



RUNNYMEDE BOROUGH COUNCIL

HOUSING AND COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE

16 JANUARY 2008

APPENDICES

<u>APPENDIX</u>	<u>REPORT</u>	<u>PAGE. NOS.</u>
A	BOROUGH RESPONSE TO THE SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL'S STRATEGY FOR WORKING WITH THE VOLUNTARY AND COMMUNITY SECTOR	1 - 3
B	AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROGRAMME DECEMBER 2006 – DECEMBER 2011	4 - 5
C	REVENUE ESTIMATES FOR 2008/09	CIRCULATED SEPARATELY

(NB: The Estimates have been circulated to Members of the Committee and relevant Officers only and a copy has been placed on the Website for all other Members).

**BOROUGH RESPONSE TO THE SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL'S
STRATEGY FOR WORKING WITH THE VOLUNTARY
AND COMMUNITY SECTOR**

This document is a joint response from;
Elmbridge Borough Council
Molevalley Borough Council
Woking Borough Council
Runnymede Borough Council and
Waverly Borough Council

1. **General comments**

- 1.1 Surrey Boroughs were very disappointed to receive the completed strategy in its draft form indicating that there had been consultation with Boroughs in its production when this had not taken place. Such a Strategy would have benefited from it being a bottom up approach, engaging people at the frontline to understand and take forward salient themes in order get "buy-in".
- 1.2 Under infrastructure activity the list suggests it was an agreed list of priority infrastructure activities to be delivered consistently across Surrey as discussed and agreed with the PCT and Borough and District Councils. Sadly this was not the case. Boroughs are however very keen to be actively involved in the redraft of this document and offer the following response:
- 1.3 There should be clarity about the support and work Surrey Community Action (SCA) deliver. There is concern that duplication exists between the work undertaken by the cvs's in the county and SCA.
- 1.4 All information produced by Surrey County Council (SCC) should be produced in various formats and should not rely on the web site alone e.g. hard copies providing information should be produced, cvs's through their newsletters and mediums such as radio and the press used.
- 1.5 There is support for a shorter, sharper document.
- 1.6 Over the last two years significant work has been undertaken in partnership through working groups. It is vitally important that this work should be incorporated into the Strategy i.e. Change Up's Infrastructure Development Plan and the Compact (and Codes of practice)
- 1.7 A "Golden Thread" of partnership working should run throughout the strategy.
- 1.8 Neither the LAA nor the LPSA should form part of the Strategy.

2. **Funding**

- 2.1 SCC should undertake discussions with the voluntary and community sector (VCS) to discuss the difficulties that the introduction of swapping from grants to contracts will have on the VCS and how SCC can support with the transition. In particular consideration should be given when grants are moved to contracts where there are pooled funding arrangements
- 2.2 If SCC are to change the type of document (and monitoring arrangements) for the tri - partite agreement currently between SCC, the boroughs and the PCT, all partners must agree the changes.
- 2.3 There is no support for Surrey having **one** CVS.
- 2.4 Suggest a group consisting of the VCS and Surrey officers that will discuss issues over funding.
- 2.5 SCC should recognise that there are likely to be cost implications when a voluntary organisation has to change from a grant to a contract i.e. insurance, redundancy.
- 2.6 It has been confirmed that some boroughs are unable to sign up to full cost recovery.

3. **Volunteering**

- 3.1 This section should solely focus on working in partnership to promote volunteer opportunities, particularly working with volunteer centres.
- 3.2 SCC must not duplicate the current work being undertaken by the volunteer centres across Surrey.
- 3.3 SCC could support volunteering by using tools particular to its organisation to add/enhance promotion of volunteering. However, it is suggested that this strategy should not include Volunteer Awards, the Volunteer Tool Kit, Volunteer expenses and Employee Volunteering. These are all internal processes for an individual organisation to best support their volunteers.

4. **Infrastructure**

- 4.1 As previously mentioned this section suggests there has been liaison with Borough and District Councils which in fact has not taken place.
- 4.2 What is a local broker service?
- 4.3 It is critical that CVS support is provided locally.
- 4.4 Agree that some Surrey wide initiatives have merit e.g. training

currently provided by SCA.

