

Economic Development Committee

Thursday 17 September 2009 7.30pm

**Council Chamber
Runnymede Civic Centre, Addlestone**

Members of the Committee

Councillors P I Roberts (Chairman), D A Cotty (Vice Chairman), A Alderson, J Broadhead, H A Butterfield, Mrs C E Gant, Mrs G M Kingerley, L C Pouyanne, A S T Ridge-Newman and P Taylor

AGENDA

Notes:

- 1) Any report on the Agenda involving confidential information (as defined by section 100A(3) of the Local Government Act 1972) must be discussed in private. Any report involving exempt information (as defined by section 100I of the Local Government Act 1972), whether it appears in Part 1 or Part 2 below, may be discussed in private but only if the Committee so resolves.
- 2) The relevant 'background papers' are listed after each report in Part 1. Enquiries about any of the Agenda reports and background papers should be directed in the first instance to **Mr M L White, Committee Section, Administration and Leisure Department, Runnymede Civic Centre, Station Road, Addlestone (Tel: Direct Line: 01932 425623). (Email: malcolm.white@runnymede.gov.uk).**
- 3) Agendas and Minutes are available on a subscription basis. For details, please ring Mr B A Fleckney on 01932 425620. Agendas and Minutes for all the Council's Committees may also be viewed on www.runnymede.gov.uk.
- 4) In the unlikely event of an alarm sounding, members of the public should leave the building immediately, either using the staircase leading from the public gallery or following other instructions as appropriate.

LIST OF MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION

PART I

Matters in respect of which reports have been made available for public inspection

	<u>Page</u>
1. FIRE PRECAUTIONS	3
2. NOTIFICATION OF CHANGES TO COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP	3
3. MINUTES	3
4. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE	3
5. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	3
6. AIRTRACK – TRANSPORT AND WORKS ACT APPLICATION	3
7. REVIEW OF OFF-STREET CAR PARKING CHARGES	8
8. COUNTY-WIDE CAR PARK SEASON TICKETS FOR SCC SOCIAL CARE WORKERS	18
9. FINANCIAL MONITORING STATEMENT	20
10. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC	21

PART II

Matters involving Exempt or Confidential Information in respect of which reports have not been made available for public inspection.

a) Exempt Information

11. HAMM MOOR SITES MASTER PLAN FOR SALE AND DEVELOPMENT	22
12. LAND AT MARLEY CLOSE, HARE HILL, ADDLESTONE	24
13. PALMER CRESCENT OTTERS HAW, POTENTIAL SALE AND DEVELOPMENT	26
14. 43/43A GUILDFORD STREET, CHERTSEY – PROPOSED DISPOSAL	27
15. YARD MEAD, WINDSOR ROAD, EGHAM – POSSIBLE SALE	30

b) Confidential Information

(No reports to be considered under this heading)

1. FIRE PRECAUTIONS

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

2. NOTIFICATION OF CHANGES TO COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

3. MINUTES

To confirm and sign, as a correct record, the Minutes of the Special Meeting of the Committee held on 13 August 2009, (Appendix 'A')

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 Legal Representative or Committee Administrator at the start of the meeting. A supply of the form will also be available from the Committee Administrator at meetings.

Members who have previously declared interests which are recorded in the Minutes to be considered at this meeting need not repeat the declaration when attending the meeting. Members need take no further action unless the item in which they have an interest becomes the subject of debate, in which event the Member must leave the room if the interest is personal and prejudicial.

6. AIRTRACK - TRANSPORT & WORKS ACT APPLICATION (DTS)

1. Purpose of the Report

1.1 **The purpose of this report is to seek Members' views on a response to the proposed Transport & Works Act application that will facilitate the Airtrack proposals for new rail access to Heathrow Airport.**

2. Background Information

2.1 Runnymede Borough Council has been one of the founding members of the Airtrack Forum, which was set up in 2000. The aim of this group is to improve public transport links to Heathrow and bring wider improvements to rail services to the area south, west and east of the airport.

2.2 The Borough has consistently recognised the economic benefits of Heathrow Airport and the number of large businesses which locate in this area because of its proximity. It was also recognised that improvements to public transportation (focused particularly on the Airtrack scheme) to Heathrow would relieve traffic congestion on the M25 and bring a range of environmental improvements.

2.3 However, over many years there has been a recognition of the problem relating to level crossing barrier down times in Egham. This has been exacerbated over recent years where half barrier crossings have been replaced with full barrier crossings, which are manually operated and this has increased barrier down time considerably. The recognition that the Airtrack proposals will increase the numbers of trains and therefore increase barrier down time has been a concern which has led to the Council's support for Airtrack being conditional upon the improvements to level crossing infrastructure.

2.4 There have been a number of consultations by Heathrow Airtrack over recent years, the last of which was late in 2008. Some 70% of the response to the consultation was in relation to level crossings in Egham.

2.5 Since then Runnymede Officers have been working closely with Heathrow Airtrack, Network Rail and Surrey County Council to both provide accurate survey data with regard to level crossing down times, but also work on a range of infrastructure improvements on both the road network and also rail side that may alleviate what is an existing problem.

