

APPENDIX 'A'

Proposed third phase of net revenue reductions together with indicative time frames

	£
1. Safer Runnymede – increased subscription and other income following successful commissioning of new centre (from 2009/10)	30,000
2. Efficiencies consequent upon joint working with neighbours (from 2010/11)	50,000
3. Reduced catering costs resulting from better trading in new Civic Centre (from 2009/10)	5,000
4. DAL – Committee/Admin restructure and discontinuance of certain tasks (from 2009/10)	15,000
5. DAL - Land Charges – changes resulting from reductions in volume and impact of private search companies (£5,000 from 2010/11 + £5,000 from 2012/13)	10,000
6. Revenue benefit in two year delay drawing down parking machine replacements (2009/10 and 2010/11 only)	10,000
7. Reduced strategic maintenance provision (£78,000 – 2009/10 only and £50,000 p.a. thereafter)	50,000
8. Review of asset management plan (£25,000 from 2010/11 and £125,000 from 2013/14)	125,000
9. Further procurement savings - target (from 2009/10)	15,000
10. General provision for restructuring opportunities when posts fall vacant (£20,000 p.a. from 2009/10 - £100,000 by 2013/14)	100,000
11. Reduction in general provisions for grants and other savings (£10,000 from 2009/10 and a further £10,000 from 2011/2012)	20,000
12. DoF – Restructuring in Revenues (from 2012/13)	20,000
13. Revenue benefit of QEH disposal to GPs for enhanced primary health services – net of capital repayment to PCT (from 2009/10)	25,000
14. Revenue benefit from reduced capital programme spend (from 2009/10)	5,000
15. Further rationalisation of community transport provision or fleet maximisation (from 2009/10)	10,000

Continued....

16.	CEO's Group – efficiency savings following reallocation of functions (from 2009/10)	5,000
17.	Target 10% reduction in authorised overtime with acknowledged service consequences (from 2010/11)	15,000
18.	Egham Leisure Centre – securing of guaranteed enhanced income for all-weather soccer pitches from private provider and associated revenue savings (from 2009/10)	45,000
19.	Above inflation rises in discretionary income charges:	
	Cemeteries (£10,000 from 2009/10, further £30,000 from 2012/13)	40,000
	Allotments (£5,000 from 2010/11)	5,000
20.	Reduction in expenditure at Leisure Centres (from 2009/10)	5,000
21.	Rationalisation of marketing functions at ELC & ALC – vacant post (No. A1005)(from 2009/10)	6,000
22.	Reduced cost of public notices in local press consequent upon move to web based publication (from 2010/11)	25,000
23.	DTS – Deletion of vacant part time administrative post (No. F0180) (from 2009/10)	15,000
24.	Out of hours noise service – reduction in nature of response (from 2009/10)	10,000
25.	Increased income from Community Halls – better utilisation (from 2009/10)	15,000
26.	Leisure development and tourism/"Visit Surrey" subscription (from 2009/10)	10,000
27.	Safer Runnymede speed camera initiative - delete (from 2009/10)	4,000
28.	Discontinue telephone surveys (from 2009/10)	2,000
29.	Trade refuse – restructuring of charges (from 2009/10)	30,000

POLICY GUIDANCE FOR REVENUE REDUCTIONS

- Financial consequences of withdrawal or service remodelling by others will no longer be picked up by the Council.
- Services with modest benefit relative to cost of provision will be reduced or withdrawn.
- Specialist discretionary services capable of being reasonably provided by the private sector will be discontinued.
- Joint working with partners to achieve service resilience or reduction in unit costs will be vigorously pursued.
- The key targets and priorities identified in the current series of Service Plans will, wherever possible, have priority call on resources.
- Changes in demographic and associated social needs/demands will, for the most part, be a key issue in future service reviews and service planning.
- The very considerable IT investment (often directed by the Government's e-government targets, rather than local service needs) to yield greater savings.
- Review back office arrangements and ensure that Members expectations are reduced.
- Maximise the return on assets, save for those occupied by voluntary and charitable groups.
- Discretionary fees and charges (including car parking charges) need to at least reflect the cost of provision and/or comparative tariffs elsewhere.
- Reinvigorate the concept of "create/save" and provide an enterprise fund to pump prime explicitly identified savings or opportunities for additional income.

GENERAL FUND CAPITAL PROGRAMME PRIORITISATION 2008/09 to 2012/13

	Approval Date	Priority Score	Evaluation Score	Budget 2008/09	Budget 2009/10	Budget 2010/11	Budget 2011/12	Budget 2012/13	Capital Receipts	Other Financing	Cumulative Cap Receipts
				£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Day Centre vehicles	HCS - June 08		Committed	100,000					350,000		350,000
Egham - Outside pitches & changing rooms	CMC - Dec 05		Committed	3,400		250,000			3,400		353,400
Addlestone - Major Improvement Scheme	L&E - Mar 05		Committed	1,600					1,600		355,000
Hythe: Creation of Park	L&E - Mar 08		Committed	193,200					115,800	77,400	470,800
Hythe: Toddlers play area	L&E - Mar 08		Committed	49,000						49,000	470,800
Hythe: Multi use play area	L&E - Mar 08		Committed	58,000						58,000	470,800
Hythe: Adventure play area	L&E - Mar 08		Committed	58,000						58,000	470,800
Play equipment replacement programme	L&E - Sept 05		Committed	46,900					46,900		517,700
Frank Muir Memorial Field - Environmental Work	L&E - June 05		Committed	9,600						9,600	517,700
Frank Muir Memorial Field - Skate Park	L&E - Nov 07		Committed	49,000						49,000	517,700
Chertsey Rec sewerage pump	L&E - Jan 06		Committed	14,000							531,700
Refuse computer system	L&E - Sept 07		Committed	3,200							534,900
Safer: Control room fit out	CMC - Jan 08		Committed	24,400					24,400		559,300
Safer: Careline	CMC - Jan 08		Committed	90,800					90,800		650,100
Safer: Alarms	CMC - Jan 08		Committed	20,000					20,000		670,100
Safer: Ancillary room fit out	CMC - Jan 08		Committed	3,200					3,200		673,300
Safer: Consultants fees	CMC - Jan 08		Committed	15,200					15,200		688,500
CO: Construction	CO Sub - Jan 06		Committed	564,000					564,000		1,252,500
CO: Car Park (Phase 2)	CO Sub - Jan 06		Committed	506,900					506,900		1,759,400
CO: Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment	CO Sub - Dec 07		Committed	213,800					213,800		1,973,200
CO: IT Network & Telephony	CO Sub - Aug 07		Committed	249,600					249,600		2,222,800
Beomonds Allotments: De-contamination	L&E - Sept 03		Committed	70,900					70,900		2,293,700
Depot pooled vehicle	SO42 - Aug 08		Committed	10,100					10,100		2,303,800
Hardware replacement programme 2007/08	CMC - Sept 06		Committed	152,100						152,100	2,303,800
Hardware replacement programme 2008/09	CMC - Sept 08		Committed	133,500						133,500	2,303,800
DMS: Council Tax / Hsg Benefits automated reporting	CMC - Jan 05		Committed	7,500							2,311,300
DMS: Link with Housing In-World system	CMC - Jan 06		Committed	26,500					7,500		2,337,800
Teleform system upgrade	CMC - Sept 04		Committed	5,100					26,500		2,337,800
Members computers	CMC - June 08		Committed	12,000					5,100		2,342,900
Queue Management System	SO42 - July 08		Committed	7,300					12,000		2,354,900
Building Maintenance helpdesk system	SO42 - July 08		Committed	14,200					7,300		2,362,200
Equipment Replacement Schedule	Awaiting SO42	1	115	40,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	14,200	440,000	2,376,400
Refuse and Street Cleansing vehicle fleet	Annual Provision	1	110				1,500,000				3,876,400
Recycling vehicle fleet - replacement of existing	-	1	110		250,000						4,126,400
Strategic maintenance programme	-	1	100	270,800	285,000	285,000	285,000	285,000	250,000		5,537,200
Dial-a-ride vehicles	-	1	70		35,000						5,572,200
Hythe: Park lighting	SO42 - Sept 08	1	70	30,000					35,000		5,602,200
Addlestone Cemetery extension	L&E - Jun 08	1	70	200,000					30,000		5,802,200
Car Parking P&D machine replacement	-	1	60	92,000					200,000		5,802,200
Hardware replacement programme	-	2	90	50,000	207,000	28,000	100,000	100,000	200,000	92,000	5,802,200