- 4.5 Clarity from SCC on how it expects funding advice to be provided - A working group with voluntary sector, borough and county representatives produced an outline proposal for the provision of a central funding advice team staffed by experts. There was a cost implication and it was proposed SCC may consider funding this. If this were to happen, CVS's would still provide funding advice but to an agreed basic level. The strategy does not include this new way of delivering funding advice.
- 4.6 Consideration must be given to the impact of tendering for infrastructure provision on current CVS organisations especially where they may have other streams of funding (e.g. Lottery) for projects which may lapse without core funding.
5. Engagement
- 5.1 There should be greater engagement from SCC with the Surrey PCT and Boroughs and District Councils over strategic planning for the future.
- 5.2 SCC should be aware of the CVS's concerns and strive to address them.
- 5.3 There should be at least one Borough Representative on the Strategic Working Group.
- 5.4 Ensure that SCC messages are received by the grass root VCO's. CVS's can support this.
- 5.5 The contact list at the end should be reduced. It is too lengthy and will lead to confusion about how it should be used. It also runs the risk of once printed it becomes out of date as Officers change.
- 5.6 Boroughs would find it helpful to attend a meeting to discuss further once you have incorporated these changes in your revised draft document and we look forward to hearing from you in the near future in respect to Borough and District representation on your Strategic Group.
- 5.7 A recent audit of voluntary sector (2007/2008) activity within Surrey Boroughs demonstrated that over £4,700,000 is contributed by Surrey Boroughs to support the voluntary and community sector. The five boroughs that have produced this document fund over £3,000,000 (this is the most up to date figure and includes health, leisure and the arts)
- This Strategy cannot be produced by SCC in isolation.**

AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROGRAMME DEC 2006 – DEC 2011 NEW BUILD

COMPLETIONS

SCHEME ADDRESS	NO. OF UNITS	TENURE MIX	PROPERTY TYPE	PROVIDED FOR	COMMENTS/ CURRENT POSITION	COMPLETION DATE
Waspe Farm, Egham (A2 Housing Group)	18	Rented	1 and 2 bed Flats	9 = General needs 9 = Supported		Completed April 2007
TOTAL	18					

UNDER CONSTRUCTION

SCHEME ADDRESS	NO. OF UNITS	TENURE MIX	PROPERTY TYPE	PROVIDED FOR	COMMENTS/ CURRENT POSITION	COMPLETION DATE
Wapshott Road (A2 Housing Group) Phase 1	62	Rented	Whole scheme 69 flats (32x1 bed 37x2 bed) 34 Houses (12x2 bed, 21x3bed)	GN	Under construction	First phase to be completed by July 2008
Roakes Avenue (A2 Housing Group)	42	Rented	15 Houses (7x 2bed, 6x3 bed 2x 4bed) and 27 Flats (9x1 bed 18x2 bed)	GN	Under construction	Spring 2009
Chertsey Bridge Wharf last phase - 3 Rademec site (TVHA)	9	Intermediate rented	9x 2 bed Flats	Local key workers	Under construction	Block C (4 Units) – Feb 08 Block D (5 units) June 08
Pretoria Road (TVHA) Phase 1	26	RT/SO	Whole scheme 13x1 bed flats 23x 2 bed flats	GN	Under construction	Summer 2008
St Annes School Site Virginia water	28	SO	8x 1 bed flats 12 x 2 bed flats 2 x 3 bed flats 4 x 3 bed houses 2 x 4 bed houses	GN	Under construction	Summer 2008
TOTAL	167					

SITES BEING ASSEMBLED (and likely to complete in 5 year programme)

SCHEME ADDRESS	NO. OF UNITS	TENURE MIX	PROPERTY TYPE	PROVIDED FOR	Grant Allocated	COMMENTS/ CURRENT POSITION
Wapshott Road (A2 Housing Group) Phases 2 AND 3	41	Rented	Whole scheme 69 flats (32x1 bed 37x2 bed) 34 Houses (12x2 bed, 21x3bed)	GN	Yes	By January 2010
Pretoria Road (TVHA) Phase 2	10	RT/SO	Whole scheme 13x1 bed flats 23x 2 bed flats	GN	£500,000 authorised from RBC. But Grant from HC also to be applied for	First phase has commenced and next phase will follow when first complete
Pinefields Addlestone (TVHA)	Estimate 16	RT/SO	To be determined 70% 2 beds requested	GN	No	Marketing complete and selection of developer in progress. Grant to be applied for in March 2008
Civic Offices site (TVHA)	61	RT/SO	Flats 70% 2 beds requested	GN	No	Developer selected and contracts being drawn up. Grant applied for.
Franklands Drive (Respond) Phases 1 & 2	234	Whole scheme 170 x RT 40x Intermediate rented 140x Homebuy	Whole scheme 178 Houses and 172 flats	310x GN and 40x key workers	No	Outline consent obtained on appeal. Developer preparing a detailed planning application. Will not be possible to provide all units in 5 year programme only 234 out of the 350.
Fremantle's school site Chertsey	13	10x rented 3x shared ownership	1 & 2 bed flats	GN	Application made to HC	Consultation with local residents has taken place and planning application to be submitted in Spring 2008
TOTAL	375					