



## CORPORATE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

30 JUNE 2010

### APPENDICES

<u>APPENDIX</u>	<u>REPORT</u>	<u>PAGE. NOS</u>
A	MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 27 MAY 2010	1
B	COUNCIL RESPONSE TO GOVERNMENT CONSULTATION ON HOUSING FINANCE	17
C	STATEMENT OF ACCOUNTS	SEPARATELY CIRCULATED
D	NEWS RELEASE ON REDUCTIONS IN GOVERNMENT FUNDING	19
E	SAFETY COMMITTEE MINUTES – 3 JUNE 2010	24
F	MINUTES OF EXTERNAL APPOINTMENTS SUB-COMMITTEE – 26 MAY 2010	31

Runnymede Borough Council

CORPORATE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

27 May 2010 at 7.30pm

Members of the Committee present: Councillors J R Furey (Chairman), P I Roberts (Vice-Chairman), A Alderson, Mrs L M Gillham, P Taylor, P B Tuley, P J Waddell and G B Woodger

Members of the Committee absent: Councillor M J Brown and Councillor H W V Meares.

FIRE PRECAUTIONS

The Chairman read out the Fire Precautions.

MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 8 April 2010 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillor M J Brown and Councillor H W V Meares.

APPLICATION OF PART OF THE DEVELOPER'S CONTRIBUTION - AVIATOR PARK

The Committee considered the application of part of the developer's contribution for Aviator Park to meet the revenue costs of the Yellow Bus Service.

At the last meeting of the Committee it had been reported that the developer of Aviator Park in Addlestone had paid a contribution of £615,000 towards a number of initiatives. As a result of the Council's decision on the allocation of this money, £100,000 of this contribution had been kept aside for a potential Scout Hut at Aviator Park. At the last meeting, Officers had reported that this contribution had been allocated towards the Yellow Bus travel initiative and sought the Committee's endorsement of this. The Committee, had, however, deferred a decision and asked Officers to enter into further discussion with the owner of the development and the Scouts and to report back to this meeting.

In 2002, there had been several meetings between the Scouts and Officers. At that time, the Scouts had confirmed that they did not require a new facility in Addlestone, but wanted to spend the money in Englefield Green. It was explained to the Scouts that the funding had to be spent on a facility closely related to the application site. The Scouts had re-opened the issue in 2008, but again confirmed that funding would not be required in Addlestone and requested that the money be used generally in Runnymede. At that time, the owners of the site had confirmed their view that the money should only be spent on proposals directly related to Aviator Park.

In order to move this impasse forward, Officers had examined the original agreement, as the owner wished for expenditure to only be related to those terms. Most of the items had already been discharged although there was an initial contribution to the Yellow Bus Scheme. The owner had therefore agreed that the £100,000 sum could be directed to support the Yellow Bus Scheme, in the absence of demand for local Scout facilities. This was confirmed to them and the Scouts in June/July 2009. The allocation was included in the 2009/10 budget. The financial support for the Yellow Buses came from fares, sponsorship and contributions from developers. Over the last year, given the recession, developer's contributions had severely reduced. The original 2009/10 budget for the Yellow Bus Scheme provided for developers' contributions of £168,800 in order to cover all the costs of the scheme. Unless the Aviator Park contribution of £100,000 was included, there would be a net cost of £100,528 falling on the General Fund.

In view of this information, the Committee agreed that it was appropriate for the £100,000 sum to contribute to the Yellow Bus Service. The Committee also agreed that in future Committee approval should be sought to apply developer's contributions to the Yellow Bus Scheme when they were originally allocated for another purpose.

**RESOLVED that -**

**the unapplied provision of £100,000 from the developer's contribution for Aviator Park be applied towards the running costs of the Yellow Bus Service in 2009/10.**

FINANCIAL RESULTS 2009/10

The Committee considered the Council's financial results for 2009/10 including actual income and expenditure for the 2009/10 financial year compared to the budget for General Fund services, the Housing Revenue Account, the General Fund Summary Revenue Account, the original and revised estimate of expenditure on services after allowing for capital charges, the capital accounts, the method of financing the Council's capital expenditure in 2009/10, and the level of General Fund working balances and other reserves. Detailed information on budgets was provided in the booklet on Service Committee Actuals for 2009/10 which had been circulated to all Members of the Council and was available on the Council's website. It was noted that the Statement of Accounts for the year 2009/10 would be presented to the Committee's June meeting.

The summary of spending on services for 2009/10 compared to the original estimate was an overspend of £40,000 and compared to the revised estimate was a reduction of £680,000. The figures in this report took no account of the sum of £100,000 from the Aviator Park developer contribution which the Committee had agreed in the previous item on the Agenda should be allocated to the Yellow Bus Service.

At its meeting in April, the Committee had resolved that management accounts should no longer include a charge for notional interest to represent the cost of capital, as from the 2009/10 financial results. However, it remained appropriate that the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) should bear a proportion of the cost of capital tied up in assets; principally, the cost of the Runnymede Civic Centre. Therefore, a charge of £36,931 had been made from the General Fund to the HRA accordingly. At this time last year, the Committee had requested details of budget variations compared to original and revised budgets and the Committee noted schedules which showed these variations.

In March 2010, the Committee had received a report that set out the need to record income and expenditure on Runnymede Pleasure Ground in a separate Trust. The Committee had resolved that a final decision on a supplementary estimate should be taken after discussions with the Charity Commission on whether the objects of the Trust could be broadened to avoid large surpluses building up. However, the accounts had to recognise that this Trust was separate from the Council. Therefore, the results excluded income and expenditure on this Trust. The need to transfer the accumulated surplus for years prior to 2009/10 was recognised in the General Fund Summary.

It was noted that the final instalment due in respect of the revenue element of performance reward grant was £4,213 lower than expected. This was because Surrey County Council (who led the Local Public Services Agreement 2005/2008) had distributed more funds than originally agreed to the voluntary sector partners in respect of one target. Instead of recovering the overpayment, Surrey had decided to reduce the proportion paid to the district councils, but not their share of the grant.

The Committee noted the major reasons for the variations in spending on services, and the variations in transfers and financing items in 2009/10. This showed an underspend of £625,000 in total net General Fund expenditure when compared to the revised estimate. The comparison of the expected use of the working balance with the result was noted. In 2009/10 there had been a draw on reserves of £2.262m.

The revised budget included net additional housing benefit subsidy of £121,500. However, it had again proved difficult to extract conclusive figures of subsidy entitlement from the benefits computer system. Therefore, the final results were based on a best estimate of benefit subsidy due, resulting in a net additional subsidy of £109,100. This figure was subject to change as better information was generated, and was also subject to external audit examination.

The programme of corporate property maintenance and improvement works had commenced on 1 April 2003. Since that time, it had been difficult for service managers and accountancy staff to obtain reliable information about the impact of the programme. This difficulty had increased because the 5-year programme had finished in March 2008, and no replacement long-term schedule had been produced. The Committee noted the comparison of the original and revised estimates for 2009/10 with actual expenditure for the strategic maintenance plan. In overall terms, the total expenditure on maintenance of £302,895 was within the budget of £312,800. However, reactive maintenance now comprised over 50% of total maintenance spend. This was not ideal as reactive maintenance was more expensive than planned maintenance. The current spend pattern indicated that there was a risk that planned maintenance was being deferred and/or neglected and this might lead to higher costs in the future. The revised estimate assumed that £143,100 of the planned maintenance programme could be classified as capital expenditure. An examination of actual work completed disclosed that much of the work had to be classified as revenue expenditure, as it was routine and/or cyclical maintenance work (e.g. painting). This meant that only £30,364 could be properly counted as capital expenditure and the difference of £112,736 had to be borne by the General Fund. It was noted that the budget for planned maintenance had been adversely affected by action taken by the Council to prepare for a joint maintenance contract with Spelthorne Borough Council. This new contract would be operative from 1 April 2011 and should result in savings.

The impact of the economic recession on income budgets had been significant, especially items that were directly related to the property market. The Committee noted the results from the Council's main income budgets. Land Charges, car parking and Leisure Centre income results had been good considering the economic climate, while overall income had reduced, particularly in the areas of planning and building control. Income from fees and charges was a major feature of the Council's budgets. The Council raised more income from this source than from its share of the Council Tax. The risk from relying on income to fund services had been recognised as part of the financial strategy.

The results for the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) for 2009/10 disclosed an in-year surplus of £133,633. This represented an in year betterment of £496,833 when compared to the revised budget, where a deficit of £363,200 was forecast. This result was better than envisaged in the HRA Business Plan and allowed some welcome flexibility over the coming years. The HRA working balance at 31 March 2010 was £3.222m.

A schedule of General Fund and Housing capital expenditure in 2009/10 that showed the source of financing was noted. The total expenditure on capital items in 2009/10 was £4.367m, compared to the estimate of £6.520m. Variances between the estimate and actual arose from provisions not being fully taken up. The largest provision was for grants to registered social landlords to help finance schemes for new affordable housing. In 2009/10, no grants had been made and the budget of £1.224m was unused. Some schemes had been put on hold pending further policy consideration. Timing differences accounted for many other variances. In the main, these capital budgets had been carried forward into 2010/11. The largest item in the capital programme in 2009/10 was the capital repair and improvement works programme for Council housing stock. This programme was led by the HRA Business Plan which provided for the repair and maintenance plan for the stock over a 30-year timescale. Total expenditure in 2009/10 was £2.934m compared to the estimate of £2.999m. This expenditure was financed from within the HRA. The Committee agreed to recommend the methods of financing capital expenditure in 2009/10 as set out in Appendix 'A'.

The capital programme for 2009/10 assumed that certain works would be financed from specific revenue reserves. These were set out below:

<b>Capital expenditure met from specific revenue reserves</b>	
<b>Name of reserve</b>	<b>£</b>
Safer Runnymede Equipment reserve	92,687
IT Renewals reserve	61,650
<b>Total</b>	<b>154,337</b>

Financing these works from capital receipts would preserve the level of revenue reserves. It was therefore agreed that sums equal to the amount that they would have financed should be transferred to the General Fund working balance.

The Committee noted a summary of capital receipts in 2009/10. Capital receipts were the main source of funding for the Council's capital expenditure plans. There had been fewer capital receipts than previous years. The balance on the usable capital receipts reserve at 31 March 2010 was £5.638m. The Committee noted the use of capital receipts in 2009/10.

