Environment and Sustainability Committee

Thursday 26 March 2015 at 7.30pm

Council Chamber
Runnymede Civic Centre, Addlestone
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Councillors J M Edwards (Chairman), D A Cotty (Vice Chairman), I A Chaudhri, Mrs V Dunster, Mrs M T Harnden, D J Knight, M T Kusneraitis, M J Maddox, N H Prescot and Mrs G Warner

AGENDA

Notes:

1) Any report on the Agenda involving confidential information (as defined by section 100A(3) of the Local Government Act 1972) must be discussed in private. Any report involving exempt information (as defined by section 100I of the Local Government Act 1972), whether it appears in Part 1 or Part 2 below, may be discussed in private but only if the Committee so resolves.

2) The relevant ‘background papers’ are listed after each report in Part 1. Enquiries about any of the Agenda reports and background papers should be directed in the first instance to Mr M L White, Democratic Services Section, Law and Governance Business Centre, Runnymede Civic Centre, Station Road, Addlestone (Tel: Direct Line: 01932 425623). (Email: malcolm.white@runnymede.gov.uk).

3) Agendas and Minutes are available on a subscription basis. For details, please ring Mr B A Fleckney on 01932 425620. Agendas and Minutes for all the Council's Committees may also be viewed on www.runnymede.gov.uk.

4) In the unlikely event of an alarm sounding, members of the public should leave the building immediately, either using the staircase leading from the public gallery or following other instructions as appropriate.
5) **Filming, Audio-Recording, Photography, Tweeting and Blogging of Meetings**

Members of the public are permitted to film, audio record, take photographs or make use of social media (tweet/blog) at Council and Committee meetings provided that this does not disturb the business of the meeting. If you wish to film a particular meeting, please liaise with the Council Officer listed on the front of the Agenda prior to the start of the meeting so that the Chairman is aware and those attending the meeting can be made aware of any filming taking place.

Filming should be limited to the formal meeting area and not extend to those in the public seating area.

The Chairman will make the final decision on all matters of dispute in regard to the use of social media audio-recording, photography and filming in the Committee meeting.
If you need help reading this document please contact the Council on 01932 838383. We will try to provide a reading service, a large print version, or another format.

বাংলা
আপনি যদি ইংরেজি পড়তে বা বলতে না পারেন, ও এই লেখাটি পড়তে যদি আপনার কোনও সাহায্য লাগে তাহলে অনুগ্রহ করে 01483 750548 নাম্বারে WITS লিংকলাইন (WITS Linkline) -এর সাথে যোগাযোগ করুন ও আপনার নিজের ভাষায় একটা মেসেজ রাখুন।

简体中文
如果您无法阅读或说英语，需要协助以明白此文件，请与和景翻译服务处之语言专线连络 01483 750548，并用您的母语留下讯息。

Italiano
Qualora non siate in grado di leggere o di parlare l'inglese, e necessitiate assistenza che vi permetta di capire il presente documento, siete pregati di contattare la WITS Linkline allo 01483 750548 e lasciare un messaggio nella vostra lingua.

اروو
آرمآ ب كريري زبان چه هاوریان زنی کهپی انریا کووک وسناو رواکوچنی میست تختین آنی
سیه کوناینو سه مینا سیه لکی انریا کووک چری 01483 750548 پرآباتری نی یوراپی

Polski
Jeżeli nie potrafisz czytać lub mówić po angielsku i potrzebujesz pomocy w zrozumieniu tego dokumentu, proszę skontaktować się z Linią Telefoniczną WITS pod numerem 01483 750548, zostawiając wiadomość w języku ojczystym.

Español
Si no puede leer o hablar ingles, y necesita ayuda para entender este documento, por favor contacte a WITS Linkline al 01483 750548 y déjel un recado en su idioma.
LIST OF MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. FIRE PRECAUTIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. NOTIFICATION OF CHANGES TO COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. MINUTES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. RISK AND RESILIENCE SERVICES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. WOODLANDS CAR PARKS ST PETER'S HOSPITAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. EGHAM HIGH STREET : CONSULTATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. BUSINESS CENTRE PLAN ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS : Q3 2014/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. MINUTES : MEMBER WORKING GROUP RECYCLING AND REFUSE SERVICES – 19.2.2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

a) Exempt Information
   (No reports to be considered under this heading)

b) Confidential Information
   (No reports to be considered under this heading)
1. **FIRE PRECAUTIONS**

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

2. **NOTIFICATION OF CHANGES TO COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP**

3. **MINUTES**

To confirm and sign, as a correct record, the Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 21 January 2015. The Minutes of this meeting were included in the March 2015 Council Summons/Minute Book.

4. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

5. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

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

Members who have previously declared interests, which are recorded in the Minutes to be considered at this meeting, need not repeat the declaration when attending the meeting. Members need take no further action unless the item in which they have interest becomes the subject of debate, in which event the Member must leave the room if the interest is a disclosable pecuniary interest or if the interest could reasonably be regarded as so significant to prejudice the Member’s judgement of the public interest.

6. **RISK AND RESILIENCE SERVICES (ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES)**

   **Synopsis of report:**

   For Council to consider being a party to a mutual venture to provide and improve RBC’s risk and resilience service (including Emergency Planning) in the Borough.

   **Recommendations:**

   1. To commence formal contractual discussions with the Mutual, including Service Level Agreements and Income Share Arrangements with a view to becoming a 10% stakeholder in a Public Sector Mutual called Applied Resilience.

   2. Any final contractual agreement to be agreed between the Chairman of Environment and Sustainability Committee, the Chairman of Corporate Management Committee in consultation with the Chief Executive and the Corporate Head of Resources.

   3. To agree an exemption to Contract Standing Orders to award a three year contract.

   4. To request the Corporate Management Committee to approve a Supplementary Revenue Estimate for £24k, which will be repaid in future years, as dividends are paid.

   **Context of report**

   1.1 Following the flooding in early 2014, Officers commenced a review of the arrangements for delivering the Council’s emergency planning, risk and resilience services. The report proposes participating in the establishment of a Public Service Mutual venture, which will provide a number of additional benefits.

   **Report**

   2.1 The service is currently co-ordinated, and mainly delivered, by one Officer, shared between this Council and Spelthorne Borough Council.
2.2 The Council’s service is facing four pressures: increasing expectations from members of the public and professional partner stakeholders to prepare and respond to any major incident; an increased risk profile, particularly with respect to severe weather; pressure on resilience services as the Authority undergoes transformation; and continued financial pressures on the Authority.

2.3 Runnymede has an unusually high risk profile relative to the rest of Surrey (with the exception of Spelthorne) for fluvial (river) flooding, of which Runnymede is in the top 5 areas of risk in the country; proximity to Heathrow Airport, Thorpe Park, nationally critical highway, particularly the M25 and M3; as well as proximity to some of the UK’s largest reservoirs.

2.4 Whilst the Authority’s emergency response broadly stood up well during the severe flooding of Jan/Feb 2014, it is clear that professional resilience support (for example specialist advice, support and contribution to command and control), came under significant strain and requires additional resilience itself.

2.5 At Runnymede, the Corporate Head of Resources is responsible for maintaining the Corporate Strategic Risk Strategy and the Risk and Resilience Manager co-ordinates the Risk Register with final sign off through the Corporate Leadership Team. Disaster recovery and business continuity planning are two areas where the capacity for review and improvement is stretched. Response pressures from the 2014 flooding has delayed important business continuity planning, designed to protect against and respond to incidents, such as the arson attack in South Oxfordshire. In addition, since the flooding, there is significant local interest in developing community level resilience measures. At the final Multi Agency Strategic Co-ordination Group meeting, it was agreed that the Borough Councils needed to take the lead on developing this important measure. This places additional pressure on what is effectively a part-time service.

2.6 Officers from Runnymede BC and Spelthorne BC have undertaken a detailed options appraisal focusing on how the service may be made more resilient and expanded, without significantly increasing expenditure.

2.7 After a vigorous assessment with the support of consultants, it was determined that a Public Service Mutual (PSM), in the form of a Company limited by shares, was the most desirable vehicle for delivering resilience services, the term refers specifically to the services currently provided through the Risk and Resilience Manager.

2.8 The proposal will increase the number of Officers employed in the service to contribute to business continuity, strategic risk management as well as increased resources and capacity during emergencies. (The full business case is available from the Democratic Services Section upon a request). The mutual will be led by the current Risk and Resilience Manager who will have an 80% stake in the venture, Runnymede and Spelthorne will each own a 10% stake.

2.9 The proposals do not impact on any other Council Service; the Housing Business Centre will still provide and run rest centres etc.

The main advantages of the Public Service Mutual for Runnymede BC are:

i). It will allow the service to better respond to an emergency event by providing additional co-ordination resource.

ii) It will ensure that RBC and Runnymede residents have a stronger voice within the multi agency planning process, as the new vehicle will be a bigger body than the two Councils individually.

iii). It will assist in ensuring that the Councils’ Statutory responsibilities are fully met.

iv) The proposal will assist in the development of a more resilient service, moving away from reliance on one part-time Officer, which will have benefits for day-day running of the service, particularly as it also provides the opportunity to grow. The service will be part of a wider, growing network enabling best practice to be shared and the introduction of common procedures. This may enable some Officer-sharing to staff BEC’s (Borough Emergency Centre) and this will also add considerably to capacity if the emergency is prolonged.
v). The service will be able to sell its services to others (other Local Authorities, NHS, universities and private businesses etc.) more easily as a mutual.

vi) As a 10% shareholder, the Council would be repaid its set up funding and be paid a dividend from the profits made.

2.10 While the report concentrates on emergency response, the additional capacity provided by the Mutual will enable Runnymede officers to review business continuity arrangements including disaster recovery plans.

2.11 The Mutual will use Runnymede and Spelthorne as reference sites – it is quite normal in Local Government for “contractors” to use their Council “employers” to provide references. The two Councils can also continue to provide office accommodation and the support services they currently provide. The support provided can help the Mutual to grow and repay the initial investment of £10k to provide working capital.

3. **Policy framework implications**

3.1 There is no change to the Council’s policy of providing a robust emergency planning, risk and resilience service. While this is clearly a new operating model it provides additional resilience and capacity to the service.

3.2 Emergency planning, risk and resilience is a unique and Statutory service. In emergencies, it is also a high profile service representing the Council with government agencies, other Councils and the emergency services. The proposals are designed to enhance the service and the Council’s reputation.

4. **Proposal**

4.1 It is proposed that Runnymede Borough Council become shareholders in a new Public Service Mutual company called Applied Resilience, along with Spelthorne Borough Council and the current Risk and Resilience Manager.

4.2 Runnymede and Spelthorne Borough Councils would both invest £10,000 per Authority. The £20,000 would be used for initial set-up expenses for the new company as well as a small contingency fund for the new organisation. In exchange for the £10,000 initial investment, RBC would receive a 10% equity stake, entitling it to receipt of dividends from any related earnings. The Shareholder Agreement will ensure that if either Council wishes to withdraw from being a shareholder in the Public Service Mutual the other Council will have the right to acquire the other Council’s shareholding.

4.3 Applied Resilience would seek to trade with other organisations and over time increase the number of employees and turnover. In turn, this would mean the dividend income stream accruing to the Council would grow over time.

4.4 The Head of Corporate Resources, as the Council’s Section 151 Officer, and Spelthorne BC’s equivalent Officer would be Board Members, and the Head of Strategy would be the Runnymede contract manager for the service.

**Options analysis**

4.5 The Business Plan, of which the Chairman already has a copy, contains a detailed analysis of current drivers, market conditions and other sensitivity analysis and financial planning and should be referred to for more detail.

4.6 Summary of the options is shown below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Maintain services at current level</td>
<td>Successful track record. Reduced short term risk</td>
<td>Resilience not increased. Resilience services will have to be carefully rationalised based on risk profile and statutory responsibilities. Reliance on key personnel. Very limited scope for savings. No innovation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Increase resilience resource – in house</td>
<td>Increased resource for resilience work</td>
<td>No savings realised. No innovation. Additional burden on RBC in terms of support services and on costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. (Recommended)</td>
<td>Creation of a PSM to deliver resilience services via a contract</td>
<td>Increased resilience to service. Additional capacity to deliver resilience work. Service delivery safeguarded under a contract arrangement. Agreed service costs fixed for contract duration of three years. Potential for payment of dividends to RBC, offsetting some costs. Aligned with corporate approach to innovation and maintaining service delivery.</td>
<td>Increased short term cost. Some short term risks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.7 It is recommended that Option 3 be adopted.

5 Resource implications

5.1 The initial cost to the Council would be a one off payment of £10k to set up the Mutual. In return, it would receive a 10% equity stake, which would attract dividends when the Mutual became profitable.

5.2 There would be no additional management costs associated with the arrangements. The Section 151 Officers for both Councils would work together as Directors of the Company to ensure their Councils both received an efficient, effective and economic service.

5.3 The Section 151 Officers of the two Councils feel the risk of loss is minimal. Essentially, the Mutual is selling expertise, as the service develops and expends there may be a “step up” cost in terms of additional costs. New contracts will be given with adequate notice periods to protect the financial position of the Mutual and, ultimately, the Councils.

