



Economic Development Committee

18 November 2010

APPENDICES

<u>APPENDIX</u>	<u>REPORT</u>	<u>PAGE. NOS</u>
A	MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 5 OCTOBER 2010	1 – 11
B	SERVICE PLAN – 2010/2011 (Circulated for Members of the Committee only)	SEPARATELY NUMBERED
C	FINANCIAL MONITORING STATEMENT	12 - 14
C(i)	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT SERVICES	12 – 13
C(ii)	HIGHWAY SERVICES	14



Runnymede Borough CouncilECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE5 October 2010 at 7.30pm

Members of the Committee present: Councillors P I Roberts (Chairman), D A Cotty (Vice-Chairman), A. Alderson, J R Furey, R N Jones, Mrs Y P Lay, S M MacKay and L C Pouyanne

Members of the Committee absent: Councillors D R Hamilton and N Stewart

FIRE PRECAUTIONS

The Chairman read out the Fire Precautions.

NOTIFICATION OF CHANGES TO MEMBERSHIP

The Group mentioned below had notified the Chief Executive of its 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.

Group Requiring Change	Remove from Membership	Appoint Instead
Conservative	Councillor H A Butterfield	Councillor JR Furey

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

MINUTES

The Minutes of the Meeting of the Committee held on 24 June 2010 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor D R Hamilton

DECLARATION OF INTEREST

Councillor J R Furey declared a prejudicial interest under the Runnymede Code of Conduct for Members with regard to Item 13 of the agenda – Addlestone Town Centre :Potential Developments as he occupied business premises within the development area.

APPLICATION FOR STREET TRADING CONSENT: DELTA WAY, THORPE

The Committee considered an application for a new street trading consent at Delta Way, Thorpe which had been received as follows:-

Mr S Rosen (trading as *The Snack Wagon*) to trade in hot and cold food and non – alcoholic drinks at Delta Way, Thorpe between 7.00am and 3.00pm, Monday to Friday for 5 days a week.

The trader proposed to trade from a catering trailer whose dimensions were 6 feet 8 inches (width), 13 feet 7 inches (length) and 8 feet 3 inches (height). The dimensions of the area which he required for trading were 17 feet (length) 10 feet (width) and 8 feet 3 inches (height).

The proposed trading location was on the Thorpe Trading Estate in the bellmouth of Delta Way, i.e. the end of Delta Way furthest away from Delta Way's junction with Crabtree Road. Delta Way, Thorpe had been designated as a "consent street" in the Thorpe Ward.

A trader had operated from this location during 2000/2001. At that time the trader's unit was slightly repositioned in order to resolve access concerns raised by one company in Delta Way. No other complaints had been received at that time. This street trading location had been established by the Council's former Highways and Works Committee in 1999. The description of the trading location for Delta Way, Thorpe, was as follows:-

From a point level with the north west boundary of Block Number K 'Cass Building' extending in a north west direction for 8 metres, located in the north east corner of the bellmouth of Delta Way.

Officers, however, advised that this site description was now out of date because the "Cass Building" no longer existed. Officers had therefore examined whether a temporary location for the trader within the bellmouth of Delta Way could be identified.

Officers advised that they had visited the bellmouth of Delta Way on two occasions, once on a Wednesday and once on a Thursday, in connection with a previous application from another trader, which had been subsequently withdrawn, for trading in this street from Monday to Friday. Both visits had taken place around noon.

The findings from the two midweek inspections were that at these times the area was congested with the parked cars of employees working in the industrial units.

On the basis of these inspections, there did not appear to be an ideal location for the trader. However, Officers had identified what appeared to be the best location available, which was as follows:-

"In the north-east corner of the bellmouth of Delta Way, approximately 8 metres from the south east boundary of Unit 3, Delta Way and adjacent to the north west and south west boundaries of Enterprise House, Delta Way".

A map of this location was appended to the report. Members were also advised as a matter of information, that following the recent successful completion of a tendering exercise, another street trader with a similar type operation now traded, with RBC permission, on Council land in Eversley Way which was near to Delta Way.