3. Airtrack Proposals

- 3.1 Airtrack is a proposed new rail service linking Terminal 5 at Heathrow with London Waterloo, as well as areas south and west of London, including Reading and Guildford.
- 3.2 It will mostly use existing rail lines, but will also need about 4 kilometres of new track, along the edge of the M25, to link the Windsor line with the airport. This will include a tunnel to take the track into the existing below ground station at Heathrow Terminal 5.
- 3.3 Within Staines, a new chord will enable trains to run from the airport directly through to Reading and Guildford. The chord will be on a viaduct, about 450 metres long, that will pass over the Elmsleigh surface car park in Staines:
- 3.4 A new platform and track will be built at Staines Station. This will allow trains, particularly Heathrow Express trains, to terminate at Staines. The existing main ticket hall and footbridge will need to be demolished, but will be replaced with new structures.
- 3.5 The new 4 kilometre line into Heathrow will go across Staines Moor and branch off the existing Windsor line. It will be on a low viaduct, which will continue along the edge of Staines Moor, before descending to ground level alongside the Wraysbury River and M25 motorway. As the chord moves north, the line will be at ground level before going into a cutting and then a tunnel, which will take the railway below Airport Way, near Junction `14 of the M25. The tunnel will continue into the station at Terminal 5, which was built at the same time as the main terminal was constructed.
- 3.6 In Feltham a new train cleaning and maintenance depot will be built on the site of the old Feltham marshalling yards, which has been vacant since the 1960's. The depot will include a large new shed, a number of rail sidings and will be used to repair, clean and maintain the trains, as well as to stable them at night.
- 3.7 The plan is that the service will be running by the end of 2014, and Airtrack services will run between Terminal 5 and:
- London Waterloo, with stops at Clapham Junction, Richmond, Twickenham, Feltham and Staines
 - Guildford, with stops at Woking and Chertsey
 - Reading, with stops at Wokingham and Bracknell
- 3.8 Two trains per hour in each direction will serve each of these routes, with journeys taking between 40 and 45 minutes. These trains will be in addition to existing services.
- 3.9 During the week services will begin at around 5.00 am and will continue to around midnight. For Waterloo the trains will comprise 10 cars; those for Guildford and Reading will be 5 car trains.
- 3.10 Whilst the service will only stop at Chertsey local residents and others will be able to gain easy access to Heathrow (and beyond) by joining the service at Chertsey or Staines stations. This is viewed as a positive benefit of the scheme in seeking to reduce general road congestion.
4. The Transport & Works Act Application
- 4.1 The consultation period for the application expires on 18 September. Representations received will be considered by the Planning Inspectorate, who will set up a Public Inquiry to look into these comments, either at the end of this year or the early part of next year.
- 4.2 The Transport & Works Act application is wide ranging in its scope. It seeks power to construct and maintain works, power to alter layout of streets and execute street works, as well as stopping up streets and temporary stopping of streets to create access to works. Further it includes permission to construct bridges or tunnels where appropriate, to acquire land and also the grant of planning permission for the works.

- 4.3 The only works proposed within Runnymede are some minor works to the railway just before it passes over the River Thames in close proximity to Riverside Drive and Coopers Close. These works are not significant.
- 4.4 Whilst the application recognises there will be significant effects at level crossings (indeed there is a separate volume of the Environmental Statement which deals with these) there are no specific proposals to deal with this. Indeed, the application states "any solution will not be part of the Airtrack scheme".
- 4.5 The estimated cost of carrying out the proposed works is some £673m (as at 2008, quarter one). A detailed break down of this cost is set out at Appendix 'B'.
- 4.6 There is very substantial supporting Environmental Statement information provided with the Transport & Works Act application. However, the bulk of this relates to the construction work and proposals which lie outside Runnymede. This report therefore concentrates on the main impacts of the proposals within Runnymede, which is limited to the effects at level crossings and also the stopping at Chertsey. These aspects are dealt with in the following section of this report.

5. Impact on Runnymede

5.1 Impact on Chertsey Station

The estimated increase in station usage from 2015 then up to 2030 is shown on the table at Appendix 'C'. Increased passenger numbers at Chertsey, Woking and Guildford are predicted to rise by less than 5%. In relation to both Woking and Guildford, these numbers are quite significant, however at Chertsey the number increases to no greater than 15 passengers per day by 2030.

- 5.2 Despite the two short platforms at Chertsey, the predicted change in number of passengers at this station is unlikely to give rise to a significant effect in terms of station use. It is not considered that this increase would cause particular problems in terms of local parking facilities.

- 5.3 The South West Main Line Route Utilisation Strategy (2006) has indicated that a programme of platform lengthening to accommodate 10/12 car trains is scheduled to be completed by 2014. Clearly this will have implications for the number of passengers at stations, and a parking demand management plan would be needed as part of any such station improvements. However, this is something that is proposed by Network Rail, rather than Airtrack and is a matter for separate consideration when such proposals come forward.

5.4 Impact on Level Crossings

To inform this part of the Environmental Statement, additional survey work was carried out in the Spring of 2009 in relation to the four level crossings in Egham and the one in Addlestone. These were conducted over an entire 12 hour day (07.00 to 19.00).

- 5.5 In terms of the Runnymede level crossings, Airtrack will double the number of passenger trains in each direction every hour, from 4 to 8.

- 5.6 The impact on individual crossings is shown below:

- Thorpe Road, Egham Hythe would have 15 minutes more closure time per hour; (Average daytime closure per hour – 37 minutes)
- Vicarage Road, Egham, would have up to 12 minutes more closure time per hour; (Average daytime closure per hour – 38 minutes)
- Station Road, Egham, would have 13 minutes more closure time per hour; (Average daytime closure per hour – 34 minutes)
- Prune Hill, Rusham, would have 4¹/₂ minutes more closure time per hour; (Average daytime closure per hour – 15 minutes)

- At Addlestone there would be 7 minutes more closure time per hour; (Average daytime closure per hour – 21 minutes)
 - At Chertsey, the impact would be negligible. (Average daytime closure per hour – 18 minutes)
- 5.7 Impacts in relation to both Chertsey and Addlestone are less than Egham, because Chertsey has a bridge over the railway line, and in Addlestone there is an alternative route along Woburn Hill.
- 5.8 The Environmental Statement acknowledges that at Thorpe Road, Vicarage Road and Station Road, in Egham, the Airtrack proposals will have a severe adverse and significant effect on traffic and community in these locations.
6. Adequacy of Environmental Statement
- 6.1 Council Officers carried out a partial review of the content of an Environmental Statement (ES) submitted in support of the Transport and Works Act 1992 Order application for Heathrow Airtrack for completeness. The review is based upon the minimum acceptable requirements pursuant to Part 2 Schedule 4 of the Town and Country Planning (Environment Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulation 1999 (S.I. 1999 No 293). Officers concluded a review of the ES supporting the Airtrack proposal [see Appendix 'D' and consider it to be incomplete due to the following omissions:
- The ES fails to provide the data required to assess the main effects the proposed development will have on the receiving environment; particularly data is omitted for the assessment of cumulative effects such as effect on air quality due in part to modified barrier operation. Data is also required to support and justify assumptions made in the ES regarding significant NO₂ reductions;
 - The ES fails to provide a complete outline of the main alternatives studied and an indication of the main reasons for their choice, taking into account the environmental effects; particularly alternative barrier operations ; and,
 - By virtue of the above omissions, it is impossible for this ES as submitted to pass the test of providing a description of measures envisaged in order to avoid, reduce and, if possible remedy significant adverse effects.
- 6.2 Accordingly, in order to address identified shortcomings within the ES, officers suggest that the Secretary of State is urged to issue to the applicants a formal Regulation 19 request for the additional information prior to determining this application. It should be noted that additional information supplied in support of a Regulation 19 request must be subsequently re-reviewed and must be found to be both sound and fit for purpose in accordance with Part 2 Schedule 4 of the Town and Country Planning (Environment Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulation 1999 (S.I. 1999 No 293) in advance of the Secretary of State considering this application. Appendix 'D', provides an overview of the issues requiring a Regulation 19 request for additional information.
7. Possible Solutions
- 7.1 As indicated above, the Transport & Works Act application identifies the severe environmental impacts of Airtrack on level crossings in Runnymede, but proposes no works to alleviate this. Whilst it is recognised that this is an existing problem, the fact that Airtrack will exacerbate this problem and do nothing about it is considered to be unacceptable.
- 7.2 Notwithstanding this, Heathrow Airtrack Consultants have been working with Officers at both Runnymede and Surrey County Council, as well as Network Rail to try and identify proposals that would provide some relief to the highway congestion that would be caused.
- 7.3 It is clear that the manually operated level crossing barriers in Egham are not managed on a consistent basis. The signaller is dealing with a number of crossings and the barrier down time varies considerably depending on what other work the signaller is dealing with.