GENERAL FUND CAPITAL PROGRAMME PRIORITISATION 2008/09 to 2012/13

	Approval Date	Priority Score	Evaluation Score	Budget					Budget 2012/13	Capital Receipts	Other Financing	Cumulative Cap Receipts
				2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13				
Egham - Replacement of fitness equipment	Annual provision	2	85	25,000	25,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	170,000	5,802,200		
Addlestone - Replacement of fitness equipment	Annual provision	2	85	20,000	20,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	130,000	5,802,200		
Play equipment replacement programme (new)	L&E - Sept 08	2	85	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	400,000	6,202,200		
Waste Recycling initiatives	Env - Jan 97	2	80	24,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	64,000	6,266,200		
Chair replacement programme	L&E - Nov 07	2	75	13,500					3,500	6,269,700		
Replacement of Parks vans		2	75	36,000	30,000				30,000	6,299,700		
Replacement Graffiti Team vehicle		2	75						36,000	6,335,700		
St Ann's Hill		2	55		500,000				500,000	6,335,700		
System upgrades & developments		2	50	77,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	477,000	6,812,700		
Provision for SPA purchases		2	45		300,000				300,000	6,812,700		
Grants to local organisations	Annual Provision	3	65	94,800	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	294,800	7,107,500		
Grants to scout & guide groups	Annual Provision	3	65	4,500	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	16,500	7,124,000		
GIS integrated datasets		3	35	92,200					92,200	7,216,200		
Purchase of Tuik Field	EDC - Nov 02	3			47,000				47,000	7,263,200		
Customer Relationship Management system	CMC - June 05	3		130,000					130,000	7,393,200		
Total General Fund Capital Programme				3,912,800	1,562,000	1,496,000	2,318,000	818,000	7,393,200	2,713,600		

ITEMS ALREADY REMOVED BY CORPORATE PROPERTY GROUP - SEPT 2008

Public Conveniences demolition	2	45	17,000
DMS: Future developments			60,000
Virtual Switchboard Initiative			13,500
CO Sub - Jan 07			

SCHEMES REMOVED NOVEMBER 2006

Task Financials Upgrade	2	30	54,000
Addlestone LC - Outdoor Courts	3	95	75,000
Egham LC - Car park extension	3	45	25,000
Beaconsfields Allotments - Chertsey Library Car Park ex	3	45	150,000
Parks - Heathvale Staff Toilets	3	40	15,000
General IT Provision	3	30	200,000
Strategic acquisitions	4	50	622,300
Parks - Brookside Play Area	4	45	20,000
Parks - RPG Access Road	4	35	25,000
Parks - Victory Park Pavilion	4	35	500,000
Thorpe Village Hall Extension	4	33	40,000

GENERAL FUND CAPITAL PROGRAMME PRIORITISATION 2008/09 to 2012/13

Capital Receipts	£	Other Financing	£	Cumulative Cap Receipts	£
------------------	---	-----------------	---	-------------------------	---

Approval Date	Priority Score	Evaluation Score	Budget 2008/09	Budget 2009/10	Budget 2010/11	Budget 2011/12	Budget 2012/13
---------------	----------------	------------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------

£ 60,000

Replacement platform vehicle

NEW

AIRTRACK - ISSUES TO BE SATISFACTORILY RESOLVED

Chertsey Station

The current consultation document continues to show that Chertsey Station remains a stopping point for the new service although the adequacy of platform length, station accommodation and supporting parking facilities are absent from the list of infrastructure to be provided in support of the overall scheme. Clarification of this is required from Airtrack.

The Level Crossings

A key strand of the Council's support for the scheme was predicated on resolving level crossing downtime. From current evidence the increased downtime will have a significant impact (estimated at 40 minutes of closure every hour) on traffic congestion in Egham. Further work would be required to assess the full impact on the local community and businesses, but locally it has generated significant opposition.

Excepting Prune Hill, the other three level crossings are already constrained in terms of traffic movements by either traffic signals or roundabouts. Therefore, even if the railway line could be bridged over or tunnelled under, traffic would not flow freely in peak times. Expenditure on such major infrastructure could not be justified unless it demonstrably relieved this problem.

Airtrack is therefore engaging with both the Highway Authority and Boroughs to look at problems in the existing highway network on an area basis. The aim is to try to achieve improvements that enable the existing traffic to flow more freely and then to be able to identify the additional impact that Airtrack would have and what infrastructure improvements might be considered to address that.

It must be accepted that there is an existing problem needing to be addressed that has not been caused, but brought sharply into focus by Airtrack. Airtrack has created an opportunity for drawing together various agencies to pool resources to address this issue. It is considered vital that measures to address the dislocation of the local community by increased rail services are in place or programmed prior to the Public Inquiry into the Transport and Works Act Order (TWA) at the end of next year.