5.4 The table below shows costs after the projected dividend is paid. While there is a need for a contribution from reserves of £24k in 2015/16, this will likely reduce over time.
The contractual costs include increasing hours from 18 a week to 33 a week. However, this additional post will be part of the new organisation and not an additional burden to the Council in terms of on-costs, NI and pension contributions etc.

It has been determined that the Council is able to offer the new organisation a directly awarded contract for the duration of three years. This is less than the Business Plan, which is based on five years, but it is sufficient to provide some medium term assurance, through the provision of business, with the prospect of it growing to increase income generation through business with other parties. A direct award of a five year contract would also be contrary to the Public Contracts Regulations 2006.

Legal implications

Local Authorities provide a wide range of services and undertake a variety of tasks. These services or tasks can be delivered through a number of delivery models, such as direct employment of staff, employment of an external contractor or the use of the voluntary sector. As highlighted in the body of the report the current approach taken by the Council in relation to this area of work is that it is a job share post with Spelthorne Borough Council being the direct employers.

The delivery model being proposed is the engagement of an external contractor to undertake the tasks, which fall under the heading of resilience. Public Sector Mutuals (PSM) are organisations that have left the public sector but continue delivering public services. Employee control plays a significant role in their operation. A PSM is not a legal form. Being a PSM is instead about staff control and how the staff run the organisation. There is no one legal form that a PSM must take. The most common are Co-operatives or Community Interest Companies – companies that are set up if they are run for the benefit of the local community - that are then either limited by Guarantee or by Share. Thus, a PSM can adopt the legal model of a company limited by Shares where the staff that work for the company also own the company by virtue of owning the shares.

In the model currently being proposed, there is a slight variation in that the Local Authorities who support the project and will receive the bulk of the services provided by the company will also have a minority share holding in the company, which is the PSM.

Part V of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989 (the 1989 Act) and the Local Authorities (Companies Order) 1995 (the 1995 Order) introduced categories of Local Authority companies and controls which apply to each type. For the purposes of Part V of the 1989 Act, Applied Resilience will be an “influenced” company because the Council, together with Spelthorne, will own at least 20% of the shares and they will have a business relationship with the company whereby payments from them will exceed 50% of turnover. It should be noted that under the legislation governing Local Authority involvement in companies the interests of two or more Local Authorities in a single company have to be aggregated. The 1995 Order has imposed further requirements, which will have to be complied with. In addition to ensuring compliance with the legislation governing Local Authority companies care will have to be taken when drafting the internal governance documents of Applied Resilience to protect the interests of all parties. This can be achieved through inserting appropriate provisions in the Articles of Association and drawing up what is termed a shareholder agreement.
6.5 Given that an Officer of the Council will be appointed to act as a Director, and, in essence, represent the Council regard should be had to the fact that the role of Director, imposes a set of duties on the post holder, including duties to act in accordance with the company’s Articles of Association and to promote the interests in the company. There is a duty to declare any conflict of interest, which might well arise if the required action of the Council conflicts with that of the company. In such cases, the Director would have to act in the best interests of the company. Care will have to be exercised when deciding which Officer to appoint as Director to ensure that their role in the Council does not conflict in any way with acting as a Director of the company. If one of the Statutory Officers of the Council is appointed to the post care needs to be exercised to avoid any conflict arising if they are placed in a situation where they are obliged to act in one way in their Council role, and, in another way, in their Director role. It should be noted, that the Council will also have to provide the Officer appointed as a Director with an indemnity, which is allowed to provide under the Local Authorities (Indemnities for Members and Officers) Order 2004. The purpose behind providing such an indemnity is to protect the position of the Officer because, by virtue of becoming a Director at the request of the Council, they take on legal obligations, which carry with them legal liabilities. Any such indemnity will only protect them if they act in a lawful manner.

6.6 State Aid involves giving financial assistance, which may be seen as distorting competition and could include granting leases rent free, and providing guarantees and other financial benefits, which are not available to other market providers. State aid, which is above the de minimis level (£200,000 over a 3 year rolling period) and not otherwise exempt, is unlawful. In the current proposal, the two Councils will be providing financial assistance to Applied Resilience in a number of ways:

- Investment amount (taking into account the 10% shareholding)
- Redundancy indemnity
- Discounted use of assets/property (licence of the building/desk space and provision of computers etc.)
- Pension guarantee or bond
- If when the value of these various forms of assistance is quantified it is found that they exceed the de minimis level it would be necessary to obtain clearance from the EU if none of what are termed the block exemptions would apply.

6.7 If the decision to proceed with Applied Resilience is made, then those staff providing the services immediately before transfer will follow the work and transfer from the Council to the Applied Resilience under the Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment) Regulations 2006. They would transfer on their current terms and conditions and continuity of service would be preserved. The Council will ensure it complies with its information and consultation requirements set out in the Regulations and allows sufficient time for this process to be completed.

6.8 Local Authority staff are entitled to pension protection under the Best Value Authorities Staff Transfer (Pensions) Direction 2007. The protection is such that a new employer must provide all transferring staff that are members of the LGPS or entitled to join with continued access to the LGPS or to a broadly comparable pension scheme. Where a broadly comparable scheme is provided, it must be certified as such, in accordance with guidance published by the Government Actuary’s Department and accrued benefits will transfer on a day for day basis. Arrangements can be made for transferred staff to have access to the LGPS via an Admission Agreement. Such an approach was adopted when the Leisure Association and to promote the interests in the company. There is a duty to declare any conflict of interest, which might well arise if the required action of the Council conflicts with that of the company. In such cases, the Director would have to act in the best interests of the company. Care will have to be exercised when deciding which Officer to appoint as Director to ensure that their role in the Council does not conflict in any way with acting as a Director of the company. If one of the Statutory Officers of the Council is appointed to the post care needs to be exercised to avoid any conflict arising if they are placed in a situation where they are obliged to act in one way in their Council role, and, in another way, in their Director role. It should be noted, that the Council will also have to provide the Officer appointed as a Director with an indemnity, which is allowed to provide under the Local Authorities (Indemnities for Members and Officers) Order 2004. The purpose behind providing such an indemnity is to protect the position of the Officer because, by virtue of becoming a Director at the request of the Council, they take on legal obligations, which carry with them legal liabilities. Any such indemnity will only protect them if they act in a lawful manner.

6.6 State Aid involves giving financial assistance, which may be seen as distorting competition and could include granting leases rent free, and providing guarantees and other financial benefits, which are not available to other market providers. State aid, which is above the de minimis level (£200,000 over a 3 year rolling period) and not otherwise exempt, is unlawful. In the current proposal, the two Councils will be providing financial assistance to Applied Resilience in a number of ways:

- Investment amount (taking into account the 10% shareholding)
- Redundancy indemnity
- Discounted use of assets/property (licence of the building/desk space and provision of computers etc.)
- Pension guarantee or bond
- If when the value of these various forms of assistance is quantified it is found that they exceed the de minimis level it would be necessary to obtain clearance from the EU if none of what are termed the block exemptions would apply.

6.7 If the decision to proceed with Applied Resilience is made, then those staff providing the services immediately before transfer will follow the work and transfer from the Council to the Applied Resilience under the Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment) Regulations 2006. They would transfer on their current terms and conditions and continuity of service would be preserved. The Council will ensure it complies with its information and consultation requirements set out in the Regulations and allows sufficient time for this process to be completed.

6.8 Local Authority staff are entitled to pension protection under the Best Value Authorities Staff Transfer (Pensions) Direction 2007. The protection is such that a new employer must provide all transferring staff that are members of the LGPS or entitled to join with continued access to the LGPS or to a broadly comparable pension scheme. Where a broadly comparable scheme is provided, it must be certified as such, in accordance with guidance published by the Government Actuary’s Department and accrued benefits will transfer on a day for day basis. Arrangements can be made for transferred staff to have access to the LGPS via an Admission Agreement. Such an approach was adopted when the Leisure Trust was established a number of years ago. In such a situation, the Council may be required to provide some form of bond to protect staff and the LGPS.

6.9 As indicated above, if this proposal proceeds the Council will be in a situation where it has to enter into a contract with Applied Resilience to provide services to the Council. Where the Council obtains services from another party a procurement exercise should normally be undertaken. If the value of the contract were to be over certain financial limits then it would be necessary to undertake a procurement process, which complies with UK and EU legislation. The current proposal is that any contract would be for a period of years which would mean that its value would be below the threshold for requiring an EU procurement process. Even though an EU procurement process is not required, the Council’s own Contract Standing Orders would normally require a procurement process, unless an exemption applies, which would justify the waiving of the Standing Orders. Under the Council’s Contract Standing Orders, there is power to grant an exception to their application if justified by special circumstances (see Contract Standing Orders C1.6 and 1.7).
6.10 Whilst an Officer of the Council will be appointed as a Director of the Mutual, the Council will have to put in place arrangements to exercise the voting rights it will have by virtue of being a shareholder.

6.11 The most common way this is dealt with, is for a Committee of the Council to be delegated authority to make decisions with regard to the exercise of the Council voting rights. Given the main functions that will be exercised by this contractor will fall under the remit of this Committee, it would seem logical that authority is delegated to this Committee concerning the exercise of voting right.

7. Conclusions

7.1 To commence formal contractual discussions with the Mutual, including Service Level Agreements and Income Share Arrangements with a view to becoming a 10% stakeholder in Public Sector Mutual Applied Resilience.

7.2 Any final contractual agreement to be to be agreed between the Chairman of Environment and Sustainability Committee, Chairman of Corporate Management Committee in consultation with the Chief Executive and Corporate Head of Resources.

7.3 To agree an exemption to contract standing orders to award a three year contract.

7.4 To approve a supplementary revenue estimate for £24k, which will be repaid in future years as dividends are paid.

(To resolve)

Background papers

Risk and Resilience Business Plan

7. WOODLANDS CAR PARKS, ST PETER’S HOSPITAL (ACE)

Synopsis of report:

To consider an objection to the use of this land as a public pay and display car park; to consider confirmation of the Order; consider future provision of parking permits and note the work required and timescale to improve the land to a standard suitable for public parking.

Recommendations:

i) Provided that acceptable terms cannot be negotiated for a lease in respect of the larger of the two car parks, the Parking Order in respect of the larger of the two car parks be confirmed to enable its use as public pay and display car parking, to be called Woodlands Car Park; and

ii) Provided that there is sufficient demand and room in the larger of the two car parks, Officers be authorised to amend the Parking Order and make available a suitable number of permits at the rate of £600 per annum or £175 per quarter.

1. Context of report

1.1 The car parks the subject of this report are shown on the plan attached as Appendix ‘A’ and have been previously reported to this Committee.

1.2 The car parks have been leased to St Peter’s Hospital since 1993, and used for staff parking and that lease expired in June 2013. Officers have been trying to negotiate a reasonable rental income for the site with the Trust since 2013, but failed to agree terms.

1.3 Accordingly, the matter was reported both to this Committee and Corporate Management Committee in September 2014, when it was agreed that the final offer of rent from the Hospital be rejected and the land used for public pay and display purposes.
1.4 A three month period of notice was given, which expired in mid-February. In December 2014, as a final compromise, Officers offered to lease the smaller of the two car parks to St Peter’s as staff parking for a set fee. Agreement to this and the terms of the lease was given by Corporate Management Committee last month.

1.5 Members will be aware that a petition requesting the Council reconsider its position and negotiate “an affordable rental” was considered by full Council on 5 March and the Resolution was as follows:-

1. The Chief Executives of RBC and Ashford and St Peter’s Hospital Trust should meet to ascertain whether an offer acceptable to the Council can be negotiated as a matter of urgency, but in the event that such an acceptable offer cannot be negotiated, then no further negotiations be held on this matter.

2. In the event that an acceptable offer cannot be negotiated, the Petitioner be informed that the Council has agreed terms on the smaller of the two car parks, but is not prepared to accept the rental offer by the Ashford and St Peter’s Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust for the larger car park, as it represents poor value for money to the public. The lease on this land by the Trust has already expired and the Council is not prepared to renegotiate on this matter.

1.6 At the time of writing this report, the urgent negotiations have not been concluded and a further update will be provided at the meeting.

2. Report

2.1 St Peter’s was allowed to remain in occupation of the smaller car park until the lease terms were agreed and the lease is being finalised. The start date is 1 April 2015, with no rental being charged until then, in return for fencing around the larger car park being retained and passed to the Council as part of the asset.

2.2 The intention to use both of the car parks as pay and display car parking was advertised as required under the legislation and the deadline for responses was 2 March. A single objection was received from St Peter’s Hospital, which is attached as Appendix ‘B’.

2.3 The first paragraph of this letter refers to, but misquotes, the minutes of this Committee’s meeting in November 2014. The letter suggests that the minutes state, “car parks are an amenity provided by the council to maintain the viability of businesses (by ensuring access to them) with the caveat that income should cover the cost of providing and maintaining the car parks.”

