes informal recreational spaces and housing green spaces. This category would include green spaces in and around housing areas, large landscaped areas, and domestic gardens as well as informal 'kick-about' play areas for children.
Outdoor Sports Facilities / Playing Fields	Those sites which are not located within a public park and which the primary role is for formal recreation. Sites include tennis courts, bowling greens, sports pitches, golf courses, athletics tracks, school playing fields, other institutional playing fields and outdoor sports areas. Categorise by ownership i.e. public/private/education.
Allotments / Community Gardens / Urban Farms	Open spaces where the primary use is allotment gardening or community farming.
Cemeteries & Churchyards	Self explanatory
Natural or Semi-Natural Urban Greenspaces	Woodland (coniferous, deciduous, mixed) and scrub, grassland (e.g. downland, meadow), heath or moor, wetlands (e.g. marsh, fen), open and running water, wastelands (including disturbed ground), bare rock habitats (e.g. cliffs, quarries, pits).
Civic Spaces / pedestrianised areas	More formally laid out hard surfaced public spaces including squares, pedestrian streets, sitting out areas and space surrounding the docks. These spaces would not normally have a formal recreational function.
Green Spaces within Grounds of Institution	Open space located within the grounds of hospitals, universities and other institutions which are accessible to the general public or some sections of the public. This definition also includes education sites where there is only hard surface and or amenity open space (no pitch sports provision).
Other	Other areas of Metropolitan Open Land which may not perform an open space function but which perform a structural or amenity role.

11.1 Parks and Open Spaces Hierarchy

Open Space Category	Approx Size of Open Space and Distance from Home	Characteristics
<p>Regional Parks and Open Spaces (Linked Metropolitan Open Land and Green Belt corridors) Weekend and occasional visits by car or public transport</p>	<p>400 hectares, 3.2km from home</p>	<p>Large areas and corridors of natural heathland, downland, commons, woodland and parkland also including areas not publicly accessible but which contribute to the overall environmental amenity. Primarily providing for informal recreation with some non-intensive active recreation uses. Car parking at key locations.</p>
<p>Metropolitan Parks Weekend and occasional visits by car and public transport</p>	<p>60 ha, 3.2km from home</p>	<p>Either i) natural heathland, downland, commons, woodland etc, or ii) formal parks providing for both active and passive recreation. May contain playing fields, but at least 40 hectares for other pursuits. Adequate car parking.</p>

Open Space Category	Approx Size of Open Space and Distance from Home	Characteristics
<p>District Park Weekend and occasional visits by foot, cycle, car and short bus trips</p>	<p>20 ha, 1.2 km from home</p>	<p>Landscape setting with a variety of natural features providing for a wide range of activities, including outdoor sports facilities and playing fields, children's play for different age groups, and informal recreation pursuits. Should provide some car parking.</p>
<p>Local Parks Pedestrian visits.</p>	<p>2 ha, 0.8 km from home</p>	<p>Providing for court games, children's play spaces or other areas of a specialist nature, including nature conservation areas.</p>
<p>Small Local Parks and Open Spaces Pedestrian visits especially by children, particularly valuable in high density areas</p>	<p>0.4- 2 ha, 0.8km from home</p>	<p>Gardens, sitting-out areas, children's play spaces or other areas of a specialist nature, including nature and conservation areas.</p>
<p>Pocket Parks Pedestrian visits especially by children.</p>	<p>Under 0.4 ha, 0.8km from home</p>	<p>Gardens, sitting-out areas, children's play spaces or other areas of a specialist nature, including nature and conservation areas.</p>

A series of locally based open space standards have been developed based upon the findings of our assessment of local open space needs. In support of this standard, we have considered the supply, quality and value of all types of open space provision within the borough and levels of demand for its multifaceted usage. Whilst assessing the needs and opportunities we applied the advice provided by the companion guide to PPG17 – in the context of our brief. This recommends that local authorities set local provision standards which incorporate:

1. A quantitative, qualitative and accessibility component;
2. Provision for children and teenagers;
3. Outdoor sports fields and playing field needs;
4. Natural or semi-natural greenspace;

11.2 Open Space and Parks Typology Aspiration

Open Space Aspiration	Quantity Standard 'A'	Quantity Standard 'B'	Quality Standard
Public Parks 2.43 ha per 1,000 population	All residents within the Borough should have access to a District Park within 1.2km from home	All residents within the Borough should have access to a Local Park or Small Local Park or Pocket Park within 800m from home	The application of the Green Flag Award Criteria as the minimum standard for all Open Spaces, in the context of their typology & taxonomy

Spelthorne Borough Council supports the aspiration described above in the context of that their open space is managed following similar locally developed, and evolving, principles as enumerated below as the 'Spelthorne Borough Council typology and associated taxonomy'.

Spelthorne Borough Council Typology and Associated Taxonomy'

11.3 Destination Parks

- Attract visitors from areas wider than the Borough boundaries
- Have a unique identity or theme which is maintained
- Contain elements of formal and informal features
- These areas should contain:
 - Large Children's Play Areas
 - Recycling Centres
 - Adequate parking to accommodate visitors, adequately surfaced car parks.
- Horticultural standards should reflect the need to maintain these areas to high standards

11.4 Large Neighbourhood Parks

- Attract visitors Borough wide
- Formal and informal features maintained to adequate standards.
- Bowling Greens and Sports Pitches should be kept to suitably high standards, other grassed areas should be allowed to grow and seed between cuts.
- These areas should contain:
 - Areas for play – including children’s play areas and where feasible
 - Recycling Centres
 - Car Parking (minimum and safe only)
- Horticultural standards should reflect the need to maintain areas of utility with focal points of finer quality planting. Extensive use of shrubs and areas of grass cut at a lesser frequency than in primary areas.

11.5 Small Neighbourhood Parks

- Attract visitors from the local areas.
- Informal areas, which may include sports pitches and minor planting maintenance to adequate or lesser standards.
- There is no presumption on the inclusion of any facilities.
- Horticultural standards will in general be of utility to suit the area. Planting will be reduced in favour of lower cost less frequent grass cutting.

11.6 Open Space and Other areas

- Attracts visitors from the immediate neighbourhood.
- There is no presumption on the inclusion of any facilities.
- Horticultural standards to the facility with the presumption that grass will be allowed to grow in line appropriate with cutting to ensure safety and basic utility use only

Using these criteria the number of Open Spaces within each category is shown in the table below.