Runnymede

BOROUGH COUNCIL



CAPITAL STRATEGY

1. Introduction

- 1.1 Runnymede Borough lies in north-west Surrey some twenty miles south-west of Central London, covering an area of 7,804 hectares. Its northern and eastern edges are formed by the Rivers Thames and Wey. It has a population of 81,600 living in around 33,000 households. The area has an extensive green belt which makes it an attractive location to live and work. Development restrictions and demand for housing are reflected in high property prices. Additionally, Runnymede has a strong local economic base with many commercial enterprises in the town centres, industrial estates and business parks. As a result, more people commute into Runnymede for work than commute out. Equestrian and market gardening activities dominate in the rural areas with some traditional farming. The local economy, in common with the rest of Surrey is dominated by the service sector which employs some 62% of the workforce while manufacturing accounts for just 15%.
- 1.2 This Capital Strategy sets out the Council's approach to meeting community and service needs through its capital programme. The Council's objectives are set out in its annual Strategic Plan. The Plan is supported by a set of service plans that are renewed each year. The Capital Strategy describes how the deployment of capital resources will contribute to the achievement of these aims.
- 1.23 This strategy is consistent with the Council's housing policies and programmes. These are covered in the Council's Housing Strategy and HRA Business Plan. The strategy is also consistent with other plans and strategies, in particular the Borough's Local Development Framework, the Best Value Performance Strategic Plan and the Community Strategy.

2. Aims and Targets

- 2.1 The Council's core service objectives, described in its Strategic Plan, are:-
- **Access to Affordable and Decent Housing**
 - **Access and Transport**
 - **Community Safety**
 - **A Sustainable Community**
 - **Economic Prosperity**
 - **Opportunities for Young People**
 - **Promoting Leisure and Culture**
 - **A Healthy and Vibrant Community**
- 2.2 In achieving its objectives, the Council attaches importance to
- **Providing quality services**
 - **Achieving value for money**
 - **Improving customer satisfaction**
 - **Achieving continuous improvement**
 - **Effective partnership working**
- 2.3 The Council has identified service objectives for each of its primary objectives. These are described in the Strategic Plan and summarised below.

Service Objectives approved in the Strategic Plan

Service Objectives approved in the Strategic Plan

- 1. Access to Affordable and Decent Housing**
 - 1.1 Provide a range of affordable housing for those in housing need, including those with support needs
 - 1.2 Ensure that private and social housing is fit and of acceptable standard
 - 1.3 Provide good quality services to the Council's tenants. Actively promote the role of formally constituted tenant groups in the management and improvement of its housing stock
 - 1.4 Ensure that homelessness is kept to a minimum and that homeless people are given appropriate assistance
 - 1.5 Develop safe and sustainable communities where people want to live
 - 1.6 Provide services fairly to all sections of the community

- 2. Access and Transport**
 - 2.1 Tackle congestion and pollution,
 - 2.2 Increase choice in public transport
 - 2.3 Raise standards to make travel safe, more attractive and accessible to all.
 - 2.4 Addressing issues of social exclusion caused by lack of access to transport

- 3. Community Safety**
 - 3.1 Work with the police and the local community to reduce incidents of
 - anti-social behaviour
 - burglary
 - domestic violence
 - drug misuse
 - race/hate crimes
 - traffic casualties and excess traffic speed
 - vehicle crime
 - 3.2 Residents to feel safe and secure in their local communities by reducing the fear of crime and increasing reassurance.
 - 3.3 Emergency planning: work with partners to ensure that the Borough is able to respond effectively in the event of any major incident.

- 4. A Sustainable Community**
 - 4.1 Maintain a first-class refuse collection service to residents, with targeted performance criteria.
 - 4.2 Maintain a first-class recycling service to residents, and meet Government recycling targets.
 - 4.3 Investigate the viability of extending the recycling scheme to additional materials, and to include schools, colleges etc. in our collection service.
 - 4.4 Introduce a pilot collection scheme for green garden waste.
 - 4.5 Ensure that planning and development is environmentally sensitive.
 - 4.6 Enhance communication and educational development of environmental issues.

- 5. Economic Prosperity**
 - 4.1 Promote economic prosperity by tackling congested roads and by providing housing for key workers.
 - 4.2 Promote local business through the Runnymede Business Partnership.

- 5. Opportunities for Young People**
 - 5.1 Improve opportunities for young people.
 - 5.2 Find out what young people want and need.
 - 5.3 Voice of young people to be heard.
 - 5.4 Improve the safety of young people going to and from school.
 - 5.5 Support scout, guide, voluntary youth groups and individual young people through grant aid.

- 6. Promoting Leisure and Culture**
 - 6.1 Develop community sports and leisure facilities.
 - 6.2 Improve parks, open space and the natural environment.
 - 6.3 Promote cultural and arts activities.
 - 6.4 Leisure and sports development.
 - 6.5 Promote and encourage local annual events and encourage tourism.

- 7. A Healthy and Vibrant Community**
 - 7.1 Provide affordable community services for the elderly and vulnerable.
 - 7.2 Create a strategic planning and consultation body for older people.
 - 7.3 Use performance indicators and standards to evaluate and monitor its services.

Service Objectives approved in the Strategic Plan

- 7.4 Work with the voluntary and faith sector to deliver the terms of the compacts that have been agreed.
- 7.5 Continue to work with the County Council and the PCT to ensure the delivery of the targets of the Healthy and Vibrant Task Group and reduce inequalities.

2.4 The capital programme (reproduced on pages 315303 to 325314 of the Budget Book 2006/07-2008/09) and summarised in paragraph 4 of the context sheet (Appendix 1 on page 7 of this document) provides for expenditure on schemes associated with these objectives.

2.5 The strategy for financing capital expenditure reflects the following principles:-

- **Grant funding or other external contributions will be used to finance capital expenditure where possible.**
- **Replacements of assets for which contributions have been made to a reserve (equivalent to a depreciation provision) will be financed from that reserve.**
- **Major repair and improvement work on Council housing stock will be met from resources available to the HRA.**
- **The remaining capital expenditure will be financed from the funds it has generated from the disposal of assets (capital receipts).**
- **The Council is debt free and has no plans to borrow to finance capital expenditure.**

3. The Council's key partners

3.1 The Council has long established links with local community and voluntary groups, many of whom it supports through grant funding, and has signed a formal compact with the voluntary and community sector. In addition, the Council works with the following organisations:-

- Surrey County Council and neighbouring Borough Councils
- Surrey Police
- Registered Social Landlords
- Primary Care Trusts, Health Trusts and the Health Authority
- Runnymede Business Partnership and the universities
- Local voluntary and community groups and sports clubs

3.2 The Council actively encourages service delivery through partnerships and the involvement of local communities. Some examples of this are:-

Public Halls and Allotments	To provide public halls and allotments that meet the needs of the local community.	Construction or funding by Runnymede BC. Facility rented to community groups at a nominal or low rent. Management provided by community groups.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Higher utilisation of amenities. • Community involvement • Reduced costs falling on the taxpayer. • Promoting sustainability in the community.
Community Safety	To enhance the quality of life for residents and businesses and to promote sustainability in the community.	Collaboration with Home Office, Surrey Police, Surrey CC, Spelthorne BC, local businesses, residents, neighbourhood groups.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emergency response 24 hours a day. • Lower fear of crime (survey results). • Reduced crime rate.
Affordable Housing	To provide affordable housing for those who cannot afford the high cost of housing in the Runnymede area. To house the homeless and people living in poor housing conditions.	Facilitated by RBC. Funded by Housing Corporation grants, through use of the planning system and local contributions. Projects delivered by Housing Associations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting housing need. • Using project management skills of the housing association • Attracting Housing Corporation funding. • Promoting sustainability in the community.
Special Needs Housing	To provide accommodation in Runnymede for	As above.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting identified needs of this client group. • Using project

	vulnerable people with support needs.		management skills of the housing association • Attracting maximum funding for support.
Town Centre Regeneration	To revitalise the town centres as a place to live and work.	Land assembly by the Council and developed with private developers and housing associations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developing the local economy. • Attracting investment. • Improving the street scene in accordance with community and business wishes. • Meeting housing need. • Promoting sustainability in the community.