2.4 The minute actually reads:

“Public car parks were an amenity provided by the Council for the convenience of the public. In shopping areas, they also encouraged and helped to maintain the viability of businesses, but the income from the car parking charges was expected to, at least, cover the cost of providing and maintaining the car parks. Thus, when deciding the level of car parking charges, the Committee had to balance the costs of operating car parks and the income for the Council against the impact on the viability and vitality of the town and neighbourhood centres in the Borough. This was particularly relevant in this year’s review, due to the Council’s financial position and the current financial climate for local businesses in the Borough.”

2.5 The objection further states that the Hospital has sufficient visitor parking; that the parking is only set to generate income; and it is suggested that the tariff should be the lower, ‘out of town’ tariff and that charging should only take place from Mondays to Fridays.

2.6 From observation, it appears that there are times when finding a visitor parking space at the hospital is difficult. Indeed, part of the justification for additional parking as part of a current planning application from the Trust is “lack of visitor spaces at peak times, resulting in queues, missed appointments and frustration for patients”. This public parking will provide alternative and cheaper parking than that offered by the hospital. Given that the Hospital Trust earns some £1.7 million a year from car parking income, then Members will draw their own conclusions about their comments on income generation.
2.7 As reported to the meeting of full Council on 5 March 2015, which considered the petition received which is referred to at paragraph 1.5 of this report, the Council has no obligation to provide, or subsidise car parking for St Peter’s Hospital, whether it be for staff or public parking. The Trust gains an income from its car parking charges, which is more than three times that which the Council receives from all its car parks combined.

2.8 The Council is obliged to make best use of, and obtain best value for, its assets for taxpayers. In dealing with another public body, it is accepted that Councils will not seek to take financial advantage, but neither are they obliged to dispose of, or lease, assets at below market value. The Council has offered the land at a lease which is 70% of that which might be expected in pay and display income, but full Council noted that the Trust’s final offer was only 40% of that which could be achieved by pay and display income. Full Council’s decision on the petition is set out at paragraph 1.5 of this report and as stated at paragraph 1.6 a further update regarding these urgent negotiations will be provided to this meeting.

2.9 A comparison between the Council’s (RBC) car parking charges and those of the Trust (St Peter’s) is shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>St. Peter’s Charge</th>
<th>RBC Charge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First 20 minutes</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 1 hour</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>80p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Minutes to 2 hours (St Peter’s)</td>
<td>£3.00</td>
<td>£1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 2 hours (RBC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 3 hours</td>
<td>£4.00</td>
<td>£2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 4 hours</td>
<td>£5.00</td>
<td>£3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 5 hours</td>
<td>£6.00</td>
<td>£3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 6 hours</td>
<td>£7.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 24 hours (St Peter’s)</td>
<td>£8.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 16 hours (RBC)</td>
<td></td>
<td>£6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to one week</td>
<td>£20.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.10 Given that, as shown above, the Council’s charges will be less than those of St Peter’s Hospital, it is considered appropriate to set the charges as shown above and not implement the Council’s ‘out of town’ tariff for car parking. Concerning the suggestion in the objection that charging should only take place from Mondays to Fridays, the hospital public parking charges are in operation from Mondays to Sundays and on Public Holidays. Therefore, it is considered that the Council should also charge from Mondays to Sundays and on Public Holidays.

2.11 As is normal practice, both Surrey County Council, as Highways Authority, and Surrey Police were consulted on the proposals. Surrey County Council noted that there are existing problems with hospital staff and visitors parking in nearby roads, rather than on the hospital site. This parking causes complaints from local residents, and there have been instances of dangerous/obstructive parking. As a result, waiting restrictions have had to be introduced at a number of locations.

2.12 Surrey County Council also observes that there have been previous changes to parking arrangements/charges within the Hospital site that appear to have resulted in increased parking on the highway. They have indicated they would, therefore, be concerned if any proposals were likely to have a similar impact in displacing parking onto the Highway. However, they note that the Borough’s proposed parking charges are considerably lower than those charged by St Peter’s Hospital. As such, they believe it would not be likely to cause parking to be displaced and they have not objected to the proposals.

2.13 Surrey Police have raised the issue of whether these proposals will displace Hospital staff parking onto local roads. They have been informed that the Council has agreed terms for the rental of the smaller of the two car parks, that there will be no reduction in the amount of parking provided as a result of these proposals, that the Council’s charges will be lower than those of the Hospital providing an incentive for visitors to use the Council car park and relieving car parking pressure elsewhere on the site, that Hospital staff do not currently receive free parking and that the Hospital have submitted a planning application to the Council to provide replacement parking on the St Peter’s Hospital site. Having noted this, Surrey Police still feel that it is inevitable that some displaced staff parking onto local roads will take place. However, they accept that this cannot be quantified and, therefore, have no formal objection to the proposals and state that if some displacement takes place it will have to be dealt with as and when it arises.
2.14 Nothing in the objection persuades Officers that the Order should not be proceeded with and it is, therefore, recommended that provided acceptable terms cannot be agreed (see paragraph 1.5 above), the Order be confirmed, albeit only in respect of the larger of the two car parks, given that terms have been agreed with the Trust on the smaller one.

2.15 In many of the pay and display car parks, permits are offered at the current rate of £600 per annum or £175 per quarter. These do not guarantee the holder a space, but offer the Council guaranteed income and the holder benefits from substantial discount over paying the daily rate.

2.16 It is further recommended that Officers be given discretion to offer permits if there is demand and room available in the car park. If this was introduced, the Parking Order would require an amendment.

2.17 The car park surface and marking is not considered suitable for a public car park and it would require making up to a better standard. This work can be undertaken by the Council’s term contractor and funding for this has already been authorised by the Corporate Management Committee.

2.18 The Council has rights to connect to electricity and drainage, and the intention is to install a separate electricity meter. The lease termination required the Trust to return the land in its original form. The Trust offered to sell the height restriction barrier, lighting and CCTV camera and pole to the Council but only as a single package. Officers considered the quality of these items to be poor and the valuation excessive, so it was rejected. The replacement of these items, as well as provision for ticket machines, is included within the agreed budget.

2.19 As indicated in paragraph 2.1 above, Officers did agree a price for the retention of the boundary fencing around the car park. Works to the car park can hopefully be undertaken in April, should take no more than four weeks to complete and in the interim, access to it has been secured against unauthorised use.

3. Policy framework implications

3.1 Provision of public pay and display car parking is for the general use of the public as an amenity and does not differentiate between local residents, workers, visitors or commuters. In this case, equally, it would be available for patients, visitors, staff at the hospital or others who have no association with the hospital.

4. Resource implications

4.1 As indicated above, the Corporate Management Committee has already approved a budget for the making good of the car park.

5. Legal implications

5.1 Under the provisions of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, the Council can provide off-street car parking. This needs to be advertised and any comments received given due consideration, which is the purpose of this report.

6. Conclusions

6.1 The single objection received to this proposal is not considered to have merit for the reasons set out in the report. It is, therefore, recommended that the Order be confirmed, albeit in respect of the larger car park only.

6.2 It is also recommended that Officers be authorised to introduce permit parking if there is sufficient space and demand.

6.3 A budget has already been approved for making good the car park and provision of appropriate equipment, signage etc. and works should commence in April.

(To resolve)

Background papers

Email correspondence with Surrey County Council and Surrey Police on the draft Order.
8. **EGHAM HIGH STREET : CONSULTATION (ACE)**

**Synopsis of report:**

To report the outcome of a consultation from Surrey County Council as to whether the pedestrian zone at High Street, Egham should be retained or not.

**Recommendation:**

None - For information only

**Context of report**

1.1 Surrey County Council has recently consulted on proposals for Egham High Street. This matter would normally have been referred to this Committee for consideration, however, it was not possible to report this to the January meeting and the consultation closed on 27 February, before this meeting. The Corporate Management Committee in February, therefore, formed the Council’s view on the options proposed.

1.2 The current arrangements for the pedestrianisation of Egham’s High Street were introduced in the early 1990s and operate between the junction with Wetton Place to the west and with Church Road to the east.

1.3 The restrictions allow pedestrians only in this zone between 11:00 and 16:00 hours, Monday to Saturday. The only vehicles permitted access during this time are emergency services on operational duty or Royal Mail vehicles.

1.4 There are no exemptions for riding pedal cycles, disabled drivers, taxis or delivery/collection vehicles. Access is controlled at the western end by a low metal gate, which is not locked, and is open to abuse by drivers, who can leave it open, encouraging further abuse of the restrictions.

1.5 The High Street is one-way to the east only, but there are regular reports of vehicles entering from the eastern end, despite signage that this is no entry.

2. **Report**

2.1 The consultation by Surrey County Council proposed two main options. The first was to retain the restrictions, but introduce a more effective means of enforcing the restriction, such as by using an electronic gate or bollard.

2.2 The second main option was to remove the existing pedestrian zone (but keep the one-way system) and have a thirty minute maximum stay parking between 08:00 and 18:00, Monday to Saturday.

2.3 In addition, as part of the Egham Sustainable Package, it is proposed to allow cycling in both directions at all times of the day.

2.4 The consultation also seeks views on the provision of taxi ranks. One would be outside the pedestrian zone on the south side of the High Street outside 169 – 172 High Street. This would provide for four taxis and would operate 24 hours a day.

2.5 The other taxi proposal is a proposed rank for two taxis on each side of the High Street at its eastern end. These would operate between 16:00 and 11:00 hours if the pedestrian zone was retained, or 24 hours a day if the pedestrian zone was removed.

2.6 Pedestrianised town centres can work well where there is adequate infrastructure for vehicles or public transport to gain reasonably close access, to drop off shoppers, visitors and workers and service commercial premises.
2.7 In Egham, there is the Hummer Road car park (125 spaces) immediately to the north of the High Street, with walkways through. Immediately to the south is the new Waitrose car park, open to the public, with 174 spaces, and again, a walkway through to the High Street. Adjoining this is the Egham Precinct car park with approximately 40 spaces. Waspe Farm car park (119 spaces) lies some 275 metres south of the High Street.

2.8 There is a bus route along Church Road and the rail station is a 270 metre walk from the south. Delivery and service vehicles can access the High Street up until 11:00 and after 16:00 hours. Many commercial premises have rear access available from Hummer Road or Church Road without restriction.

2.9 Corporate Management Committee felt that it would be inappropriate to put forward a view in relation to the retention of the pedestrianized zone, on the basis that the results of the public consultation were unknown when the matter was considered. However, it did resolve:

- It is considered premature to remove the pedestrian zone until the wider impacts of the Waitrose store on the town centre as a whole can be assessed.
- If the pedestrian zone within Egham High Street is retained, the existing gate be replaced with an electronically operated bollard or gate, which could be linked to and operated by, Safer Runnymede.
- The proposed taxi ranks are supported.
- If the pedestrian zone within Egham High Street is retained, no objections are raised to permitting two-way cycling in the High Street.
- Whatever the outcome of the consultation, parking bays in the High Street be made available for 30 minutes between 08:00 and 18:00 hours, Monday to Saturday to facilitate proper enforcement and the Traffic Regulation Order be appropriately amended.

2.10 Officers reported the consultation to the Runnymede Business Partnership Transportation Sub-Group who supported the retention of the pedestrianised zone, but had reservations about the proposed taxi rank outside 169-172 High Street. These comments were passed onto SCC as part of the consultation.

2.11 The Consultation has now closed and 630 responses were received, some 87% of which were in favour of retaining the pedestrianised zone. The matter is being reported to the Surrey County Council Local area Committee meeting on 23 March and the recommendations are:

1. The existing pedestrian zone is retained with the same hours of operation (11am to 4pm) and exemptions but is extended to also apply on Sundays;
2. Authorisation is given to advertise a notice, the effect of which will be to extend the pedestrian zone to also operate between 11am and 4pm on Sundays;
3. Authorisation is given to the Area Team Manager in consultation with the Chairman of the Local Committee and Local Member to resolve any objections received in connection with the proposal;
4. Subject to no objections being maintained, the order be made and the proposed change to the pedestrian zone implemented;
5. Subject to the provision of funding, a more effective method of controlling access to the pedestrian zone (such as an electronic gate or bollard) is designed and introduced; and
6. The views expressed about the proposals relating to cycling, taxi ranks and parking are noted and taken into account in any decisions on changes to these aspects of the High Street.

Officers will give a verbal update at the meeting of the Local Area Committee’s decision and a copy of the SCC report is attached as Appendix ‘C’.
3. **Policy framework implications**

3.1 Runnymede’s Sustainable Community Strategy has two key themes relating to ‘An Environment to be Proud of’ and promoting town centre revitalisation, so an enhanced town centre that promotes an attractive environment for all visitors, shoppers and traders would be supportive of this.

3.2 The master planning work jointly commissioned by Runnymede and Surrey County Council included suggested principles for Egham town centre, one of which was ‘Create a truly public realm that makes it a pleasure to walk around Egham Town Centre’. The reintroduction of unrestricted vehicular traffic in the High Street would be directly contrary to this.

3.3 It would also appear to be contrary to the Sustainable Transport objective in the Surrey Transport Plan 2014, which seeks the provision of “an integrated transport system that protects the environment, keeps people healthy and provides for lower carbon transport choices”.

3.4 The submission to the Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership for the Egham Sustainable Package was based on promotion of walking, cycling and bus use to encourage modal shift away from the use of cars. The option to allow vehicles throughout the day in the High Street would undermine this.