- 7.4 A number of possible solutions are being discussed with Network Rail, including the use of a dedicated signaller at Feltham signal box, and the use of new automated systems which use CCTV and radar to scan crossings and close barriers automatically.
- 7.5 The second aspect that is being actively pursued is the possibility of a bridge or tunnel which would enable traffic to by-pass the level crossing entirely. This is something which for cost and practical reasons could only be provided at one of the level crossings, not all three.
- 7.6 The Vicarage Road crossing is by far the busiest in the area and also has the largest amount of land available in the immediate vicinity. Technical work has demonstrated that a bridge capable of taking HGVs is not possible because the gradient needed to get over the railway line and then down under the M25 bridge is not possible. Whilst it might be possible to construct a bridge that would take cars only, the prospect of HGVs turning round in the road would simply replicate problems that already exist at the Byfleet Road bridge leading to Brooklands.
- 7.7 It is, however, apparent that it would be technically feasible to provide an under-pass satisfactory for all types of vehicles under the railway line at this point, subject to it being a 20 mph speed limit. This would include the removal of one residential property and would also affect access arrangements to some other residential properties in the immediate area.
- 7.8 It should be emphasised that whilst the technical work done thus far shows that this solution is feasible, there are no proposals to provide this at present by either Surrey County Council, Department for Transport or Heathrow Airtrack. It is simply an exercise that is being carried out in terms of technical feasibility.
- 7.9 The third aspect of work that is being carried out has looked at the wider highway network, because of existing constraints in the area, there is concern that even with an under-pass traffic will not move in an unrestricted fashion because of other bottlenecks nearby. For example, the Runnymede roundabout is a constraint on movements, as is the roundabout immediately adjacent to Staines Bridge.
- 7.10 Surrey County Council has already designed an improvement scheme for the Runnymede roundabout, which would increase capacity and also reduce the number of vehicles entering onto it from the M25. Other technical work is under way, including looking at realignment of the mini roundabout in Egham, as well as the potential for widening Thorpe Road and adjusting signalisation in Staines town Centre to allow greater traffic flow over Staines Bridge.
- 7.11 It will be appreciated that looking at the highway network including Egham in its entirety, as well as feeder roads into Staines Town Centre, is very complicated and time consuming. Surrey County Council have dedicated substantial resources into this project, but work continues. However, with the implementation of a possible under-pass, as well as improvements to Runnymede roundabout, there are technical solutions which taken together may provide a real impact on the existing and potential problems of delays at level crossings.
- 7.12 It is proposed that this technical work continue as well as investigation into potential funding streams for these highway works. This might include regional funding, funding from the Department of Transport, the potential for the Runnymede roundabout works to be given greater priority for funding by Surrey County Council, and indeed some funding from Heathrow Airtrack.

8. Council Policy

- 8.1 Runnymede's Sustainable Community Strategy and Corporate Plan has a specific aim to seek improvements to transport infrastructure, including Airtrack and railway infrastructure. This is considered to be fundamental in delivering the Council's principal aim of enhancing the quality of life for residents and providing an attractive environment for businesses and visitors.

9. Resource Implications

- 9.1 It is anticipated that the representations will be examined at a Public Inquiry, but the length of this is not known at this stage. Runnymede would present evidence via an appropriate Officer, but it is not anticipated that any other expert witnesses would be required. Legal

representation and advice by Counsel would however be needed to support the case. At this stage an estimate of cost is difficult, but might be in the order of £10,000. There is no budgetary provision for this and a supplementary estimate will be required in due course.

10. Conclusion

- 10.1 Over many years Runnymede Borough Council's position has been as a supporter of the principle of Airtrack, and it is suggested that this stance still be put forward to the Secretary of State in response to the Transport & Works Act application. However, that support has always been conditional on measures to be taken to relieve problems in relation to barrier down time on level crossings in the Borough.
- 10.2 The fact that the Transport & Works Act application recognises that there will be a significant effect on Egham in relation to level crossings, but then proposes no action whatsoever to address this, is considered to be unacceptable. Whilst Heathrow Airtrack are working with Officers in terms of looking at solutions and have funded survey work and continue to be supportive, it is considered that any solutions should benefit from at least partial funding by Heathrow Airtrack, in so far as this is not part of the application, objection should be made to this particular issue.
- 10.3 It is recommended that Officers continue to work with Surrey County Council, Network Rail, and BAA Airtrack to further develop the technical justification and feasibility for road and rail infrastructure improvements, so that these may be presented at the Public Inquiry as potential solutions to this issue. Similarly, avenues for funding for this infrastructure will continue to be investigated.

OFFICERS' RECOMMENDATION that –

- i) the principle of the Airtrack proposal, including the stopping point at Chertsey, be supported;**
- ii) objection be raised to the fact that impact on level crossings in Runnymede is identified to be severe, but that no alleviation measures are proposed (including funding of provision by others);**
- iii) the Secretary of State for Transport be urged to issue a Regulation 19 request under the Town and Country Planning (Environment Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulation 1999 requiring that the information deficiencies identified in section 6 above and Appendix 'D' be addressed by the applicants;**
- iv) Officers continue to work with Network Rail, Surrey County Council and Heathrow Airtrack Consultants, to identify infrastructure improvements to relieve level crossing barrier down times, including funding arrangements; and**
- v) Officers prepare a detailed case in respect of the future Public Inquiry to elaborate on these issues.**

(TO RESOLVE)

Background Papers

None.