4. How the Council works to achieve cross-cutting outcomes

4.1 Examples of the Council's collaborative approach are as follows:-

Redeveloping the Pooley Green area following extensive consultation with the local community, using the 'Planning for Real' model, and in partnership with Thames Valley Housing Association and the Primary Care Trust.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A new social centre and local park in consultation with the local community. • 7 units of social housing to help meet housing needs. • A new purpose built doctors' surgery. • Better use of community land assets. • Investment in improved allotment facilities.
Rationalisation of Chertsey allotments in consultation with allotments users and providing 56 units of social housing with Apex A2 Dominion Housing Association.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better use of under-utilised allotment asset. • Improved allotment facilities on new sites. • Meeting identified need for additional cemetery land. • Providing extra social housing to help meet the housing strategy needs target. • Facilitating redevelopment of unpopular PRC built Council estate that failed the decent homes standard.
Reprovision of the Civic Offices in a new building shared with Surrey Police and Addlestone Library.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replacing old buildings that required major investment to continue occupation. • Multi-agency services delivered from one building to improve customer focus. • New building design supports customer focused service delivery and IT infrastructure.

4.2 The Council establishes multi-disciplinary project groups to ensure that schemes achieve corporate outcomes. Progress is regularly monitored by the Chief Officers' Management Team.

5. Prioritisation of capital project proposals

5.1 New capital projects are brought forward in the first instance to the appropriate Service Committees, having been appraised in consultation with the Director of Finance using the Capital Programme Appraisal Form (Appendix 2). Schemes are then prioritised and evaluated according to the agreed corporate criteria (Appendix 3) before the Corporate Management Committee consider the impact on the overall capital programme. The housing capital programme is evaluated separately in accordance with the Council's Housing Strategy.

5.2 The financial strategy includes projections of capital resources likely to be available within the period of the plan and provides the framework within which the forward Capital Programme has been developed based on existing and expected resources. The Capital Programme is reviewed in September each year with budgets being set in February. Review of the capital programme is an ongoing process

throughout the year with only those schemes which have undergone detailed scrutiny being included in the programme.

5.3 Repair and maintenance is prioritised according to the guidance from DCLG in respect of the national performance indicators.

5.4 Potential schemes are evaluated in terms of the following categories to give an order of priority.

Priority 1

- Schemes essential and to the extent necessary to comply with statutory obligations
- Schemes for which there is a contractual commitment to another party
- Schemes necessary to avoid a service breakdown
- Schemes necessary in the interests of safety

Priority 2

- Schemes necessary to maintain an existing asset
- Schemes necessary to maintain required standards of service
- Schemes to meet urgent established need
- Schemes which will permit future savings or increased efficiency
- Schemes which a business plan demonstrates to be self-financing

Priority 3

- Schemes to permit the development of services in accordance with approved policies

Priority 4

- Schemes representing other desirable development services
- Schemes to meet emerging needs and/or demands emanating from consultation, benchmarking or Best Value exercises.

6. Capital Resources

6.1 The Council considers the resources required to finance the capital programme when it reviews its Housing Strategy and Business Plan and its medium term (5 year) Financial Forecast and at its budget setting meeting in February each year. The capital programme is regularly updated, monitored and reported to Members throughout the year to ensure finance is available and to take account of new opportunities and demands.

6.2 The Council is debt free. The capital programme has been funded from a combination of usable capital receipts, revenue reserves, grants, contributions and operational leases. Under the prudential code, the Council evaluates the financial case for financing capital expenditure from borrowing and sets a borrowing limit each year.

6.3 The Council seeks to attract private finance where this offers better value for money than internally generated resources. This approach has been successful in achieving urban renewal schemes in partnership with private developers and rolling out e-government. For large value schemes, it is Council policy to invite developers to submit innovative funding proposals where these represent value for money.

6.4 The Council seeks to attract grant funding to support service development where it can demonstrate that scheme objectives fulfil the purpose set by the grant-giving body.

7. Evaluation and Monitoring of Capital Schemes

7.1 The Council's capital programme includes spending plans for the ensuing five years. The Financial Forecast and capital programme are based on the Council's strategic objectives (see section 2). The revenue implications of capital schemes (i.e. financing costs, running costs, income and savings) are reflected within the Financial Forecast. Decisions on the phasing of capital schemes will depend upon the availability of funds, the priorities accorded to each scheme and the implications for the revenue budget.

- 7.2 Evaluation and monitoring is co-ordinated by the Property Management Group who report to the Chief Officers' Management Team. This is a group of senior officers including the legal, property and finance disciplines and key service managers. It implements programmes, monitors progress and develops plans and strategies for the effective management of the Council's portfolio.
- 7.3 New capital schemes are subject to scrutiny and appraisal by the Council through its Committee structure. The detailed arrangements are set out in the Council's Financial Regulations and the Finance Rule Book.
- 7.4 Monitoring of resources takes place throughout the year. Project management disciplines are used to ensure that targets are met and expenditure is contained within budgetary provision. Financial Regulations require Chief Officers to report any anticipated overspending in excess of 10 per cent or £25,000 (whichever is the less) to the Corporate Management Committee stating the amount of the anticipated excess and the reason. In any event, the Committee receives regular progress reports on all schemes over £100,000 and, on completion, an evaluation of the success of the schemes in meeting the stated objectives. The more significant schemes are subject to a formal project management procedure (see paragraph 4.2).
- 7.5 In addition to the monitoring of progress during the year, the Council receives an annual report on the expenditure achieved in the last financial year compared with the capital programme. All strategic schemes require a further report within 12 months of completion to review their success in achieving the stated objectives.