4. **Resource implications**

4.1 Enforcement of any parking restrictions would be undertaken through existing resources (although see the comments in the Legal Implications section below).

4.2 If the option chosen was the retention of the pedestrianised zone with an electronically controlled gate or bollard, this could be operated and controlled remotely by Safer Runnymede, using existing resources. Expenditure relating to its installation, connection to Safer Runnymede and ongoing maintenance would be the responsibility of Surrey County Council.

5. **Legal implications**

5.1 The taxi proposals, if acceptable to Surrey County Council would require a further discrete consultation which RBC would undertake (Section 63 of the Local Government Miscellaneous Provisions Act, Part II).

5.2 There are concerns that waiting restrictions in the Town Centre have to be aligned with the Traffic Regulation Order and this should be undertaken whether or not there are any changes.

5.3 Vehicles currently park in bays on the High Street when it is closed to traffic (i.e. between 11.00 and 16.00 hours) although RBC does not have the ability to take action against this. It is therefore recommended that whatever the outcome of these proposals, parking in these bays be restricted to 30 minutes only between 08:00 and 18:00 hours, Monday to Saturday, to enable this to be managed and enforced.

6. **Conclusions**

6.1 There was very strong local support in favour of retaining the pedestrian zone and the suggestion of the Egham Chamber of Commerce to extend this to include Sundays has also been taken on board. Clearly when these restrictions were first implemented, Sunday trading was very much more low key than today and this recommendation is supported.

6.2 If pedestrianisation was to be retained, the majority of respondents preferred cycling to be prohibited or at least one way only.

(For Information)
Background papers

Egham High Street Consultation, Surrey County Council 2015
Surrey Transport Plan 2014
Egham & Chertsey Masterplanning, GVA
Egham Sustainable Package, submission to Enterprise M3 LEP
Report to Local Area Committee 23 March 2015, Surrey County Council

9. BUSINESS CENTRE PLAN (ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES)

Synopsis:

The purpose of this report is to inform Members of the progress made against last year’s Environmental Services Business Centre Plan and provide a summary of this year’s Environmental Services Business Centre Plan for approval.

Recommendation:

Members approve the 2015/16 Environmental Services Business Centre Plan.

1. Context of report

1.1 A corporate-wide Performance Management Framework (PMF) has been established to assist Members and Officers with the decision making process. The general purpose of the PMF is to bring about improvements and/or take remedial action in the event of service or financial challenges.

1.2 To complement the PMF, a Business Planning Cycle has also been introduced. This cycle involves each Business Centre Manager/’Head of’ completing an annual Business Centre Plan which sets out for the forthcoming year: key drivers/influences, objectives, performance/activity indicators, the links to the Sustainable Community Strategy and the links to the Corporate Business Plan for the teams/function under their responsibility, by utilising a standard corporate template.

2. Report

2.1 The full Environmental Services Business Centre Plan can be found in Appendix ‘D’. A summary is provided below.

2.2 Key achievements in 14/15 and Objectives for 2015/16

2.2.1 Key achievements in 2014/15 and Objectives for 2015/16, across the Environmental Services Business Centre team, have been presented through the Key Performance Indicators throughout the year.

2.3 Purpose of the Business Centre

2.3.1 Environmental Services is a multi-disciplinary business centre covering a range of services including Environmental Health and Licensing, Direct Services Organisation (DSO), Building Services, Engineering Services and Parking Services.

2.4 Key drivers/influences

2.4.1 The key drivers/influences impacting on the Environmental Services Business Centre in 15/16 are laid out in Section 3 of the appended Plan but are primarily driven by:

- Regulatory and Statutory requirements in the Environmental Health and Licensing Department
- Surrey Waste Partnership agreed refuse and recycling rates in the Direct Services Organisation
- Statutory Maintenance requirements and Climate Change obligations in the Building Services Section
- Flood Prevention and Placemaking Challenges in the Engineering Section
- National and Local Parking policies for the Parking Team

2.5 Objectives

2.5.1 The objectives, which have been set for 15/16, are described in full in Section 4 of the appended report.

2.6 Performance/Activity Indicators

2.6.1 The Performance Activity Indicators for 15/16 are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Q1 (Apr-June)</th>
<th>Q2 (Jul-Sept)</th>
<th>Q3 (Oct-Dec)</th>
<th>Q4 (Jan-Mar)</th>
<th>Full year (Apr-Mar)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of formal complaints related to the business centre.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of decisions investigated by the ombudsman requiring a remedy by the Council.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of days learning per full time equivalent in the business centre.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.25]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES1: Residual household waste per household (kg)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES2: Percentage of household waste sent for re-use, recycling and composting (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES3: Number of missed bin collection complaints</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Key Performance Indicators Quarter 3, 2014/15 (ACE)

**Synopsis:**

To provide the Committee with the Quarter 3 (October to December) 2014/15 key performance indicator results.

**Recommendation:**

None - For information only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Activity Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ES4: Number of street cleansing complaints (overflowing litterbins, overflowing dog bins, and general litter/detritus complaints)</td>
<td>Activity Indicator</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES5: Number of parking Penalty Charge Notices issued</td>
<td>Activity Indicator</td>
<td>8000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES6: Number of trade refuse customers</td>
<td></td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES7: Percentage of food establishments in the borough achieving level 3 or above ratings under the National Food Hygiene Rating Scheme (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES8: Carbon emissions from local authority operations (measured in tonnes of CO2e)</td>
<td>Activity Indicator</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES9: Number of fly-tipping incidents</td>
<td>Activity Indicator</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES10: Income from car parking charges</td>
<td>Activity Indicator</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Council Policy

3. **Council Policy**

3.1 This Plan supports the achievement of all four of the Council priorities in the Sustainable Community Strategy.

(To resolve)

**Background papers**

None

### 10. KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS QUARTER 3, 2014/15 (ACE)

**Synopsis:**

To provide the Committee with the Quarter 3 (October to December) 2014/15 key performance indicator results.

**Recommendation:**

None - For information only
1. **Context of Report**

1.1 Key performance indicators have been established to provide Members and Officers with a regular snapshot of performance/activity across key areas in order to aid the decision making process and ensure that corrective measures are put in place where necessary, in a timely fashion.

1.2 The targets and indicators for the current year were agreed by this Committee at its last meeting in June.

2. **Report**

2.1 The outturn for the third quarter of 2014 is shown in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Q3 Target</th>
<th>Full year Target (Apr-Mar)</th>
<th>Q3 Actual</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ES1: Residual household waste per household (kg)</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>Total kg of household waste remains below target.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES2: Percentage of household waste sent for re-use, recycling and composting (%)</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>45.54%</td>
<td>Whilst dry recycling was greatly increased in December the lack of garden waste has had a negative impact on the recycling rate in this quarter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES3: Number of missed bin collection complaints (includes refuse, recycling and food and excludes trade and green waste)</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>There has been an increase in reported missed collections for two main reasons. One is the changing dates over the Christmas period and the second reason is the number of front line vehicles that have broken down resulting in work being collected the following day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES4: Number of street cleansing complaints (overflowing litterbins, overflowing dog bins, and general litter/detritus complaints)</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>Street cleansing complaints have increased due to the leafing season. Whilst complaints have increased, we have not seen the level of complaints associated with this period from previous years. This is due to the extra funding provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES5: Number of parking Penalty Charge Notices issued</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>2247</td>
<td>The results for this indicator are provided for monitoring purposes only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES6: Percentage of Food establishments in the borough achieving level 3 or above ratings under the National Food Hygiene Rating Scheme (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>Annual figure. Reported annually due to the variation in number of premises inspected in each quarter.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ES7: Carbon emissions from local authority operations (measured in tonnes of CO2e) | 3.5% reduction on actual for 2013/14 | Annual figure. Much will depend on the severity of the winter and energy consumption related to heating council buildings.

Trade customers have increased during this period and some existing customers have also increased their trade bin numbers. Officers would like to propose that this indicator is changed moving forwards to the number of trade bins emptied in order to demonstrate the true scope of the service. Officers will therefore consider suitable targets to be proposed when the end of year results are reported.

ES8: Number of trade Refuse Customer | 570 | 570 | 515 | The number of fly-tipping incidents are outside the direct control of the Council. It is noted that an increase number of incidents involve builders waste. A coordinate response with Surrey Police, DSO and Environmental Protection Staff is being undertaken.

Number of fly-tipping incidents | 100 | 400 | 140 | The results for this indicator are provided for monitoring purposes only. (and represents the period to 9th June 2014 due to accounting practices used)

Income from car parking charges | £92,000 | £368,000 | £126,399 | The recycling rate continues to be of concern but this is part of a wider national picture where recycling rates have remained stubbornly flat. The Surrey Waste Partnership continues to seek ways of increasing recycling and reducing waste.

Number of formal complaints related to the business centre | 0 | 0 | 1 | A detailed analysis of trade waste is being undertaken with a view to promoting the service. This is a service operated in direct competition with the private sector. Initial indications are that the Council is not so much losing out to competitors, but commercial businesses are seeking to reduce their costs by cutting back on their waste. Further work on this issue is being undertaken.

Number of decisions investigated by the ombudsman requiring a remedy by the Council | 0 | 0 | 0 | As Members will be aware from previous reports, street cleansing complaints include all reports of littering or full bins. Fine Summer weather and school holidays always tends to seasonally increase the problem with more people on the streets and in our parks.

2.2 The recycling rate continues to be of concern but this is part of a wider national picture where recycling rates have remained stubbornly flat. The Surrey Waste Partnership continues to seek ways of increasing recycling and reducing waste.

2.3 A detailed analysis of trade waste is being undertaken with a view to promoting the service. This is a service operated in direct competition with the private sector. Initial indications are that the Council is not so much losing out to competitors, but commercial businesses are seeking to reduce their costs by cutting back on their waste. Further work on this issue is being undertaken.

2.4 As Members will be aware from previous reports, street cleansing complaints include all reports of littering or full bins. Fine Summer weather and school holidays always tends to seasonally increase the problem with more people on the streets and in our parks.

2.5 This item presents the opportunity for Members of the Committee to ask any questions relevant to the remit of the Committee. However, to ensure that Officers are able to give a full response, Members are reminded that advance written notice of any questions must be given to the Chairman and relevant Corporate Head of Planning and Environmental Services, no less than 48 hours prior to the meeting.
2.6 Members are also asked to note that this report should be distinguished from Committee specific reports and is a standard report submitted to all the Service Committees. The aim is to improve awareness of corporate performance and should be read in conjunction with this Committee’s Business Centre Plan.

3. Council policy

3.1 The quarterly reporting of key performance indicators forms part of the Council’s Performance management Framework.

4. Resources implications

4.1 Monitoring the KPIs requires extra officer time, but there is no additional cost associated with their reporting.

(For information)

Background Papers

None

11. MINUTES : MEMBER WORKING GROUP ON RECYCLING AND REFUSE SERVICES – 19.2.15

The Minutes of the Working Group are at Appendix ‘E’ for information.

12. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

If the Committee is minded to discuss any of the foregoing reports in private it is the OFFICERS’ RECOMMENDATION that –

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

(To resolve)

PART II

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

a) Exempt Information

(No reports to be considered under this heading)

b) Confidential Information

(No reports to be considered under this heading)
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26th February 2015

Corporate Head of Law and Governance,
Runnymede Borough Council,
Civic Centre,
Station Rd,
Addlestone,
Surrey,
KT15 2AH

Re: Borough of Runnymede (Off-street parking places) (Amendment) (No.*) Order 201

Dear Sir,

Ashford and St. Peter's Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust objects to Order 201 as we consider that the proposed tariff is contrary to the principles used by Runnymede Borough Council for determining parking charges. These principles were recorded in the minutes of the meeting of the Environment and Sustainability Committee on 20th November 2014 when approving revisions to car parking charges. The minutes of the meeting state that car parks are an amenity provided by the council to maintain the viability of businesses (by ensuring access to them) with the caveat that income should cover the cost of providing and maintaining the car parks.

Order 201 covers car parks adjacent to the St.Peter's Hospital site. The hospital has used these car parks for pre-paid staff car parking and is seeking planning permission to transfer the capacity to alternative locations within the hospital and does not consider there is a demand for these spaces.

The Trust and the neighbouring Surrey and Borders Partnership Mental Health Trusts undertake annual surveys of car parking on the St.Peter's health campus. These have consistently shown that the site has generally sufficient visitor car parking and therefore there is no further requirement.

As the car park is not being installed for the purposes of public amenity to maintain the viability of the hospitals it is only possible to conclude that the car parks and tariff are set to generate income.

Furthermore Runnymede Council has recently converted the Homewood Park car park from free use to Pay and Display with 3 free hours. This has resulted in very limited and mainly free use of the car park which is unlikely to cover the costs of the Pay and Display equipment, cash collection and enforcement activities.