11.7 Parks Related to the above Categories

Park Designation	No. in Spelthorne
Destination Parks	5
Large Neighbourhood Parks	11
Small Neighbourhood Parks	58
Open Space & Other Areas	1

11.8 Hierarchy of Parks by Category

Park Typology	Comments
Destination Parks	
Fordbridge Park	Green Flag Standard Park
Laleham Park	Green Flag Standard Park
Lammas Park	Green Flag Standard Park
Staines Park	Green Flag Standard Park
Sunbury Park	Green Flag Standard Park
Large Neighbourhood	
Ashford Recreation Ground	Potential Green Flag Standard Park
Bishops Duppas	
Cedar Recreation Ground	
Donkey Meadow 1	
Millennium Wood	
Groveley Recreation Ground	
Halliford Park	
Long Lane Recreation Ground	
Memorial Gardens	
Stanwell Moor Recreation Ground	
Stanwell Recreation Ground	
Shepperton Manor Park	
Small Neighbourhood	
Allen Road	
Alexander Recreation Ground	
Birch Green	
Brickle Green	
Catlin Crescent	
Charlton Village Play Area	
Church Gardens	
Clay Lane	
Coal Tax gardens	
Donkey Meadow	
Dumsey Meadow	
Echelford Recreation Ground	
Elgin Avenue	
Elizabeth gardens	
Feltham Hill Recreation Ground	
Flower Plot Green	
Greenfield Recreation Ground	
Halliford Greens	
Hengrove Farm	
Holywell Way	
Kenyngton Manor Recreation Ground	

Park Typology	Comments
Knowle Green	
Leacroft Staines	
Littleton Green	
Littleton Recreation Ground	
Lower Hampton Road	
Moormede	
Monks Bridge	
Nuthatch Close	
Old Bathing Field	
Pocket Park Hithermoor	
Priory Green	
Pucks Corner	
Rivermede Island	
Riverside Walk Staines	
Russell Road Greens	
Scott Freeman Gardens	
Shepperton Recreation Ground	
Splash Meadow	
Spelthorne Grove	
Stanwell Village Green	
Studios Walk	
Swans Rest Island	
Sykes Meadow	
Town lane Gardens	
Towpath Greens	
Thames Meadow	
Thames Street	
The Markway	
The Wickets Play Area	
Oakington Drive	
Victoria Jubilee Gardens	
Village Park Stanwell	
Windmill Common	
Woodlands Parade	
Woodthorpe Recreation Ground	
Woodthorpe Riverside	
Wharf Square Shepperton	
Open Space and Other Areas	Further discussion required for this category, once the two categories above are confirmed
Town Lane Recreation Ground	

11.9 Effective catchment distances

The catchment distances defined above and elsewhere in this strategy relate to the typical effective catchment area for each park type. The effective catchment area represents the area from which 70-80% of park users are likely to be drawn from. The catchment area and threshold population should reflect the average for each park category. Variations in catchment area sizes and the number and frequency of visits can be explained by a number of factors including;

1. The range of facilities and environments within the park and their quality and condition affect the attractiveness of the space to potential users. Parks with a wider range of facilities are likely to exert influence on catchments, perhaps beyond the distance parameters identified above. The number and frequency of visits is also likely to be higher.
2. The demographic and socio-economic structure of the population residing within the park catchment area is a fundamental to the extent to which park facilities meet their needs.
3. The pattern of land use within the park catchment particularly patterns of residential development and population density also involve their affect.
4. The range of park and open space opportunities within the locality, and sometimes beyond it will influence levels of usage at individual spaces, as will the prevailing weather conditions and access to personal transport.

Finally, it is important to consider variations in catchment area size within the same level of the hierarchy when identifying priorities for enhancing and investing in the quality and access of Open Space and Parks.

11.10 Mapping

All parks and open spaces are currently mapped on GIS, including common land. These designations would need to be updated to the new classifications.

11.11 Outdoor Sports Facilities

In terms of the sports pitches provision, we concur with previous studies that, Spelthorne is provided for in terms of outdoor sports facilities. Generally the quality, usage and accessibility of sites of this type are good throughout the Borough. A playing pitch strategy has been agreed to provide a means for balancing supply and demand, and coupled with the recent comprehensive asset review, has informed our conclusions.

However, we are also of the view that there is an urgent need to concentrate sports provision at sites that have the space and facilities to meet current and projected demand, and to focus investment in those facilities. This may well release underused and sub-standard facilities that may provide asset release or development opportunities for other recreational or leisure provision; thereby reducing the overall cost of sports provision.

11.12 Supporting Infrastructure

- 09 pavilions
- 4 bowling greens (three are self managed and one going self managed 2011)
- 11 Football pitches
- 1 Cricket
- 2 outdoor basketball.
- 25 tennis courts
- 5 multi use games area.

For comparison purposes only, we produce below the National Playing Fields Association (NPFA) pitch dimension definitions for sports pitches.

When assessing the provision of sports facilities, Sport England's policy would seem to be based on an assessment by the local council of the number of people that it takes to support a team in a given geographic area. This analysis has been carried out in partnership with a number of Councils. The table below shows the number of football, cricket, hockey and rugby teams per head of population, based on the Sport England's data.

Pitch Dimensions (NPFA data)

Pitch	NPFA Measure (ha)
Senior football	0.9
Junior football	0.82
5-aside football	0.35
Rugby union	1.26
Cricket	1.5
Hockey	0.62

Sport England has recommended a methodology for detailed assessment of playing pitch requirements, which is a five stage process thus;

1. identify teams
2. assess number of home games per week.
3. calculate the number of home games per week.
4. assess the temporal demand for pitches.
5. calculate the pitch requirements.

11.13 Children's' Play Facilities

Open space provides an important opportunity for children's play needs. It is widely acknowledged that the importance of children's play extends far beyond the activity itself, contributes towards the child's development through the application of a range of physical, social and emotional outlets.

The key issues relating to children's play are the nature, extent, challenge and location of play provision is crucial in this scenario. It is acknowledged also that age, gender, safety and risk issues and of proven, if uncertain, importance. Principally, it is the actual location of play provision that has the most immediate and lasting influence on its use and adoption by the community.