With regard to this particular application various Council Officers and outside organisations had been consulted with appropriate recent site visits taking place. They had been asked to comment on the best location and whether they considered that there was any other location within Delta Way which would be more suitable.

The Committee was reminded that if it was minded to grant a consent this would allow the trader to trade at a specific location but would not guarantee that the trader could trade there if, for example, a parked vehicle was preventing him from doing so. The trader would have to be in the location before other vehicles, to establish his trading position and the Council would be under no obligation to enforce against other vehicles in the area in order to allow the trader to trade. Equally, if drivers of vehicles in the area were to complain to the Council that they were unable to park in the location because of the presence of the trader, if the trader had a consent to trade in a particular location, then the Council would not be empowered to remove the trader.

Comments on this application had been received as follows:

- (i) Surrey County Council West Area Transportation Service Highway Issues:
 - a) Parking was at a premium in Delta Way and demand for on-street parking exceeded availability on an almost permanent basis. As a result, vehicles were regularly parked within the bellmouth area (including the proposed trading site) and also partially on the footways along both sides of the road.
 - b) Due to the high demand for parking, there might be occasions when other vehicles were parked in the proposed site identified which would prevent access for the trader. There was no mechanism for reserving the site specifically for the use of the trader and it was unacceptable for the trailer to be left at the site permanently.

- c) Further to the above comments, there were likely to be occasions where anyone visiting the catering trailer in a vehicle would have to park in a manner that caused obstruction of either the carriageway or accesses to adjacent premises. Large vehicles regularly accessed premises near the proposed trading site and these obviously required a greater manoeuvring space than smaller vehicles. A "Keep Clear" marking on the carriageway surface suggested there had been previous problems with obstructive parking at the location.
- d) It was unclear from which side of the trailer the applicant proposed to serve customers. However, since there were no footways at the location, customers would have to stand in the carriageway. This created the potential for conflict between queuing customers and vehicles (whether it be from vehicles accessing *Enterprise House* or the private area to the north of the proposed site which appeared to be used as a parking area for large vehicles).

Surrey County Council West Area Transportation Service was unable to suggest a more suitable trading site within Delta Way since at least some of their above concerns would apply equally to any location within the road (due to the existing parking problems throughout Delta Way, the size of vehicles using the road and the number of accesses to premises).

In the light of the above concerns, Surrey County Council West Area Transportation Service was unable to support the application.

(ii) Runnymede Borough Council's Parking Manager

The Council's Parking Manager had commented that the trading location identified was an open area currently used for storing buses and lorries. If the buses were not there it would place the facility in the middle of the road, in its current lay out. Emerging vehicular traffic from Units 3 and 4 would be a hazard to pedestrian traffic visiting the facility. Due to the presence of the entrance to *Enterprise House* there was no way of reaching the facility on foot without either approaching on the road or crossing vehicular access points. There was no area immediately adjacent to the proposed site to park vehicles and, therefore, inconsiderate parking was almost inevitable which would result in congestion. The Council's Parking Manager, therefore, did not consider the proposed position to be at all suitable.

Furthermore, the Council's Parking Manager could not identify any other suitable site in Delta Way, except for, possibly, an area on the highway which was on the left hand side of Delta Way, if entering Delta Way from Crabtree Road. This location appeared to be in front of a disused, or lightly used, premises car parking area. This was, however, fairly close to the junction of Delta Way with Crabtree Road and such a location might be unpopular with the property occupier.

(iii) Surrey Police Road Safety And Traffic Management Officer

The Surrey Police Road Safety and Traffic Management Officer had commented that in the identified proposed location the catering trailer would be parked end-on to the retaining wall situated on the north west boundary of *Enterprise House*. This was very close to the north west entry/ exit to the *Enterprise House* car park and, therefore, there might be some conflict between the customers using the catering trailer and vehicles using these premises. This area was used as a regular parking area for two cars and these would be displaced elsewhere, if indeed the catering trailer could always command this position. The Surrey Police Road Safety and Traffic Management Officer could not recommend anywhere more suitable in Delta Way which would not displace even more private parking. However, he had confirmed that he had no firm objections to the application.