Runnymede Borough Council has published the revised parking charges which came into force on 2nd February 2015. This tariff is broken down into Town Centre (9 car parks) and Out—of—Town (6 car parks including Homewood Park). A third category of 9 free car parks such as Thorpe Green car park are listed on the RBC website.
The Trust considers that the Tariff imposed at Homewood Park is appropriate tariff for providing out-of-town car parking. It is also noted that the tariff for the Woodlands Car Parks is unique within Runnymede by charging on Sundays. Again this does not reflect the need for an amenity to maintain the viability of the business but is simply revenue earning scheme.

In summary, The Trust objects to Order 201 and considers that the Borough should change the tariff to reflect the Out-of Town tariff which should only operate on Monday to Friday basis.

If you have any queries regarding this matter please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

Chris Bell
Associate Director
Estates and Facilities
The Local Committee has agreed that a public consultation should be undertaken to seek public views about the existing pedestrian zone in Egham High Street and a number of proposals relating to it.

This report provides details of the consultation undertaken and the views expressed in response to it.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Local Committee (Runnymede) is asked to agree that:

i) The existing pedestrian zone is retained with the same hours of operation (11am to 4pm) and exemptions but is extended to also apply on Sundays;

ii) Authorisation is given to advertise a notice, the effect of which will be to extend the pedestrian zone to also operate between 11am and 4pm on Sundays;

iii) Authorisation is given to the Area Team Manager in consultation with the Chairman of the Local Committee and Local Member to resolve any objections received in connection with the proposal;

iv) Subject to no objections being maintained, the order be made and the proposed change to the pedestrian zone implemented;

v) Subject to the provision of funding, a more effective method of controlling access to the pedestrian zone (such as an electronic gate or bollard) is designed and introduced; and

vi) The views expressed about the proposals relating to cycling, taxi ranks and parking are noted and taken into account in any decisions on changes to these aspects of the High Street.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

The majority of responses (87%) received to the consultation were in support of the existing pedestrian zone being retained with the introduction of a more effective method of enforcing the restriction (such as an electronic gate or bollard).

www.surreycc.gov.uk/Choose an item.
The Egham Chamber of Commerce support retaining the pedestrian zone and have requested that it is extended to also include Sundays. The level of activity in the High Street on Sundays has increased significantly since the pedestrian zone was first introduced and therefore the requested extension is being recommended.

The introduction of a more effective method of enforcing the pedestrian zone will help resolve the ongoing problems with vehicles illegally entering the High Street during the times when access is restricted to pedestrians only.

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:

1.1 The section of Egham High Street between its junctions with Wetton Place and Church Road (eastern junction) is currently restricted to pedestrians only from Monday to Saturday between 11 am and 4 pm. The restriction is enforced by gates located at the start of the pedestrian zone.

1.2 During the times the pedestrian zone applies, all vehicles are prohibited from travelling along this section of the High Street. This includes ridden pedal cycles (although cyclists may dismount and push their cycles).

1.3 There are a limited number of exemptions to the restriction including emergency service vehicles on operational duty. However, there is no exemption for disabled drivers, taxis or vehicles making deliveries/collections from properties within the pedestrian zone (with the exception of royal mail vehicles).

1.4 Outside of the hours that the pedestrian zone applies, vehicles can travel one-way (eastbound) along the road and there is a 20mph speed limit. Traffic calming measures have been installed to help reduce vehicle speeds.

1.5 There are a number of loading bays and parking areas within the High Street.

1.6 The pedestrian zone has been in place since the early 1990s and many changes have taken place since that time. The opening of the new Waitrose Store and Travelodge Hotel is also likely to bring further change to the nature of the High Street.

1.7 In addition, a number of issues have been raised about the pedestrian zone and the way it is currently enforced. These include the following:

- Runnymede Borough Council’s Parking Enforcement Officers and local Police Officers try to ensure the gates remain closed during the times when access is restricted to pedestrians only. However, the gates are not locked. As such, they can easily be opened and the restriction is subject to significant abuse. This results in regular complaints about vehicles illegally accessing the High Street during the restricted hours.

- There are regular reports of vehicles entering the High Street from the eastern end against the one-way system despite road markings and signs indicating no entry.
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Some traders think that the pedestrian zone has an adverse impact on their income and that removing it to allow vehicular access at all times would lead to increased numbers of customers using local businesses.

Taxi drivers would like taxi ranks provided in the High Street and to have access at all times.

The restriction can cause difficulties for the disabled and those with limited mobility since disabled drivers and taxis are not permitted access during the restricted times.

In response to the above issues, the Runnymede Local Committee has agreed that the existing arrangements in the High Street should be reviewed to see whether they still best meet the needs of shoppers and local businesses or whether changes should be considered.

A public consultation has therefore been undertaken. As part of the consultation views were sought about the pedestrian zone and a number of existing proposals (relating to cycling, parking restrictions and the provision of taxi ranks) that apply to this section of the High Street. Further details about these proposals and the consultation can be found in the consultation leaflet attached as Annex 1 to this report.

As part of the public consultation the following were undertaken:

- A consultation leaflet and questionnaire (with pre-paid envelope) was delivered to businesses on Egham High Street between it junctions with Church Road (western end) and Hummer Road.

- A public exhibition was held at Egham Library from 27 January 2015 to 20 February 2015 where questionnaires were available (as well as pre-paid envelopes for those that wished to complete the questionnaire at a later date).

- An electronic version of the consultation leaflet and questionnaire was available on the County Council’s website.

- Posters were erected in Egham High Street and on notice boards in Costa Coffee, The Museum/Literary Centre and the United Church of Egham to publicise the consultation and public exhibition. Posters were sent to the Royal Holloway University and Strodes College so they could be circulated/displayed. Details of the consultation were included on the Borough Council’s Website.

- Large road signs were erected in Egham High Street and a press release issued to also help publicise the consultation.

Copies of the consultation leaflet and questionnaire are attached as Annexes 1 and 2 to this report.

2. ANALYSIS:
2.1 A total of 630 completed questionnaires were received during the consultation which is a very good response and suggests significant public interest in the issues being consulted about.

2.2 The following provides a summary of the responses provided. (Note: In some cases respondents did not answer all questions and therefore some totals do not match the overall number of responses received).

2.3 **Description of what respondents do in Egham:**

- Live - 410 (65% of replies)
- Work - 148 (23% of replies)
- Study - 31 (5% of replies)
- Shop - 357 (57% of replies)
- Run a business - 48 (7.5% of replies)

Note: Respondents were asked to tick each option that applies.

2.4 **Pedestrian Zone**

- Keep existing pedestrian zone (with improved enforcement) - 529 (87% of replies)
- Remove pedestrian zone and allow traffic at all times - 79 (13% of replies)

2.5 **Cycling**

If the existing pedestrian zone is retained:

- 332 respondents (55%) would prefer all cycling is prohibited when access is restricted to pedestrians only.
- 172 respondents (29%) would support cycling but only in the direction of the one way system.
- 95 respondents (16%) were in favour of cycling at all times and in both directions.

If the pedestrian zone were removed:

- 485 respondents (88%) would be in favour of cycling only being permitted in the direction of the one-way.
- 64 respondents (12%) would support cycling in both directions.

2.6 **Taxi ranks**

Proposed introduction of taxi ranks if pedestrian zone is retained:

- Location 1: 303 in favour (59% of replies), 210 against (41% of replies)
- Location 2: 136 in favour (30% of replies), 323 against (70% of replies)
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Proposed introduction of taxi ranks if pedestrian zone is removed:

- Location 1: 188 in favour (48% of replies), 201 against (52% of replies)
- Location 2: 114 in favour (31% of replies), 254 against (69% of replies)
- Location 3: 91 in favour (25% of replies), 273 against (75% of replies)

Details of the locations of the proposed taxi ranks can be found in the consultation leaflet attached as Annex 1 to this report.

2.7 Parking Restrictions

If the existing pedestrian zone is retained:

- 470 respondents (86%) were in favour of restrictions remaining unchanged.

If the pedestrian zone were removed and traffic allowed at all times:

- 309 respondents (81%) were in favour of introducing 30 minute maximum stay car parking in the existing parking areas.

3. OPTIONS:

3.1 There are 3 options that can be considered in respect of the pedestrian zone:

- Retain the existing pedestrian zone with the same hours of operation (Monday to Saturday, 11 am to 4 pm) and exemptions.
- Retain the pedestrian zone but with amendments (e.g. different hours of operation and/or exemptions)
- Remove the pedestrian zone and allow vehicles to access the High Street at all times.

4. CONSULTATIONS:

4.1 A number of key local stakeholders were contacted directly to advise them of the consultation and invite their comments. These included Runnymede Borough Council, Royal Holloway University, Surrey Police, Surrey Fire and Rescue, South East Coast Ambulance Service, Egham Resident's Association, Runnymede Access Liaison Group, Egham Chamber of Commerce, Hackney Carriage Drivers' Association, Waitrose and Strodes College.

4.2 Runnymede Borough Council has confirmed that the consultation was considered by its Corporate Management Committee which felt it would not be appropriate to support either option (removing or retaining the pedestrian zone) without knowing the outcome of the consultation and the general consensus of opinion amongst interested parties. However, the Committee
resolved the following which forms the Borough Council's formal view on the consultation:

i) It is considered premature to remove the pedestrian zone until the wider impacts of the Waitrose store on the town centre as a whole can be assessed;

ii) If the pedestrian zone within Egham High Street is retained, the existing gate be replaced with an electronically operated bollard or gate, which could be linked to and operated by, Safer Runnymede [subject to costs being borne by Surrey Council of installation and maintenance];

iii) The proposed taxi ranks are supported;

iv) No objections are raised to permitting two-way cycling in the High Street, if restrictions are retained;

v) Whatever the outcome of the consultation, parking bays in the High Street be made available for 30 minutes between 08:00 and 18:00 hours, Monday to Saturday to facilitate proper enforcement and the Traffic Regulation Order be appropriately amended

4.3 The Egham Chamber of Commerce have made the following comments in response to the consultation:

- The car free period in the High Street be revised to Monday to Sunday from 11.30am to 3pm.
- The barrier be replaced with a more sophisticated system (raising bollards) with possible offsite control placed in the hands of Runnymede BC (Safer Runnymede) if practicable. Access for exempt vehicles to be allowed with a smart card?
- Explore methods for preventing access to the eastern end of the High Street (raised teeth allowing only egress from the west)
- Better enforcement of the parking regime once the new system in place
- Access for those with mobility and disability difficulties be reviewed

4.4 The note provided by the Chamber of Commerce which is attached as Annex 3 to this report provides further information about the reasons for its comments.

4.5 Surrey Fire and Rescue Service have confirmed their operational crews have reviewed the consultation and have no concerns to raise from their perspective.

4.6 Surrey Police responded highlighting concerns about vehicles accessing the pedestrian zone from its eastern end and requesting consideration is given to introducing further measures to deter motorists from doing this.

5. FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS:
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5.1 Further detailed investigation will need to be undertaken to establish the cost of introducing a more effective method of controlling access to the High Street. Depending on the type of system introduced there may also be ongoing operating costs.

5.2 At present no funding has been allocated and therefore a source of funding will need to be identified for the following:

- to design, introduce and maintain an improved system of controlling access to the pedestrian zone.
- to advertise and make a new Traffic Regulation Order to extend the pedestrian zone to include Sundays.
- to introduce new signs to indicate that the pedestrian zone applies every day of the week.

6. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS:

6.1 There are no Equalities and Diversity implications.

7. LOCALISM:

7.1 The views of the local community have been sought as part of the public consultation undertaken.

8. OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area assessed:</th>
<th>Direct Implications:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crime and Disorder</td>
<td>No significant implications arising from this report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability (including Climate Change and Carbon Emissions)</td>
<td>No significant implications arising from this report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Parenting/Looked After Children</td>
<td>No significant implications arising from this report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults</td>
<td>No significant implications arising from this report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>No significant implications arising from this report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

9.1 On the basis of the replies received in response to the public consultation the following can be concluded:

9.2 Who were responses received from:

The majority of responses were received from people who live and shop in Egham.

9.3 Pedestrian Zone:
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There is significant support for the existing pedestrian zone to be retained together with the introduction of more effective measures to control access to the High Street during the restricted times. 87% of respondents favour this option as do the Egham Chamber of Commerce (although they have suggested some changes to the hours the pedestrian zone operates).

9.4 Cycling:

There is little support for the introduction of two-way cycling regardless of whether the pedestrian zone is retained or removed (only 16% of respondents favoured its introduction if the pedestrian zone is retained and 12% if it is removed).

If the pedestrian zone is retained the majority of respondents (55%) would prefer cycling to remain prohibited during its hours of operation.

9.5 Taxi Ranks:

The large majority of respondents were against the introduction of the taxi ranks at locations 2 and 3 regardless of whether the pedestrian zone is retained or removed.

Views about the proposed taxi rank at location 1 differ between scenarios with a greater level of support (59%) if the pedestrian zone is removed. This compares with 48% of respondents in favour if the pedestrian zone is removed.

9.7 Parking Restrictions:

There is significant support (87% of respondents) for the existing parking restrictions to remain unchanged if the pedestrian zone is retained.

If the pedestrian zone were to be removed the large majority of respondents (81%) favour the introduction of 30 minute maximum stay parking in the existing parking areas.