Since 8 August 2009, the Council had been in a position to exercise the right to call for the transfer of the old police station site to Council ownership. Accordingly, the Council now held the beneficial interest in the site, which meant that in accounting terms, the Council now held the old police station site as an asset. In effect, the lease payment due from Surrey Police had been met by way of the transfer of the land, i.e. a barter transaction. Therefore, the £3.12m (the value of the lease of part of the Civic Centre to the Surrey Police Authority), previously recognised as a capital receipt was extinguished.

Grants or contributions received from third parties formed an important part in funding new capital initiatives and the scale of receipts in 2009/10 reflected the success in attracting Government and other third party support. The capital grants and contributions used totalling £640,867 and the significant revenue one-off or short-term Government grants and other third party contributions in 2009/10 were noted. The use of S106 powers to require developers to make financial contributions and/or asset transfers had become an important feature of financing services, eg the Yellow Bus Service. A schedule of S106 financial contributions and other grants and receipts held and/or used in 2009/10 was noted.

It was vital that an adequate minimum level of General Fund reserves was maintained in order to provide for the risks and uncertainties that might arise during a year. The Committee noted the position on the Council's various reserves. The statement on forecast reserves and balances presented with the Budget for 2010/11 estimated that total General Fund revenue balances would be £4.475m at 31 March 2010. The main reason for the improvement was the reduced actual net General Fund expenditure compared to the revised estimate. The Council currently had what appeared to be substantial revenue balances, including £3.928m as a working balance and contingency. However, the approved General Fund budget for 2010/11 alone estimated the use of £2.065m of these balances to support service spending. A financial result had been achieved that was better than predicted at the time the revised estimates had been set. However, the result still meant that £2.262m of reserves had been used. This was £193,000 more than envisaged at the time the original estimate had been set. Total revenue reserves – including earmarked reserves – had reduced from £6.991m to £5.045m.

The cumulative impact of previous net revenue reduction exercises had removed the flexibility that was available within budgets. The need to continue to identify and generate sustainable savings in the medium-term would remain a priority. Runnymede had a low level of Council Tax that it could not increase significantly because of capping. Action had to be taken before reserves ran out. The UK economy appeared to be heading slowly out of recession. However, the impact of the recession was likely to remain with the Council for some time. This included service based factors, such as the speed of recovery in terms of activity in the local property market and the impact on housing services of homelessness. A further significant risk would arise from the need to repair national public finances. It seemed probable that the main financial impact of this need would be reduced or constrained Government grants received by the Council combined with low or no Council Tax increases.

It was noted that £12,000 of the funding for the Frank Muir Memorial Field Skate Park had been obtained from the Youth Opportunities Fund. At Egham Leisure Centre, the lease of the all-weather football pitches had been finalised later than anticipated so the planned saving arising from this (£45,000) had not been achieved in 2009/10. There could be no reliable estimate of the eventual costs that the Council might possibly obtain from the Padd Farm Planning Inquiry, or the timescale on which those costs might be received.

It was noted that when staff vacancies arose, Directors and the Chief Executive analysed in depth whether it was necessary to fill these posts. The Committee noted the summary of planned underspends in 2009/10. £278,200 of planned underspends were to be carried forward to 2010/11. Members requested that in future the Committee should receive a more detailed report on planned underspends indicating why spending had not taken place within the anticipated timescale and verifying the justification for a carry forward to the next financial year. It was noted that current procedures required good reasons for underspends being carried forward. Budget managers were

not encouraged to spend their budget for the year if there were reasons why spending should be delayed.

**RECOMMEND that –**

**the methods of financing capital expenditure in 2009/10 be as set out in Appendix 'A'.**

PROGRESS IN ACHIEVING NET REVENUE REDUCTIONS

The Committee noted progress in achieving the Council's revenue reductions targets.

The Financial Forecast approved by Council on 18 December 2008 had identified a need to make further revenue reductions. Accordingly, the Corporate Management Committee had recommended proposals to reduce net revenue expenditure by £712,000 per annum by 2013/14 and these had been approved by Council on 18 December 2008. Following a report on the deteriorating financial outlook, the Council had approved further savings of £653,000 at its meeting on 15 October 2009. The Financial Forecast approved by Council on 17 December 2009 showed that these savings were not sufficient to produce a sustainable budget. In view of the urgency of reducing net expenditure, the Committee had approved a pay freeze in 2010/11 and 2011/12, which would yield £327,000 in savings and had recommended additional savings totalling £886,500 which had been approved by the Council on 22 April 2010. The total value of these savings targets was therefore £2,578,500. This target only related to the current revenue reductions that the Council aimed to achieve. It followed other savings programmes, the last of which had achieved savings of £2.4 million.

The Committee noted a schedule listing each of the savings initiatives. The schedule had been split between those initiatives where action to achieve the savings had been completed and the remainder where action was still pending. For each of the savings initiatives that were not yet complete there were risk indicators. The Committee considered that this format provided a clear summary of the position and thanked Officers for presenting the information in this way.

The Committee noted that good progress had been made in achieving the savings. Specialist legal advice was being obtained to settle the terms under which the Council's Leisure Centres would be converted into charitable trusts and changes to the working arrangements in parks and open spaces had been implemented. Other sources of income generation were being explored. The implications for the Council of the new coalition Government's public sector reduction programme would be reported to the Committee when known. The Committee commended Council Officers and staff for the work which had been done and was being done to deliver savings.

TREASURY MANAGEMENT ANNUAL REPORT 2009/10

(Ref: Minutes of Corporate Management Committee, 5 February 2009, page 729, para. 475; 28 May 2009, page 10, para. 25; and 4 February 2010, page 518, para 557).

The Committee noted the annual report on treasury management activity and performance for the 2009/10 financial year.

Treasury management in public sector organisations had assumed a high public profile following the collapse of the Icelandic Banks in 2008. Two national reports had been published in 2009 - the Audit Commission's "Risk and Return" report on local authority treasury management and the Communities and the DCLG Select Committee's report on "Review of local authority investments". Both reports had criticised the way in which local authorities had managed their treasury activities and had recommended a number of actions for improvement. Revised investment guidance had also been issued by the DCLG and CIPFA had revised the Treasury Management Code. In July 2009, the Council had approved a revised Annual Investment Strategy for 2009/10 in response to Government guidance and CIPFA recommendations.

In March 2007, the Council had approved an investment strategy for the £15 million of funds for medium term investment (periods from one to five years). The strategy involved investing a proportion of the portfolio (£5 million) in fixed term investments for a 2 to 5 year period in order to give a greater degree of certainty over the yield that the portfolio would generate. It was also agreed to use a manager specialising in cash investments for the remaining £10 million. Tradition (UK) Limited had been appointed and had commenced the management of these funds in September

2007. Tradition were required to follow the same investment parameters as for the management of internally managed investments. Tradition had been able to generate higher returns by using their knowledge of counterparties and, in particular, by using long-term investments, which also had significant risk premiums. For short-term investments, Tradition was less able to generate significant out-performance. However, there had been a significant reduction in the number of counterparties that met the Council's credit quality criteria for long-term investment. Therefore, the scope for Tradition to achieve enhanced returns had been significantly reduced. The arrangement with Tradition would be kept under close scrutiny. Hopefully, the market conditions that allowed the benefits of the arrangement with Tradition to be enjoyed would return. However, if the risks in long-term investment remained too high, as at present, or if the arrangement otherwise did not create value for money, the agreement with Tradition would be terminated.

Sterling Consultancy Services had been re-appointed as the Council's treasury management consultants for a three-year period from October 2007. Sterling provided advice on all aspects of treasury management, including their own interest rate forecasts. The latest set of interest rate forecasts received from Sterling Consultancy Services was noted. The forecast indicated an increase in short-term interest rates commencing in 2011 and continuing into 2012. Sterling's forecasting record had been good. Their latest forecasts were fairly conservative, with some economists thinking that interest rates might be raised to higher levels. There was no consensus amongst commentators about forthcoming interest rate levels.

The net General Fund investment income actual figure for 2009/10 was £592,000, compared to an original estimate of £800,000 and a revised estimate of £560,000. The overall return on investments in 2009/10 (including the Tradition portfolio) was 2.967%. The return excluding the Tradition portfolio was 2.176%. The return on the Tradition portfolio was 4.050%. The overall return on short-term (up to 1 year) investments was 0.932%. The Bank base rate had remained at 0.5% throughout the year. The poor rates of return on short-term investments (which were, however, very secure) was noted. The overall results had been bolstered by better rates of return on longer term investments which carried a greater degree of risk. However, over the course of the next year, a number of the longer term investments would expire. Significant income from asset management would be required to produce the income to invest in future years and the Council was taking steps to achieve this. A low level of capital receipts had been received in 2009/10.

There might be good opportunities to lock into good long-term interest rates, probably for shorter terms than 5 years, with good quality institutions during 2010/11. In this case, investment income would increase accordingly. Making a modest further long-term investment would also provide a balance to the investment portfolio and mitigate the interest rate risk inherent in keeping all investments for short-terms. Therefore, Officers would be alert to the possibility of making modest new long-term investments in 2010/11, should market conditions become more favourable.

Investment returns had been above benchmark returns as a result of locking a proportion of the portfolio into high interest rates. The Annual Investment Strategy was designed to minimise risk as far as reasonably possible whilst retaining the ability to invest with secure institutions. It would be possible to increase investment returns by investing in longer-term maturities. However, the recent advice from the Government strongly emphasised that security and liquidity of funds had to be placed before yield, which meant that there should not be too much reliance on long term investments. Hopefully, liquidity and confidence would return to money markets and investor confidence in general, which would allow for less risky long term investment. If prevailing interest rates or the cash flow forecast significantly changed it would be necessary to revise the investment income budget and report to the Committee with proposals for further action.

#### ECONOMIC CONDITIONS IN RUNNYMEDE – MARCH 2010

The Committee noted a report based on a County-wide summary developed by the Surrey Economic Partnership, which provided a snapshot of the economic conditions in Runnymede in March 2010. Where available, statistics relating to Runnymede and neighbouring districts were provided. The information in the report had had an effect upon the priority performance indicators 2009/10 outturn, which was the next item on the Committee's agenda.

It was noted that the report suggested that Runnymede was not being as badly affected by the recession as other areas of Surrey. Runnymede had fewer Job Seekers Allowance claimants than other Surrey authorities. Businesses throughout Surrey had had problems in borrowing money.

Some businesses reliant on Heathrow Airport had suffered from the Icelandic volcanic ash eruption which had led to cancelled flights. The level of youth unemployment had increased again and this issue was the subject of discussion at meetings of the Surrey district Chief Executives. The difficulties being encountered in the recession by the voluntary and faith based sectors were noted.