7. REVIEW OF OFF-STREET CAR PARKING CHARGES (DTS)

1.1 Purpose of Report

1.1 The purpose of this report is to review car parking charges in the Council's off-street car parks.

2. Background Information

- 2.1 In considering this Committee's Service Plan at its meeting in September 2005, the Committee resolved that there should be an annual review of car parking charges.
- 2.2 Public car parks are an amenity provided by the Council for the convenience of the public. In shopping areas they encourage and maintain the viability of businesses.
- 2.3 Recent History of Parking Charges
- June 2003 Economic Development Committee
- Committee introduced consistent scale of charges in all of the Council car parks. Before this the scale of charges varied in different car parks.
- Charges increased. (Previous increase was in 1997).
- September 2005 Economic Development Committee
- Committee advised of parking services deficit of £136,000 in financial year 2004/05.
- Charges increased with the aim of reducing the burden of the car parking service on the general Council Tax Payer. Charges implemented in January 2006.
- Minimum charge was now 80p for two hours.
- The Committee resolved that there should be an annual review of parking charges.**
- September 2006 Economic Development Committee
- Car parking charges reviewed. Committee resolved not to increase parking charges but introduced a 50p for one hour charge.
- September 2007 Economic Development Committee
- Committee advised that the parking service made a surplus of £83,200 in the financial year 2006/07.
- Car parking charges were increased except for the minimum charge. Charges implemented in January 2008.
- September 2008 Economic Development Committee
- Committee advised that the parking service made a surplus of £126,200 in the financial year 2007/08.
- The 'all day' parking charge was increased to £4 and reduced charges were introduced in the 'out of town centre' car parks. These charges were implemented in January 2009.
- Season ticket charges were increased but contract parking charges were unchanged.
- At this meeting the Committee considered another report reviewing the Council's free car parks and concluded that there was no potential for charging in these car parks at that time.
- 2.4 The 'pay and display' car parks are managed by the Engineering Division of Technical Services Department. Borough car parks where pay and display charges are imposed are listed in Table 1. **The current charges are shown in Table 2, para 2.10.**

Table 1 – Borough Pay and Display Car Parks

Car Park	No. of Spaces
The Precinct, Church Road, Egham	86
Precinct Extension, Church Road, Egham	44
Wasp Farm, Station Road, Egham	123
Hummer Road, Egham	126
Victoria Street, Englefield Green	34
St. Jude's Road (Cemetery), Englefield Green	39
The Bourne, Station Road, Virginia Water	153
Memorial Gardens, Virginia Water	50
Beomonds, Heriot Road, Chertsey	55
Chertsey Library, Heriot Road, Chertsey	168
Gogmore Farm Park	53
Pooley Green	35
Garfield Road, Addlestone	52
Runnymede Pleasure Grounds, Windsor Road, Egham*	352

Notes

Figures in the above table include disabled bays, motorcycle bays and taxi ranks.

- 2.5 The Runnymede Pleasure Grounds levies higher charges, which are sustainable due to its popularity as a leisure destination. All income from this venue has to be used for the improvement and maintenance of the site due to the terms of the trust under which it is held. Leisure Services reviews these charges annually and they are currently £1.50 per hour or £6.00 all day.
- 2.6 The central car park in Heriot Road, Chertsey, (171 spaces) is managed by J Sainsbury Ltd, which has full discretion to set the charges in that car park. Budgeted income from Sainsbury for 2009/10 is £46,200.
- 2.7 Season ticket prices for the pay and display car parks were increased by the last parking charges review (September 2008) and implemented in January this year. They are currently £500 per annum or £150 per quarter. Residents living in close proximity to the car parks can purchase these at £250 per annum or £75 per quarter.
- 2.8 Penalty charges issued for contraventions in the car parks are set at two levels depending on the contravention. The charges are designed to reflect the severity of the contravention where, for example someone parking in a disabled person's bay when not entitled would be subject to a higher level penalty. Someone whose ticket has expired would receive a lower level. Higher level penalties are £70 (reduced to £35 if paid within 14 days). Lower level penalties are set at £50 (reduced to £25 if paid within 14 days). The scale of penalty charges is set nationally by the Department for Transport.
- 2.9 All of the Councils chargeable car parks have achieved the 'Park Mark' award for safer parking. These are awarded to car parks that achieve national standards with respect to quality and security of the parking area for the benefit of the car park users. Annual inspections are carried out by external assessors and Police Crime Reduction Officers to ensure that standards are maintained. This ensures that the parking facilities are of a high standard for which a reasonable charge should be expected. This also helps to offset the additional expenditure in maintaining the car parks in a safe and tidy condition, including the maintenance of the car park markings, signage, ticket machines, lighting, landscaping, boundaries, barriers and CCTV coverage.
- 2.10 The following table shows a comparison of Runnymede parking charges with other Surrey and Neighbouring Councils.

Table 2 – Comparison of Runnymede Parking charges with other Surrey and Neighbouring Councils

Borough/District	1 hour	1 to 2	2 to 3	3 to 4	4 to 5	5 to 6	6 to 7	All day
Runnymede (Town Centre)	0.50	1.00	1.50	2.00	2.50	3.50	3.50	4.00
Runnymede (Out of Town)	0.20	0.50	1.00	1.50	2.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Guildford (Town Centre)	1.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	6.00	7.00	8.00
Elmbridge (Town Centres)	0.50	1.00	2.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
Mole Valley (Town Centres)	0.60	1.00	1.80	2.40	3.00	4.00	5.00	8.00
Epsom & Ewell (Ashley Centre)	1.10	1.60	2.10	3.50	6.50	15.00	15.00	15.00
Epsom and Ewell (High Street)	0.60	1.20	2.00	2.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
Spelthorne	0.90	1.60	2.20	3.20	6.50	11.00	11.00	11.00
Surrey Heath (Main Square)	1.50	1.50	1.80	3.00	4.50	4.50	4.50	7.50
Waverley (Farnham Town)	0.70	1.50	2.50	3.50	4.50	5.50	6.50	7.50
Windsor (Town)	0.90	1.80	2.70	3.20	4.20	5.50	5.50	5.50
Woking (Town)	1.10	2.20	3.30	4.40	5.50	6.60	7.70	8.80

The main Network Rail station car parks in the Borough have a charge of £4.50 per day and are normally full to capacity on weekdays.