Spelthorne Borough Council provides a range of play facilities in parks, open spaces and on housing estates. These include playgrounds, skateboard parks and BMX facilities, youth shelters and a water park. A programme of upgrading all of the boroughs play facilities has been continuing since 2004 and is now near completion and that provides play areas which are in accordance with the criteria associated with LEAP and NEAP criteria. In addition, some Open Spaces have unclassifiable 'Other children's play provision' that fulfil some of the criteria for a LEAP/NEAP and could be classified as such if qualitative improvements are made to them.

12.0 Proposed Quality Assessment Standard for Open Space

It is proposed that the quality of each open space is assessed by a survey using the 'Green Flag' assessment criteria and involving qualitative and quantitative judgements. The assessment considered the physical, social and aesthetic qualities of each space, and is in common usage by the greater majority of Parks and Open Spaces services in England and Wales. The assessment of physical quality would involve judging the quality of the built features of the site and its landscape elements, including standards of maintenance through the delivery of the Landscape Maintenance contracted service.

We further propose that 'Destination Parks', which are at the apex of our proposed hierarchy, are surveyed first, and then the surveying process works through the remaining levels of the hierarchy.

12.5 Management and Maintenance

In partnership with stakeholders and the contractor, Spelthorne Borough Council will periodically review the open space management and maintenance priorities and standards. The review will inform changes to current specifications, and ensure that Spelthorne Borough Council achieves the most efficient value for money procurement possible. One of the aims of this approach is to consider, in partnership with stakeholders, whether the current maintenance approach is appropriate for the site and meets local requirements.

12.6 Consultation

Engagement with local residents associations, users and supporters' groups, such as Friends of Sunbury Park, Civic Pride and Spelthorne Natural History Group and other identified stakeholders will take place on all proposals for the development of existing and new open space and recreation facilities. In this respect the Council is committed to maintaining a dialogue with its community of stakeholders and will continue to consult on proposals for improved facilities through a variety of means.

12.7 Partnership Working

It is a primary aim of Spelthorne Borough Council to work in partnership with the public, private and voluntary sectors to manage and enhance parks and open spaces, and where feasible engage with them as volunteers. Developing strong relationships with external people and organisations to develop a range of external expertise that will develop and enhance this service, is considered to be a vital step in the implementation of this Parks and Open Space Strategy.

12.8 Biodiversity Action Plan

The continued development of an approach to biodiversity targets and incorporating them into the Parks and Open Space Strategy and day to day management regime is an important priority for the Council. These targets will inform the management and maintenance of all council-owned areas of open space.

12.9 Natural and Semi-natural urban green spaces

In respect of natural and or semi-natural green spaces such as woodlands, grasslands, and wetlands, these areas form part of the natural biodiversity of the borough. They are considered to be important because they extend the accessible options to green spaces, often close to where people live. This provides further opportunities for recreation and exercise that can benefit health and used for e.g. informal play and contact with nature.

Spelthorne Borough's commitment is to protect and manage these sites to provide accessible green spaces for people to enjoy and as important wildlife habitats. In this way, it extends the opportunities for local communities to use, and enjoy the benefits closer to home. This will also involve local communities and partners in the management and promotion of these areas.

12.10 External Funding

An important function of this strategy is to use the data collected to inform and develop an external funding process. In this regard, Spelthorne Borough Council will continue to identify appropriate sources of external funding and make appropriate bids for them. This will include Section 106 agreements (or future replacements).

12.11 Branding and Marketing the Service

An essential component of an effective Open Space Strategy is the Marketing and Promotion of the services and the amenities provided. At the current time little coordinated marketing is undertaken.

12.12 Strategic Policy and the Management of the Ground Maintenance Contractors

Consideration should be given to the strategic advantages of uniting these functions for the delivery of this open Space Strategy.

12.13 Provision for children and young people

That further development is undertaken on the provision of formal and informal leisure facility provision for children and young people to include:

- play areas
- multi-use games areas (MUGAs - containing facilities for basketball, football and cricket)
- teenage shelters and informal kick-about areas
- Neighbourhood Equipped Area for Play (NEAP's)
NEAP's should cater for children eight years and older, with at least 8 types of play area. There should be opportunities for ball games or wheeled activities. Ideally, they should be located no more than 1500m away from all homes.
- Local Equipped Area for Play (LEAP's)
LEAP's should cater for children between the ages of 4 and 8 years old. Ideally, there should be at least 5 types of play area and that provision matches demographic requirements as set out above ensuring that all play spaces and facilities are safe to use and maintained to the necessary standard.

12.14 Civic Spaces

Spelthorne Borough Council in the form of this strategy has demonstrated its commitment to regenerating and improving its Civic Spaces, and in designating this Open Space Strategy, extended its oversight of environmental excellence to those areas. Therefore its policy commitment is to the creation of high quality design, and the use of materials and the creation of a sense of place for all its Civic Spaces. This leads to a vision for creating quality Civic Spaces that reflect and enhance the borough's built and developed landscape heritage and provide places that people want to use, to meet friends and to have lunch, or simply relax in.

12.15 Amenity Grassland

Amenity grassland is a common description given to areas of short-mown grass that exist in large and small open spaces. It is often easy to create and maintain, providing a sense of tidiness. However, it is also quite expensive to maintain but can be an overused solution.

It is therefore policy to review each of these areas, with stakeholders to ensure that they meet their needs, and to establish whether more ecologically sensitive treatment can be adopted, without additional cost. This approach will lead to the potential to create a more interesting open spaces aesthetic and a cost-effective, treatment for open spaces.

13.0 Recommendations - The Action Plan & Next Steps

Parks and Open Spaces within Spelthorne Borough should be of an adequate quality and provide the range of facilities associated with their respective tier within the parks hierarchy and the locally agreed criteria. Those public parks which either under perform in terms of their value to the local community or are deficient in some way should have their condition improved consistent with the guidelines identified above.

The following recommendations that the following policy proposals are adopted.

14.0 Policy Framework

We propose the following framework as a methodology of informing practice and capital and revenue financing:

- To identify who uses parks and open spaces and sports facilities;
- To assess patterns of usage and determine the purposes for which the parks and open spaces and sports facilities are used;
- To explore attitudes towards and perceptions of parks and open spaces and sports facilities;
- To identify reasons for non-use;
- To determine issues, problems and potential improvements that could increase usage of Spelthorne's Open Spaces and sports facilities.