(iv) Runnymede Council's Environmental Protection Team

It was reported that Runnymede Environmental Protection had no concerns over this location.

(v) Surrey Police – Egham

Surrey Police Egham had not raised any concerns over this location.

(vi) Council's Community Safety Manager - Safer Runnymede

The Council's Community Safety Manager had reported that, although there was no CCTV in the area, there was no current problem in this location with anti-social behaviour and, therefore, no reason to believe that trading would have an adverse impact on crime and disorder.

(vii) Thorpe Ward Members

No comments had been received from Thorpe Ward Members on this application.

(viii) The Trader

A copy of this report had been sent to the trader who had been invited to comment if he so desired. No comments had been received from him.

Unauthorised Trading

Members were informed that during the week of 19 to 23 July 2010, the trader had traded without authority in the bellmouth of Delta Way, during the day.

Complaints had been received by the Council from employees of a business in Delta Way stating that the trader was causing an obstruction and making it difficult for delivery vehicles to pass and repass. Concern was also expressed about the safety of road users as the trader was blocking vision and his customers were causing an increase in traffic.

The trader was warned by Officers that he must not continue to trade in Delta Way as he had no street trading consent. He had not returned to trade in the location.

Members were reminded that it was Council Policy to give due consideration to the suitability of all applications to trade on consent streets and to prohibit trading in all streets where it would be detrimental to road safety and where evidence of detriment to public amenity existed. The Council's legal responsibilities, with respect to this application, including the European Convention on Human Rights which secured certain fundamental human rights, were particularly noted.

Whilst Members were genuinely sympathetic to the commercial aspirations of Traders, particularly as the estate was relatively isolated from facilities such as shops and cafes and this additional trader could reduce car journeys to access such facilities elsewhere, they were mindful, too, that this industrial area generally suffered from a severe shortage of car parking for both employees and visitors alike and the presence of this trader would reduce this even more in terms of casual parking.

On the basis of the comments made by the Surrey County Council West Area Transportation Service, the Council's Parking Manager and the Police Road Safety and Traffic Management Officer, the Committee acknowledged that there were major difficulties in relation to the placement of the trading unit anywhere within Delta Way. When the trader traded in the street without authority in July 2010, concerns were immediately reported to the Council by a business in the vicinity.

Accordingly, the committee agreed that the application should be refused.

Since the review of consent streets had last been conducted more than 10 years ago and because there were just 3 consent streets in the Borough, Members agreed that it would be appropriate for a review to now be carried out with report back to Committee in due course. It was accordingly -

RESOLVED that -

- i) the application for a street trading consent in Delta Way be refused, as no suitable location can be found for the placement of the trading unit which does not give rise to highways difficulties; and**

ii) Officers be asked to review the list of consent streets in the Borough and report back to the Committee in due course.

REVIEW OF OFF-STREET CAR PARKING CHARGES

The Committee gave consideration to a comprehensive report which reviewed car parking charges in the Council's off-street car parks.

As part of the background information the recent history of parking charges was drawn to Members' attention. In January 2010, the Economic Development Committee had agreed not to change parking charges due to the financial climate and with the agreement of the Corporate Management Committee the £100,000 reduction in anticipated income had been added to the Council's savings target. Members were reminded that the total value of the savings programme was now some £2,578,500.

Whilst steps to achieve this budget reduction were progressing time was running short to implement the necessary savings. Should the current provision in the Financial Forecast for increased car parking income not be met, the revenue reductions target would of necessity increase accordingly. Each delay in the savings programme increased the overall savings target, leaving the Council with the prospect of reducing valued services in the short term in order to bridge this shortfall. Accordingly, the Committee was presented with two Options to increase charges.

The current scale of car park charges and penalty charges across the Borough was noted including the results of a customer survey carried out in July 2010, the result of which indicated that 10% of customers found the charges very reasonable, 53% found them acceptable and 37% found them too expensive (a return of 50 responses, 10% of the survey forms handed out).

