



10 December 2008

Dear Councillor

I hereby summon you to attend the meeting of the Council to be held on **Thursday 18 December 2008 at the conclusion of the business of the Special Council Meeting**, in the Council Chamber at the Civic Centre, Addlestone.

I am, Sir/Madam,
Your obedient servant

T N Williams
Chief Executive Officer

A G E N D A

1. FIRE PRECAUTIONS

The Mayor will read the Fire Precautions which set out the procedures to be followed in the event of fire or other emergency.

2. MINUTES

To approve and sign, as a correct record, the Minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 16 October 2008 (page 336).

3. MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

4. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

5. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

If Members have an interest in an item please record the interest on the form circulated with this Agenda and hand it to the Clerk at the start of the meeting. A supply of the form will also be available from the Clerk at the meeting.

6. SPEAKING OR QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC UNDER STANDING ORDER 12

7. PETITIONS

To receive Petitions under Standing Order No 10.

8. QUESTIONS

To answer the following Questions asked by the Councillors specified under Standing Order No 13:-

Question from Councillor Mrs Lay

"If the AirTrack proposals as currently envisaged were to go ahead there would be considerable disruption to the journeys of local residents and particularly those of 3,000 local school children, with there being a real risk of them missing the start of the school day.

Would the Leader agree that this is unacceptable?"

Question from Councillor Mrs Angell

"Would the Leader of the Council agree with me that for AirTrack to be acceptable to local residents the following actions should be agreed with BAA?

- o That AirTrack funds a dedicated signaller/level crossing operator for the Egham crossings?
- o That funding for the role should be contractually binding for the duration of AirTrack?
- o That formal reports on crossing downtime be produced by AirTrack on a regular basis and reported to both relevant local authorities?
- o That AirTrack sign a binding agreement that if the downtime exceeds an agreed limit that it will revise the frequency of the service to remedy this?"

Question from Councillor Miss Heath

"Would the Leader of the Council agree with me that if AirTrack is to be supported BAA and the Government have to demonstrate far more concern for the lives, quality of life and well-being of local people than they currently appear to be doing?

Causing or worsening traffic congestion is not in the interests of local people".

9. RECOMMENDATIONS OF COMMITTEES

- (i) To consider the following recommendations from the Committees specified. The recommendations are set out in full in the appropriate set of Minutes attached to this Summons, commencing on the page/paragraph numbers shown:-
- a) Financial Forecast
(Corporate Management Committee – 30 October 2008)
(Page 346, para 270 – yellow pages. The recommendation appears on page 350)
 - b) Sustainable Community Strategy and Strategic Plan and Committee Service Plans
(Corporate Management Committee – 30 October 2008)
(Page 351, para 271 – yellow pages. The recommendation appears on page 352)
 - c) Concessionary Bus Passes
(Corporate Management Committee – 30 October 2008)
(Page 355, para 273 – yellow pages. The recommendation appears on page 357)
 - d) St Peter's Hospital, Chertsey – Report of Review Board on Parking
(Corporate Management Committee – 30 October 2008)
(Page 359, para 278 – yellow pages. The recommendation appears on page 360)
 - e) Revisions to Runnymede Borough Council Local Development Scheme
Revised Local Development Scheme 2008 – 2012
(Planning Committee – 12 November 2008)
(Page 411, para 304 – green pages. The recommendation appears on page 412)

- (ii) To consider the following recommendations from the Corporate Management Committee held on 27 November 2008 and Review Board held on 4 December 2008. The Minutes of these meetings have not yet been finalised and therefore only the specific recommendations are set out below.

Corporate Management Committee – 27 November 2008

a) Revenue Reductions – Phase 3

The Committee considered a further phase of revenue reductions, (set out at Appendix 'A'), which consisted of a series of twenty-nine items with a proposed timescale for implementation for each of them. These proposals had been drawn up in consultation with Committee Chairmen, Directors and UNISON.

Revenue and other efficiency savings, together with “create/save” initiatives had been both a feature and a discipline in the authority for many years. Over the last three years, specific revenue savings had needed to be identified as a result of cumulative grant loss and “capping” from the Government which had imposed a limit on increases in Council Tax levels. In 2005, the Committee had approved a range of measures to reduce net budgets by £2.6 million. As reported in the five year Financial Forecast considered by the Committee at its last meeting, this was expected to achieve a total of £2.415 million. A further sum of not less than £600,000 was required to achieve some medium term stability. In March 2005, Council had approved Policy Guidance for Revenue Reductions, which was noted by the Committee (attached at Appendix 'B'). This again formed the basis of the approach to the current exercise.