#### PRIORITY INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE 2009/10 – OUTTURN

The Committee considered the 2009/10 outturn against the Council's priority performance indicators. The Committee was content with the progress in achieving the indicators. There had been a lower number of anti-social incidents for the fourth quarter and there had been a slight increase in acquisitive crime offences for the period, although the total of all other crime incidents was lower than predicted. There had also been a significant reduction in flytipping in the fourth quarter. It was noted that there were an increasing number of households in temporary accommodation and that demand for this service was increasing. The usage of the Council's Leisure Centres had increased, possibly as a result of the public transferring from more expensive private facilities in the recession. Unemployment for young people was on the increase and if this trend persisted, this could lead to social problems in future years. The 2009/10 result of 127 for affordable homes was above the annual target of 100 because of the conversion of 37 open market units to discounted Homebuy. There were currently 187 affordable units on site, but this included 94 at Franklands Drive which might not be completed within the target period as decontamination works were required which would cause delay. It was unlikely, in the present economic climate, that the affordable homes targets in future years would be achieved and Officers would be reviewing the Council's strategy on this issue. The numbers of volunteer placements had increased but these placements were not always long term, as some people undertook voluntary work temporarily, particularly in a period of economic downturn, while looking for paid work.

On the proposed Airtrack rail scheme which, if implemented, would run through the borough, the Committee noted that since late 2009 BAA Airtrack had been undertaking further work on the indicative railway timetable and level crossing barrier downtime modelling for the Airtrack services into Waterloo, Reading and Guildford. Additional information on various matters including the assessment of the effects at level crossings had been made available as part of an addendum to the Environmental Statement (ES) on 12 May, and the consultation period for the ES would expire on 23 June. The ES had indicated that the barrier downtimes for Egham would be less, but would be greater for Addlestone and Chertsey, than previously estimated. It was expected that the Public Inquiry into the Airtrack scheme would be formally scheduled in autumn 2010 following the conclusion of that consultation. Runnymede was continuing its investigation into the feasibility, practicality and justification for mitigation measures at the Egham and Pooley Green level crossings, in conjunction with Surrey County Council, Network Rail and BAA Airtrack. The Surrey County Council work on mitigation was nearly completed and should be available to the public soon. The delay before the inquiry did give greater time to undertake this technical work in order to be able to present the inquiry with a menu of tested options. It was agreed that Officers should explore with the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead whether it would be possible to share barrister costs at the inquiry on the issue of the effects of the scheme at level crossings, as that authority would experience problems at the Sunningdale level crossing which would be similar to those which would be encountered at the level crossings in Runnymede.

#### **RESOLVED that –**

**it be noted that the Committee is content with the progress in achieving the new priority performance indicators.**

#### PETITION SCHEME

The Committee discussed the establishment of a petition scheme for handling valid paper and electronic petitions submitted to the Authority in accordance with new statutory requirements. The Committee considered a proposed draft scheme which had been prepared by Officers.

The Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 (the Act) had introduced a new duty for local authorities to respond to petitions. Section 11 required local authorities to make a scheme for handling valid petitions and Section 10 required the local authority to make e-petition facilities available. Where petitions were deemed to be valid then there was a requirement to acknowledge the petition within a specified period and to take certain steps (provided that the petition

was not vexatious, abusive or otherwise inappropriate). It was for the Local Authority to determine what constituted an inappropriate petition considering the individual circumstances of the case. Valid petitions had also relate to a 'relevant matter', ie a function of the Authority or an improvement in the economic, social or environmental wellbeing of the Authority's area to which any of its partner Authorities could contribute, which were defined in chapter 1 of part 5 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007. The Scheme had to be approved by a meeting of the full Council before it came into force, had to be published on the local authority's website and by any other method appropriate for bringing it to the attention of those who lived, worked or studied in the local authority area and could be revised at any time. Any revised scheme had to be approved and publicised in a similar manner and the authority had to comply with its petition scheme.

The 2009 Act required petition schemes to meet some minimum standards. Beyond this, Local Authorities had a considerable scope for local determination. Anyone who lived, worked or studied in the local authority area, including someone under the age of 18 years, could sign or organise a petition and trigger a response. A facility for making electronic petitions had to be provided by the local authority. Petitions had to be acknowledged within a time period specified by the local authority. The local authority had a number of possible options that it could follow in response to a petition. It could take the action requested in the petition, consider the petition at a meeting of the local authority, hold an inquiry into the matter, hold a public meeting, commission research into the matter, compose a written response to the petition organiser setting out the authority's views on the request in the petition, or refer the petition to an Overview and Scrutiny Committee of the authority.

Petition organisers could prompt a review of the local authority's response if the response was felt to be inadequate. Local authorities could include other information which they considered to be appropriate in their petition scheme, for example, details about how they handled petitions which did not qualify under the scheme, or which applied to the functions of another principal local authority, particularly in areas with two tiers of local government, such as Surrey. The Government had excluded from the obligation to respond to a petition any matters relating to planning or licensing decisions or any other matter where a person had a separate right of appeal or review. However, failure to deliver services in these areas remained within the scope of the obligation to respond to a petition.

'My Society', a not-for-profit company that built websites of a democratic nature, had been selected to develop an e-petitions system for Surrey. Most of the cost (£20,000) was being funded by Surrey County Council with a £500 contribution from each Surrey district to allow a separate e-petitions facility for each authority. This site would go live from 15 December 2010 in accordance with statutory requirements. The Council's e-petition facility would allow citizens to create a petition which could be published on line on the Authority's website and could be made available to others who might 'sign up' to the petition on -line. Petitions would be able to be submitted in paper or electronic form under the scheme.

Administration of the scheme would be undertaken by the Committee Section. Workload arising from the new duty was unquantifiable at this stage and would be monitored. The previous Government had advised that the cost to the public sector of responding to petitions would be approximately £4.7 million per year which they considered would decrease over time. These costs arose from increased work for Council Officers, time at both Council meetings and at Overview and Scrutiny Committees and the set up costs for e-petitions. The previous Government had made a commitment to fully fund the costs to local authorities.

The Committee considered three thresholds which the Act required the local authority to determine. The first of these was the minimum number of signatures which would normally be required for the Council to consider a petition. The second threshold occurred where the petitioners wished a senior Council Officer to give evidence at the Overview and Scrutiny Select Committee and an appropriate minimum number of signatures to trigger this giving of evidence needed to be agreed. The third threshold was the minimum number of signatures that would trigger a debate of the full Council (unless the request was for a senior Council Officer to give evidence). In the cases of both e-petitions and paper petitions, the total number of signatures would be counted, all of the signatures from a particular household would be counted and there was no limit to the number of signatures from a particular household. The threshold for the debate of the full Council had to be no higher than 5% of the local authority population, although the guidance to the Act expected local authorities to set a limit considerably below 5%. Officers had suggested that the full Council debate threshold might be 1,000 signatures, (which represented 1.19% of the local population based on a 2008 Borough

population figure of 83,400) and that the threshold for the Officer giving evidence might be 500 signatures. In the proposed draft scheme, Officers had set the minimum number of signatures for a petition to be considered by the Council (but not the full Council) at the figure of 25 signatures, although each case would be considered on its merits when considering this aspect of the scheme.

The Committee considered that a balance should be struck between a reasonable number of signatures for a particular process to happen, given the time and cost involved, and the need for issues raised by local people to be properly addressed. Given that the Government's threshold for a debate at full Council was set at no higher than 5% of the local population, the view was expressed that the various thresholds for signatures in the proposed draft scheme might be too low. Having debated the matter, the Committee agreed to recommend that the threshold for the Council considering petitions should be 50 signatures, the threshold for a senior Officer giving evidence should be 750 signatures and the threshold for debate at full Council should be 1,500 signatures.

Section 19 of the Standing Orders for Council Meetings in the Council's Constitution related to the presentation of a petition by a Member of the Council at a full Council meeting. The Committee could see no reason why this section needed to be revised as it was not in conflict with the new petition scheme.

The Committee agreed to recommend a scheme for responding to petitions based upon the above statutory requirements and guidance as attached at Appendix 'B'. The thresholds for requiring responses would be reviewed after 12 months operation.

**RECOMMEND that -**

**the scheme for handling petitions submitted to the Authority at Appendix 'B' be approved and the Council's Constitution be amended accordingly.**

(As an equality of votes was cast in respect of a motion regarding the threshold, the Chairman exercised his second vote in favour of the thresholds as set out in the scheme at Appendix 'B').

DIVERSION OF SEWER – REAR OF CIVIC CENTRE

The Committee considered proposals for essential works to the private sewer serving the Runnymede Civic Centre, Middlesex Court and part of Surrey Towers in Addlestone.

The construction of the new Civic Centre had formed Phase 1 of the Civic Centre project. A sewer system serving Middlesex Court and part of Surrey Towers ran under the Civic Centre site and Willmott Dixon, the contractor for the Civic Centre, had installed a new sewer system around the Civic Centre building to replace the existing sewer in Phase 1. However, the final connection to bring the new sewer into operation had not been installed as that would have meant that it would be necessary to dig up Marnham Place, the main entrance into the Civic Centre staff and Member car park. It had been intended that this final connection would be included in the Phase 2 works, under which The Avenue would have been constructed, as Marnham Place would have had to be excavated as part of these works. The construction of Phase 2 had originally been planned to follow soon after Phase 1, but this had been delayed as the development proposals had changed.

Although the construction of the car park and landscaping in Phase 2 was not critical to the operation of the Civic Centre, the construction of the new sewer connection was needed as soon as possible. During the construction of the courtyard and landscaping at the side of the Civic Centre in Phase 1, an access chamber on the existing sewer had been buried. This chamber had a history of blockages that had resulted in flooded properties in Surrey Towers. The new system had been designed to cater for the combined flows from Middlesex Court, Surrey Towers and the Civic Centre but was only used by the Civic Centre at the moment, so the flow in the sewer was much lower than that for which it was designed. This had resulted in a build up of debris and other solid matter that had been causing unpleasant smells in parts of the Civic Centre. As a temporary measure the new sewer was being jetted regularly to prevent this odour from occurring. However, there was a major risk that the old sewer system could become blocked somewhere underneath the Civic Centre. Should this happen, there was no direct means of access to it and depending upon the location of the blockage, jetting alone might not be sufficient to clear the blockage. That could lead to more than 100 properties in Middlesex Court and Surrey Towers not being able to use their toilets whilst the problem

was being resolved. In these circumstances, it could be necessary to provide alternative accommodation for the residents and around the clock emptying of the old sewer by tanker, as well as carrying out repair works. There was therefore a need for the Council to take action to clear the problem in order to fulfil its duties under the Miscellaneous Provisions Act 1976 and the Building Act 1984.