A comparison of Runnymede parking charges with other Surrey and neighbouring Councils and the main Network Rail station car parks was also noted. Since the last review, most Authorities had left their charges unchanged; Epsom and Ewell and Surrey Heath had increased charges whilst Woking had reduced some charges. All of the RBC chargeable car parks had achieved the 'Park Mark' award for safer parking. These were awarded to car parks that achieved national standards with respect to quality and security of the parking area for the benefit of the car park users. Annual inspections were carried out by external assessors and Police Crime Reduction Officers to ensure that standards were maintained. This ensured that the parking facilities were of a high standard for which a reasonable charge should be expected. This also helped to offset the additional expenditure of maintaining the car parks in a safe and tidy condition, including the maintenance of the car park markings, signs, ticket machines, lighting, landscaping, boundaries, barriers and CCTV coverage.

There were also a number of free Runnymede Council car parks in parks, cemeteries, recreation grounds and corporate buildings. In September 2008, the Committee had concluded that there was no potential for charging in these car parks at that time and nothing had changed since then to alter this position.

It was clear that the usage of car parks was dependant on their location across the Borough and varied between short term parking to predominantly all day commuter and business users. An analysis of the percentage of tickets sold in each car park for the various tariff periods from January to July 2009 and January to July 2010 was presented in the report. Parking income had reduced and whilst usage patterns had remained stable, in most of the car parks overall ticket sales had fallen again in all but one car park (Garfield Road) thus reflecting the similar trend of previous years. The main commuter car parks at Waspe Farm, Egham and Bourne, Virginia Water, showed a reduction in all-day ticket sales but an increase of sales for lower tariffs. Whilst the long term parking across the Borough had shown a consistent reduction over the last two years, possibly as a direct reflection of the economic situation and associated job losses, Officers had not been able to find any direct evidence to support this. With regard to the Out of Town Centre Car Parks it was noted that the usage of these car parks had also dropped over the last year but the introduction of new lower 'out of town centre' tariffs, for Englefield Green and Pooley Green, appeared to have been well received. Verbal feedback from local businesses, in particular, had been complimentary in response to the introduction of the lower tariffs.

The planned development of the Precinct Car Park in Egham was likely to start in this financial year and this would affect the amount of available parking in Egham during the development but the Council would be compensated for lost income. Officers were currently discussing the possibility of the Borough's Parking Service managing the new car park within the development in future. This would only be done if it was financially viable for the Council. The Borough Valuer was currently negotiating with the developer over the provision of parking for the occupants of premises displaced by the development. This was likely to include the Precinct Extension car park.

Income from car park season tickets and permits remained buoyant despite some non-renewals but in the last financial year income from contract parking was £ 7,400 as compared with £ 9,900 in the previous year. It was noted that a number of holders had vacated their bays over the last year as a result of businesses closing. However, recently enquiries in relation to vacant bays had been received from two new businesses opening adjacent to Bemonds Row.

Resource Implications

It was Council policy that "*Discretionary fees and charges (including car parking charges) need to, at least, reflect the cost of provision and/or comparative tariffs elsewhere.*" Accordingly Members had to balance covering the costs of operating car parks with concerns about the impact on the viability and vitality of the towns and neighbourhood centres in the Borough. Surrey County Council's policy was to support measures to reduce on-street car parking and had therefore requested that all charges were kept under review to ensure they were appropriate for the location so as to avoid additional demand for parking on the public highway.

The total car park income from pay and display sources was £395,000 in 2009/10 as compared to £413,000 in the previous year. This was in line with the reductions in car park use across the Borough and also reflected the increase in VAT back to 17½%. Without any further increase in the charges this figure would further deteriorate when the VAT rose to 20% in January 2011.

Annual season ticket and permit charges had been increased from £400 to £500 in January 2009 following the 2008 review. They were mainly bought by businesses and employees and sales were currently reducing, possibly as a result of the current financial climate. Charges for contract parking had remained unchanged for five years. Very few contract parking permits were sold so altering the current charge of £500 would have minimal effect on income. Officers recommended, however, that contract charges should be increased by £50 in order to reflect a reserved parking space.