8. Procurement Strategy

- 8.1 The Council is committed to achieving best value for money in the procurement of its services. The Council's Procurement Strategy describes how procurement activities support the delivery of objectives and the efficient discharge of services.
- 8.2 The Council's Standing Orders For Contracts and Financial Regulations set out the rules that apply to the commissioning of works or services to ensure that the Council receives value for money for the expenditure it authorises. Separate instructions deal with the value for money and probity aspects of land acquisition and disposal.
- 8.3 Industry quality standards for plant, vehicles and capital equipment are also used where available.

9. Best Value

- ~~9.1 All services of the Council have been the subject of a Best Value Review. The Strategic Plan sets out the timetable for further cross-cutting reviews over the next four years. The assets used by each service and any capital needs are identified as part of these reviews. Housing needs are determined in accordance with the Housing Strategy and the HRA Business Plan.~~
- ~~9.2 All Best Value Reviews are reported to the Council and the Best Value Improvement Plans require the approval of Council. Progress on the plans are reported to the appropriate Committees. Where these include capital spending implications, they require a justification in accordance with the practice described in section 7.~~
- ~~9.3 Best Value reviews also consider the need to hold assets and the opportunities for asset disposals to fund future service initiatives. Savings in asset management are reported as part of the Annual Efficiency Statement that is submitted to the government.~~

9. Efficiency and Value for Money

- 9.1 The efficient delivery of services and the achievement of revenue savings requires an ongoing review of asset holdings. For General Fund related services, this is achieved through the Asset Management Plan. Housing needs are determined in accordance with the Housing Strategy and the HRA Business Plan.
- 9.2 The Asset Management Plan considers the need to hold assets and the opportunities for asset disposals to fund future service initiatives.

9.3 The Procurement Strategy requires procurement decisions to take account of the whole life costs of the options under consideration.

10. Consultation

- 10.1 The Council consults on its strategies and provides feedback with the community and a wide variety of interested groups. This is undertaken through the Residents' Panel, special interest groups (e.g. Disability Liaison Group, Tenants Associations and Allotment Users), the Runnymede Business Partnership, other local authorities and other strategic partners. This two-way process is informed by the use of relevant performance indicators, benchmarks and detailed outcome reports.
- 10.2 The views obtained inform the development of service strategies, the Community Strategy and the Strategic Plan and these feed into the Capital Strategy.
- 10.3 Major capital investment will be in response to evidence based work, need, demographic trends and the appropriate local or user group consultation. Effective ward networks provide an important source of policy and service aspirations.

i) Statistical & Financial Information

1. Gross and net revenue budget 2008/09

	£000	£000	£000
Gross expenditure	46,120	15,629	61,749
Net expenditure	10,802	1,692	12,494

2. Information on the type and value of assets across the main service areas

Housing - operational			
Houses, flats and bungalows	2,963		258,147
DIYSO portfolio	92		7,415
Miscellaneous properties	5		766
Reception Centre	114 bed spaces		275
Other operational land and buildings			
Car Parks	15	1,220 spaces	4,883
Civic Offices	1	5,500	6,520
Community Centres & Public Halls	11	3,230	4,294
Depot	1	578	1,040
Public Conveniences (Excluding Parks)	4	390	104
Day Centres	5	3,028	5,431
Leisure Centres	1	2,900	3,191
Leisure Centres – Dual Use	1		1,335
Cemetery buildings	4	336	393
Parks and Open Spaces buildings	20	2,776	2,568
Museum	1	337	0
HRA - Heathervale Caravan Site	68		1,057
Other HRA properties	1		218
Community Assets			
Cemeteries	4		118
Parks and open spaces land		361 hectares	2,696
Allotments	14	plots	977
Non operational assets			
Investment properties			
- General	40		14,927
- HRA Garages	1,269		3,108
- HRA General	4		792
Assets under construction	1		14,382
Surplus assets held for disposal	5		4,463
Vehicles, plant and equipment			
Intangible assets			4,514
– Computer software & licences			290
Infrastructure assets			260

3. Maintenance Backlog: Non-housing stock :-

Category 1	Information not available	Urgent works
Category 2		Essential work required within 2 years
Category 3		Desirable work required in 3 to 5 years
£ 0		

Housing Stock: The definition of maintenance backlog is different in respect of the housing stock. The Housing Business Plan Statistical Appendix provides details of the maintenance programme.

4. Summary capital programme

HOUSING CAPITAL PROGRAMME

Service areas				
Improvement of Council dwellings	4,340	3,790	3,796	4,008
Refurbishment and redevelopment	521	40	40	40
Private sector housing renewal	444	495	521	547
Affordable housing programme	2,637	2,150	1,500	1,500
	7,942	6,475	5,857	6,095
Method of Financing				
Capital Receipts	2,209	3,790	3,796	4,008
Government Grant	270	270	270	270
Developers' Contributions	0	650	0	0
Revenue contributions (including MRA)	5,463	1,765	1,791	1,817
	7,942	6,475	5,857	6,095

CAPITAL PROGRAMME FOR OTHER SERVICES

Service areas				
Community Services	50	35	250	0
Leisure Services	1,152	175	170	170
Environmental Services	86	360	110	1,610
Economic Development	285	585	285	285
Information Technology	532	165	128	200
Grants to local organisations	53	53	53	53
	2,158	1,373	996	2,318
Method of Financing				
Grants and contributions	689	300	0	0
Revenue Reserves	502	210	198	270
Capital Receipts	967	863	798	2,048
	2,158	1,373	996	2,318

The Council currently has no plans to borrow to finance the capital programme.

5. Anticipated capital receipts

FORECAST CAPITAL RECEIPTS

Service areas				
Housing	3,080	1,075	775	775
Other Services	25	9,645	775	1,662
	3,105	10,720	1,550	2,437

(ii) Other contextual information

Population (mid 2006)	81,200
Area	7,800 hectares
Electorate (June 2008)	57,625
Principal Towns	Addlestone, Chertsey and Egham
Homes in the Borough (June 2008)	33,298
Number of Staff employed by Runnymede (January 2008)	309 Full time; 183 Part time (428 full time equivalents)

CAPITAL PROJECT APPRAISAL FORM

A full set of appraisal forms must be completed in full and returned to the Director of Finance for signature and evaluation prior to submission to any Committee.

Scheme Appraisal

Project Name _____

Brief Description of Scheme

Proposed start date _____

Length of Project _____

Type of project (Please tick)

- New
- Improvement
- Refurbishment
- Replacement

Is scheme a result of legal/statutory requirements? (If yes please specify) Yes / No

Is scheme a result of stakeholder consultation ? (If yes please specify) Yes / No

Which elements of the Council Strategy does this scheme assist in the delivery of and why?

- Affordable and Decent Housing
- Access and Transport
- Community Safety
- A Sustainable Community
- Economic Prosperity
- Opportunities for Young People
- Promoting Leisure and Culture
- A Healthy and Vibrant Community

What other aims /objectives / strategies are relevant to this scheme?

What are the expected outcomes?

(Please quantify where possible e.g. improved BVPI performance, extra users, additional income etc)

What other options have been considered?