In order to carry out the works to install the new sewer connection the access to the Civic Centre rear car park (Marnham Place) would have to be diverted through the temporary service road to the rear of the Civic Centre. Access to the residents' car park at the back of Middlesex Court would also be restricted and diversions put in place for pedestrians. When the new system was installed, the old system would be filled with concrete and abandoned.

The current estimated cost of the new sewer connection and the associated works was approximately £14,000. The final cost of the works would be based on the work carried out and calculated on a re-measured basis. This sum would be taken from the current Capital Programme provision for the Civic Centre Phase 2 works. The works would be carried out under the Engineering Services, Minor Civil Engineering Works Term Contract.

**RESOLVED that -**

- i) the diversion of the sewer to the rear of the Civic Centre be undertaken at a currently estimated cost of £14,000; and**
- ii) this expenditure be met from the provision for Civic Centre Phase 2 works in the capital programme and a capital estimate be approved accordingly.**

**SAFER RUNNYMEDE - EXPANSION OF CCTV MONITORING**

Authority was sought by Officers to bid for, or enter into Contracts expanding the activities of Safer Runnymede.

When the Safer Runnymede Control Room had been rebuilt in the new Civic Centre, it had been specifically designed for expansion in terms of the number of CCTV cameras monitored and other issues such as Care Alarm monitoring, and buildings alarm monitoring and out-of-hours call out. A new post of Marketing and Development Officer had been created to increase the usage and income of Safer Runnymede. Over recent months, the prospect of significant new contracts had become evident. Discussions had been held with Elmbridge and Epsom & Ewell Borough Councils about possible transference of their CCTV monitoring. However, the value of these contracts meant that those authorities had to undertake a formal procurement process inviting bidders. Discussions were also ongoing in relation to the Wentworth Estate in Virginia Water, whereby a new network of cameras might be established to cover the numerous entrances and exits of individual householders. Additional cameras would be needed to cover the full route between the Royal Holloway University of London (RHUL) Campus in Egham and the M25, together with some peripheral areas to the Campus, to provide the necessary security for RHUL in its role in the 2012 Olympic Games. It was understood that these facilities for RHUL would be retained after the Olympic Games had ended. Officers were also looking to expand Safer Runnymede's role in building alarm monitoring and in providing a range of out-of-hours services. Powers existed to enable the Council to levy a charge for undertaking CCTV monitoring. A proper business case for each new area would need to be developed.

The Committee considered that every opportunity should be taken to increase Safer Runnymede's role as extra income from this source formed an important part of the Council's financial strategy. Safer Runnymede also played a vital role in tackling crime.

**RESOLVED that -**

**the Director of Technical Services be authorised to bid for and enter into contracts to expand the activities of Safer Runnymede.**

## COUNCIL TAX INFORMATION LEAFLET

(Ref: Minutes of Policy and Resources Committee, 26 November 1997, page 581, para. 434)

The Committee considered the future format of the Council Tax information leaflet.

There was a statutory requirement for Council Tax bills to be accompanied by various items of information prescribed in Regulations. Each precepting authority was required to provide information. This meant that in the Runnymede area, information had to be provided by Runnymede Borough Council, Surrey County Council and Surrey Police. This information was currently provided on three separate leaflets. At its meeting on 26 November 1997 the former Policy and Resources Committee had rejected a proposal to combine the information produced by the three authorities into one leaflet. Members at that time favoured separate leaflets in the interests of public accountability. The Council, in its capacity as billing authority, enclosed 42,000 leaflets with the Council Tax bills each year: 34,000 when the annual bills were despatched in March and 8,000 during the year when there was a change of occupancy. For the past four years the Runnymede leaflet had been produced as a sixteen page A5 booklet in colour. This format had been adopted at the request of Members in order to provide more space to publicise the services provided by the Council. The cost of producing 42,000 of these leaflets was £7,000. Three other Surrey districts were producing leaflets jointly with Surrey County Council and Surrey Police Authority. The cost was shared between each Authority and if this arrangement were adopted in Runnymede the cost to the Council of producing 42,000 leaflets was estimated to be £4,000. If the Committee wished to pursue a less expensive option, a cheaper leaflet could be produced that met the minimum statutory requirements. Any change to the format of the Council Tax leaflet needed to be planned well in advance of annual billing so that there was no disruption to the billing timetable. The printing and despatch of the annual bills was handled by an external contractor.

The Committee agreed that the quality of the Council Tax information leaflet should be maintained and that a less expensive option should not be pursued as it was important that residents had a clear and well presented summary of information. The Committee was unable to reach a decision on whether the Council Tax information for Runnymede should be contained in a separate leaflet as at present, or should be combined in one leaflet with the County Council and the Police, as it was noted that there were examples in other areas (eg Tower Hamlets) of leaflets being produced of the necessary quality explaining which agencies provided which services in a particular area. Whichever option was chosen, it was vital that the services provided by Runnymede and those provided by the County Council were differentiated. It was agreed that this matter should be considered by the Corporate Communications Member Working Group and, in view of the lead time needed to provide the leaflet, that they should report back to the Committee by no later than September 2010. It was also agreed that the Group should make a recommendation on whether it was appropriate to continue including a Council Leader's Statement in the information.

### **RESOLVED that -**

**the arrangements for the Council Tax information leaflet for 2011/12 be referred to the Corporate Communications Member Working Group to report its findings to the Committee for decision by no later than September 2010.**

### MEMBER WORKING GROUPS 2010/11

The Committee gave consideration to the arrangements for its informal cross party Member Working Groups in 2010/11. Substitute Members were permitted for these Groups where necessary. It was agreed that the title of the Group on communications should be amended to read "Corporate Communications Member Working Group" and that it might meet every two months. The terms of reference, frequency of meetings, and titles of the other three existing Groups were unchanged. The 800<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of Magna Carta occurred in 2015. Runnymede would have a key role in co-ordinating the celebrations that would be taking place in that year. The Committee agreed that a Working Group was required to discuss this matter and bring proposals forward for consideration. There were a large number of groups with an interest in the 2015 celebrations. It was agreed that it would be appropriate to co-opt only three of these organisations to the Group from Royal Holloway University of London (RHUL), Brunel University and the National Trust, along with the local County Councillor, to prevent the Group from becoming too unwieldy. At its first meeting, the Group would decide on local representation and consultation with the various organisations involved. Brunel University were included because of their land interests and their proposals for Runnymede Meadow.

It was agreed that five groups should all operate in 2010/11 on the following basis:

Local Government Legislation Member Working Group

- Terms Of Reference:
1. To consider matters emanating from legislation and guidance relating to local government, including assessment of local authority performance, and to give preliminary consideration to related Government consultation papers.
  2. To make recommendations regarding the Council's constitution, when so requested.

Composition: Eight Members, comprising six Conservatives and two Runnymede Independents.

Programme of meetings: ad hoc

Corporate Communications Member Working Group

Terms of Reference: To oversee the direction of the corporate communication strategy and the form and content of the associated work programme.

Composition in 2009/10: Four Members, comprising three Conservatives and one Runnymede Independent.

Programme of meetings: Bi-monthly

IT Member Working Group

Terms of Reference: To examine proposals for the purchase of new IT systems, changes to existing systems and the ongoing development of corporate projects, and to make recommendations on corporate ICT Strategy.

Composition in 2009/10: Eight Members, comprising six Conservatives and two Runnymede Independents.

Programme of meetings: Monthly

Personnel Services Member Working Group

Terms of Reference: To be determined by the Corporate Management Committee from time to time, and for the immediate future, to report on proposals for the Council's Appraisal, Competencies and Performance Related Pay Framework, in accordance with the previous decisions of the Committee.

Composition in 2009/10: Four Members, comprising three Conservatives and one Runnymede Independent.

Programme of meetings: ad hoc

Magna Carta 2015 Member Working Group

Terms of Reference:

1. To advise on the 2015 celebrations of the sealing of the Magna Carta in Runnymede and events leading up to 2015.
2. To consider and advise on the legacy from the celebrations in partnership with other interested parties.

3. To recommend application for any grants, which may be available to support events or the legacy of the celebrations.
4. To be the conduit for communication with partner organisations and the local community on plans and proposals.
5. To liaise with the Trustees and the national 2015 Steering Committee to co-ordinate activities and plans.
6. To refer any proposals which have resource implications to the Corporate Management Committee.

Composition in 2009/10: Five Members, comprising four Conservatives and one Runnymede Independent.

One Surrey County Councillor  
 One Co-optee from RHUL  
 One Co-optee from Brunel University  
 One Co-optee from the National Trust.

Programme of meetings: To be decided at the Group's first meeting.

**RESOLVED that –**

i) **the Member Working Groups listed above operate in the 2010/11 Municipal Year with the terms of reference, composition and programme of meetings indicated above; and**

ii) **the memberships of the respective Member Working Groups for 2010/11 be as follows:**

**1. Local Government Act**

**Conservative - Councillors Edwards, Furey, Parr, P Roberts, Tuley, Woodger**

**Runnymede Independents - Councillors Ashmore, Mrs Gillham**

**2. Corporate Communications**

**Conservative - Councillors Butterfield, Cotty, Waddell**

**Runnymede Independents - Councillor Mrs Gill**

**3. Information Technology (IT)**

**Conservative - Councillors Brown, Mackay, Meares, P I Roberts, Waddell, Wilson**

**Runnymede Independents - Councillors Mrs Gillham, Mrs Gill**

**4. Personnel Services**

**Conservative - Councillors Francis, Parr, Waddell**

**Runnymede Independents - Councillor Mrs Gillham**

**5. Magna Carta 2015**

**Conservative - Councillors Cotty, Meares, Taylor, Tuley**

**Runnymede Independents - Councillor Alderson**

- iii) **the Chairmen of the respective Groups be appointed at their first meetings in the Municipal Year; and**
- iv) **the Magna Carta 2015 Member Working Group decide on local representation, frequency of meetings and consultation at its inaugural meeting.**

PAYROLL BUREAU CONTRACT - WAIVING OF STANDING ORDERS

The Committee considered granting retrospective authority to waive Standing Orders to enter into a contract without inviting competitive quotes.