9.8 On the basis of the views expressed during the public consultation this report recommends that the existing pedestrian zone is retained (with the same hours of operation and exemptions) and that a more effective method of controlling access to this section of the High Street (such as an electronic gate or bollard) is introduced.

9.9 However, in response to a request from the Egham Chamber of Commerce, it is recommended that the pedestrian zone is also extended to apply on Sundays. This recommendation reflects the increase in activity in the High Street on Sundays since the pedestrian zone was first introduced.

9.10 The Chamber of Commerce also requested that the hours of pedestrianisation are revised to apply from 11.30am to 3pm (from the existing 11am to 4pm). It considers this would better meet business needs (by increasing the period when there is passing trade and when deliveries can be made) whilst maintaining a car free zone at times when the greatest number of pedestrians visit the High Street.
9.11 Amending the times of the pedestrian zone as requested would mean that vehicles could travel along the High Street for a large part of the shopping day. This would undermine the benefits of the scheme to pedestrians. It is therefore recommended that the existing, and long established, hours of pedestrianisation are retained.

9.12 It is recommended that the Local Committee ensures the views expressed about cycling, taxi ranks and parking restrictions are taken into account in any decisions on changes to these aspects of the High Street.

10. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

10.1 Initially a source of funding will need to be identified.

10.2 Subject to approval and the provision of funding,

- a new Traffic Regulation Order will be advertised for the proposed extension of the pedestrian zone to include Sundays. A period would then be allowed for any objections to be submitted in response to the proposal. Any objections received would then have to be considered.

- more effective measures to control access to the High Street will be designed and introduced.

10.3 The findings of the consultation will be referred to:

- Runnymede Borough Council so the views expressed about the proposed taxi ranks can be considered as part of a statutory consultation that will also have to be undertaken about the proposals.

- The Member Task Group for Egham Major Schemes so it can consider the views expressed about cycling in the High Street in relation to cycle improvement measures proposed as part of the Egham Sustainable Transport Package.

- Surrey County Council’s Parking Team so the views expressed about the parking restrictions can be considered before any proposals for this section of the High Street are presented to the Local Committee.

10.4 Subject to agreement that the pedestrian zone is extended to include Sundays and that more effective access control measures are introduced, the changes will be publicised prior to their implementation and local traders will be contacted directly. Details of any changes relating to cycling, parking restrictions and the provision of taxi ranks would be included in the information publicised.

Contact Officer:

Jason Gosden – Senior Engineer – tel: 0300 200 1003

Consulted:
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Local residents/traders/shoppers/employees. Runnymede Borough Council, Royal Holloway University, Surrey Police, Surrey Fire and Rescue, South East Coast Ambulance Service, Egham Resident’s Association, Runnymede Access Liaison Group, Egham Chamber of Commerce, Hackney Carriage Drivers’ Association, Waitrose and Strodes College.

Annexes:

Annex 1 – Egham High Street public consultation leaflet.


Annex 3 – Note regarding comments from Egham Chamber of Commerce.

Sources/background papers:

Highways Update report presented to the Runnymede Local Committee at its meeting held on 1 December 2014.
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Section 1: Environmental Services Business Centre Structure

Committee(s):

Environment and Sustainability
Corporate Management
Licensing Sub
Regulatory
Section 2: Environmental Services Business Centre overview

Environmental Services Business Centre

Environmental Services is a multi-disciplinary business centre covering a range of services including Environmental Health and Licensing, Direct Services Organisation (DSO), Building Services, Engineering Services and Parking Services

Environmental Health and Licensing

Environmental Health and Licensing consists of three main areas of work, Commercial, Residential and Licensing.

Commercial – enforcement of legislation relating to Food Safety in commercial premises such as restaurants and cafes, Health and Safety and Environmental Protection, smoke free commercial businesses, dealing with Private Water Supplies, Infectious Diseases and Animal Licensing.

Residential - enforcement of legislation relating to Air Pollution, Environmental Protection, Pest and Dog Control, Noise in residential premises, Caravan Site Licensing, Park homes and Contaminated Land matters.

Licensing - enforcement and administration of alcohol and related licences, gambling licences and taxi licencing.

Staff (12)

Environmental Health and Licensing Manager
2.4 x Senior Environmental Health Officers
1 x Senior Environmental Health Technician
2 x Environmental Health Officer
1 x Environmental Health Technician
Contaminated Land Officer
Senior Licensing Officer
0.67fte x Taxi Licensing Officers
Project specific contracted Air Quality Officer

Key service statistics

No of food premises = 685
No of H&S = 1664
No of smoke free premises 3000 approx.
No of licensed caravan sites = 36
No of industrial/pollution permits = 32
No. of Betting shop premises licences = 11
No. of Family entertainment centres licensed = 1
No. of Gaming machine licences = 55
No. of Lottery Licences = 55
No of premises/club licences = 267

No. of Private Hire Operators = 22
No of taxi drivers licensed = 243
No of taxis licensed = 230

Request for service/complaints 2014/15 = 1950
No of enforcement notices served 2014/15 = 33
No of prosecutions/formal cautions 2014/15 = 4

**Direct Services Organisation (DSO)**

The DSO operates the Council’s Recycling and Waste Collection and Street Cleansing Services and a number of other related services from the Council’s Ford Road Depot in Chertsey.

The main Waste Collection services include the collection of mixed recycling, food and garden waste, household, trade and clinical waste and bulky household items and the management of recycling bring sites.

Street Cleansing includes street sweeping and litter picking and the removal of fly tips and fly posters from public highways and land. Associated services include the removal of graffiti from public facing highway and other property, the maintenance of public lighting on Borough Housing land, parks, open spaces and car parks and the maintenance of CCTV cameras operated by the Council’s Safer Runnymede service.

The DSO also has teams that carry out the maintenance of drainage and sewers and watercourses, minor civil engineering works, Borough Housing void clearance, elections support, winter maintenance on Borough property and the opening and cleaning of public toilets.

The DSO also manages a scheme for the sponsorship of highway roundabouts and an agency agreement with SCC for highway verge and hedge maintenance and weed control.

The DSO has a key role in providing resources and equipment in the event of civil emergencies and operates Chertsey Depot, which provides a base for all of the DSO operated services, the Council’s Parking Services team, Community buses and community meals vehicles and the Council’s emergency store. The Depot also contains a workshop for the servicing and maintenance of the Council’s operational vehicles.
Key service statistics:

Recycling

Tonnes of recycling collected per year:
- Mixed recyclables (Kerbside) = 6,900
- Mixed recyclables (Bring sites) = 210
- Food waste = 2,000
- Green waste = 2,600

No of green waste customers = 6,000

Refuse

Tonnes of waste collected per year:
- Domestic = 15,930
- Trade = 2,100
- Special collections = Now outsourced to Surrey Reuse

Street Cleansing

- No. of litter bins = 625
- No. of dog bins = 290
- Fly tips removed per year = 480

Graffiti

No. of instances of graffiti removed per year = 30

Staff (74)

- Direct Services Manager (1)
- Deputy Direct Services Manager (1)
- Waste and Street Cleansing Supervisors (2)
- Senior DSO Officer (1)
- DSO Officer (1)
- Transport Manager (1) (shared with Spelthorne B C)
- Depot /Transport Assistant (1)
- Recycling Officer (1)
Environmental Officer (0.6)  
Street Cleansing staff (22)  
Recycling and Refuse staff (35)  
Taskforce and Drainage (6)  
Graffiti Operative (0.6)  
Electrician (0.4)  
Office Cleaner (0.3)  

**Building Services**

The Building Services Team manages the maintenance of Runnymede and Spelthorne Borough Council’s corporate buildings and facilities.

The team is responsible for managing the repair, maintenance and improvement of the two Council’s corporate buildings through a range of building services including:-

- Facilities Management  
- Condition surveys  
- Planned and reactive repairs  
- Refurbishment and improvements  
- Fire safety improvements  
- Works and service contracts  
- Asbestos and Legionella control management  
- Energy management and sustainability  
- Legislative compliance and advice

**Staff (8)**

Principal Building Manager  
Senior Building Manager  
Energy and Sustainability Manager  
Building Surveyor  
2 x Building Maintenance Officers  
1 x Facilities Management Officer  
1 x Facilities Management Assistant

Annual Budgets: RBC - £376,000; SBC - £580,000
Engineering Services

The Engineering Services team provides a local land drainage service to identify, design and implement land drainage schemes that alleviate the risk of flooding and liaises with the Environment Agency in carrying out their land drainage functions. The team also liaises with Thames Water in improving sewage management in the Borough and advises Planners on the drainage provision for planning applications.

The team’s engineers design and supervise the construction of projects such as town centre environmental improvements and provide engineering support and technical advice for other Council services. It manages the maintenance of street furniture (bus shelters and benches) and manages street naming and numbering within the Borough.

Key business centre statistics

No. of Street nameplates = 3,176
No. of seats = 127 - Two have been discovered in undergrowth.
No. of bus shelters = 90 - We are just about to install one at Thorpe Park

Staff (3)

Principal Engineer
2 x Engineers

Parking Services

The Parking Services team operates, manages and carries out enforcement in the Council’s off street car parks and also carries out on street parking enforcement under an agency agreement on behalf of Surrey County Council.

The team deals with challenges, representations and appeals relating to Penalty Charge Notices (PCNs) and with complaints and correspondence in relation to parking matters.

The team liaises with SCC on parking policy and issues within the Borough and also manages on street abandoned vehicle notices and removals.

Staff (5)

Parking Manager
Parking Administration Officer
3.5 FTE Civil Enforcement Officers
Key business centre statistics

15 pay and display car parks (1,598 spaces)
5 free car parks (294 spaces)
Number of Penalty Charge Notices (PCN) issued per year:
On street per year - 4837 (2013/14)
Off street per year - 3567 (2013/14)


On Street enforcement 2012/13 Gross expenditure £151.508 Gross Income £198,630 Surplus -£47,122. Please note this includes the refund of the previous years deficit by SCC. We do not anticipate a similar refund this year.

Abandoned Vehicles

No. of vehicles investigated per year 13/14 = 200
No. of vehicles removed per year = 7
## Section 3: Key drivers/influences for the business centre

### Environmental Health and Licensing

#### Drivers and influences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal drivers/influences</th>
<th>Key drivers/influences of any business centre strategies/key documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key corporate drivers/influences</strong></td>
<td>Food Safety Service Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The SCS is trying to achieve against four priorities: A voice for Runnymede, an environment to be proud of, Healthy and vibrant communities, and revitalisation.</td>
<td>Air Quality Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Key action points from the Corporate Business Plan.</td>
<td>Contaminated Land Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Corporate Key Performance Indicators.</td>
<td>Environmental Services Enforcement Policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Target to achieve a saving up to £3.4 million corporately by 2017.</td>
<td>Licensing Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gambling Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National &amp; European legislation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External drivers/influences</th>
<th>Key partner’s / supplier’s drivers/influences</th>
<th>National key drivers/influences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key community/consultation drivers/influences</strong></td>
<td>• Surrey Borough and District Councils</td>
<td>• Regulate enforcement expectations and delivery of services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Food Standards Agency</td>
<td>• Health Protection Agency</td>
<td>• Regulatory minimum service standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Health and Safety Executive</td>
<td>• Surrey County Council</td>
<td>• Submission of statutory returns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Department for Environment, Farming and Rural Affairs (Defra)</td>
<td>• Central Government Agencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Gambling Commission</td>
<td>• Surrey Police</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Home Office</td>
<td>• Chartered Institute of Environmental Health (CIEH)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Public Health England</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Environment Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

---

---
### Drives and influences

#### Internal drivers/influences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key corporate drivers/influences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The SCS is trying to achieve against four priorities: A voice for Runnymede, An environment to be proud of, Healthy and vibrant communities, and revitalisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Key action points from the Corporate Business Plan (will follow once CBP written).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Corporate Key Performance Indicators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Target to achieve a saving up to £3.4 million corporately by 2017.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key drivers/influences of any business centre strategies/key documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• SWP and SCC targets for increasing domestic recycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• RBC KPI’s for recycling and refuse collection and street cleansing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• EPA standards for street cleansing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### External drivers/influences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key community/consultation drivers/influences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Consultation with trade waste customers to establish demand for trade recycling service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consultation with schools to establish demand for recycling food waste</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key partner’s / supplier’s drivers/influences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Surrey Waste Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Surrey County Council as Waste Disposal Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Surrey County Council as Highway Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Environmental Protection Act 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Changes in Government Legislations eg treatment of road sweepings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Biffa and Surrey Heath for disposal of dry recycling materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Collier Environmental Services for disposal of garden waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Heil Europe Ltd for servicing of transport fleet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National key drivers/influences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Cleaner Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Environmental Protection Act 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• EU Waste Framework Directive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulation 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hazardous Waste Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Landfill Directive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• End of Life Vehicles (ELVs) Regulation 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Environment Act 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Waste Minimisation Act 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Health and Safety at Work Act 1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Vehicle and Operator Services Agency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Drivers and influences**

**Internal drivers/influences**

- **Key corporate drivers/influences**
  - The SCS is trying to achieve against four priorities: A voice for Runnymede, An environment to be proud of, Healthy and vibrant communities, and revitalisation.
  - Key action points from the Corporate Business Plan (will follow once CBP written).
  - Corporate Key Performance Indicators.
  - Target to achieve a saving up to £3.4 million corporately by 2017.