- 2.11 Elmbridge Borough Council increased its car parking charges in January 2009. Surrey Heath, Mole Valley, Spelthorne, Woking, Guildford and Tandridge Councils all increased their charges in April 2009.

Reigate and Banstead and Waverley are not increasing their charges this year.

- 2.12 The Engineering Division also manages two 'contract only' car parks at Bemonds Row and White Hart Row in Chertsey and nine other free car parks throughout the Borough.

- 2.13 There are also a number of free Borough Council car parks in parks, cemeteries, recreation grounds and corporate buildings. These are managed by Leisure Services and reported to the Leisure and Environment Committee.

- 2.14 Alongside the Car Parking Charge Review report to this Committee in September 2008 Officers also reported on the potential to introduce charges in the Council's free car parks. The Committee concluded that there was no potential for charging in these car parks at that time and nothing has changed since then to alter this position.

3. Report

- 3.1 During the financial year 2004-2005 the car parks ran at a considerable deficit of £136,000. Following the increase in charges in January 2006, part way through the financial year, the deficit was reduced to £15,000. Over the last three financial years the service has operated at a surplus: 2006-2007 £83,000, 2007-2008 £126,000 and 2008-2009 £71,000. The budget for the current year assumes a surplus of £26,000. The reduction in 2008/09 and onwards is partially due to an increase in Capital Charges of approximately £40,000.

- 3.2 The usage of car parks is dependant on their location across the Borough and varies between short term parking to predominantly all day commuter and business users. An analysis of the percentage of tickets sold in each car park for the various tariff periods is shown below. Table 3 below compares the number of tickets sold in the period January to April 2009, after the charges had changed, with the number sold in the same period in 2008 shown in brackets.

Table 3 – Comparison of the number of tickets sold at each tariff as a percentage of the total January to April 2008 and January to April 2009.

Car Park	Number of P&D Spaces	Up to 1 hr %	Up to 2 hrs %	2 to 3 hrs %	3 to 4 hrs %	4 to 5 hrs %	5 to 6 hrs %	All Day %
Memorial Virginia Water	47	35 (12)	23 (19)	6 (9)	9 (13)	6 (16)	12 (31)	N/A
Bourne Virginia Water	148	6 (1)	5 (1)	3 (1)	4 (2)	8 (5)	N/A	74 (90)
Library Chertsey	157	32 (17)	35 (30)	12 (10)	8 (9)	4 (5)	N/A	9 (29)
Beomonds Chertsey	52	32 (14)	28 (22)	9 (11)	14 (16)	8 (17)	10 (20)	N/A
Garfield Road Addlestone	80	55 (24)	27 (22)	6 (6)	5 (9)	2 (8)	N/A	5 (31)
Hummer Road Egham (short stay)	45	75 (58)	22 (35)	3 (7)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hummer Road Egham (long stay)	81	60 (37)	26 (31)	5 (6)	5 (1)	2 (8)	3 (7)	N/A
Precinct Egham	75	64 (50)	30 (32)	6 (18)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Precinct Extension Egham	43	48 (25)	38 (47)	14 (28)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Wasp Farm Egham	123	11 (1)	11 (3)	4 (2)	6 (5)	10 (9)	N/A	57 (80)
Pooley Green Egham	33	49 (45)	23 (29)	14 (12)	3 (9)	9 (2)	N/A	2 (2)
St Jude's E.Green	40	20 (9)	15 (17)	11 (8)	1 (8)	4 (5)	N/A	48 (53)
Victoria Street E.Green	32	27 (11)	32 (26)	19 (13)	7 (13)	9 (8)	N/A	6 (29)

Disabled/motorbikes, etc spaces are not included.

Reasons for Reduced Parking Income 2008/09

- 3.3 Throughout all car parks the sale of one hour tickets has increased considerably as a proportion of the total tickets sold. The introduction of reduced tariffs in the last three car parks on the table has also shown an increase in the percentage of tickets being sold at the lower tariffs. The tickets being sold at the all day rate in these car parks, with the exception of Victoria Street, has remained fairly stable.
- 3.4 The main commuter car parks at Wasp Farm, Egham and Bourne, Virginia Water showed a reduction in all day ticket sales and an increase of sales for lower tariffs.

Table 4 - Comparison of number of pay and display tickets sold April to July 2008 and 2009

Car Park	April – July 2008	April - July 2009	% Difference
The Precinct, Egham	37519	37169	-1%
Precinct Extension, Egham	6299	6891	11%
Wasp Farm, Egham	7759	6468	-18%
Hummer Road, Egham	26803	28076	5%
Victoria Street, Englefield Green	1524	1712	14%
St Judes Road, Englefield Green	2907	3274	13%
The Bourne, Virginia Water	4049	3222	-20%
Memorial Gardens, Virginia Water	4107	4112	0%
Beomonds, Chertsey	3420	3741	9%
Chertsey Library, Chertsey	11420	12575	10%
Pooley Green, Egham	493	706	41%
Garfield Road, Addlestone	8476	10939	29%

- 3.5 The above table shows a considerable reduction in ticket sales overall particularly in the commuter car parks and other Surrey Councils have reported a similar trend. This could be a result of the current economic climate.
- 3.6 Car park occupancy checks carried out in April this year as compared to April last year seem to correlate with the reduction in tickets sales and a general reduction in car park usage. Long term parking in the commuter car parks is noticeably less when comparing the two periods.
- 3.7 The total pay and display income from car parks for the period of January to March 2008 was £119,838.85 and was £115,168.24 for the same period in 2009 following the implementation of the 2008 Review changes in January 2009. This is a reduction of 4%. These figures do not include VAT.

Town Centre Car Parks

- 3.8 A new charging system was introduced by Sainsbury, in Chertsey, where the charge has been increased from 20p to £1.00 for a maximum two hour stay. This charge is refundable to their customers. This may explain the significant increase in short term users of the nearby Library and Beomonds car parks by drivers that used to use Sainsbury's car park.
- 3.9 The long term parking across the Borough has shown a significant reduction. As these car parks tend to be used by commuters and local workers this could be a direct reflection of the economic situation and job losses.

Out of Town Centre Car Parks

- 3.10 The introduction of new lower 'out of town centre' tariffs, for Englefield Green and Pooley Green, seems to have been well received with increases of usage. Verbal feedback from local businesses has been complimentary in response to the introduction of the lower tariffs.