Whilst the sales of tickets across all tariffs had dropped in all of the Council's car parks, with the exception of Garfield Road, Addlestone, between January and July 2010, as compared with the same period in 2009, the decrease in sales was relatively low in the larger more profitable car parks. The reasons for this reduction were difficult to determine. It could be that some users had been deterred by the level of the charges or it could have been caused by the financial downturn. However, the level of charges in the Council's car parks had not increased since January 2008 and even with the increases proposed by both of Options they would still be lower than the charges in all of the other Surrey Boroughs and Districts.

Members were reminded that increased car park usage could not be relied on to increase income so the only other alternative was to increase the car parking charges which had the inherent danger of reducing car park use.

Members considered that Option 1, which gave modest increases, provided the appropriate balance of increasing charges in line with the Council's Policy of fostering economic prosperity. Option 2 in the report gave more significant increases but might result in a significant drop in usage and therefore income. Members, however, were minded to further revise Option 1 and increase the level of Town Centre charges in Option 1 with the *one hour charge* being raised to 60p. It was therefore agreed that the following revised scale of charges should be introduced as from January 2011:

Town Centre Car Parks - Current Charges and Option 1 (as revised at meeting) for increased charges

<u>Time Period</u>	<u>Current charges</u>	<u>Revised charges as from January 2011</u>
Up to 1 hour	£0.50	£0.60
1 to 2 hours	£1.00	£1.20
2 to 3 hours	£1.50	£1.70

3 to 4 hours	£2.00	£2.20
4 to 5 hours	£2.50	£2.70
5 to 6 hours	£3.50	£3.70
All Day	£4.00	£4.00

During the resulting discussion, Members also agreed that the sale of annual permits should be introduced for both the Victoria Street car park, Englefield Green and Pooley Green car park, Egham at a cost of £100 per permit but limited to 25 in number in each case. This would give local business employees and residents more opportunity for parking and produce a guaranteed income for the Council. Members strongly agreed that charging should not be introduced for disabled badge holders in the Borough's car parks.

Members were reminded that the introduction of the lower level of increases in Option 1(as revised) was unlikely to fully meet the increase in income in the Financial Forecast whereas the Option 2 increases would come nearer to meeting the required increase. However, with the exception of one Councillor, the Committee agreed that the increases in Option 1(as revised) should be adopted. (It was estimated that at current rates of occupancy, the increase would generate further revenue of £41,000 per annum).

Councillor Alderson could not support increases in charges, particularly the increase in the one hour charge being raised to 60p, at a time when significant income was already being derived from car parking charges. Accordingly, he asked for a Named Vote to be taken with regard to Resolutions (ii) and (iii) below.

Upon a requisition by Councillor Alderson for the names of those voting on the Motion to increase charges in line with Option 1(revised), as set out above, to be recorded, there voted:

For (7): Councillors P I Roberts, Cotty, Furey, Jones, Mrs Lay, Mackay, Pouyanne

Against (1): Councillor Alderson

Abstain: None

Accordingly it was -

RESOLVED that -

- i) the off street parking 'Out of Town' charges remain unchanged;**
- ii) the off street parking 'Town Centre' charges be increased with effect from January 2011;**
- iii) the level of increase in the Town Centre charges be as follows :**

<u>Time Period</u>	<u>Revised charges as from January 2011</u>
Up to 1 hour	£0.60
1 to 2 hours	£1.20
2 to 3 hours	£1.70
3 to 4 hours	£2.20
4 to 5 hours	£2.70
5 to 6 hours	£3.70
All Day	£4.00

- iv) charging should not be introduced for disabled badge holders in the Borough car parks;**
- v) contract parking charges should be increased to £550 per year;**
- vi) the sale of annual permits be introduced for Victoria Street car park Englefield Green and Pooley Green car park, Egham at £100 per permit and be limited to 25 in number; and**

- vii) future Annual Car Parking Charge review reports be submitted to the Economic Development Committee in November for implementation of changes in the following April.**

CORPORATE PROPERTY STRATEGY MAINTENANCE PROGRAMME

The Committee considered a report which (i) noted the progress to date made in relation to a planned and reactive maintenance joint partnering agreement with Spelthorne Borough Council and which highlighted the financial benefits of the partnering agreement; and (ii) sought approval for RBC's five year programme of works to be included in the partnering agreement.