Reasons for pursuing this option?

What would be the consequences of not undertaking /delaying the scheme?

What are the Risk Management Issues in pursuing this scheme?

(Managerial, Financial, Operational etc. Please list)

How does the project meet the objectives of the Procurement Strategy?

What Efficiency Gains does this scheme produce?

Implications for the Council Tax

Loss of Investment Income	-	-	-	-	-
Net Revenue costs /savings)	-	-	-	-	-
Impact on Band D Council Tax	£	-	£	-	£

What are the Staffing Implications?

What are the VAT Implications?

Authorisation

Signed _____ Project Officer Date _____

Signed _____ Chief Officer Date _____

Signed _____ Director of Finance Date _____

Accountancy Use Only

Date of Approval by Corporate Property Group (Where applicable) _____

Evaluation Score _____

Committee Report to be presented to: _____

CAPITAL PROJECT APPRAISAL
Evaluation Criteria

Criteria	Score	Range of scores
Complies with Councils Corporate Objectives as set out in the Leaders Position Statement		40 Fully complies 20 Partly complies 0 Does not comply
Complies with Property Strategy		20 Complies 0 Does not comply
Complies with Service Objectives contained within the Best Value Performance Plan/Service Plan		10 Fully complies 5 Partly complies 0 Does not comply
Is necessary to comply with legislative requirements		20 Essential 10 Recommended 0 No requirement
Supports meeting a Contractual Obligation		20 Fully supports 15 Partly supports 0 Does not support
Is necessary in interests of safety		20 Essential 0 No safety issues
Necessary to avoid service breakdown		20 Essential 0 Not Essential
Necessary to avoid consequential financial losses		10 Essential to avoid 0 No losses
Produces identifiable revenue savings		10 Covers capital charges 5 Partly covers charges 0 No saving
Involves Partnership working		5 Involves partners 0 No partners
Total		Out of a possible 175

COUNCIL RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION PAPER ON CODE OF CONDUCT FOR MEMBERS

N.B. The script set out below in italics contains the Council's response to the questions in the Consultation Paper

Do you agree that the Members Code should apply to a Member's conduct when acting in their non-official capacity?

It is accepted that some conduct by Members acting in a private capacity can have a damaging effect on their authority or its reputation. It would therefore be appropriate for the Code to cover some conduct which is not official conduct.

Is there is agreement to the proposed definition of criminal offence (proposed to be defined as any criminal offence for which the Member has been convicted in criminal court, where the Member has not had the opportunity of paying a fixed penalty instead of facing a criminal conviction) and if not, should other conduct, for example, conduct which has resulted in a police caution, also be included within the Code?

The definition is broadly acceptable, but it does not make it fully clear whether it excludes any offence for which the relevant statute provides that a fixed penalty notice may be issued, or only offences in which this option was not in fact made available to the Member. The latter approach would be better - if the enforcing authority considers that the offence was too serious for a fixed penalty notice, it is more likely that the conduct should be subject to the Code. An example might be a serious breach of a regulatory regime where the Member in question is a senior Member of a Committee with related functions. It is further suggested that it should apply to conduct which has resulted in a police caution. In accepting a caution a person accepts that he or she was guilty of an offence, and cautions are often used, for example, for public order offences which might not merit the expenditure of resources for a prosecution but which are still very capable of damaging the reputation of the authority and indeed of local government.

Should 'official capacity' be defined as 'being engaged in the business of your authority, including the business of the office to which you are elected or appointed, or acting, claiming to act or giving the impression that you are acting as a representative of your authority', or if not, what other definition would be supported?

The definition is not particularly easy to follow and leaves it unclear whether a Member is bound by the Code when they are acting as a Member of a body to which they have been appointed by their authority. In principle, the Code should cover both clearly official conduct, and occasions where the Member has identified themselves as such. It should also cover the Member's conduct in roles that the Member exercises, or to which they have been appointed, by virtue of their membership of the local authority (for example as an appointed Trustee of a local charity).

Is there agreement that the Code should apply to criminal offences committed in a foreign country for which a Member has been convicted in that country, but only if the conduct would also have constituted a criminal offence in the United Kingdom?

The principle is acceptable but should simply state that the Code applies to conduct constituting a criminal offence for which the Member is convicted abroad, provided that the conduct would also have constituted a criminal offence in the United Kingdom. There is no need to require that the offence and the conviction should have occurred in the same country.

It is possible for conduct to give rise both to a complaint under the Code of Conduct, and to criminal proceedings. Should action under the conduct regime follow only at the conclusion of the criminal procedure, i.e. at the conclusion of any appeals process, with the Member not being suspended during the criminal process? .

This is too broad brush an approach. Some criminal investigations and court processes can take years. It is suggested that there is no need for a rigid rule preventing proceedings under the Code of Conduct, on two conditions:

- a) *that the police (or other investigating authority) agree that the assessment and investigation process under the Code of Conduct will not prejudice their own investigation; and*
- b) *that a finding that the Member has breached the Code of Conduct is not taken as proof that a criminal offence has been committed.*

The present Code provides that Members have a personal interest in any business of the authority where it relates to or is likely to affect certain kinds of body of which they are a Member on which they serve. Should these provisions explicitly exclude membership of the Council itself ?

There is no harm in adding this clarification.

Should the Code should clarify that a Member is required to register a gift or hospitality with an estimated value of at least £25 in the register of Members' interests?

There is no objection to a suitable clarification, which should state exactly what must be placed on the register. At the same time, the Government should review the value limit of £25, which has been unchanged since the first edition of the Code and was arguably on the low side then. It is not clear why local authority Members were thought to be corruptible for £25, while MPs only have to register gifts exceeding 1% of Parliamentary salary (ie about £620). Some thought should also be given to the position of Members such as the Mayor who receive very large numbers of invitations purely by virtue of their office without any suggestion of impropriety. This provision of the Code is capable of creating numerous pitfalls and complications for Members during or after a mayoral year.

Should the definition of prejudicial interests be amended to remove the double negative presently found in paragraph 10 (2) of the Code which can make it difficult to follow?

It would certainly be helpful to remove the double negative. It would also be helpful to find a new way of expressing what is meant by 'the determining of any approval in relation to you or any person or body described in paragraph 8'. The words 'in relation to' are not at all clear as to their scope. The specific exclusions to the definition of prejudicial interest in paragraph 10 (2) (c) could usefully be expanded to include the giving of evidence before a Standards Committee.

One of the categories of prejudicial interest in the present Code is a matter that relates to 'the determining' of approvals, consents, etc in relation to the Member or someone with whom they are associated. Should the meaning of 'determining' be clarified to include variation, attaching, removing or amending conditions, and waiving or revoking applications?

No objection is seen to this.

Do you agree that Members should not be required to re-register their interests when the new Code is introduced, but that notices lodged under the previous Code will still hold good.