It should be noted however, that almost all Parks and Open Spaces have value of some kind along one or more of the dimensions described above or conferred on them by their local community. The parks and open spaces which perform the most roles are likely to be the most valued spaces to the community. This is not to downgrade the value of scoring Parks and Open Spaces in an assessment methodology, but just to exercise a note of caution against applying an exclusively quantitative methodology that is not moderated by a qualitative and stakeholder 'voice'.

The proposed policies and actions contained in the Parks and Open Space Strategy and accompanying Action Plan & Next Steps are framed in the context of existing council policy, practice, resource allocation and availability. It is proposed that this section takes the form of a series of policy commitments, thus:

15.0 Review of the Parks and Open Space Strategy

The Parks and Open Space Strategy will be monitored annually and a detailed review will be undertaken every 3 years. This will ensure the strategy and its action plan are kept up to date with the outcomes from these review reported to the responsible Executive Member and in the service's annual report. The Action Plan illustrates the potentials and possibilities that the Draft Open Space Strategy reports on. The Action Plan has four objectives:

1. To increase and optimise the use of capital, revenue, staff, and contracting resources;

2. To address basic standards of Parks and Open Space management, planning, their infrastructural facilities, cleanliness and safety in parks by adopting the 'Green Flag Award' assessment methodology as a quality standard⁶;
3. To develop a strategic & operational ethos that co-ordinates a cost effective approach to the provision of sports facilities, general activities, events and unsupervised play provision in parks, targeting excluded and priority groups;
4. To create a clear understanding of the service's aims, objectives and standards that can be expect in managing, maintaining and developing parks by the stakeholders. This will be achieved in part by;
 - developing a reporting regime for problems, complaints and compliments;
 - regularly engaging with stakeholders to seek their views;

16.0 Quality Assessment

The quality of our parks and open spaces is of paramount concern to Spelthorne Borough Council and a critical element of open space delivery. Spelthorne Borough Council therefore intends to improve standards for the benefit of all its users. All parks and open spaces will therefore be subject to a quality audit using the 'Green Flag' criteria as described below. However, that does not commit the council to achieving a 'Green Flag Award' for all or any of its Parks and Open Space. It will, after careful consideration of the cost and benefits of the award, take a decision on a site by site basis, and after due consultation, as and when necessary.

In order to 'test' this approach with the 'best in class' Spelthorne Borough Council will establish baseline information about investment in parks and open spaces and monitoring expenditure on an annual basis and crucially, comparing it with benchmark authorities to ensure that they continue to achieve 'best in class' value for money outcomes.

⁶ The Green Flag Award Scheme is the benchmark national standard for parks and green spaces in England, Wales and Scotland. At Appendix 2. Is a summary of the 'Green Flag Award' standard.

17.0 Proposed Action Plan and Next Steps

Implementation of the strategy is critical to achieving the outcomes that Spelthorne Borough Council has set itself. What follows is an Action Plan, with a ten year horizon, and a three year review. The targets for each of the actions are listed beneath a policy heading.

The Proposed Action Plan and Next Steps Summarises the contents of the Open Space Strategy

Issue	Action/Project	Priority	When	Cost/ Resources required
Continuing Professional Development				
Identifying skills gaps through skills analysis audit. Identify essential skills development programme.	Targeting CPD programme to resolve skills gaps.	1	Autumn 2011	Existing staff resources
Financial Objectives				
Identify cost of Parks and Open Spaces maintenance, park by park	Budgetary assessment and control project	1	2011	Existing staff resources
Identify a rolling programme of improvements to Parks and Open Spaces.	A planned capital investment programme to increase the focus on major parks and on whole-park projects, leveraging in external funding (capital/revenue) from external agencies, partnerships and alliances.	1	2011	Existing staff resources
Focused investment.	Direct capital investment at areas of high need within major Parks.	1	Commence autumn 2011	Existing staff resources
Lever in finance.	To identify and pursue opportunities to use existing Council capital investment to lever in external funding by identify revenue expenditure to support new capital investment.	1	Commence autumn 2011	Existing staff resources
			2011	Existing staff resources
Marketing Objectives				
Produce a Marketing Strategy for Parks and Open	Integrate marketing of Parks and Open Spaces with the wider marketing of events and focus	1	Commence 2011	Existing staff resources

Issue	Action/Project	Priority	When	Cost/ Resources required
Spaces, linked to the financial objectives above.	marketing on target groups.			
Stakeholder and Customer Strategy				
Web Based Presence	Establish a web presence for the service, containing continually up-dated information and service standards. Train current service staff as Web Masters, responsible for keeping the web site up-dated and current.	1	Commenced 2010 – updated frequently	Existing IT & service staff resources
Publicity material.	Produce a clear 'Public Commitment to Standards' of service, including a clear complaints mechanism, and publicise through a wider marketing and communications strategy, web based and include information on signage in parks to make customers aware of the standards, and who to contact if they are dissatisfied or wish to compliment the service.	1	2011	Existing staff resources
Education and Interpretation				
Education & Interpretation	New build project to demonstrate sustainable woodland management, visitors centre/ educational facility	2	2010-2014	To be identified, and contained within existing capital and revenue budgets.
Green Travel Routes	Construction of Green Cycle Routes / Green Corridor through Parks And Open Spaces.	2/3	Phase 1. 2011	To be identified, and contained within existing capital and revenue budgets.
Climate Mitigation and Sports use				
Tree Management Plan	Preparation of a Tree Management Risk Strategy for the service with individual action plans to restore, rejuvenate, and diversify existing tree coverage and valuable habitats, with an emphasis on climate change mitigation.	2/3	2011 - 2014	To be identified, and contained within existing capital and revenue budgets.