The Council's payroll was processed using the Moorepay bureau system (which was now part of the Northgate Company). Data input and verification of the payroll output was undertaken by staff in the Finance Department. Since April 1992, Moorepay had processed the monthly payroll and maintained tax and national insurance tables.

In 2006 a specification had been prepared with a view to inviting tenders for a joint personnel and payroll system. Soon afterwards a moratorium had been placed on all new computer developments prior to the office move so this was taken no further. Subsequently, a new personnel system had been acquired in order to facilitate the operation of flexitime in the new office building. In 2009, Moorepay offered to upgrade the system to their Windows product at no charge to the Council and had agreed to maintain the monthly charge at the same rate. A contract had been signed on 1 October 2009, effective from 15 July 2009. The contract had no end date but could be terminated on giving six months notice in writing. The arrangement with Moorepay had worked well. Benchmarking data shared amongst the Surrey districts indicated that Runnymede's payroll processing costs (including staffing, IT and overheads) were below average in Surrey. There had been no further work on retendering the contract for a payroll system or bureau service since the office move, because Officers were waiting to see what emerged from the Surrey First initiative on back office services.

However, Officers had identified that a technical breach of Standing Orders had occurred when the 2009 contract had been agreed, because Standing Orders required a minimum of three tenders or written quotations for a contract of this value. In the absence of a retendering exercise, Officers believed that the terms achieved were unlikely to be bettered, but the matter was now brought to the Committee in order that the position might be regularised.

**RESOLVED that -**

**Standing Order C2.5 requiring at least three tenders or written quotations be waived in the case of the 2009 Moorepay agreement, in view of the advantageous terms available from the existing contractor, and the disruption that would be caused by a change to a new provider.**

SAFETY COMMITTEE - MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the Safety Committee held on 3 March 2010 were noted.

URGENT ACTION – STANDING ORDER 42

The following action taken after consultation with the Chairman of the Committee under Standing Order 42 was noted.

<u>Officer</u>	<u>Action</u>	<u>Central Index No</u>
Director of Technical Services	Obtaining authority to recruit a new 0.5 FTE post of Emergency Planning Officer to be shared with Spelthorne Borough Council.	718

Chief Executive	Supplying new and re-elected Councillors with computers, printers and a broadband connection to the internet.	719
Director of Administration and Leisure	Replacement of the existing IT system used by the Local Land Charges Section to process Local Land Charges Searches.	721

#### PROPERTY UNIT – STAFFING IMPLICATIONS FOR INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL REPORTING STANDARDS

By resolution of the Committee, the press and public were excluded from the meeting during the consideration of this matter under section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 on the grounds that the discussion would be likely to involve disclosure of exempt information of the description specified in paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A to Part 1 of the Act.

The Committee considered the staffing implications of the International Financial Reporting Standards valuation requirements for Runnymede.

Another Council had proposed that Runnymede might undertake valuation work for that authority and that other Council was seeking a response as soon as possible to this proposal. The Committee therefore agreed that it should determine this matter under paragraph 1.3 of "Committee Responsibilities" in the Scheme of Delegation, rather than having the supplementary estimate which would be required if the proposal were to be implemented, referred to full Council.

The advent of the International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS) imposed a new compliance burden on the Property Unit in the Administration and Leisure Department, as reported to the Committee earlier in the year. The Committee had been informed in April 2010 that Officers would prepare a report bringing forward specific proposals to identify the additional resource implications.

The Property Unit's primary objective was income generation from a significant portfolio, and a strengthening of the Unit for this purpose through the recruitment of a qualified Valuer had been agreed by the Council at its meeting on 22 April 2010, having received a recommendation from the Committee at its 8 April 2010 meeting. A wider strategy was being prepared to use the Council's property assets actively and intelligently. Capacity and skills would need enhancement for this strategy to succeed.

IFRS would cover accounting changes, implementation and presentation, leases, and fixed asset accounting for investment properties. An unforeseen opportunity had arisen by way of a request from another Council to undertake their annual valuation work. Runnymede could meet that commitment by employing a member of staff who would work for both authorities. A start in early summer this year would be needed and the potential terms and conditions of this arrangement were reported to the Committee. The Committee agreed that this opportunity should be accepted, provided that certain conditions were met, as reported to the Committee.

Some level of staff augmentation appeared necessary to undertake the Runnymede IFRS work alone. The maximum benefit to Runnymede would be secured by taking on the work of the other Council specified and enhancing the staff resource. The pressures of income generation and IFRS meant that the invitation from the other Council was a potential opportunity to offset Runnymede's service costs of the Property Unit. It was agreed that a sum as reported, including employer's costs, should be included as a supplementary estimate for an additional 12 month post in the property unit. Officers would be negotiating with the other Council with a view to the additional staff costs being fully covered by that authority and Officers anticipated an additional income above costs. A formal legal agreement would be drawn up between the parties if negotiations were successful and it would be necessary to check that appropriate insurances were in place. Officers would aim to settle terms with the other Council reported for the IFRS valuation service in 2010 that generated an income surplus by exceeding the cost of employing an additional qualified valuer. If terms of this kind were not able to be achieved, a cost-benefit analysis would be presented to the Committee for a decision to be made on the way forward. Either way a report would be brought to Committee on the outcome of the negotiations with the other Council.

**RESOLVED that -**

- i) in the event that a payment can be negotiated with the other Council reported that covers the cost of a qualified valuer/asset manager post within Runnymede Borough Council's Property Unit, and provided that the other conditions reported can be met, the Director of Administration and Leisure be authorised to appoint a suitable Officer for a maximum period of 12 months subject to any further review, and to enter into an agreement with the other Council reported for the provision of valuation services;**
- ii) subject to i) above, a supplementary estimate be approved in respect of the post at i) above at a total cost to the Council, including employer's costs, not exceeding the sum reported; and**
- iii) in the event that the payment negotiated does not cover the cost referred to at ii) above, a further report be made to the Committee on the business case for offering valuation services to the other Council reported and for appointing an Officer.**

WRITE OFFS

By resolution of the Committee, the press and public were excluded from the meeting during the consideration of this matter under section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 on the grounds that the discussion would be likely to involve disclosure of exempt information of the description specified in paragraphs 1 and 3 of Schedule 12A to Part 1 of the Act.

**RESOLVED that -**

**the Council Tax arrears of £2,245.01 and the Non-Domestic Rates arrears of £2,070.87, as detailed in Exempt Appendix '1' to the Agenda, be written off as irrecoverable.**

Chairman

(The meeting ended at 9.48 pm)

**HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT SUBSIDY – GOVERNMENT SELF FINANCING DEBT SETTLEMENT****RESPONSE TO THE CONSULTATION PAPER**

- Q. 1** What are your views on the proposed methodology for assessing income and spending needs under self financing and for valuing each council's business?

*Runnymede Council supports the general process and recognises the need to amend the current HRA subsidy system which is unfair and unsustainable. The proposed increases in management and maintenance allowances are very welcome and bring us much closer to the true cost of these services. The proposed discount rate of 6.5% also seems appropriate and is more likely to enable us to achieve a viable HRA Business Plan.*

*The proposal to allow local authorities to retain all receipts from the sale of housing stock is welcomed. However, the proposal to require local authorities to submit an audited return (paragraph 2.43 of the Consultation Paper) seems unnecessary.*

*Going forward the sustainability of this comprehensive and well considered proposal could be undermined by significant changes in national rent policy. For this reason we would urge the Government to provide more local discretion on rent setting.*

*Runnymede is currently debt free and therefore needs to establish new treasury management skills. Provision therefore needs to be made for debt free councils to develop the skills needed.*

- Q. 2** What are your views on the proposal for the financial, regulatory and accounting framework for self financing?

*The consultation paper suggests that a separate HRA balance sheet would assist asset management. This seems quite an optimistic objective as a balance sheet is simply a statement of assets and liabilities at a point in time based on a set of accountancy standards. Making sure that the HRA Business Plan is regularly updated and scrutinised would be a more effective aid to asset management. There is an inevitable extra cost to producing a separate HRA Balance Sheet and, although the cost would be relatively modest in the context of the service, the Government is urged to reconsider whether this really would be a useful extra resource.*

*The consultation paper sets out in broad terms some of the options for treating housing debt under the new system. This is a highly technical area, and the final system will have to be sufficiently flexible to cater for all local housing authorities. The Government is encouraged to allow as wide a range of options for local authorities as possible. This would enable a local authority to select a suitable approach. The proposal to introduce a strict separation of HRA and General Fund debt is not supported as this may introduce perverse incentives into the system. In particular, the options should cater for local authorities that will have substantial new HRA debt under the proposed system, but also investments in the General Fund. In this case, there could be clear benefits for both accounts if the borrowings and investments were pooled in terms of reduced risk (both interest rate and counterparty risk) and economies and efficiencies of administration.*

*The consultation paper also sets out the Government's concern that Local Authorities may use the freedom under the prudential regime to significantly increase borrowing (for example, to build new homes), and thereby adversely impact on national fiscal policies. Therefore, the Government proposes restricting borrowing to the opening debt level set under self-financing. For Runnymede, this means that the headroom for new borrowing in the early years of the new regime will be limited to that generated from annual surpluses under the new system. However, Local Authorities can only borrow to pay for capital expenditure, and this must also be prudent in the fullest sense. Therefore, the Government is urged not to introduce strict borrowing limits as this may limit the ability of local housing authorities to implement new schemes that offer significant benefits (including value for money savings) in a prudent way.*

*The consultation paper proposes new guidance about the services and expenses that are properly chargeable to the HRA. Runnymede has for many years endeavoured to ensure*

that those costs that fall to the HRA and General Fund are charged to the appropriate accounts. Although there is no objection to the clarification of the accounting treatment of "Core, Core plus and non Core services" included in the consultation paper, we would urge that the Government does not adopt too strict an approach that might lead to unintended, adverse outcomes.

The Council welcomes the opportunity to have greater independence regarding the management of stock. However, it would wish to see conditions in the settlement that protect local authorities from changes in Government policy that have the potential to leave the Council's financial position exposed.

- Q. 3** How much new supply could this settlement enable you to deliver, if combined with social housing grant?