This is sensible provided that the list of registerable interests is not altered.

What other drafting amendments would be helpful?

- i) *A recent decision of the Adjudication Panel for England clarified that the Code did not apply to Members who had been suspended, as it was argued that they were not acting in their official capacity during that time. It is, however, possible for Members to describe themselves as such even though suspended and in the case in question, the Member had disregarded the wishes of his own authority's Standards Committee. The definition of 'official capacity' should therefore make it clear that the Code can apply to Members who are suspended.*
- ii) *In the requirement to register interests, the threshold value for shareholdings is a nominal value of £25,000. The actual value might be much higher or lower, with a corresponding*

impact (or lack of it) on a Member's financial affairs. However, tying the requirement to market value could result in a Member being unaware of the requirement to register unless he or she kept a careful eye on stock market prices. There is no perfect answer but it might be best to limit this requirement simply to a set percentage (in the present Code 1%) of the total issued share capital.

- iii) Under the present Code, a Member has to declare an interest where the business of the authority affects, inter alia, the affairs of a person with whom they have a 'close association'. There is Standards Boards guidance as to the meaning of this phrase but it should be tightened to make it clear that the test is whether a reasonable member of the public might conclude that the relationship could affect the Member's judgement of the public interest.*
- iv) The effect of paragraph 12 (2) is that a Member with a prejudicial interest who is asked by their authority's Overview and Scrutiny Committee (Runnymede's Review Board) to give evidence about a particular matter may only do so if the public are also allowed to attend the meeting for the same purpose. This is not sensible. It should suffice that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee has asked the Member in question to attend and answer questions.*

Are there any aspects of conduct currently included in the Code of Conduct that do not need not to be in the Code?

No suggestions are offered in this regard.

Are there any aspects of conduct in a Member's official capacity not specified in the Code of Conduct that should be included?

No specific suggestions are offered in this regard.

Is the proposed timescale of two months during which a Member must undertake to observe the Member's Code of Conduct, from the date of its adoption, sufficient?

Two months is sufficient for the vast majority of Members but there are always some exceptions. It is suggested that the time limit remain, but the sanction be that a Member cannot act after the time limit has expired, until they give the undertaking, rather than anything more onerous such as disqualification.

Do you agree that Statement of General Principles (the ten overarching general principles of Member conduct set out in Runnymede's Constitution along with the Code), should be amended by providing that the existing principles apply when a Member is acting in his or her official capacity, and adding a new principle of universal application that Members should not engage in conduct which constitutes a criminal offence?

If the ten existing principles are restricted in the manner suggested, there is a danger that in certain respects they will be narrower than the Code which is suppose to depend upon them. It should be noted that breach of the general principles is not in itself a breach in the Code of Conduct, although it is noted that the relevant bodies (Adjudication Panel for England, Standards Board for England, and Local Standards Committee) can have regard to the general principles in considering whether particular conduct breaches the Code, and how serious a breach it is if so. Unless the general principles effectively become a supplementary Code (which would require specific provision in the regulations) nothing is to be gained from the amendment suggested.

More generally, should it be necessary to provide that a Member must not break the criminal law?

If the above amendment is nevertheless adopted, should the General Principles Order be amended further to contain a definition of 'criminal offence' and of 'official capacity', analogous to the provisions found in the Code itself.

The same comments would apply to these definitions as made above in relation to the Code. However, it is reiterated that no purpose seems to be served by the basic amendment of the General Principles Order in the first place.

COUNCIL RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION PAPER ON PROPOSED TWO CODES OF CONDUCT FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT OFFICERS

N.B. The script set out below in italics contains the Council's response to the questions in the Consultation Paper

GENERAL COMMENTS

Do you agree that a mandatory Model Code of Conduct for Local Government Employees, which would be incorporated into employees terms and conditions of employment, is needed?

There is no evidence of widespread breach of acceptable ethical standards by local government employees. However, as with Members, public confidence in the service could be strengthened by the existence of a standard Code of Conduct, and it would ensure that there was a common core of provisions and method of enforcement across the country. While it is difficult to say that the Code is essential, its introduction is broadly supported.

Should the Government apply the employees Code to fire fighters, teachers, community support Officers, and solicitors?; and

Are there any other categories of employee in respect of whom it is not necessary to apply the Code?

There is sense in excluding employees in separate services which have established Codes of Conduct, such as fire fighters, teachers, etc. However, the position of Members of particular professions, who have their own Codes of professional conduct, engaged in 'mainstream' local government is different. The professional Codes of Conduct are designed to regulate professionals in sometimes quite a narrow field of activity. There will be a large degree of overlap with any local government Code, but it could lead to an anomalous situation if such employees are not covered by a general local government Code, particularly when it is deemed to be incorporated into other employee terms and conditions. Accordingly it is suggested that (i) there should be specific exceptions to a general Code if there is an established Code, covering similar ground, applicable to all employees within a particular service such as fire fighters or teachers; and (ii) the general Code should apply to other local government employees, notwithstanding that they may be subject to their own professional Codes, provided that if the provisions of the professional Code conflict with the general local government Code, the professional Code will prevail.

Subject to the above, it seems appropriate to apply the Code to every category of employee.

COMMENTS ON PROPOSED FIRST TIER CODE APPLYING TO ALL EMPLOYEES

Does the employees Code for all employees correctly reflect the core values that should be enshrined in the Code? If not, what has been included that should be omitted, or what has been omitted that should be included?

Although very generally drafted, the proposed first tier Code requires appropriate standards, subject to the following comments:

- i) *Some of the provisions duplicate statutory requirements - for example, use of confidential information, and appointment of staff on merit. Is this necessary? Indeed taken as a whole the proposed first tier Code does not require local authority employees to observe standards of conduct much different from that which would already be required by the general law and by their contracts of employment. It appears to be slightly uncertain as to whether it is a statement of principles or a genuine Code of Conduct. The Civil Service Code, which has obviously provided the inspiration for some of the proposals, is open to similar criticisms but on the whole works better as a document.*

- ii) *In the paragraph on accountability, if the Government accepts the suggestion set out above, that the Code should apply to all employees even where covered by their own professional standards, then it will be necessary to acknowledge here that there may be supervening categories of accountability, for example a solicitor's duty to the Court.*
- iii) *The second sentence of the paragraph on political neutrality appears to be entirely redundant.*
- iv) *In the paragraph on relations with Members, the public, and other employees, the phrase 'working relationships should be kept on a professional basis' is very vague. It should be expanded. It could usefully deal explicitly with the position of employees who are related to other employees.*
- v) *The paragraph on equality adds virtually nothing to known requirements.*
- vi) *The paragraph on personal interests is unclear. The first sentence appears to trespass into areas of private life. An employee of any organisation might well find themselves in a position where their private interests or beliefs conflict with their professional duty, but this should not be grounds for disciplinary action. What matters is the manner in which the conflict is resolved and the Code could more usefully provide proper guidance as to how this is to be achieved.*

The phrases 'personal interests', 'private interests', and 'private interest' are all used without any clarity of meaning, or indication as to whether they mean the same thing.