Issue	Action/Project	Priority	When	Cost/ Resources required
Improvement of sports facilities and pavilions	Upgrade existing pavilions, as part of a rationalisation plan that matches demand for sports use and compliance with DDA, within existing or up-graded facilities.	2/3	2011 – 2014	To be identified, and contained within existing capital and revenue budgets, under planned maintenance
Biodiversity				
Local Biodiversity	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Enhancement of habitats in line with the Local Biodiversity Action Plan; 2. Areas in Parks and Open Spaces to be naturalised, with wildflower meadow areas and planting of native shrubs and trees 3. Developers to consider mitigation on site by introducing wildlife aspects when submitting planning applications; 	<p>2/3</p> <p>2/3</p> <p>2/3</p>	Commence 2010 - 5 year rolling programme	To be identified, and contained within existing capital and revenue budgets.
Engagement & Consultation				
Annual Customer Survey	Undertake a regular consultation and user surveys in order to gauge progress achieved by the Open Spaces Strategy.	1	Commence 2011	To be identified, and contained within existing capital and revenue budgets.
Impacting on anti-social behaviour	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Install teenage facilities for the age ranges from 12-20 years in various parks in the borough; the facilities to contain sports activities such as streetscape courses, street basketball, volleyball, table tennis and youth-shelters 2. Arrange for organised sport sessions especially for after school hours and out-of hours times, during weekends and during school holidays; 	<p>2/3</p> <p>1</p> <p>1/2</p>	2010 – 2015	To be identified, and contained within existing capital and revenue budgets.

Issue	Action/Project	Priority	When	Cost/ Resources required
	creation of a youth – sport support officer 3. Establish the post of a project worker through external funding.			

Appendix 1. Council Priorities

Identified Spelthorne Borough Council Policies relevant to this project

Policy	Implication	Comments
Vision & Objectives: To safeguard valuable urban open space and provide for open recreational uses	To be realised through this project	To be confirmed. Some sites will be confirmed to at least SNCI status. Open space sites not only have a value individually but also collectively as broader networks, and the Council supports the 'Green Arc' initiative which covers outer London Boroughs and North Surrey. Sport England has a target to increase participation in sport and physical activity generally from the current 30% to 50% by 2020.
Strategic Policy SP6: Maintaining and Improving the Environment	The Council will seek to maintain and improve the quality of the environment of the Borough.	
Policy CO3 deals with provision of open space in new developments.	In new housing developments of 30 family dwellings and above the Council will require the inclusion of a minimum of 0.1 ha of public open space increased proportionally according to the size of the scheme.	
Policy EN4 deals with protection of existing open space	The Council will seek to maintain and improve the quality of the environment of the Borough	
Provision of Open Space, Sport and Recreation Facilities	Refer to Policy EN4 & Policy CO3	

Appendix 2. Green Flag Award Standard⁷

The Green Flag Award scheme is the benchmark national standard for parks and green spaces in England and Wales.

It was first launched in 1996 to recognise and reward the best green spaces in the country. The first awards were given in 1997 and, many years later, it continues to provide the benchmark against which our parks and green spaces are measured. It is also seen as a way of encouraging others to achieve high environmental standards, setting a benchmark of excellence in recreational green areas.

Entries for the Green Flag Award are open to parks/green spaces located in England and Wales.

Green Flag Award applicants can also enter themselves for a Special Award for Innovation.

Green Flag Award Assessment Criteria

Green Flag Award applications are judged against eight key criteria, and involves a two stage process, a 'desk top' assessment of information provided by the applicant and a 'site inspection' visit.

Where certain criteria are not met, applicants can provide justifications that may be taken into account. What's more, if management practice changes are in progress but not yet fully implemented, transitional phases will be acknowledged and viewed positively.

The judging criteria also considers the fact that each park/green space will offer different kinds of facilities, and will be managed and developed to varying opportunities and constraints. Innovation and the way facilities offered are tailored to the needs of the community will also be taken into account.

Scoring system

To achieve Green Flag Award status, applicants must score a minimum of 66% of the overall marks, as follows:

- with at least 50% on the desk assessment (score 15 out of 30)
- and 60% in the field evaluation (score 42 out of 70).

Scoring line

0 1	2 3 4	5 6	7	8	9	10
Very Poor	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Exceptional

⁷ © CLG and the Green Flag Partnership.

Green Flag Award applications are judged against eight key criteria. Where certain criteria are not met, applicants can provide justifications that may be taken into account. What's more, if management practice changes are in progress but not yet fully implemented, transitional phases will be acknowledged and viewed positively.

The judging criteria also considers the fact that each park/green space will offer different kinds of facilities, and will be managed and developed to varying opportunities and constraints. Innovation and the way facilities offered are tailored to the needs of the community will also be taken into account.

Eight key criteria

1. A welcoming place

When approaching or entering the park/green space, the overall impression for any member of the community - regardless of the purpose of their visit - should be positive and inviting. There should be:

- Good and safe access
- Good signage to and in the park/green space
- Equal access for all members of the community

2. Healthy, safe and secure

The park/green space must be a healthy, safe and secure place for all members of the community to use. Any issues that have come to light must be addressed in the management plan and implemented on the ground. New issues that arise must be addressed promptly and appropriately.

- Equipment and facilities must be safe to use
- It must be a secure place for all members of the community to use or traverse
- Dog fouling must be adequately addressed
- Health and safety policies should be in place, in practice and regularly reviewed
- Toilets, drinking water, first aid, public telephones and emergency equipment where relevant (e.g. life belts by water) should be available in or near the park/green space, and be clearly signposted.

3. Clean and well maintained

For aesthetic as well as health and safety reasons, issues of cleanliness and maintenance must be adequately addressed, in particular:

- Litter and other waste management
- The maintenance of grounds, buildings, equipment and other features
- A policy on litter, vandalism and maintenance should be in place, in practice and regularly reviewed.

4. Sustainability

Methods used in maintaining the park/green space and its facilities should be environmentally sound, relying on best practices available according to current knowledge. Management should be aware of the range of techniques available to them, and demonstrate that informed choices have been made and are regularly reviewed.