*Runnymede welcomes the prospect of attracting additional funding for the provision of Affordable Housing. The price of market housing in this area is unaffordable to many households and opportunities to provide additional Affordable Housing are always welcome. The use of the 7% discount rate provides some scope for provision of new Affordable Housing. We would anticipate being able to increase stock by around 0.5% (15 units) by 2016 with the additional discount. However the cost of land in Runnymede remains high and the proposed cap on borrowing at the level of the initial debt allocation will, even with the availability of social housing grant, limit the Council's ability to fund significant higher levels of new build. A relaxation of the borrowing constraint would make a more substantial level of new supply possible.*

*In view of potential difficulties in identifying land the Government is also asked to indicate whether or not they would be prepared to allow any headroom to be used to purchase existing satisfactory properties (e.g. former housing stock) or to fund cash incentive schemes for tenants to move into the Private Sector and release social housing stock.*

- Q. 4** Do you favour a self financing system for council housing or the continuation of a nationally redistributed system?

*Runnymede Council believes that the current national redistributive system is unfair, underfunded, unworkable and no longer meets the needs of councils and their tenants. We therefore welcome the proposal to dismantle the HRA subsidy system and abandon the national redistribution system. However, we would also welcome greater clarity regarding the allocation of funds for expenditure streams that are not currently recognised in the proposal, such as disabled facilities grant, works to deal with fire precautions and the housing health and safety rating system.*

- Q. 5** Would you wish to proceed to early voluntary implementation of self financing on the basis of the methodology and principle proposed in this document? Would you be ready to move to self financing in 2011/12? If not, how much time do you think is required for implementation?

*The Council would wish to move to the self-financing system as soon as the opportunity arises. However, we recognise that there is a great deal of detailed work required by the Government to create a proper and fair regulatory and technical basis for the system.*

- Q. 6** If you favour self financing but do not wish to proceed on the basis of the proposals in this document, what are the reasons?

*Runnymede Council is in favour of the self financing in principle and on the broad terms set out in the consultation paper. However, detailed proposals need to be established before a definitive acceptance can be made (e.g. on debt). There is also a risk that economic factors such as interest rate movements and inflation may require a reassessment of the decision.*

## Government sets out further detail on local government savings

Published 10 June 2010

The Government has today published details of the £1.166bn Local Government contribution to the £6.2bn cross government savings in 2010/11. Communities Secretary Eric Pickles has confirmed that no local authority will face reductions in their revenue grant of more than 2 per cent.

The £6.2bn savings represent the first step in the Government's efforts to tackle an unprecedented £156 billion deficit inherited from the previous government in order to restore confidence in our economy and support the recovery.

Unless borrowing is reduced, interest on Government debt will hit £70 billion a year by 2014-15. This is more than is currently raised from council tax, business rates, stamp duty and inheritance tax combined.

Ministers have given careful consideration to how savings can be found without affecting the quality of key frontline services. The priority has been on driving out Whitehall waste with the brunt of the cuts being borne at the centre.

- Communities and Local Government has been asked to find £780m savings in 2010/11. Departmental and Arms Length Body running costs are therefore being reduced by 10 per cent.

The need to act quickly to reduce the deficit means that Government departments have had to make difficult decisions about reducing grants to local government. Shielding the frontline has underpinned decisions on where savings can be found.

- The £29bn general grant, the main source of funding that local government receives every year, is not being reduced. This will ensure that key frontline services can be protected and prevent council tax rises.
- Local Government is being asked to contribute £1.166bn to overall savings. No individual local authority will face a reduction in their revenue grant of more than 2 per cent.

Government is reducing the management burden of authorities and giving councils the extra flexibility they need to concentrate on local priorities and protect the frontline.

- Reduction in revenue and capital non-schools ring-fencing this year from 10.7 per cent (£4.5bn) to only 7.7 per cent (£3.2bn) as a first step to giving councils more freedom over spending decisions. In addition, a major scaling back of quangos puts local government centre stage in meeting the needs of local residents.

All councils will, by January 2011, be publishing online details of their spending over £500. This will mean local taxpayers will be able to see how councils are spending money-helping protect frontline services, encouraging greater efficiency and shining a spotlight on waste.

Communities Secretary Eric Pickles:

"The nation's deficit is running at £156bn. Reducing that deficit, putting the finances back on a stable footing and continuing to ensure economic recovery is the most urgent issue facing Britain. Tough fiscal times will be challenging for all, but the reductions

have been made to reflect the Government's policy of decentralisation and a scaling back of the quango state.

"The detailed spending decisions outlined today show a clear determination to make the necessary savings whilst minimising the impact on essential frontline services like rubbish collections and protecting spending on schools and Sure Start. We have focused attention on reducing the centre and it is here that the reductions are the hardest.

"Steps have been taken to limit the impact on local authorities and make savings proportionally. Councils have been given the flexibility they need to determine where they make savings. We are clear that no extra burden must fall on local taxpayers. We are committed to freezing council tax in England for at least one year, and seek to freeze it for a further year, in partnership with local authorities."

The details being published today will enable local government to get on with the work of managing their budgets effectively.

The Government recognises that it will be challenging for local authorities to make in-year savings, as it is for other parts of the public sector. But Ministers are clear that delaying the cuts now will simply compound the impact on authorities for the future. For all grant streams the Government is satisfied that it has adopted a fair approach to making the necessary reductions.

### Notes to editors

1. Local Government will make a contribution of £1.166bn towards the overall saving of £6.2bn across Government in 2010-11 through reductions in individual grants to Local Authorities. This is made up of:

Department for Education	£m
<b>Revenue</b>	
Reduction in the overall amount available to local authorities through Area Based Grant (ABG) from DfE.	311.0
<b>Total DfE</b>	<b>311.0</b>
<b>Department for Transport</b>	
<b>Capital</b>	
Integrated Transport Block	150.8
Major Projects	61.4
Yorkshire and Humber ITB transfer	23.5
Capital detrunking	6.8
PRN networking funding	5.9
Urban congestion fund	7.9
Road Safety capital grant	17.2
<b>Total capital</b>	<b>273.4</b>
<b>Revenue</b>	
Smaller grants, of which:	15.0

Kickstart 2009	5.0
Other funding support, as yet unallocated	10.0
Area Based Grant - Road Safety revenue grant	20.6
<b>Total revenue</b>	<b>35.6</b>
<b>Total DfT</b>	<b>309.0</b>
<b>Communities and Local Government (CLG)</b>	
<b>CLG Departmental Expenditure Limit (DEL)</b>	
<b>Capital</b>	
Housing Market Renewal	50.0
Gypsy & Traveller site grant	30.0
Total capital	80.0
<b>Revenue</b>	
Housing and Planning Delivery Grant	146.0
Connecting Communities	19.1
Other cohesion funding	5.0
Area Based Grant - Supporting People administration	30.0
Area Based Grant - Working Neighbourhood Fund	49.9 <sup>1</sup>
Area Based Grant - Local Enterprise Growth Initiative	17.5
Area Based Grant - Prevent	7.0
Area Based Grant - Cohesion	4.0
Total revenue	278.5
Total CLG revenue and capital	358.5 <sup>2</sup>
<b>Local Government DEL</b>	
Local Area Agreement Reward	125.0
Local Authority Business Growth Incentives scheme	50.0
Total	175.0
<b>Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs</b>	
<b>Capital</b>	
Contaminated Land	7.5
Total	7.5
<b>Home Office</b>	
<b>Revenue</b>	
Reduction in the overall amount available to local authorities through Area Based Grants (ABG) from HO.	6.0
Total	6.0
<b>Adjustment grant</b>	<b>-1.1</b>
<b>Grand total revenue</b>	<b>805.0</b>

<b>Grand total capital</b>	<b>360.9</b>
<b>Grand total local government grant reduction</b>	<b>1,165.9</b>

<sup>1</sup> Includes £4.9m of DWP funding for WNF

<sup>2</sup> Includes £4.9m of DWP funding for WNF

2. The CLG grants above, total £353.5m (excluding those on Local Government DEL), and are part of the £780m in year savings to be made by CLG. The other CLG programmes which make up this £780m reduction are set out in the following table.

#### Reductions in CLG DEL

<b>Programmes: 2010-11</b>	<b>Savings £000's</b>	<b>% Saving</b>	<b>Description</b>
Cutting waste - CLG, Quangos and lower priority programmes	90,421		
Running costs for CLG and its Quangos	50,000	10	Efficiency savings from 2010-11 budgets
Running costs - Regional Development Agencies	17,000		Efficiency savings from 2010-11 budgets
Fire - New Dimensions Programme	5,000	10	Procurement Saving
Crosscutting Cohesion & Extremism	3,100	100	Unallocated funding
Thames Gateway	500	10	Unallocated funding
Cohesion & faith (non Local Government element)	3,235	32	Unallocated funding
Prevent (non ABG element)	6,586	53	Unallocated funding
Unallocated funding	5,000	100	Unallocated funding
<b>Regional Development Agencies</b>	<b>186,000</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>Savings in line with plans to restructure regional tier</b>
<b>Housing Programmes</b>	<b>150,000</b>	<b>4</b>	
National Affordable Housing Programme	100,000	3	Funding announced but not yet allocated
Kickstart	50,000	12	Funding announced but not yet allocated
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>426,421</b>		

In addition, £10.9m will be cut from CLG's element of the Olympics funding contributing to the announced £27m saving across Government.

3. The following table showing the £0.405bn (26 per cent) savings to be made from Local Government DEL (the Departmental Expenditure Limit managed by CLG which holds all Government budgets for, or in relation to, local government which are not specific to a particular local government service), apart from the two specific grants to local authorities on this DEL (LAA Reward and LABGI) which are part of the £1.166bn reduction in local authority grants and included in the first table above:

#### Reductions in Local Government DEL

Programmes: 2010-11	Savings £000's	% Saving	Description
PFI Special Grant	160,000	15	Underspend
Valuation Office Agency	17,000	10	Efficiency Savings from 2010-11 budgets
Improvement, Transformation and Efficiency	40,500	33	Efficiency Savings from 2010-11 budgets
Local Area Agreements Reward Grant	125,000	100	Reduction in grant
Local Authority Business Growth Incentives	50,000	100	Reduction in grant
Inspection Grant to the Audit Commission	10,000	51	Efficiency Savings from abolishing CAA
Valuation Tribunal Service	700	6	Efficiency Savings from 2010-11 budgets
Standards Board for England	1,450	18	Efficiency Savings from 2010-11 budgets
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>404,650</b>	<b>26</b>	

4. Details of grant reductions to individual local authorities:

<http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/localgovernment/xls/1611273.xls>

5. Ring-fences removed from local government funding streams:

<http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/localgovernment/doc/1611282.doc>

#### Twitter

Keep up to date with the Department by following us on [Twitter](#) (external link).

#### Media enquiries

Visit our [newsroom contacts page](#) for media enquiry contact details.