Progress to date with regard to the joint partnering agreement was reported as follows :

- i) A project board had been established consisting of Officers from both Authorities and had had its first meeting.
- ii) A target date for having both planned and reactive contracts in place was set for April 2011 (there would need to be some initial work undertaken in setting up the structure, updating the property database, visiting the properties and developing a plan, and this was yet to be agreed with Spelthorne).
- iii) Runnymede's 5 year planned maintenance schedule had been developed. Spelthorne's was currently being undertaken. Both were yet to be agreed by their respective Committees.
- iv) Both Runnymede and Spelthorne legal teams were currently working on a draft partnering agreement.
- v) A draft Service Level Agreement had been compiled and would be integrated into the partnering agreement for approval by Members when ready.
- vi) Tender documentation for planned and reactive works was currently being drafted.

Both RBC and SBC would benefit from the reduced costs achieved by jointly procuring building maintenance with estimated savings of £92,000 (RBC) and £100,000 (SBC) respectively, per year, with this arrangement.

Corporate Property Maintenance

Members were advised that Runnymede's 5 year planned maintenance schedule had been developed with the strategic maintenance budget financed from both capital and revenue resources. Works that substantially lengthened the economic life of the building or provided significant improvements to the asset could be treated as capital expenditure and financed from capital receipts in hand. All other works were met from the revenue budget.

During the financial years 2009/10 and 2010/11, only essential planned and reactive maintenance works had been carried out, which meant that buildings were starting to deteriorate with buildings having high levels of "traffic", such as Day Centres, Halls and Sports Centres deteriorating first.

During the last two financial years expenditure on corporate property maintenance had been just over £300,000. The average annual budget for the previous 5 year strategic maintenance programme was £567,000. Substantial savings had therefore been produced.

Building condition surveys had now been carried out on all of the RBC and SBC corporate properties and the 5 year programme of works had been produced from the data obtained. The required essential works had resulted in a financial commitment greater than that shown in the Financial Forecast. Members were assured that the necessary works programme had been pared down to the minimum needed to maintain operational property. Thus any further reductions were not considered possible without compromising safety or allowing premises used by the paying public to deteriorate to a condition that would lose income by virtue of the reduced quality of venue.

A major incident might occur where a large amount of the reactive maintenance budget was required to be expended. Members were therefore recommended that Runnymede re-instate the maintenance regime as set out in the 5 year plan with the associated cost profile. The maintenance

programme over the next five years had been restricted to £1.9 million which was split between planned maintenance and reactive maintenance in order to cushion the revenue impact whilst the General Fund was facing financial constraints. Consequently, the approved maintenance budget for the 2010/11 financial year totalled £312,800, of which £143,100 had been provisionally treated as capital expenditure.

This meant that the cost of maintenance works falling on the General Fund in the 2010/11 budget was £169,700. This level of expenditure had been projected forward over the next five years. The revenue works in the new programme (£1,724,861 over 5 years) would result in annual revenue expenditure that was substantially more than the 2010/11 budget. However, as £28,093 related to the Runnymede Pleasure Ground this should be charged to the Trust rather than to the General Fund. The additional financial commitment would also be offset by the annual saving of £67,000 that was expected to be achieved by the new building maintenance partnership arrangements on top of the saving that had already been included in the Financial Forecast (£25,000). Taking these factors into account, the new programme would require an additional revenue commitment of between £52,000 and £144,000 each year as compared with the current budget.