The net revenue reductions were anticipated to total approximately £350,000 in year one (2009/10), rising to £712,000 by 2013/14, the last year of the Financial Forecast. Some of these proposals (e.g. strategic maintenance, all-weather pitches at Egham Leisure Centre and Queen Elizabeth House disposal) had or would be reported to the appropriate Committee. A report on progress on implementing the reductions would be made in February/March 2009. As services and functions were reviewed and opportunities arose, posts would, where appropriate, be deleted from the staffing establishment over the next five years. This would be achieved through retirements and staff turnover, thus avoiding redundancies and the associated costs. Appropriate and timely consultations would take place with the Trade Union and sections concerned on any staff-related matters. Where necessary, detailed proposals and their service consequences would be included in the reports on the Annual Pay and Workforce Plan which was considered by the Committee in the early months of each year. These proposals would have an impact on Runnymede's responsiveness and general service resilience, but the measures were considered to be the best available to the Council and were sensitive to the needs of residents and service users. The Council would seek to achieve the reductions without a perceptible diminution of service.

The total size and content of the General Fund Capital Programme needed to be settled for 2009/10. Over recent years a classification priority had been applied to potential schemes. The Committee noted the ten lowest priority schemes underlined on the second page of the full programme, attached at Appendix 'C'. The Committee did not wish to recommend that any schemes be deferred or discontinued at this stage, but agreed that Committee Chairmen should discuss this further and that the matter be reconsidered again, if any proposals emerged.

In order to work towards Target Number 5, on reductions in volume and impact of private search companies in relation to the Land Charges service, Officers would need authority to vary the approved fees for the Local Land Charge service, where lawful, to optimise income and provide incentives for users. Achieving Target Number 22, on web based publication of public notices, would be dependent on a change in legislation being provided by the Government. There were unlikely to be equality implications in service or staffing terms relating to most of the proposed reductions. The Council would need to be satisfied that above inflation increases for allotment charges were affordable and did not disadvantage older allotment users relative to others. Any equality implications would be considered by Service Committees at the appropriate time. Other service related proposals were only likely to emerge over the five year programme.

Regarding Target Number 24, on reduction in the response for the out-of-hours noise service, it was noted that the proposal was to cease the use of the outside contractor for complaints received outside normal office hours, thereby making a saving of £10,000. This service had been previously removed and then reinstated and the proposal was now to remove it again. In the first seven months of the service since its reinstatement, twenty-nine calls had been received and one statutory nuisance had been witnessed. This was, therefore, a costly service which was not being used by many residents. Safer Runnymede would continue to take any calls from the public on noise nuisance outside office hours, staff might be available for callout on a voluntary basis, and complaints would be reviewed by staff in the office on the following day.

UNISON had been made aware of the proposals and had discussed them with the Chief Executive Officer and Personnel Officer and was content, at this stage, with the reassurances given that full consultation with staff and UNISON would take place as staff related issues arose, but reserved the right to make more detailed representations as necessary.

RECOMMEND that:

- i) subject to satisfactorily concluding any consultations that may be necessary, the revenue reductions detailed at Appendix 'A' be approved;**
- ii) service Committees be advised accordingly;**
- iii) Officers be authorised to prepare future budgets based on these proposals;**
- iv) any variations to the staffing establishment, where appropriate, be reported in the Annual Pay And Workforce Plan; and**
- v) the Director of Administration and Leisure be authorised to approve amended fees for replies to enquiries and other local search services from time-to-time, either generally, or, for specific users or classes of users, with the intention of optimising search income and use of the service.**

b) Capital Strategy

The Committee considered a proposed revised Capital Strategy (set out at Appendix 'D') which showed the changes to the current Strategy. The current Strategy had been approved by Council on 19 October 2006. The Capital Strategy set out how the Council evaluated and managed its capital programme and was periodically reviewed to ensure that it was still consistent with Council policies and reflected current developments. Officers had made some minor changes to ensure that the document remained up to date, these changes mainly relating to updated references to other strategy documents. Latest performance indicator data had also been included. At Appendix 1 on Statistical and Financial Information, the figures regarding the maintenance backlog for non-housing stock were not available, because the analysis of the new programme had not yet been completed. However, all Category 1 works had been completed and Officers were satisfied that the stock was in good condition. While the information relating to the former Best Value system of performance measurement had been deleted from the strategy, this did not mean that services and the ways in which those services were delivered, would not be regularly reviewed. The Committee noted that details of all Council assets were broken down individually in the Asset Register. The Council's Asset Management Plan would be presented to a future meeting of the Economic Development Committee.

RECOMMEND that –

the Capital Strategy as set out at Appendix 'D' be approved.

c) Calendar of Meetings 2009/2010

The Committee considered the Calendar of Meetings for the Municipal Year May 2009 - 2010. For ease of reference, a diary schedule of the Committee dates was also submitted. It was now proposed that the Housing and Community Services Committee be moved from 4 June to 16 June 2009 to avoid a clash with the European Parliament and County Council Election date, and that, as a consequence, the provisional Planning Committee meeting be held on 1 July 2009, rather than 16 June 2009. Regarding the Standards and Audit Committee, it was considered appropriate to hold an extra meeting on 9 June 2009 to consider the Statement of Accounts and Governance Statement. At the request of the Chairman of that Committee, Mr Tully, it was now proposed that the Standards and Audit Committee meeting in September 2009 be moved from the 8th to 30th day of that month. An electronic version of the final Calendar, when agreed, would be made available to Members in a format which could be loaded into *Outlook*.