- **Key drivers/influences of any business centre strategies/key documents**
  - Management of Asbestos, Legionella, Fire Risk – to improve and safeguard the health and well-being of the public, Council staff and their families
  - Structural maintenance of all Council’s operational buildings

**External drivers/influences**

- **Key community/consultation drivers/influences (if applicable)**
  - Partnership with Spelthorne BC on Asset Maintenance – SBC striving to improve their efficiency saving while meeting stated maintenance objectives
  - Operational targets for services operated from buildings managed by Building Services (E.g. Leisure Centres, Halls etc.)

- **Key partner’s / supplier’s drivers/influences**
  - Statutory maintenance requirements
  - Energy Act 2011
  - Climate Change Act 2008

- **National key drivers/influences**
  - Structural maintenance of all Council’s operational buildings
### Drivers and influences

#### Internal drivers/influences

- **Key corporate drivers/influences**
  - The SCS is trying to achieve against four priorities: A voice for Runnymede, An environment to be proud of, Healthy and vibrant communities, and revitalisation.
  - Key action points from the Corporate Business Plan (will follow once CBP written).
  - Corporate Key Performance Indicators.
  - Target to achieve a saving up to £3.4 million corporately by 2017.

#### External drivers/influences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key community/consultation drivers/influences (if applicable)</th>
<th>Key partner’s / supplier’s drivers/influences (if applicable)</th>
<th>National key drivers/influences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Runnymede Flood Forum</td>
<td>Runnymede Flood Forum</td>
<td>Public Health Act 1925 (for street naming and name plates)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
<td>Town and Improvement Clauses Act 1847 (for numbering of properties)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey County Council</td>
<td>Surrey County Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey Borough and District Council</td>
<td>Surrey Borough and District Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Engineering Services**

---
### Parking Services

#### Drivers and influences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal drivers/influences</th>
<th>Key corporate drivers/influences</th>
<th>Key drivers/influences of any business centre strategies/key documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The SCS is trying to achieve against four priorities: A voice for Runnymede, An environment to be proud of, Healthy and vibrant communities, and revitalisation.</td>
<td>- Sustainable Community Strategy - Environment to be proud of. Less congestion through parking enforcement resulting in improved air quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Key action points from the Corporate Business Plan (will follow once CBP written).</td>
<td>- Corporate Key Performance Indicators. Number of Penalty Charge Notices issued per Civil Enforcement Officer per hour Increasing On Street PCN income and reducing operating costs to break even</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Corporate Key Performance Indicators.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Target to achieve a saving up to £3.4 million corporately by 2017.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### External drivers/influences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key community/consultation drivers/influences (if applicable)</th>
<th>Key partner’s / supplier’s/ drivers/influences</th>
<th>National key drivers/influences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- SCC Local Transport Plan Parking Strategy</td>
<td>Department for Transport (DfT) National and Local Polices for coordinating on and off street parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- SCC/RBC Agency Agreement for On Street Parking Enforcement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Section 4: Team/function objectives and delivery timetable

### Projects in 2015/16

### Team or function: Environmental Health and Licensing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Outcome(s)</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Risk/Opp. Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EHL1</strong> Continuance of National Food Hygiene Rating Scheme (FHRS) ESvii KPI</td>
<td>The FHRS is national scheme that provides consumers with information about hygiene standards in food business establishments at the time they are inspected to check compliance with legal requirements on food hygiene.</td>
<td>Action in accordance with the Food Service Plan</td>
<td>Key focus of the Environmental Health team&lt;br&gt;Lead Officer: Peter Burke&lt;br&gt;Environmental Health and Licensing Manager&lt;br&gt;Staffing resources from within the Environmental Health team&lt;br&gt;Additional Resources from Legal Services team as necessary</td>
<td>See Risk chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EHL2</strong> Declaration of AQMA around Vicarage Road</td>
<td>Completion of action under the Air Quality Action Plan to declare and redefine the AQMA at Vicarage Road</td>
<td>Action to be taken in accordance with the review to consult local residents and publicise and confirm the new AQMA</td>
<td>Key focus of the Environmental Health team&lt;br&gt;Lead Officer: Contaminated Land Officer Lucy Hawkings&lt;br&gt;Additional Resources through contracted Air Quality Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EHL3</strong> Runnymede Taxi Forum</td>
<td>Continued Assistance to establish and support a local Taxi Forum</td>
<td>Engagement with Local Taxi Drivers and SCC</td>
<td>Key focus of the Licensing team&lt;br&gt;Lead Officers: Taxi Licensing Officers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Collaborative Working

| EHL4 | Collaborative Working | Review and enhance collaborative environmental enforcement and consultation work with DSO, Planning Development Management, and Surrey Law Enforcement | Optimise opportunities for joint working | Key focus of the Environmental Health and licensing team  
Lead Officer: Peter Burke  
Environmental Health and Licensing Manager |

---

### Team or function: Direct Services Organisation (DSO)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Outcome(s)</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Risk/Opp. Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| DSO1 Increase of Recycling Rate | Improved Recycling Rates to increase recycling credits and reduce costs | Adoption of formal Recycling improvement plan                         | Key focus of the DSO Team  
Lead Officer: Dave Steadman  
DSO Manager  
Staffing resources from within the DSO team, in particular Recycling Officer  
Additional Resources from Communications team as necessary | See Risk chapter |
| ES2 KPI                   |                                                                           |                                                                        |                                                                         |                     |
| DSO2 Optimising Trade Refuse and Green Waste income opportunities | Identification of cost effective ways to increase income generating services | Audit of opportunities to reduce costs of service and increase customer base to increase income | Key focus of the DSO Team  
Lead Officer: Dave Steadman  
DSO Manager  
Staffing resources from within the DSO team,  
Additional Resources from Commercial Services team as necessary |                     |
| ES6 KPI                   |                                                                           |                                                                        |                                                                         |                     |
| **DSO3** Engage with Surrey Waste Partnership to make positive steps to scope and progress the consideration of alternative models for DSO delivery | Identify any changes in the delivery model of the DSO in advance of contract expiry date | Consider outcomes of SWP review of DSO operations | Key focus of the DSO Team  
Lead Officer: Dave Steadman  
DSO Manager  
Staffing resources from within the DSO team,  
Additional Resources from Commercial Services team as necessary |
|---|---|---|---|
| **DSO4** Investigate and implement layout and practical changes to the Depot, including consideration of the feasibility of a Transfer Station facility. | Identify scope and opportunities for alternative waste disposal strategy within current delivery model when current arrangements with Biffa cease | Produce business case for alternative waste disposal strategy including a Transfer Station facility | Key focus of the DSO Team  
Lead Officer: Dave Steadman  
DSO Manager  
Staffing resources from within the DSO team,  
Additional Resources from Commercial Services team as necessary |
| **DSO5** Review and commence programme to increase HGV driver training/recruitment. | Identify specific training and retention strategy for HGV drivers to reduce staff turnover in this area | Consider formal retention or incentivisation strategy, including business case. | Key focus of the DSO Team  
Lead Officer: Dave Steadman  
DSO Manager  
Staffing resources from within the DSO team,  
Additional Resources from Human Resources team as necessary |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team or function: Building Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| BS1 Maintenance and Survey of Runnymede and Spelthorne Borough Council corporate properties | Continue to efficiently and effectively manage the maintenance of Runnymede and Spelthorne Borough Council corporate properties. | Rolling maintenance programme and Building Maintenance Surveys | Key focus of the Building Services Team  
Lead Officer: Richard Webb  
Principal Building Manager  
Staffing resources from within the Building Services team | See Risk chapter |
| BS2 Additional property consultancy and improvement projects for Spelthorne BC | Carry out income generating property improvements for Spelthorne BC | Carry out property improvements as required for operational efficiency or enhancement. | Key focus of the Building Services Team  
Lead Officer: Richard Webb  
Principal Building Manager  
Staffing resources from within the Building Services team | |
| BS3 Support Site logistics of Main Contractor of the Addlestone ONE development | Ensure Civic Centre remains fully operational throughout adjacent construction | Liaison with project management team and main contractor | Key focus of the Building Services Team  
Lead Officer: Richard Webb  
Principal Building Manager  
Staffing resources from within the Building Services team in particular Facilities Management Officer | |
### BS4
Support the delivery and integration of a CHP/DHN within the Addlestone ONE development

**ESvii KPI**

| BS4 | Support the delivery and integration of a CHP/DHN within the Addlestone ONE development | Introduce value for money district heating network or combined heat and power to support the new assets and current civic centre | Liaison with project management team and main contractor | Key focus of the Energy Management Team

Lead Officer: Richard Webb
Principal Building Manager

Staffing resources from within the Building Services team in particular Energy and Sustainability Manager |

### BS5
Investigate opportunities for Service delivery to the Addlestone ONE development

| BS5 | Investigate opportunities for Service delivery to the Addlestone ONE development | Identify income generation opportunities for services for the new asset | Liaison with project management team and main contractor | Key focus of the Building Services Team

Lead Officer: Richard Webb
Principal Building Manager

Staffing resources from within the Building Services team |

### Team or function: Engineering Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Outcome(s)</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Risk/Opp. Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ENG1 | Deliver Chilsey Green Flood Alleviation Project | Introduction of cost effective solution to flooding within the Lyne and Chilsey Green areas caused by a watercourse that runs through the area that will reduce the risk of flooding for Runnymede residents and businesses. | Progress work with partners (including Highways Agency, Environment Agency and Surrey County Council) to deliver project | Key focus of the Engineering Team

Lead Officer: John Godden
Principal Engineer

Staffing resources from within the Engineering Section | See Risk chapter |
| ENG2 | Contract Civil Engineering and Drainage work for other Local Authorities | Identification of contract work, whether one-off project or ongoing consultancy, for other Boroughs and Districts or Surrey County Council | Make contact with other Boroughs and Districts and respond positively to requests  
Recruit to vacant post to ensure resilience and ability to respond to opportunities for work | Key focus of the Engineering Team  
Lead Officer: John Godden  
Principal Engineer  
Staffing resources from within the Engineering Section |
| ENG3 | SuDS | In combination with Planning Development Management, the integration of SuDS approval and management for Major Developments within Development Management from 6th April 2015 onwards. | Liaison with SCC at the lead local flood authority and internal planning colleagues to ensure changes to national policy and guidance are integrated | Key focus of the Engineering Team  
Lead Officer: John Godden  
Principal Engineer  
Staffing resources from within the Engineering Section |
| ENG4 | Runnymede Roundabout and Egham Sustainability Package | Delivery of early phases of SCC/LEP lead local infrastructure projects | Support the delivery of projects as they move into their construction phases | Key focus of the Engineering Team  
Lead Officer: John Godden  
Principal Engineer  
Staffing resources from within the Engineering Section |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Outcome(s)</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Risk/Opp. Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAR1 Annual Off Street Car Park Review</td>
<td>Complete report to the Environment and Sustainability Committee</td>
<td>Annual review of car parking charges to inform report</td>
<td>Key focus of the Parking Services Team</td>
<td>See Risk chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lead Officer: Merv Robins Parking Services Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Staffing resources from within the Parking Services Team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAR2 Management of intended closure of Bourne Car Park and Garfield Road Car Park and intended opening of Woodland Car Park (St. Peters Hospital)</td>
<td>Manage customer expectations and contractor works to facilitate the changes on site</td>
<td>Necessary amendments to Orders and site works</td>
<td>Key focus of the Parking Services Team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lead Officer: Merv Robins Parking Services Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Staffing resources from within the Parking Services Team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAR3 Investigate opportunities for Service delivery to the Addlestone ONE development</td>
<td>Identify income generation opportunities for services for the new multi-storey car park</td>
<td>Liaison with project management team and main contractor</td>
<td>Key focus of the Parking Services Team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lead Officer: Merv Robins Parking Services Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Staffing resources from within the Parking Services Team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **PAR4** | On line case management for penalty charge notices (PCNs) | Consideration of introduction of on line case management and virtual permits for dealing with penalty charge notices. | Complete business case for on line case management | Key focus of the Parking Services Team
Lead Officer: Merv Robins
Parking Services Manager

Staffing resources from within the Parking Services Team and additional resources from Commercial Services Team |

|  |  |  |  |  |
## Section 5: Environmental Services Business Centre Performance Indicators 2015/16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Q1 (Apr-June)</th>
<th>Q2 (Jul-Sept)</th>
<th>Q3 (Oct-Dec)</th>
<th>Q4 (Jan-Mar)</th>
<th>Full year (Apr-Mar)</th>
<th>Q1 (Apr-June)</th>
<th>Q2 (Jul-Sept)</th>
<th>Q3 (Oct-Dec)</th>
<th>Q4 (Jan-Mar)</th>
<th>Full year (Apr-Mar)</th>
<th>Current status</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of formal complaints related to the business centre.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of decisions investigated by the ombudsman requiring a remedy by the Council.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of days learning per full time equivalent in the business centre</td>
<td>Activity Indicator</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES1: Residual household waste per household (kg)</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>460</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES2: Percentage of household waste sent for re-use, recycling and composting (%)</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES3: Number of missed bin collection complaints</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES4: Number of street cleansing complaints (overflowing litterbins, overflowing dog bins, and general litter/detritus complaints)</td>
<td>Activity Indicator</td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES5: Number of parking Penalty Charge Notices issued</td>
<td>Activity Indicator</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES6: Number of trade refuse customers</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>570</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Indicator</td>
<td>94%¹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Indicator</td>
<td>Reduction of 3.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Figures accurate 1<sup>st</sup> April 2014 – 4<sup>th</sup> March 2015
Section 6: Summary of the Environmental Services Business Centre’s contribution to Sustainable Community Strategy/Corporate Business Plan

Environmental Health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corporate Vision</th>
<th>Please see final vision agreed at SMT (attached).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>1. A voice for Runnymede 1-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. An environment to be proud of 13-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Healthy and vibrant communities 20-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Revitalisation 28-36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key action points from CBP</th>
<th>EHL1 Continuance of National Food Hygiene Rating Scheme (FHRS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ESvii 94% of food establishments in the borough achieving level 3 or above ratings under the National Food Hygiene Rating Scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EHL2 Declaration of AQMA around Vicarage Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EHL3 Support Runnymede Taxi Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EHL4 Optimise Collaborative Working from Environmental Health and Licensing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DSO1 Increase of Recycling Rate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- ES2: 47% of household waste sent for re-use, recycling and composting
- To support ES1: Kg of Residual household waste per household

**DSO2**
Optimising Trade Refuse and Green Waste income opportunities

- ES6 Increase and maintain number of trade refuse customers to 560

**DSO3**
Engage with Surrey Waste Partnership to make positive steps to scope and progress the consideration of alternative models for DSO delivery

**DSO4**
Investigate and implement layout and practical changes to the Depot, including consideration of the feasibility of a Transfer Station facility.