Penalty Charge Notices

- 3.11 Penalty Charge Notices issued for contraventions in car parks for the last financial year resulted in a return of £74,462 (excluding vat) compared to £94,465 in the previous year. The number of fully paid tickets was 2549 in the last year and 2275 in the previous year. Reduction in the income is also due to the fact that most Penalty Charge Notices issued in car parks are payable at the lower rate since the introduction of differential penalties under the Traffic Management Act at the beginning of the last financial year. (See paragraph 2.8). A reduction in the issue of Penalty Charge Notices can also result from drivers realising that the car parks are regularly enforced.

Future Reduction in Car park Income

- 3.12 The planned development of the Precinct car park in Egham is likely to start in the next financial year (2010/11). This will affect the amount of available parking in Egham during the development but the Borough will be compensated for lost income. Officers are currently discussing the possibility of the Borough's Parking Service managing the new car park within the development in future. This would only be done if it was financially viable for the Borough.
- 3.13 The Borough Valuer is currently negotiating with a developer over a proposal to construct a supermarket on the site of the Memorial and Bourne car parks in Virginia Water. This could result in the loss of income from these car parks but the Valuer would negotiate compensation for the Council for the loss of income.

Car Park Season Tickets and Contract Parking

- 3.14 Car park permits are available in most of the Council car parks. Income from the sale of these permits was £61,077 in the last financial year (2008/09) compared to the previous year of £47,238 (2007/08). The cost of the annual permits was increased in January from £400 to £500. Some holders have not renewed expiring permits as a result of the increase or businesses closing down but the full implications of the increase will not be known until next year. Contract parking in Bemonds Row and White Hart Row, Chertsey is also available at £500 per year. In the last financial year income from this was £9,891 compared to £4,539 in the previous year. It is noted that a number of holders have vacated their bays in recent months. The economic climate was quoted as the main reason for vacating them.

Customer Survey

- 3.15 As part a requirement of the Park Mark award scheme the council carries out an annual survey of car park users to assess satisfaction levels. Customers are asked to comment on satisfaction levels in a number of areas including the car park charges
- 3.16 A customer survey was carried out in July 2008 the result of which indicated that 9% found the charges very reasonable, 45% found them acceptable and 46% found them too expensive. (Return of 74 responses, 14% of the survey forms handed out.)
- 3.17 A customer survey was also carried out in June 2009 that indicated that 24% found the charges to be very reasonable, 36% acceptable and 40% too expensive. (Return of 49 responses, 10% of the survey forms handed out). The question relating to 'Overall satisfaction with the parking facilities' resulted in 76% respondents that were 'happy' with the facilities and 24% that were 'not happy'.

Consultation with SCC

- 3.18 As part of the On-Street Civil Enforcement Agreement with SCC the Council is required to consult the County Council if it intends to alter the Off-Street Car Parking charges. The Chairman of SCC's Local Committee for Runnymede has been consulted and response on behalf of the Chairman is: *Surrey County Council supports measures to reduce on street car parking. We do not object to the options detailed in this report to raise charges in the Borough*

Council car parks. However, we would be concerned if this results in additional demand for parking on the public highway and would request that all charges are kept under review to ensure they are appropriate for the location

4. Council Policy

4.1 In March 2005 the Council approved a recommendation from the Corporate Management Committee following a detailed examination of initiatives as part of the revenue reductions exercise, which should be guided by the principles set out in the Statement by the then Leader of the Council, which included the following:

"Discretionary fees and charges (including car parking charges) need to, at least, reflect the cost of provision and/or comparative tariffs elsewhere."

4.2 The Council's Sustainable Community Strategy and Corporate Plan includes the following aims:

- to play an effective role in enhancing the quality of life for residents and providing an attractive environment for businesses and visitors.
- A Runnymede that fosters economic prosperity, with strong, local businesses and vibrant town centres.

4.3 Members will wish to balance covering the costs of operating car parks with concerns about the impact on the viability and vitality of the towns and neighbourhood centres in the Borough.

5. Equality Impact Assessment

5.1 Parking Services has conducted and published an Equality Impact Assessment. Part of that assessment looked at the provision of parking facilities for disabled persons. All Borough car parks contain dedicated and marked provision for disabled badge holders who are also able to use the car parks without charge.

5.2 As part of the annual customer satisfaction survey users were asked to comment on the facilities for the disabled users of the car parks. In July 2008 41% described them as good, 32% as acceptable and 27% as poor. In a similar survey in June 2009 40% described them as good, 47% as acceptable and 13% as poor.

6. Legal Implications

6.1 Notice of any new charges must be given in a local newspaper and in the affected car parks at least 21 days before they are implemented.

7. Resource Implications

7.1 There is a provision in the budgets for the current year (2009/10) for an increase in income of £20,000. The Financial Forecast approved by Full Council in December 2008 included a further increase of £80,000 in 2010/11, all as a result of a possible revised tariff in January 2010.

7.2 At its meeting on 25 June 2009 the Corporate Management Committee received a report setting out the financial prospects for the Council, the recommendation of which was that a report be submitted to its next meeting with *"options to reduce the General Fund net budget by £1,500,000"*.

7.3 As stated in paragraph 3.1 of this report, the car parks made a surplus of £83,000 in 2006/07, rising to £126,000 in 2007/08 but falling again to £71,000 in 2008/09. The budget for 2009/10 assumes a surplus of £26,000. Due to the current financial climate and the falling car park usage last year it was expected that the surplus could fall further during the current financial year. However, comparing the car park income for the first financial quarter this year (April to June 2009) with the same period last year most of the car parks, and the main ones in Egham, Chertsey and Addlestone in particular, showed an increase in income. This is partially due to the decrease in the standard VAT rate from 17½% to 15% in

December 2008. The Council therefore retained more of the income. The VAT rate may rise again in January 2010.

7.4 Car Park income is achieved from a combination of parking charges, season ticket and contract parking sales and Penalty Charge Notices (PCN's). The income from PCN's is uncertain as we cannot predict how many will be issued and the Council cannot alter the level of these charges as they are set by the Department for Transport. It's recommended that season ticket charges remain unchanged as they were increased from £400 to £500 in January this year following the 2008 Review. They are mainly bought by businesses and employees and sales are currently reducing, possibly as a result of the current financial climate. Very few contract parking permits are sold so altering the current charge of £500 would have a minimal effect on income. Car parking charges is the source of income over which the Council has the most control.