# RUNNYMEDE BOROUGH COUNCIL

APPENDIX 'E'

## Notes of Runnymede Safety Committee Meeting 2 p.m. Wednesday, 3<sup>rd</sup> June 2010

**Present:**

Dennis Speight	(DNS)	Head of Environmental Protection. Chairman
Ed Keith	(EK)	Municipal Safety Advisor, Secretary
Stuart Cawthorne	(SC)	Director of Finance,
David Thomas	(DT)	Personnel Manager
Clare Pinnock	(CP)	UNISON
Julie May	(JM)	IT Section
Andy Cryer	(AC)	Housing & Community Services
Cathy Knubley	(CK)	Assistant Direct Services Manager

**Apologies for Absence:**

Jenny Soffe	(JS)	Leisure Services
Steve Dandridge	(SD)	UNISON – Chertsey DSO
Ian M <sup>c</sup> Leod	(IM <sup>c</sup> L)	UNISON – Safer Runnymede
Dave Stedman	(DS)	DSO Manager

**Absent:**

Brian Mannian	(BM)	Principal Building Manager
---------------	------	----------------------------

- |      |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | ACTIONS                  |
|------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 2.   | <b><u>NOTES OF MEETING HELD ON 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2010</u></b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |                          |
|      | The minutes were passed as a true record.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |                          |
| 3.   | <b><u>MATTERS ARISING NOT ON ROLLING LIST</u></b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |                          |
|      | There were no matters arising.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |                          |
| 4.   | <b><u>ROLLING LIST OF OUTSTANDING ITEMS</u></b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |                          |
| i.   | <b>Safety Management System</b> – EK has spoken with the Head of IT with a view to producing a limited database using Access, however this is a large undertaking which may be better incorporated into another existing database. EK advised that this may fit well into the Document Management System. | EK                       |
| ii.  | <b>Bomb Procedures</b> – BM to review bomb procedures with Police at next liaison group meeting. Ongoing.                                                                                                                                                                                                 | BM                       |
| iii. | <b>Lone Working – New street cleaning process</b> – Assistant DSO Manager has produced a new lone working procedure for street cleaning. EK now has a copy of the new street cleaning procedures.                                                                                                         | Closed                   |
| iv.  | <b>Adverse Weather Policy</b> – This matter was discussed in detail. SC agreed to take it back to chief officers and J A-D will look at HR policy for details.                                                                                                                                            | SC<br>J A-D<br>Directors |
| v.   | <b>Risk Assessment Training</b> – Some Risk Management training has already taken place and further sessions will be organised as required. (See item 8)                                                                                                                                                  | ALL                      |
| vi.  | <b>Outstanding Audit Action (1)</b> - EK to produce, and place on the intranet, a spreadsheet of records required to be retained by managers/supervisors. Feedback, on draft spreadsheet, requested from Safety Committee Members.                                                                        | Completed                |
| vii. | <b>Outstanding Audit Action (2)</b> - The Health and Safety Management System document for Runnymede be revised and adopted as good practice and formally approved by Chief Officers. EK to review system document and submit it to directors for adoption. Ongoing.                                      | EK                       |

viii.	<b>Outstanding Audit Action (4)</b> - EK to liaise with the Council's insurance officer to produce, and place on the Intranet, suitable instructions and guidance for the completion of accident and incident reports including a blank template for a witness statement and guidance on its completion. Ongoing	EK
ix.	<b>HSE Strategy – Sign up to Health and Safety</b> – EK to arrange presentation for directors.	EK Directors
x.	<b>DSE – Online Assessment Returns</b> – See Item 6.	EK
xi.	<b>Fire – Building Plans</b> – EK to provide BM with a list of building plans required.	EK/BM
xii.	<b>Fire – Glass viewing panels</b> – BM to provide legal compliance response as to why some doors do not have any.	BM
xiii.	<b>Civic Centre – Reception – Cold drafts.</b> – Reception staff are exposed to cold drafts when doors open. Building Services have the matter under review.	BM
xiv.	<b>Egham Leisure Centre – Reception – Cold drafts.</b> – Reception staff are exposed to cold drafts when doors open. BM to review issues.	BM
xv.	<b>Egham Leisure Centre – Provision of seating</b> – Issue of staff having to stand throughout shift, even when not busy.	JS
xvi.	<b>Staff Sickness Absence Provisions</b> – UNISON will review the amended provision prior to giving response.	CP
xvii.	<b>Civic Centre – Out of hours working.</b> – Can staff be reminded of the policy whereby those working in the Centre after 7 p.m. or at weekends inform Safer Runnymede staff when they are in the building and when they are leaving. Also issue of police going out to smoke on their balcony. DNS agreed to raise the issue with the Director of Technical Services.	DNS

### **NEW CIVIC CENTRE: ONGOING HEALTH AND SAFETY ISSUES**

1. Heating and ventilation  
Issues with drafts and temperature variations, due to windows and controls.  
**Update:** New motors are being ordered for the windows. Ongoing
  
2. Traffic/Pedestrian segregation.  
Safety of pedestrian staff walking down the side of the building to access through the undercroft.  
Blind sighted areas for cars entering or leaving the undercroft.  
**Update:** Further mirrors and signs to be placed. Pedestrians should not be accessing the building by this route. Part of Phase 2 Review. (Access via rear door.) Ongoing
  
3. Plinth safety in Council Chamber – The drop from the plinth is sufficient to cause an injury and is highly likely due to the narrowness of the platform.  
**Update:** EK to provide BM with legal proof that plinth does not comply with health and safety legislation. BM/EK
  
4. Card Access at Barrier – Proximity to kerb/hole at ramp – to access the proximity reader it is necessary to park very close to the kerb and stretch upwards, making it extremely difficult for a disabled driver to use the two disabled parking bays in the undercroft.  
**Update:** To await for Phase Two works. BM
  
5. Bin area – Flooding – Slip Hazard – The bin area is prone to flooding and presents a slip hazard. In hand with contractors.  
**Update:** In consultation with contractors. Ongoing BM

It was noted that the ongoing issues for the civic centre could not be discussed due to the BM

absence of any management representative from Building Services.

Directors

It was also agreed that completion dates should be stated, with directors prioritising actions and reviewing those which have not been completed by the stated date. Any items specifically requiring directors attention should be highlighted as such in the side column.

5. **STRESS**

EK once again raised the issue of monitoring for stress and if we knew how effective our control measures were. This matter was discussed; in particular about getting managers to review their performance against the Equivalence Checklist found on the HSE stress website; and the follow actions were agreed:

SC will take this issue back to the DMT.

EK will include Stress as part of his presentation to directors.

J A-D will look at sickness reporting procedures to see if we can determine sickness absence rates due to stress.

EK also mentioned that the HSE had now produced a new spreadsheet to allow managers to assess their personal management performance against an agreed stress management standard. This can be found at <http://www.hse.gov.uk/stress/mcit.htm>

The equivalence checklist is at

<http://www.hse.gov.uk/stress/furtheradvice/equivalence.htm>

EK  
SC  
J A-D  
Directors

6. **DSE**

To date, 319 members of staff have completed the online DSE assessment form. EK to produce a list for directors of those still to complete assessments and send out an all staff e-mail advising those who have not yet completed the assessment, to do so.

EK

7. **FIRE**

Fire Risk Assessments are ongoing for Parks Buildings but will require building plans to convert into fire plans before completion. BM has asked EK for a list of which building plans are required. Ongoing.

IMcL raised the issue of the lack of glass viewing panels in some doors. BM to provide legal compliance response. Ongoing

EK/BM

8. **RISK ASSESMENTS**

EK has conducted risk management training for Contractors, Day Centres, Sheltered Housing and some Leisure Centre staff.

Further training sessions will be arranged as required, however it is up to senior managers to identify, and provide names, of staff requiring training.

The subject of risk assessments was further discussed with it being noted that, while there was a corporate risk assessment for the Civic Centre, managers should still be carrying out separate work assessments for their staff, such as lone working or manual handling. EK to talk with DNS about further Risk Assessment training sessions.

EK  
Directors

9. **DRIVERS POLICY – ALCOHOL AND DRUGS/GREY FLEET**

The Drivers policy has been ratified by Directors.

The Policy would now cover staff who used their own vehicles for work-related matters, and there would be an obligation to check all necessary documentation eg Driving Licence, car insurance. It was considered more cost effective to employ a company to check the relevant documentation.

DS

DS is to obtain quotes from companies offering drivers document management services.

The draft Alcohol and Drugs policy has also been ratified by directors with the agreed limit being the statutory maximum for driving a motor vehicle.

This Policy would apply to all staff and the breathalyser kit would be held at the Depot.

EK is to incorporate the Drugs and Alcohol policy awareness into the Risk Management training for managers and staff are to be informed of the new arrangements via their respective managers and Personnel Bulletin.

EK

This policy was discussed again by members present and it was felt that, while it should be implemented as soon as possible, further review should take place to see if there were options to change to a zero tolerance policy which may be easier to enforce. This should involve a discussion with Legal, HR and UNISON to review contract implications. EK to discuss with DNS.

EK

#### 10. LONE WORKING

The policy has been amended in light of comments from directors and implemented.

Notwithstanding the implementation, discussions would take place with Safer Runnymede on the provision of a comprehensive system of monitoring and costs thereof.

Since purchase of a comprehensive system of monitoring is likely to involve a significant cost, it was asked whether it would be funded either wholly, or in part, from the corporate budget. SC agreed to raise this with chief officers

SC  
Directors

#### 11. Committee Vacancies

Due to changes in personnel, the committee has the following vacancies.

- Administration division safety officer – JS has agreed to take on this role as well as leisure services.
- Non-union Representative of Employee Services – J A-D to ask for nominations in next Personnel Bulletin.

#### 12. ACCIDENTS REPORTED SINCE MEETING OF 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2010

Twelve accidents had been reported and were discussed.

It was suggested, and carried, that all accident reports should be accompanied by a copy of the relevant risk assessment and training record. EK to request copies for all future accident returns. EK to discuss with DNS.

#### 13. DIFFICULT VISITS AND INTERVIEWS INCIDENTS SINCE 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2010

There have been no difficult visits and interviews recorded since 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2010.

#### 14. HEALTH & SAFETY ARTICLES POSTED SINCE MEETING OF 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2010

##### HSE's WHATS NEW

HM = Housing Maintenance. BS = Building Services.

CS = Community Services PS = Property Services

EH = Environmental Health.

Please note that these entries are links to articles on the HSE website.