Parks/green spaces should:

- Have an environmental policy or charter and management strategy in place, which is in practice and regularly reviewed
- Minimise and justify pesticide use
- Eliminate horticultural peat use
- Recycle waste plant material
- Demonstrate high horticultural and arboriculture standards
- Have energy conservation, pollution reduction, waste recycling, and resource conservation measures

5. Conservation and heritage

Particular attention should be paid to the conservation and appropriate management of:

- Natural features, wildlife and fauna
- Landscapes
- Buildings and structural features
- These should serve their function well without placing undue pressure on the surrounding environment

6. Community involvement

The park/green space management should actively pursue the involvement of members of the community who represent as many park/green space user groups as possible. The following should be demonstrated:

- Knowledge of user community and levels and patterns of use
- Evidence of community involvement in management and/or developments and results achieved
- Appropriate levels of provision of recreational facilities for all sectors of the community

7. Marketing

- A marketing strategy should be in place, which is in practice and regularly reviewed
- There should be good provision of information to users, e.g. about management strategies, activities, features, ways to get involved
- The park/green space should be promoted as a community resource

8. Management

- A management plan or strategy should be in place which reflects the aspirations of Local Agenda 21
- This should clearly and adequately address all of the above criteria and any other relevant aspects of the park/green space's management
- The plan must be actively implemented and regularly reviewed
- A financially sound management of the park/green space must also be demonstrated

Playing Pitch Strategy Update

Report of the Assistant Chief Executive

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

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

The provision of formal outdoor sports facilities has a positive impact within the community. The availability of sports facilities contributes to the corporate priority of supporting younger people by providing positive activities for their engagement. The availability of sports facilities also allows a wide range of residents of all ages and backgrounds to take part in physical activity and team games, therefore creating opportunities for the whole community. Outdoor sports facilities enable local sports clubs and teams to develop and they can in turn strengthen community identity and enhance the social fabric of an area.

Purpose of Report

To update cabinet on the progress of playing pitch strategy action plan.

Key Issues

The playing pitch strategy (2007 – 2012) is an assessment of the current supply and demand for cricket, football, hockey and rugby playing pitch facilities compared with the likely future levels of demand. It helps to identify the need for new facilities as well as suggesting where there may be the wrong type of facilities or facilities in the wrong location. The report made a number of strategic recommendations and an action plan was produced as a result of the strategy. A number of actions have been completed or have started to be addressed.

Financial Implications

The strategy will help to support bids for external funding both by the council and local clubs. Several funding streams require the borough to have a playing pitch strategy in place. In addition the strategy has been used by the planning department, when considering applications such as that of London Irish which may have an impact on outdoor playing pitches.

Corporate Priorities

Supporting Younger People

Officer Recommendations

Cabinet is asked to:-

- 1) Continue to support the ongoing actions resulting from the playing pitch strategy.
- 2) Support the research required to prepare an up to date playing pitch strategy for 2012 – 2017. The new research will be carried out by the leisure team.

Contact: Liz Borthwick, Assistant Chief Executive Tel: (01784) 446376

Portfolio Holder: Councillor Mrs. Denise Grant

MAIN REPORT

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 The playing pitch strategy assessment was undertaken in 2007 to identify current levels of provision in the area and to compare this with current and likely future levels of demand. The strategy helps ensure a strategic approach to facility provision and a more efficient use of resources.

2. KEY ISSUES

- 2.1 The playing pitch forum continues to meet regularly and is supported by both Middlesex FA and Surrey Cricket.
- 2.2 All current self management agreements have been looked at and we are continuing to work on a standardised approach for all clubs.
- 2.3 The 2011 version of the leisure directory is currently being designed and will contain up to date information on local clubs and participation opportunities.
- 2.4 Regular consultation with pitch users has been established by setting up the playing pitch forum. This gives users the chance to provide feedback on satisfaction and common pitch issues. A Spelthorne cricket development group has also been set up by Surrey Cricket and Middlesex FA have the first meeting of Spelthorne Football Clubs organised for late January.
- 2.5 Fees and charges are currently being reviewed for the season 2011/12. These are being set in accordance with neighbouring local authorities fees and charges.
- 2.6 Council officers are continuing to provide advice to local clubs, schools regarding sports development, external funding sources, planning issues and grounds maintenance.
- 2.7 The findings of the playing pitch assessment were used to prioritise investment in the upgrade of changing and shower facilities.
- 2.8 Junior football has been given priority over adult games and some grounds which have previously had adult pitches marked now have junior pitches on them. Teams playing in the Surrey Primary League are likely to move to 9 v 9 football for next season rather than 11 a side which is likely to require different pitch markings to the current ones.
- 2.9 The council are working in partnership with the Football Association and the England and Wales Cricket Board to monitor growth of clubs, look at the potential for shared facilities through local clubs and support development of clubs and teams.
- 2.10 Matthew Arnold School have recently opened a new 3G pitch which is used by a number of local clubs. This helps address deficiencies identified for artificial pitches.
- 2.11 Preliminary discussions have been opened with Kempton Park about the possibility of using some of the additional land next to the race course for football pitches which can be used by local clubs

3. OPTIONS ANALYSIS

- 3.1 To continue to support the ongoing actions resulting from the playing pitch strategy for 2012 – 2017.

- 3.2 To not support the continue to support the ongoing actions from the current playing pitch strategy for 2012-2017
- 3.3 To support the research required to prepare an up to date strategy for 2012 – 2017. The new research will be carried out by the leisure team.
- 3.4 To not support the research required to prepare an up to date strategy for 2012-2017.

4. PROPOSALS

- 4.1 To review the use of existing pitches each season and designate the use each season according to the demand and requirements of local teams.
- 4.2 To continue to look at different ways to address pitch deficiencies including exploring the possibility of using Kempton Park for football.
- 4.3 To consider the extension of pitch booking arrangements to assist venues with hiring out facilities. This would help provide a consistent service to local clubs and help resource issues often experienced by smaller schools.
- 4.4 To look at different management options including the possibility of self management arrangements.
- 4.5 To continue to support the playing pitch forum to ensure regular consultation with pitch users.
- 4.6 To continue to review the fees and charges regularly taking into consideration the fees and charges of neighbouring boroughs.
- 4.7 To continue to support the Spelthorne Cricket development forum and the Middlesex FA Spelthorne Clubs meetings to ensure joined up working and maximum benefit.

5. BENEFITS AND SUSTAINABILITY

- 5.1 **Social Inclusion** Outdoor sports facilities enable local sports clubs and teams to develop and they can in turn strengthen community identity and encourage those from different areas of the community to integrate.
- 5.2 **Community involvement** Local sports teams can create or strengthen community identity and enhance the social fabric of an area.
- 5.3 **Community Safety.** Strong anecdotal evidence exists to show that sport has a part to play in preventing crime. Indirectly sport can have an impact by providing challenge and adventure and giving meaning and sense of purpose to an individuals life. It is important to ensure that local facilities are adequate to achieve these objectives.
- 5.4 **Lifelong learning.** Young people can develop a range of physical and social skills from taking part in team sport.
- 5.5 **Healthy living.** The physical, social and psychological health benefits of participation in sport are well documented. Facility provision is important in ensuring that effective development work can take place to raise participation levels.