7.5 If the parking charges remain unchanged the required increase in income in 2010/11 (para. 7.1) could only be achieved if the car park usage increased considerably, which is unlikely. A significant increase in income could only be achieved by increasing the charges. However, Members will need to balance this with the Council's Policy of fostering economic prosperity. Increasing the charges at this time could discourage shoppers and other visitors and further affect local businesses.

7.6 If Members decided to consider increasing town centre car parking charges Table 5 below gives suggested options. Option 1 gives modest increases and Option 2 gives more significant increases.

Table 5 – Town Centre Car Parks – Current Charges and Options for increased Charges

Time Period	Current Charges	Option 1	Option 2
Up to 1 Hour	£0.50	£0.50	£0.60
1 to 2 Hours	£1.00	£1.20	£1.50
2 to 3 Hours	£1.50	£1.70	£2.00
3 to 4 Hours	£2.00	£2.20	£2.50
4 to 5 Hours	£2.50	£2.70	£3.00
5 to 6 Hours	£3.50	£3.70	£4.00
All Day	£4.00	£4.20	£4.50

7.7 Referring to Table 2 in paragraph 2.10, the charges in Options 1 and 2, if adopted, would still be less than or equal to those in neighbouring Boroughs and Districts. The 'All Day' charge in Option 1 would remain less than the charge at Network Rail station car parks and that charge in Option 2 would rise to meet the station car 'All Day' charge.

7.8 Table 6 shows the estimated annual income if the same numbers of tickets were sold as in 2008/09 for Option 1 and 2. It also shows the estimated income if ticket sales decreased by 5% for Option 1 and 10% for Option 2. It should be noted that these figures are indicative and are not accurate predictions.

Table 6 - Comparison of Estimated Annual Income 2010/11 with Current Charges and for Options 1 and 2

Option	Estimated Income (£)	Estimated Income reduced (£)
Current Charges	£400,000	
1	£430,000	£410,000 (5% reduction)
2	£490,000	£440,000 (10% reduction)

7.9 The Estimated Income from the Current Charges in Table 6 is the income that would be achieved if car park usage remained at 2008/09 levels. The table also shows the estimated income for the increased charges for Options 1 and 2 (shown in Table 5) if car park usage remained at 2008/09 levels. However, in the current financial climate an increase in charges combined with other factors could result in reduced car park usage. The third column in Table 6 gives an indication of the income if car park usage fell. The incomes shown for Options 1 and 2 have been reduced by 5% and 10% respectively. This anticipates a greater

fall in usage as a result of the larger increase in charges in Option 2. These figures show that there could still be an increase in income for Options 1 and 2 if car park usage fell. The figures include income from The Precinct as it is not known at this time when the development will commence.

- 7.10 The Committee may also consider a further option (Option 3), which would be to keep the existing charges unchanged. Due to the uncertainty in the levels of car park usage a further interim review could be carried out in January 2010 when more data will be available to assess whether increases in charges would achieve increased income.
- 7.11 In considering the options for increasing the charges it can be inconvenient for drivers if the charge requires a combination of several coins as the pay and display machines do not give change. Therefore, drivers would need a selection of coins or be forced to overpay, which might be the case in Option 1. All of the charges in Option 2, except for the one hour charge, can be paid for with a combination of £1 and 50p coins.
- 7.12 In order to implement a change of car park tariffs each pay and display machine has to be reprogrammed and the tariff boards in the car park need to be updated. An amendment is also required for the Traffic regulation Order. The total costs involved in this are in the region of £3000.

8. Conclusions on Parking Charges

- 8.1 Although overall income from Parking Services remained at a surplus in the last financial year, there are indications that the usage of car parks and renewal of season tickets is reducing. As many of the all day customers are either commuters or employees a reduction in these sales could probably be related to the economic environment.
- 8.2 Short term use of the car parks, in particular the sale of one hour tariff tickets has increased but this has not resulted in an increase in the issue of Penalty Charge Notices for overstaying. This could indicate that, as well as spending the minimum amount on parking, users are also taking care to arrive back at their cars in time to avoid penalties. Again this could reflect the current economic concerns of the public.
- 8.3 There has been some positive public response to the reductions in short stay charges in the out of town car parks. It is felt that any increase in these charges could lead to resentment and reluctance to use the facilities, resulting in reduced usage and income. The 'All Day' parking charge is an exception as it is the same as the 'All Day' charge in Town Centre Car Parks and would change accordingly.
- 8.4 In considering car parking charges the Committee will need to balance the Council's Policy of fostering economic prosperity with the need to increase income as stated in the Financial Forecast. Neither the modest increase in charges in Option 1 nor the significant increase in Option 2 are likely to achieve the £100,000 increase specified in the Financial Forecast.
- 8.5 The Borough Council does not have the discretion to change the scale of penalty charges. This is set nationally by the Department for Transport.
- 8.6 The Committee resolved at its meeting in September 2005 that Car Parking Charge Reviews should be carried out annually. Since then the research for subsequent reviews has taken place in the summer with a report to Committee in September and any changes implemented the following January. It is recommended that future Reviews are reported to the Committee in January and any changes implemented in the April for the following reasons:-
- It will make reporting much easier with only one financial year to contend with. Not using the Council's year end means that at present, several manual adjustments over two financial years are needed in order to attain the correct figures.
 - It will bring us in line with most other Councils dates making inter authority comparisons easier
 - It will allow discussions with other authorities to establish their proposals before we finalise ours.

- It will bring the fee setting in line with the budget setting process for approval at the same committee meeting (albeit in a separate report).

If agreed the next Review would be reported to this Committee in November 2011 and any changes implemented in April 2011

- 8.7 A review of car park usage and parking trends will be carried out early in the New Year and will be reported to the January meeting of the Committee. If the Committee approved Option 3 in this report the review would form the basis of the Committee's decision on whether to increase charges at that time.