RECOMMEND that –

the Calendar of Meetings for the Municipal Year 2009/2010 be approved, as attached at Appendix ‘E’, and as set out in diary form at Appendix ‘F’, subject to the meeting of the Standards and Audit Committee scheduled for 8 September 2009 being rescheduled to take place on 30 September 2009.

Review Board – 4 December 2008

a) Parking at St Peter's Hospital, Chertsey – Trust response

The Board considered the response of the Ashford and St Peter's Hospitals NHS Trust to the Board's report and conclusions arising from the review of car parking provision at St Peter's Hospital, Chertsey.

At its meeting on 9 October 2008, the Board had reviewed car parking provision at St Peter's Hospital, Chertsey because of public concerns about the adequacy of the provision and the ability of patients, visitors and staff to adequately access the site and its services. The Board agreed that their findings should be reported to the Corporate Management Committee with a recommendation that the Committee add any comments of its own and make a further recommendation to the full Council meeting. The Board's report is attached at Appendix 'G'.

At its meeting on 30 October, the Corporate Management Committee noted the Board's report on this matter and the conclusions which the Board had reached and agreed that before the issue was considered by the Council, it would be helpful to seek to obtain the Ashford and St Peter's Hospitals NHS Trust's response to the findings of the Board.

The Committee accordingly agreed that the Board's report and conclusions be sent to the Trust and that the Trust be requested to make a response, which would be submitted to the Board. The original report of the Board, the Trust's response and the Board's comments on the Trust's response would then be submitted to a full Council meeting. The Board's comments on the Trust's response are contained within this Recommendation. The Trust's response is attached at Appendix 'H'. This had been received on the afternoon of the Board's meeting, after a number of requests.

The Trust referred in their response to paragraphs 6 and 23 of the Board's report in particular.

The Board was pleased to note that the Trust was now actively targeting the patient car parks to prevent staff from parking in the Visitor/Patient designated areas. Although it was helpful that one of the designated car parks had been given over to patient use, this only provided an additional 26 places. Staff parking to the rear of the hospital being designated as shared between staff and visitors after 2.30pm, and the Trust's signage review, were welcomed. The Board wished, however, to see more measures to restrict staff parking, particularly during the peak period of congestion in the afternoon, at the time of outpatient appointments. Car parking income which the Trust obtained was not ring-fenced and could be treated as general resources for the hospital.

The Council had not registered as valid a planning application which the Trust had submitted for temporary parking, as the Trust had not supplied up to date information. The Council would wish to see a more comprehensive approach provided by a Masterplan.

The Board could see no evidence of a real commitment to a Park-and-Ride scheme from the Trust's response and although the Trust's car parking policy was being revised they had provided no details of its contents. There did appear to be a recognition by the Trust that they had to formulate a Masterplan – St Peter's Hospital was the only major site in the Green Belt within the borough that had not produced one. The Trust seemed to be only seeking a temporary solution to their parking difficulties. They had decided that their original application for decked car parking had been sited in the wrong place, despite having spent large sums in bringing the proposal forward. If the Trust could make progress on a Masterplan, that would provide a more long term solution to parking on the site. An indicative plan was all that was required and a high level of detail would not be expected. The Board considered that a timescale should be put on the production of a Masterplan and recommended accordingly that the Trust should advise them of progress in six months time.

THE REVIEW BOARD RECOMMENDS that –

i) the Council welcomes:-

- a) the recognition by the Trust that patient and visitor parking should be prioritised;**
- b) the fact that the Trust's car parking policy is being revised;**
- c) the fact that the Trust is pursuing a Masterplan; and**
- d) the fact that additional parking is being provided, albeit on a temporary basis;**

ii) the Council urges that:-

- a) the Masterplan be completed by the Trust as soon as possible, discussed with Runnymede Officers and be submitted formally as a planning application;**
- b) the Trust advise the Council's Review Board of progress on the Masterplan in six months time;**
- c) the Trust agree and implement the revised parking policy as soon as possible; and**
- d) the Trust investigate and implement increased parking provision as soon as possible, subject to the details provided in the Masterplan;**

iii) the Council advises the Trust that:-

- a) both Borough and County Council Officers would be pleased to provide advice on experience elsewhere of formulating and implementing parking policies; and**
- b) Runnymede Officers would welcome early consultation over the Masterplan and proposals for additional car parking.**

10. PRESS AND PUBLIC TO BE EXCLUDED BY RESOLUTION

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

11. COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS - EXEMPT

To consider any recommendations which relate to exempt business.