6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The playing pitch strategy will help to support bids for external funding both by the council and local clubs. Several funding sources require the borough to have a playing pitch strategy in place. Working through the actions of the playing pitch

strategy could help provide investment through national governing bodies and other funding providers. Looking at self management lease agreements with clubs could help them receive considerable investment to develop facilities.

The playing pitch research was previously carried out by an external consultant and the Spelthorne research officer. The current financial climate and internal staff changes means that the leisure team will be required to carry out this research, which will be an additional responsibility for the department.

7. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS / OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- 7.1 The playing pitches are situated in public parks and open spaces. Any self management arrangements would need to be drawn up in liaison with the legal team.

8. RISKS AND HOW THEY WILL BE MITIGATED

- 8.1 If we are unable to meet the needs of local clubs then there is the risk of clubs moving outside the borough to access facilities which meet their needs. This may mean that there are less participation opportunities locally. Completing actions from the playing pitch strategy should help us satisfy demand and prevent teams having to look elsewhere for facilities.

9. TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

- 9.1 The playing pitch strategy actions are ongoing. It is advised that the adequacy of playing pitch provision is re-assessed on a 5 year rolling assessment programme with the first re-assessment complete by 2012. Research for re-assessment would need to take place during 2011 in order to have an up to date strategy in place by 2012.

Report Author: Claire Moore, Sport and Facilities Manager. Tel: (01784) 446452

Background Papers:

The updated playing pitch strategy action plan will be available in the members room.

PLAYING PITCH ACTION PLAN - updated January 2011

POLICY	ACTION	LEAD BODY	PARTNER AGENCIES	RESOURCES	TIMESCALE	UPDATE JAN 2011
General						
G1	To help address deficiencies in pitch provision, the Council should seek to work in partnership with the Local Education Authority and individual schools to obtain secure community use of school facilities.	SBC	Surrey County Council Schools School Board of Governors	SBC Human resources	Ongoing Short/ medium/ long	Caretaking/key holder issues in schools continue to restrict progress. To also consider the extension of council pitch booking arrangements to assist venues with hiring out facilities. This would help provide a consistent service to local clubs and help resource issues often experienced by smaller schools.
G1	There is a need to strengthen and develop partnership working by establishing forums for key sports in the Borough e.g. football and cricket.	SBC	Local sports clubs	SBC Human resources	Ongoing Short/ medium/ long	The playing pitch forum continues to meet regularly and is supported by both Middlesex FA and Surrey Cricket. Separate meetings with the FA/football clubs and Surrey cricket/cricket clubs held recently.
G2	To monitor and continually update the pitch supply and demand information on an annual basis. Re-assessing the adequacy of playing pitch provision on a 5 year rolling assessment programme.	SBC	Schools Sport England Local Clubs All pitch providers	SBC funds Sport England?	First reassessment complete by 2012	In addition we aim to review the use of existing pitches each season and designate the use each season according to the demand and

PLAYING PITCH ACTION PLAN - updated January 2011

POLICY	ACTION	LEAD BODY	PARTNER AGENCIES	RESOURCES	TIMESCALE	UPDATE JAN 2011
					Long	requirements of local teams.
G2	<p>Review and update the Club database and sports directory on a regular basis, to ensure that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council has up to date information about local clubs and their pitch requirements • Local residents have access to information about local sports clubs and participation opportunities • The Council can monitor supply and demand trends, particularly growth in focus sports 	SBC	<p>Local Clubs Local Leagues SBC</p>	SBC	<p>By December 2008 and ongoing annually</p> <p>Short / Medium</p>	<p>The club database is regularly updated in liaison with the local football and cricket leagues. Clubs are advertised in our leisure directory (Hard copy and online) and the sport in the community brochure. Middlesex FA and Surrey Cricket keep detailed records of the football and cricket clubs in the Spelthorne area</p>

PLAYING PITCH ACTION PLAN - updated January 2011

POLICY	ACTION	LEAD BODY	PARTNER AGENCIES	RESOURCES	TIMESCALE	UPDATE JAN 2011
G3	Review all self-management agreements and offer a standard formal agreement with clubs where appropriate.	SBC	Local Clubs	SBC	Ongoing Short / medium	Staines Albion continue to self manage their pitches at staines Park. At least one club is interested in becoming self managed. It is proposed that this is seriously considered. Further arrangements will depend on the success of this.
G4	Continue to develop regular consultation with pitch users to establish trend data in relation to satisfaction, ratings of quality and common pitch issues.	SBC	Local Clubs Use the proposed 'Sports Forum' to provide information	SBC	Ongoing Short / medium	See G1
G5	Review the level of fees and charges on a regular basis. Comparing these with neighbouring authorities/ Surrey Sports Partnership.	SBC		SBC Officers	Medium / long	The fees and charges are in line with Runnymede and Elmbridge and are reviewed on an annual basis.
G6	Provide advice on sports development planning, external funding sources and bids, business planning, technical design, planning issues, security of tenure and grounds maintenance advice to independent clubs, trusts and schools looking to develop open space and playing fields.	SBC	Sport Associations Local Clubs Surrey County Council (SCC) Schools	SBC Officers	Ongoing	This information can be provided to clubs either on an individual basis or via the playing pitch forum. Surrey County Playing Fields

PLAYING PITCH ACTION PLAN - updated January 2011

POLICY	ACTION	LEAD BODY	PARTNER AGENCIES	RESOURCES	TIMESCALE	UPDATE JAN 2011
						Association now have a borough development officer for Spelthorne who can help to provide advise specific to the development of playing fields.
G6	Establish a Playing Pitch Working Group at SBC with representatives from all services equally represented. The group should work towards delivering the playing pitch strategy and action plan.	SBC		SBC Officers	Ongoing Short / medium/ long	See G1
G6	Continue to invest in the provision, improvement and management of grass pitches and ancillary accommodation. Make improvements to ancillary accommodation at key multi pitch sites and those with greatest need.	SBC	Local Clubs	SBC Capital and commuted sums External Funding	Ongoing Short / medium/ long	Pavilions part refurbished in 2008/9 as part of the planned maintenance. Pitches continue to be maintained as part of grounds maintenance contract. Any comments are fed back to the contractors. Contractors attend the playing pitch forum so comments can be fed back directly. Looking at alternative venues for pitches to help improve provision.