THE COMMITTEE IS ASKED: -

- i) which of the proposed Options should be adopted;**

OFFICERS' RECOMMENDATION that –

- ii) there be no change in the car parking charges in 'Out of Town' Car Parks or in the charges for season ticket or contract parking at this time; and**
- iii) future Annual Car Parking Charge review reports be submitted to the Economic Development Committee in January for implementation of changes in the following April.**

(TO RESOLVE)

Background Papers

Economic Development Committee September 2005
 Economic Development Committee September 2006
 Economic Development Committee September 2007
 Economic Development Committee January 2008
 Economic Development Committee June 2008
 Economic Development Committee September 2008

8. COUNTY-WIDE CAR PARK SEASON TICKETS FOR SCC SOCIAL CARE WORKERS (DTS)

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 **To consider accepting the provision of a County wide parking permit for Surrey County Council Social care workers to use Borough Council car parks without having to buy a parking ticket at each visit.**

2. Background Information

- 2.1 Surrey County Council's (SCC) Business and Administration Manager for Children Schools and Families attended a meeting of the Surrey Chief Technical Officers Association (SCTOA) in May and asked the members of the Association to consider the feasibility of introducing a County wide car park permit for use by the County Social care team. This would enable them to park in any of the local Borough operated car parks throughout the County. It was proposed that a charge per permit would be agreed and the income from the permits would be shared amongst all the Boroughs and Districts participating.
- 2.2 Currently Social Care staff are required to pay for use of each of the car parks and reclaim monies after their visit. A pass that was valid in all the car parks would dispense with the need for each of the staff to carry significant amounts of change. SCC would need a total of about 500 permits so this would also dispense with the administrative process of reimbursing this number of staff with the parking charges.

3. Report

- 3.1 All of the Runnymede Borough Council payment car parks currently operate under a pay and display system where a ticket is purchased from a machine and then displayed in the vehicle. Patrols of the car parks are carried out by the Borough's Civil Enforcement Officers who check compliance with the charging regime by inspecting for either pay and display tickets or other authorised permits.
- 3.2 Charges operate in all of the Borough's pay and display car parks from 8am to 6 pm Monday to Saturday, except for Runnymede Pleasure Ground where the charges operate on Sundays.
4. Resource Implications
- 4.1 Since the SCTOA meeting in May the SCTOA Chairman has looked into the proposal in more detail with SCC's Business and Administration Manager and they have suggested that the charge per permit should be half of the average charge of the permits offered by the participating Boroughs. This means that the current permit charge would be £325 per permit if all the Boroughs and Districts agree to participate.
- 4.2 The cost of a season ticket for Runnymede's car parks is currently £500 and Officers have recommended in a separate report to this Committee that the charge should remain the same until the next Car Parking Charge Review in 2010/11
- 4.3 For five hundred County-wide season tickets SCC would pay a total of £162,500. The current proposal is that this sum is shared equally between the eleven Borough and District Councils, provided that they all participate. Therefore Runnymede's share would be about £14,700.
- 4.4 SCC is unable to provide details of their Care Worker's usage of Runnymede's car parks in order to compare the income from these season tickets with the potential income if Care Workers paid at each visit. However, the total income that the Borough received from season ticket sales in 2008/09 was £72,300 so if shared equally among the Districts seems reasonable.
- 4.5 The Borough Council's Civil Enforcement Officers currently deal with a number of passes in the car parks and they would monitor the use of these new passes so there would be no additional staffing implications.
- 4.6 The agreed cost of the permits and actual income could vary depending on the number of Boroughs and Districts that agree to participate.
5. Legal Implications
- 5.1 The Council's Off Street Parking Places Order will need to be amended to allow SCC Social Care Workers to park free of charge in the Borough's pay and display car parks, provided they display the necessary permit.
6. Equality impact Assessment
- 6.1 This policy could be seen to be improving access and supervision by social care workers to vulnerable members of the Community living in the Borough.
7. Environmental Implications
- 7.1 The provision of car park passes could be seen to encourage the use of cars. The users of these passes are currently required to visit vulnerable service users throughout the County and the use of alternative transport facilities other than private cars is likely to be very limited.

OFFICERS' RECOMMENDATION that -

the Council agrees in principle to the sale of county-wide parking permits to SCC for use by their social care workers in Borough operated car parks and delegates authority to the Director of Technical Services and the Director of Finance to agree the charge for these permits and the mechanism for sharing the income amongst the participating Boroughs and Districts.

(TO RESOLVE)

Background Papers

None

9. FINANCIAL MONITORING STATEMENT (DF)

1. **Purpose of Report**

1.1 **To inform the Committee of the latest financial projections for the 2009/10 financial year for Economic Development services.**

2. Background Information

2.1 The Financial Monitoring Statement was introduced to all Committees in September 2006 to inform Members of the current financial position of the services under the remit of each Committee.

2.2 Each statement reflects an updated position based upon the 2009/10 original estimates approved by this Committee in January. The Financial Forecast previously approved by Council in December 2008 has now been updated to reflect changes made during the updating of the Council's Revenue estimates.

3. Report

3.1 The statement at Appendix 'E' is split into two parts:

- (i) Economic Development Services
- (ii) Highway Services

Each statement is split into three distinct parts:

- Projected budget and forecast
- Savings still to be delivered
- Current year key budget indicators

3.2 The Projected budget and forecast sections show any anticipated variations in the current year's budget. These variations are categorised as approved changes and other potential changes. Implications for the following three years are included for completeness so that the full-year effect of any changes can be seen.

3.3 The achievement of the revenue reductions programme approved by the Council is one of the Council's key performance indicators. Savings targets not yet achieved are reported in the second section of each statement. These savings are all incorporated into the projected budget and forecast figures in section one.

3.4 The final section sets out the key budget indicators for the significant areas of this Committee's budget. This indicates the actual income received against the amount expected (the budget) for the period covered by each statement.

(FOR INFORMATION)

Background Papers

None stated

10. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

OFFICERS' RECOMMENDATION that –

the press and public be excluded from the meeting during discussion of the following reports under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 on the grounds that the reports in question would be likely to involve disclosure of exempt information of the description specified in paragraph 3 of Part I of Schedule 12A of the Act.

(TO RESOLVE)

PART II

Matters involving Exempt or Confidential Information in respect of which reports have not been made available for Public Inspection

a)	<u>Exempt Information</u>	<u>Para</u>
11,	HAMM MOOR SITES MASTER PLAN FOR SALE AND DEVELOPMENT	3
12.	LAND AT MARLEY CLOSE, HARE HILL, ADDLESTONE	3
13.	PALMER CRESCENT, OTTERSHAW, POTENTIAL SALE AND DEVELOPMENT	3
14.	43/43A GUILDFORD STREET, CHERTSEY – PROPOSED DISPOSAL	3
15.	YARD MEAD, WINDSOR ROAD, EGHAM – POSSIBLE SALE	3
b)	<u>Confidential Information</u>	
	(No reports to be considered under this heading)	