Additional revenue cost of the Corporate Property Maintenance plan

	Year 1 2011/12 £	Year 2 2012/13 £	Year 3 2013/14 £	Year 4 2014/15 £	Year 5 2015/16 £	Total £
Total revenue works	367,749	372,679	384,993	305,404	294,036	1,724,861
LESS Runnymede PG	-5,491	-9,119	-4,711	-4,091	-4,681	-28,093
Saving from partnership not already in Forecast	-67,000	-67,000	-67,000	-67,000	-67,000	-335,000
Currently revenue budget	-169,700	-169,700	-169,700	-169,700	-169,700	-848,500
Additional revenue cost	£125,558	£126,860	£143,582	£64,613	£52,655	£513,268

During consideration of this matter there was discussion with regard to maintaining the ratio between planned and reactive maintenance. Officers were asked to keep this under review.

RESOLVED that –

- i) the progress in relation to a planned and reactive maintenance joint partnering agreement with Spelthorne Borough Council be noted;**
- ii) the Director of Technical Services be authorised to agree the Council's five year programme of works which is to be included in the partnering agreement;**
- iii) the financial benefits of the partnering agreement be noted; and**
- iv) the Corporate Management Committee be recommended to approve the cost implications of the 5 year strategic maintenance plan and to incorporate them into the next Financial Forecast.**

REFERENCE FROM THE HOUSING AND COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE – SALE OF 28 RUNNEMEDE ROAD, EGHAM

This item had been withdrawn from the Agenda prior to the meeting and transferred to the Corporate Management Committee which had considered this matter as an urgent item at their meeting on 1 October 2010.

FINANCIAL MONITORING STATEMENT

The Committee noted the latest financial projections for the 2010/11 financial year for Economic Development Services and Highway Services.

STANDING ORDER 42 – URGENT ACTION

The Committee noted that the following action had been taken by the Officer shown below after consultation with the Chairman of this Committee under Standing Order 42.

<u>Officer</u>	<u>Action Taken</u>	<u>Central Index No.</u>
Director of Administration and Leisure Services	New Lease: 9 High Street (Charter Place) Egham	724

ADDLESTONE TOWN CENTRE: POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

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 the disclosure of exempt information of the description specified in paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A to Part 1 of the Act. 13.

Councillor J R Furey withdrew from the meeting prior to the consideration of this agenda item.

Members were advised an offer had been made to the Council for its land interests from a development company following an advertisement inviting developers to express interest in the regeneration of Addlestone Town Centre.

Officers had duly met with the development company's Directors in July and, subsequently, a presentation was made by the Company to an Officer/Member panel in September. Members attending that presentation were Councillors Furey, P Roberts and Cotty. The presentation outlined the design concept and scale of the development. Members noted the details including the funding proposals.

The Officer/Member Panel was impressed by the initial concept and design, the commitment of the developers and their track record. It was recommended that a "due diligence" exercise should therefore be carried out and in order to complete the due diligence exercise quickly, the Chief Executive had formed a project team of Officers from Planning, Housing, Legal, Property and Finance. External assistance was being sought from Surrey County Council Highways and Transportation department.

Due diligence would entail:

- (i) seeking further detail on the design and concept;
- (ii) clarifying how the proposed scheme would fit-in with existing and developing planning policies;
- (iii) examining the robustness of the financial model and clarifying issues regarding the offer to the Council;
- (iv) timescales;
- (v) planning requirements (e.g. a traffic impact assessment, retail study, etc);
- (vi) affordable housing offer;
- (vii) land interests and covenants;
- (viii) approach to public consultation.

It was proposed to undertake this work as quickly as possible (within the next 4 – 6 weeks) and to report back to this Committee with a recommendation to proceed or alternatively to outline alternative strategies for the regeneration of Addlestone Town Centre.

Members welcomed the proposals and congratulated Officers on the work carried out to date.