**DSO5**
Review and commence programme to increase HGV driver training/recruitment.

- To Support ES3: Number of missed bin collection complaints

**BS1**
Maintenance and Survey of Runnymede and Spelthorne Borough Council corporate properties

**BS2**
Additional property consultancy and improvement projects for Spelthorne B C

**BS3**
Support Site logistics of Main Contractor of the Addlestone ONE development
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BS4</th>
<th>Support the delivery and integration of a CHP/DHN within the Addlestone ONE development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ESvii Reduce Carbon emissions from local authority operations (measured in tonnes of CO2e) by 3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS5</td>
<td>Investigate opportunities for Service delivery to the Addlestone ONE development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG1</td>
<td>Deliver Chilsey Green Flood Alleviation Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG2</td>
<td>Contract Civil Engineering and Drainage work for other Local Authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG3</td>
<td>Support and Integrate the SuDS system with Development Management Planning for Major applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG4</td>
<td>Runnymede Roundabout and Egham Sustainability Package</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAR1</td>
<td>Annual Off Street Car Park Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAR2</td>
<td>Management of intended closure of Bourne Car Park and Garfield Road Car Park and intended opening of Woodland Car Park (St. Peters Hospital)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAR3</td>
<td>Investigate opportunities for Service delivery to the Addlestone ONE development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAR4</td>
<td>On line case management for penalty charge notices (PCNs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- To support ES5: Number of parking Penalty Charge Notices issued</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section 7: Risk Management

The Risk and Resilience Manager will view these sections and work with Business Centre Managers to update the Corporate Risk Register. Any risks identified during the year which are not shown here should be shared with the Risk and Resilience Manager.

**Risk assessment** Please use the matrix on the next page to identify the appropriate numbers for the table. Please also fill the Rating cells with the appropriate colour as shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref *</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Consequences</th>
<th>Impact area</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Impact**</th>
<th>Risk Rating</th>
<th>Control Measure(s)</th>
<th>Probability *** (Post control measures)</th>
<th>Impact*** (Post control measures)</th>
<th>Rating (Post control)</th>
<th>Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Life and limb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reputational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Financial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Legal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Health and Licensing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EHL1** Staff unable to attend work for any reason (severe weather, sickness) Unable to provide full range of the services Would lead to delays with potential life and limb, operational, reputational, financial or legal impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref *</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Consequences</th>
<th>Impact area</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Impact**</th>
<th>Risk Rating</th>
<th>Control Measure(s)</th>
<th>Probability *** (Post control measures)</th>
<th>Impact*** (Post control measures)</th>
<th>Rating (Post control)</th>
<th>Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Life and limb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reputational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Financial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Legal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Services Organisation (DSO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DSO1** Staff unable to attend work for any reason (severe weather, sickness) Unable to provide full range of the services Would lead to delays with potential life and limb, operational, reputational, financial or legal impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref *</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Consequences</th>
<th>Impact area</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Impact**</th>
<th>Risk Rating</th>
<th>Control Measure(s)</th>
<th>Probability *** (Post control measures)</th>
<th>Impact*** (Post control measures)</th>
<th>Rating (Post control)</th>
<th>Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Life and limb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reputational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Financial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Legal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DSO2</th>
<th>Highways Environm’nt’l Maintenance Agreement with SCC ends</th>
<th>RBC no longer has control of the standard of highway environmental maintenance</th>
<th>Would lead to possible reputational and financial, impacts</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>SCC assurance for term of agreement</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>SF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DSO3</td>
<td>SCC removes financial support for graffiti removal from highway assets</td>
<td>Extra cost for RBC in operating the service.</td>
<td>Would lead to possible reputational and financial, impacts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>None available</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS1</td>
<td>Staff unable to attend work for any reason (severe weather, sickness)</td>
<td>Unable to provide full range of the services</td>
<td>Would lead to delays with potential operational, reputational, financial or legal impacts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Small team. Difficult to have more staff trained</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS2</td>
<td>Partnership with Spelthorne ends</td>
<td>Staff surplus to RBC requirements</td>
<td>Would lead to delays with potential reputational, financial or legal impacts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Unable to mitigate with certainty</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS3</td>
<td>Prolonged power cut at or other shut down of Civic Centre</td>
<td>RBC, Police and SCC unable to operate essential services</td>
<td>Would lead to delays with potential life and limb, operational, reputational, financial or legal impacts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Maintain generator. Identify buildings for relocation of staff</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS4</td>
<td>CWGC removes financial support for Coopers Hill public toilets Coopers</td>
<td>Serious effect on all RBC, Police and SCC services operated from Civic Centre</td>
<td>Would lead to delays with potential reputational and financial impacts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Contingency provision in budget</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engineering Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES1</td>
<td>Staff unable to attend work for any reason (severe weather, sickness)</td>
<td>Unable to provide full range of the services</td>
<td>Would lead to delays with potential reputational, financial or legal impacts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Unable to mitigate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS1</td>
<td>Staff unable to attend work for any reason (severe weather, sickness)</td>
<td>Unable to provide adequate car park and on-street enforcement. On street potentially leading to increased traffic congestion</td>
<td>Would lead to delays with potential reputational, financial or legal impacts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Other team members trained to cover some areas. Use of agency or temporary CEO's to cover prolonged absence.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>IM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS2</td>
<td>Small team with reliance on single individuals for key areas of work.</td>
<td>Unable to provide service if key staff are absent</td>
<td>Delay. Potential financial, reputational</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>In the absence of the Parking Manager the Parking Assistant can deal with some routine issues. Prioritising.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>IM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS3</td>
<td>Prolonged loss of power to computer systems</td>
<td>CEO’s unable to issue PCN’s and admin staff unable to process them</td>
<td>Would lead to legal, financial, reputational, operational impacts and possibly leading to increased traffic congestion due to lack of enforcement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Relocate computers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>IM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Risk matrix** When assessing a risk for the first time you should assume there are no controls already in place. The subsequent assessment is completed with the controls in place. The assessor should assign values for the identified ‘likelihood’ of occurrence (A) and the severity of the ‘Impact’ (B). By multiplying ‘A’ and ‘B’ together you get the rating score, which gives an indication of how important the risk is. The thick black line is the “line of tolerance”. Those risks that are plotted above the line (score 10 – 25) are “out of tolerance” and will be referred to the Corporate Risk Register for further oversight and support.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIKELIHOOD (A)</th>
<th><em>negligible</em> 1</th>
<th><em>small</em> 2</th>
<th><em>noticeable</em> 3</th>
<th><em>serious + significant</em> 4</th>
<th><em>critical + considerable</em> 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Certain 5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probable 4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlikely 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly unlikely 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Likelihood of Occurrence (A)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity of Impact (B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – Highly unlikely to happen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – Unlikely to happen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – Possibly will happen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – Probably will happen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – Certain to happen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Green = Low risk, Amber 9 = Medium risk, Amber 10 –12 high risk, Red = High risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Section 8: Key action points for this business centre in the Corporate Business Plan

Please list below the relevant key action points for this business centre from the Corporate Business Plan (CBP).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBP key action point number</th>
<th>Key action point description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To be completed once the Corporate Business Plan has been updated</td>
<td>To be completed once the Corporate Business Plan has been updated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Member Working Group on Recycling and Refuse Services

Held on Thursday 19 February 2015

Member Room

Present:  Councillor Mrs Elaine Gill (EG)
          Councillor Mrs Gill Warner (GW)
          Councillor Mrs Margaret Harnden (MH)
          Peter Sims (PS) - Assistant Chief Executive
          Ian Maguire (IM) – Corporate Head of Planning and Environmental Services
          Bo Sambo-Donga (BSD) – Recycling Officer
          Cathy Knubley (CK) - Deputy DSO Manager
          Dave Stedman (DS) – DSO Manager

Copy:    Councillor Mr John Edwards
          Councillor Mr Derek Cotty
          Malcolm White

Apologies:

Minutes of last meeting

CK updated meeting with the use of plastic bags to line food caddies. Whilst Agrivert is willing to take food waste in plastic bags they are not happy for us to promote this fact.

Action

Overall summary of Service

DS discussed the following subject matters:

The new vehicle maintenance fitters have been sporadic in their attendance, however things appear to be settling down with permanent staff now on site.

We have been suffering vehicle breakdowns in the past months due to the age of the overall fleet. 4 new vehicles have now been ordered and awaiting delivery; 1 x compact sweeper, 2 x 7.5t caged vehicles and a new cherry picker.

The new CpC licence that is required by drivers using vehicles over 3.5t is providing difficulties for recruiting agency staff. Runnymede pays lower wages compared to other neighbouring local authorities and this issue may need to be looked at in the future.

Street cleansing has improved. We are using a new mobile barrow beat operative to clean our main roads on a more regular basis and the additional funding has allowed us to maintain a dedicated leafing team whilst still covering our regular barrow beats.

The contractual arrangement with Biffa and Surrey Heath to take and pay for our dry recycling waste expires in 2016. DS is
investigating the possibilities of a small transfer station at the Depot, currently the scout hut site.

Work on building the trade waste continues.

A summary of performance is attached.

Christmas arrangements

CK discussed that last year’s Christmas collections went well with very few complaints. This Christmas will be more complex due to the additional day’s holiday falling on Monday 28 December. CK to bring her ideas of collection dates to the next meeting for discussions.

Surrey Waste Partnership Update

Action plan on recycling improvements have been drawn up by all Boroughs. The main theme across Surrey is communication and education. We are placing a bid for kerbside WEEE and textile collections and should know if we have been successful by next meeting.

CK to debrief meeting in July regarding the WRAP pilot scheme work on increasing kitchen waste tonnages.

Discussions are taking place to possibly tender out clinical waste and trade services.

Trade KPI’s

A discussion took place regarding altering the current trade KPI’s from the number of traders to total bin capacity.

H&S

We now have a new H&S Advisor who is looking at our working activities including reversing banksman training. She is also reviewing the Depots risk assessments and codes of practice. Traffic Management for street cleansing maybe brought in under Chapter 8 which would have major costs implications.

AOB

Cllr G Warner discussed a problem at Pooley Green Close that CK said she would look into. Also bins being left out all the time at Pooley Green Road, which again CK will investigate.

Cllr E Gill mentioned that there was still a vehicle in Thorpe using Runnymede logo. CK to discuss again with Legal.

Next Meeting

Thursday 9 July at 2pm Members Room
Summary of Service 2014

All figures taken from Corporate Performance data

Residual household waste per household kg

We continue to decrease household kgs in the 1st and 2nd quarter of 2014 from 115kgs to 113kgs. We have a query on Quarter 3 so October – December 2014 is not yet available.

Recycling Percentage

In quarter 2 we increased recycling percentage from 42% to 45.5%. Due to query on Quarter 3 this figures are not yet available.
Missed waste bins

This figure has been increasing slightly over the past 3 quarters starting from 491 missed complaints in April-June, to 603 complaints in July-Sept to finally 778 in Quarter 3.

Street Cleansing Complaints

Street Cleansing complaints have been steady for the last three quarters. Particular attention should be paid to the last quarter where historically complaints have increased due to leaf fall. The low customer complaints in this period has a direct link with the additional 20k funding for the leafing period.
Trade customers

Trade customers have mainly stayed stable over the course of the 3 quarters although a request has been made to change the method of reporting new trade business as currently existing trade increasing collections or number/size of bin is not reflected in these figures.