PLAYING PITCH ACTION PLAN - updated January 2011

POLICY	ACTION	LEAD BODY	PARTNER AGENCIES	RESOURCES	TIMESCALE	UPDATE JAN 2011
G7	Consider extending pitch booking arrangements to school sites to help provide a consistent service to clubs whilst providing a consistent level of fees and charges across the Borough.	SBC		SBC staff resources	Ongoing Short	This continues to be a possibility.
G8	Use the findings of the assessment together with the Quality scores to prioritise investment in facilities.	SBC		SBC	Ongoing Short / medium / long	Part refurbishment of pavilions took place in 2008/9 as part of the planned maintenance.
G9	Identify potential new sites for re-instatement to address recorded deficiencies. Undertake detailed site feasibility studies on sites to assess potential and provide a cost benefit analysis of re-instating these facilities.	SBC		SBC staff resources Technical appraisal costs	Medium / Long	Preliminary discussions have been opened with Kempton Park about the possibility of using some of the additional land next to the race course for football pitches which can be used by local clubs
Football						
F1	Increase the number of mini soccer and junior pitches to address deficiencies. Consideration should be given to the re-designation of some surplus senior pitches to accommodate demand.	SBC	Local Leagues Local Clubs Schools/LEA SCC	SBC	Short	This was carried out and each season pitches are designated are either designated junior or senior based on the requirements of the clubs that are hiring them.
F2	Continue to monitor demand in growth areas of football and the possible effect on future demand of pitches.	SBC	Local Clubs Local Leagues	SBC Human Resources	Medium / Long	ongoing

PLAYING PITCH ACTION PLAN - updated January 2011

POLICY	ACTION	LEAD BODY	PARTNER AGENCIES	RESOURCES	TIMESCALE	UPDATE JAN 2011
F3	Address the loss of pitches and ancillary facilities at Laleham Park following the re-development of the site in 2008.	SBC	Local Clubs Local Leagues	SBC	Short / medium	See G9 update above
G1	Establish a football forum for the Borough which would focus upon the issues arising from the supply and demand analysis	SBC	Local Leagues and other pitch providers. Clubs	SBC Human Resources	Short	See G1 update above
Cricket						
C1	Identify potential sites for use by new and existing teams where no suitable venue is available or ground share with other clubs is not possible	SBC	Local Clubs Local Leagues	SBC (support role)	Ongoing	The requirements of the cricket clubs is monitored closely through the borough's cricket development group / Surrey Cricket. The group helps improve communication amongst clubs and often pitch requirements can be met by ground share with others clubs. One club is currently interested in having a second pitch at their club and initial discussions are taking place to look at the possibility.

PLAYING PITCH ACTION PLAN - updated January 2011

POLICY	ACTION	LEAD BODY	PARTNER AGENCIES	RESOURCES	TIMESCALE	UPDATE JAN 2011
C2	Use the quality scores to prioritise investment in facilities. Work in collaboration with cricket clubs who are seeking to improve ancillary accommodation on site.	SBC	Local clubs ECB	Club External Agencies Funding SBC – support role	Various Medium / long	Through the borough's cricket development group, we work with Surrey Cricket to monitor clubs requirements and point them in the direction of funding which they can apply for to improve facilities. All cricket clubs in the borough except 1 have their own grounds and are therefore responsible for improvements to their facilities.
C3	Continue to monitor demand in growth areas and the possible effect on future demand of pitches.	SBC	Local Clubs Local Leagues	SBC Human Resources	Medium / Long	Growth areas and the possible effects on cricket pitches are being monitored through close liaison with clubs at the cricket development group and Surrey Cricket.
G1	Establish a cricket forum for the Borough which would focus upon the issues arising from the supply and demand analysis	SBC	Local Leagues and other pitch providers. Clubs	SBC Human Resources	Short	The playing pitch forum and the Spelthorne cricket development group both meet regularly and deal with issues arising.

PLAYING PITCH ACTION PLAN - updated January 2011

POLICY	ACTION	LEAD BODY	PARTNER AGENCIES	RESOURCES	TIMESCALE	UPDATE JAN 2011
Rugby						
R1	Work in collaboration with the local rugby club(s) and Sports Development Team to monitor the capacity of private club, voluntary sector clubs and school facilities	SBC	Local Clubs Local Leagues RFU	None	Short/Medium/ Long	Ongoing
R2	Identify potential sites for use by new and existing teams where no suitable venue is available or ground share with other clubs is not possible	SBC	Local Clubs Local Leagues	SBC (support role)	Ongoing	London Irish planning application is at the appeal stage. If this is approved the new site would provide many new pitches in the borough.
Hockey						
H1	Ensure that planned STP provision meets the England Hockey Specification and design guidance for matches to enable facilities to be used for hockey fixtures in the future if required.	SBC	England Hockey Sport England		Short/Medium/ Long	Ongoing
H2	Work in collaboration with the local hockey clubs and Sports Development Team to monitor the capacity of private club, voluntary sector clubs and STP facilities	SBC	Local Clubs Local Leagues	SBC	Short/Medium/ Long	Ongoing
Synthetic Pitches						
S1	Work in partnership with providers to ensure full community access to existing and new STP's being developed.	SBC	Local Clubs Schools/LEA SCC	SBC	Short/Medium/ Long	A new 3G STP was built in the summer of 2010 at Matthew Arnold School and has

PLAYING PITCH ACTION PLAN - updated January 2011

POLICY	ACTION	LEAD BODY	PARTNER AGENCIES	RESOURCES	TIMESCALE	UPDATE JAN 2011
						community access.
S2	Support the delivery of a floodlit STP for training purposes	SBC	SCC Schools	SBC SCC Football Foundation	Short/Medium	See S2 above

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

WORK PROGRAMME

Meeting date	Topics
5 April 2011	<p>Capital and Revenue Monitoring reports</p> <p>Update on Leisure Services</p> <p>Streetscene Services long term vision</p> <p>Procurement Action Plan</p> <p>Partnerships</p> <p>Reports from Task Groups</p> <p>Cabinet Forward Plan</p> <p>Work Programme</p>