DATE

ARTICLE

AFFECTS

March

2010

01/03/10

March 2010 myth of the month

All

Illegal gas fitter fined for putting residents at risk

HM

<b>DATE</b>	<b>ARTICLE</b>	<b>AFFECTS</b>
01/03/10	New Managing for Health & Safety website launched	All
	Rogue trader' prosecuted for gas safety crimes	HM
	Reducing the risks from top-handled chainsaw use	DSO
	Shattered Lives – Sainbury's case study	All
	Safe and sound at work – 'Do your Bit' Subsidised Training from HSE	All
02/03/10	HSE launches crackdown on dangerous construction sites	BS & HM
	Workplace transport – Load Safety campaign	DSO
03/03/10	Risk of vehicles falling from two-post vehicle lifts	DSO
05/03/10	Contractor fined for failing to provide toilets for workers	All
10/03/10	Merseyside builder fined after putting lives at risk	BS & HM
	Shattered Lives – use 'STEP' to manage slips and trips risks	All
11/03/10	Tackling stress – Harrogate NHS case study	All
12/03/10	Tree Work News – April 2010	Arboricultur e
	'Do your bit' to reduce death and injury in the workplace	All
15/03/10	HSE Chair Speech – Local Government Strategy Workshop	All
	Shattered Lives – give us your feedback	All
17/03/10	Fines after worker left brain damaged by fall	All
	Tackling stress – Oxford Council create teacher support programme	All
19/03/10	Local Authority Circular – The control of silica risks associated with kerb, paving and block cutting	EH
	New tool launched online to help prevent musculoskeletal disorders	All
22/03/10	Provision of welfare facilities during construction work	BS & HM
22/03/10	LPG bulk installations and pipework topic inspection pack	EP
	Managing health and safety – guidance and advice for successful management	All
	Assessment of Repetitive Tasks of the upper limbs (the ART tool)	All
	Safety Notice – Death prompts telehandler warning	All
	Good practice reminder on open farms	All
24/03/10	Strategy pledge Forum – Tell us what you've been doing	All
25/03/10	Safety Alert – Use of chain flail/non standard accessories on brush cutters	Leisure
29/03/10	HSE and council help businesses get safe and healthy	All
	HSE Chair Speech – IOSH 10	All
31/03/10	Podcast – Noise and vibration at work	Leisure

<b>DATE</b>	<b>ARTICLE</b>	<b>AFFECTS</b>
31/03/10	Potential effects of noise induced hearing loss	All
	Take a risk – it's good for your health	All
<b>April</b>		
01/04/10	HSE Commons Sense newsletter	
06/04/10	Central interventions by lead inspectors to national waste management and recycling companies	DSO
08/04/10	Waste Industry Safety and Health (WISH) meeting minutes	DSO
14/04/10	Myth of the month – April 2010	All
	Leeds city council fined for high voltage shock	All
	£200,000 fine after Kent worker falls to his death	All
	REACH website re-branded – Your role explained	All
16/04/10	Asbestos Liaison Group (ALG) Minutes 21 January 2010	BS & HM
	Stress – Line Manager Competency Indicator Tool	All
	Explosion at Buncefield Oil Storage Depot	
20/04/10	Five-year ban for director after raft of health and safety breaches	All
	Nationwide construction firm fined for multiple health and safety failings	CDM
21/04/10	Construction – Free leaflet: Provision of welfare facilities during construction work	CDM
23/04/10	RoSPA – Health and Safety in Waste Management	DSO
30/04/10	The Control of Artificial Optical Radiation at Work Regulations 2010	
<b>May</b>		
04/05/10	RR795 – Triaxial measurements of the performance of anti-vibration gloves	
06/05/10	Myth: You don't need to secure your load if you're just driving down the road	All
	Competence is key: Ensure asbestos surveyors are qualified for the job	BS & HM
10/05/10	New 'one stop shop' website for landlords on domestic gas safety	HM
11/05/10	HSE Publications – Free to download or buy online	All
12/05/10	Lincoln College fined after window cleaner falls from roof	BS
14/05/10	Businesses urged to take proper precautions after worker suffers serious back injuries in fall	All
17/05/10	Inspection in the waste/recycling industry 2010/11	DSO
19/05/10	Noise Action Week	All
	LA prosecution reports – three-year data sheet for convictions	All
	Occupational health – advice line pilot	All
20/05/10	Working safely under motor vehicles being repaired	DSO

15. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

There being no further business the meeting closed at 3.45 p.m.

16. **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting will take place on Thursday, 2<sup>nd</sup> September at 2pm in the Committee Room.



Ed Keith  
Municipal Safety Advisor

7<sup>th</sup> June 2010

Runnymede Borough Council

EXTERNAL APPOINTMENTS SUB-COMMITTEE

APPENDIX 'F'

26 May 2010 at 7.00pm

Members of the  
Committee present: Councillors A Alderson, D A Cotty, J R Furey, P I Roberts and G B Woodger

Members of the  
Committee absent: Councillor M J Brown

1. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN

**RESOLVED that -**

**Councillor J.R. Furey be Chairman of the Sub-Committee for the ensuing year.**

2. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the Sub-Committee held on 27 May 2009 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

3. NOTIFICATION OF CHANGES TO SUB-COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

The Group mentioned below had notified the Chief Executive of their wish that the change listed below be made to the membership of the Committee. The change was for a fixed period ending on the day after the meeting and thereafter the Councillor removed would be reappointed.

<b>Group requesting Change</b>	<b>Remove from Membership</b>	<b>Appoint Instead</b>
Conservative	Councillor H W V Meares	Councillor D A Cotty.

(Councillor D A Cotty would also be a Member of the Corporate Management Committee for the same period).

The Chief Executive had given effect to these wishes in accordance with Section 16(2) of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989.

4. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Councillor M J Brown

5. APPOINTMENT OF OUTSIDE BODIES

Members considered appointments to outside bodies.

**RESOLVED that -**

**the following appointments be made for the Municipal Year 2010/2011, and for longer periods where stated:**

**(1) Addlestone Leisure Centre Joint Management Committee**

**Councillors M J Brown, Mrs R M Denby, S Mackay.**

**(2) Addlestone Chamber of Commerce**

**Member: Councillor Mrs P Broadhead. Deputy: Councillor J Broadhead.**

- (3) Age Concern Runnymede Management Committee  
Councillor P Taylor.
- (4) Age Concern Surrey  
Councillor Mrs G Warner.
- (5) Air Training Corps (No 398 Squadron) Management Committee  
Councillor R N Jones.
- (6) Basingstoke Canal Joint Management Committee  
Councillor J M Edwards.
- (7) Chertsey Chamber of Commerce  
Member: Councillor P B Tuley. Deputy: Councillor D A Cotty.
- (8) Chertsey Combined Charity (for a four year term of office: 2010 - 2014)  
Mrs J Norman.
- (9) Chertsey Market and Fairs Charity - Feofees of Chertsey Market (for a four year term of office 2010 - 2014)  
Councillor C J Norman
- (10) Chobham Common Liaison Group  
Councillor Mrs M Roberts.
- (11) Duke of Edinburgh's Award Forum  
Councillors Mrs G Warner, J J Wilson
- (12) Egham Chamber of Commerce  
Member: Councillor P I Roberts. Deputy: Councillor J E Ashmore.
- (13) Fairoaks Airfield Joint Consultative Committee  
Member: Councillor Mrs F J Barden. Deputy: Councillor R N Jones.
- (14) Runnymede Flood Forum  
Member: Councillor D A Cotty. Deputy: Councillor G B Woodger.
- (15) Frank Muir Memorial Field  
Councillors Mrs E Gill, Mrs L M Gillham and Mrs M T Harnden
- (16) Heathrow Airport Consultative Committee  
Member: Councillor A M Moore. Deputy: Councillor C Knight.
- (17) Henry Smith's Charity  
Mrs A C Edwards, Ms Shan Hughes and Councillor C Knight.

- (18) **Joint Committee of the Traffic Penalty Tribunal (PATROL)**  
Councillor Mrs G Warner.
- (19) **Joint East Berkshire Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee**  
Councillor H W V Meares.
- (20) **Local Authorities M25 Consortium - SE Quadrant**  
Councillors R J Edis, P A Francis and Mrs L M Gillham.
- (21) **Local Strategic Partnership**  
Councillors J R Furey, M J Brown and P I Roberts.
- (22) **Mary Drew Almhouses**  
Mrs M Gibbon.
- (23) **New Haw and Woodham Community Association Governing Body**  
Councillors M J Brown, R N Jones and C J Knight.
- (24) **Relate (Woking, Spelthorne and District)**  
Councillor Mrs M T Harnden.
- (25) **Runnymede Access Liaison Group**  
Councillors Mrs E Gill, R J Edis.
- (26) **Runnymede Association of Arts**  
Councillors D A Cotty, P A Francis and P B Tuley.
- (27) **Runnymede Citizens' Advice Bureau Management Committee**  
Councillors P B Tuley, P A Francis.
- (28) **Runnymede Council Sports and Social Club Management Committee**  
Councillor Mrs P Broadhead.
- (29) **Runnymede Mental Health Association**  
Councillor J R Ashmore.
- (30) **Sir William Perkin's Foundation (for a three year term of office 2010 - 2013)**  
Mr F Balfour.
- (31) **South East England Councils (formerly the South East England Regional Assembly (SEERA))**  
Member: Councillor J R Furey. Deputy: Councillor P B Tuley.
- (32) **Services for Young People**  
Councillor Mrs G Warner.

- (33) **South East Employers**  
Member: Councillor P B Tuley. Deputy: D W Parr.
- (34) **Spelthorne and Runnymede Community Mediation Service Management Committee**  
Councillor Mrs M T Harnden.
- (35) **'Sport Runnymede' (formerly known as the Runnymede Sports Council)**  
Councillors J R Ashmore, P B Tuley and G M Kingerley.
- (36) **Strode's Foundation (for a four year term of Office 2010 - 2014)**  
Mrs E E Price
- (37) **Surrey Heathland Management Project**  
Councillor Mrs M Roberts
- (38) **Surrey Museums Consultative Committee**  
Member: Councillor C Knight. Deputy: Councillor R J Edis.
- (39) **Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Strategic Partnership Board**  
Member: Councillor G B Woodger. Deputy: Councillor D W Parr.
- (40) **Town Twinning Association**  
Councillors P B Tuley, J R Ashmore and Mrs M Roberts.

Chairman

(The meeting ended at 7.04pm)