It was -

RESOLVED that:

- (i) The Chief Executive be authorised to undertake the ‘due diligence’ exercise and to grant a period of exclusivity to the Developer up to 18 November 2010 (this being the date of the next ordinary meeting of the Committee);**
- (ii) the proposal and the exclusivity period be reviewed at that date with a view to continuing negotiation or adoption of an alternative strategy;**
- (iii) if in November the Committee considers it appropriate, the Developer be invited to give a detailed explanation and presentation of the proposals at the date of the January meeting.**

Chairman

(The meeting ended at 8.50 pm)



**ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
FINANCIAL MONITORING STATEMENT**

Figures to the end of October 2010

PROJECTED BUDGET AND FORECAST

	2010/11	Future Years		
	Budget £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000	2013/14 £'000
Approved budget:				
Car Parks	-187	-187	-187	-187
On Street Car Parking Enforcement	23	23	23	23
Markets and Street Trading	14	14	14	14
Runnymede Travel Initiative	29	29	29	29
Corporate Land & Property Holdings	-667	-667	-667	-667
Energy Management	52	52	52	52
Runnymede Business Partnership	65	65	65	65
Civic Centre	-477	-477	-477	-477
Chertsey Depot	-5	-5	-5	-5
Total approved budgets	-1,153	-1,153	-1,153	-1,153
Approved and reported changes:				
Planned Underspends brought forward from 2009/10				
Car Parks	17			
Corporate Land & Property	5			
Energy Management	21			
<u>Changes approved in Financial Forecast (CMC October 2009)</u>				
Civic Centre				
Rental income (Library)		-26	-28	-28
<u>Other approved changes</u>				
Corporate Properties				
Valuer (Income generation) 1 year - Corp. Man Apr 2010	40	20		
Other potential changes:				
Car Parks				
Egham Precinct leasehold disposal - deferred to 1 Feb 2011	-6	-20	25	33
Revised tariffs January 2011 (as per Financial Forecast)	-20	-80	-80	-80
Revised tariffs January 2011 - Eco Dev. Cttee 5 Oct 10	12	46	46	46
Cost of changing fees & display boards	4			
Revised tariffs April 2013				-80
Corporate Properties				
Forecast Improvement in lettings		-104	-104	-104
Uplift in rent - deferred	75	75	75	75
Rents - Egham Precinct - deferred to 1 February 2013			-20	-121
Civic Centre				
Catering Subsidy	4	1	1	1
Latest budget projection	-1,001	-1,241	-1,238	-1,411

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
FINANCIAL MONITORING STATEMENT
 Figures to the end of October 2010

CURRENT YEAR KEY BUDGET INDICATORS

	2010/11 Budget £	Budget to Date £	Actual to Date £	Variance to Date £
Income budgets				
Pay & Display income - collections to 25/10/10	394,900	225,000	219,700	-5,300
Penalty Charge Notice income	70,100	41,000	51,000	10,000
Yellow Buses - School Fares	123,000	60,000	56,800	-3,200
Yellow Buses - Section 106 Agreements	171,200	100,000	44,655	-55,345
Yellow Buses - Sponsorship and Donations	50,000	12,500	12,500	0
Corporate Property income	1,158,800	746,000	736,400	-9,600

HIGHWAY SERVICES
FINANCIAL MONITORING STATEMENT
 Figures to the end of October 2010

PROJECTED BUDGET AND FORECAST

	2010/11	Future Years		
	Budget £'000	2011/12 £'000	2012/13 £'000	2013/14 £'000
Approved budget:				
Environmental Maintenance	115	115	115	115
Borough Highways Functions	145	145	145	145
Flood Mitigation	356	356	356	356
Engineering Services	-2	-2	-2	-2
Total approved budgets	614	614	614	614

Approved and reported changes:

Planned Underspend brought forward from 2009/10	
Environmental Maintenance	3
Environmental Maintenance - The Broadway	17
Environmental Maintenance - SCC Grass Cutting	11
Flood Mitigation	24

Changes approved in Financial Forecast (CMC October 2009)

None

Other potential changes

The government consultation paper on changes to the Formula Grant mechanism was considered by the Corporate Management Committee on 30 September. In respect of the land drainage element of Formula Grant, Runnymede stands to lose grant of £372,000 if the proposed change is implemented. This will jeopardise the Council's ability to continue funding this work.

Latest budget projection	669	614	614	614
---------------------------------	------------	------------	------------	------------

CURRENT YEAR KEY BUDGET INDICATORS

	2010/11 Budget £	Budget to Date £	Actual to Date £	Variance to Date £
None				