The second paragraph in the section on personal interests must in fairness depend on whether the employee knows that the particular person or body was seeking to do business with the authority, or would benefit from a relationship with the authority. Perhaps the answer is intended to be found in the 'rules of their authority' which are referred to, although this again tends to make the sentence redundant. The final sentence of this paragraph about accepting benefits from a third party needs clarification as to the scope of conduct which is caught.

- vii) *The paragraph on whistleblowing represents a strange departure from the Member Code of Conduct. The paragraph requiring Members to report apparent breaches of the Code by others caused substantial problems and anxiety, and was dropped from the 2007 revision of the Model Code. Yet a provision very similar in intent is now introduced into the proposed employee Code. This paragraph should be removed and employees should be subject to no higher standard than is required by the general law or (where applicable) the Code of Conduct of their professional body. Further, it is not clear how the Public Interest Disclosure Act 1998 applies to matters which are breaches of a Code of Conduct but not criminal offences, breaches of legal obligations, safety breaches, etc.*
- viii) *Consideration should be given to requiring staff to disclose arrest, cautions, and criminal convictions to their employer but also imposing strict duties of confidentiality on the employer in relation to such information.*
- ix) *Under "Investigations By Monitoring Officers", staff may feel reassured if the obligation is to comply with the Monitoring Officer's "reasonable" requirements.*

Should the selection of 'qualifying employees' for be made on the basis of a 'political restriction' style model or should qualifying employees be selected using the delegation model?

On a drafting point, the use of the term 'qualifying employees' is questionable. Under Section 82 of the Local Government Act 2000, the qualifying employees will be all employees of a relevant authority other than those excluded by regulation. Nevertheless it is probably lawful for the Code to provide that some provisions will apply to certain qualifying employees but not to others.

This does, however, highlight the fact that the Government has merely stated that it proposes to create a two tier Code and has not raised this as a point for consultation. In general, this authority would prefer to see a single Code applied to all employees. No case is seen for saying that ethical

standards are grade dependent, although it is clearly the case that some provisions are only relevant to employees carrying out certain types of duty.

In response to the specific question, it is difficult to see how a delegation model would work in the way intended, or consistently between authorities. For example, a common approach is that in formal terms delegation is restricted to named Officers such as heads of departments. The head of department might entrust certain of his staff with the carrying out of particular actions but will remain accountable for them. However the objective of the Code is surely that all Officers involved in the discharge of functions on behalf of the authority should be required to observe certain standards, as do Members.

Even where a wider range of Officers are formally entrusted with delegated functions, practice varies so widely that there would be no consistency of approach between authorities. Furthermore the range of functions delegated ranges from the purely administrative to the economically and politically sensitive.

For these reasons, if it is decided that it is lawful and appropriate to define a separate category of employees for the application of the second tier of the Code, the politically restricted posts model is preferred. It would be preferable, however, to have a single Code with the so-called second tier provisions potentially applicable to any employee carrying out relevant activities. The only exception to this might be in the requirement for registration of certain interests.

COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED SECOND TIER CODE FOR QUALIFYING EMPLOYEES

Should the Code contain a requirement for qualifying employees to publicly register any interests?

First paragraph to be revised to state that the general principle of registration is not supported.

The requirement for the register to be public is problematic. Even if the Government continues with its proposal to apply the Code to specified categories of employees, rather than to all employees as suggested above, it will still catch some comparatively junior staff. Given that the method of enforcement is through the authority's disciplinary processes rather than through the public committees and tribunals applicable at the political level, it is more appropriate that the information on the register should not have to be disclosed other than to the employee's head of department, to relevant Committee Chairmen or portfolio holders, and to anyone legitimately involved in a disciplinary process. It should be left to individual authorities as to whether they consider that a wider range of disclosure is justified. It is noted that Civil Servants are not normally required to disclose personal matters on a public register, while Ministers and MP's are.

Do the criteria of what should be registered contain any categories that should be omitted, or omit any categories that should be included?

It is not necessarily the most helpful approach to take the drafting of this section from parts of the Members' Code; however this does have the merit of consistency. The general aim should be to require the same standard as is imposed on Civil Servants who are required to register business interests if they would be able to further them as a result of their official position (Civil Service Management Code para 4.3.9). The proposal clearly goes further than that but it does not require employees to dispose of interests at their employer's direction as is the case in the Civil Service. Accordingly it probably strikes the right balance between disclosure, simplicity of application and coverage of detail. The comments about the registration of shareholdings made in relation to the Member Code apply equally here.

Does the section of the employees Code which will apply to qualifying employees capture all pertinent aspects of the Members Code? Have any been omitted?; and

Does the section of the employees Code which will apply to qualifying employees place too many restrictions on qualifying employees? Are there any sections of the Code that are not necessary?

The section on considering advice about the application of the Code of Conduct is much too vague to be of any use and also tends to diminish the personal responsibility of the employee.

On a drafting point, the use of the word 'force' in the section on compromising the impartiality of Officers of the authority is probably too restrictive and some other word such as 'coerce ' might be preferable.

Should the employees Code extend to employees of parish Councils?

This borough is not parished and no specific comment is offered.

Should authorities be required to incorporate the exact words of the employees Code into contracts of employment?

Employers should be allowed some discretion in the phrasing of their terms and conditions of employment. However, it would be appropriate to provide that the terms of the Model Code would be deemed to be incorporated to the extent that the authority's own Code did not require at least an equivalent standard as part of the terms and conditions of employment.

CALENDAR OF MEETINGS – MUNICIPAL YEAR 2009/2010

* MAY 2009

Mon		BH	11	18	BH
Tue		5	12	19	26
Wed		6	PL	AC	EA
Thr		7	(RB)	21	CM
Fri	1	8	15	22	29
Sat	2	9	16	23	30
Sun	3	10	17	24	31

JUNE

Mon	1	LSP	15	22	29
Tue		ALC	SAC	HCS	EG ADSG
Wed		PL	LC/RC	GT	PL
Thr		EE/CE	ED	LE	CM
Fri	5	12	19	26	
Sat	6	13	20	27	
Sun	7	14	21	28	

JULY

Mon		RWAC	13	20	27
Tue		7	14	21	28
Wed	(PL)	8	PL	22	29
Thr		RB	9	C	23 30
Fri	3	10	17	GT	31
Sat	4	11	18	25	
Sun	5	12	19	26	

AUGUST

Mon	3	10	17	24	BH
Tue	4	11	18	25	
Wed		PL	12	19	PL
Thr		6	13	20	27
Fri		7	14	21	28
Sat	1	8	15	22	29
Sun	2	9	16	23	30

SEPTEMBER

Mon		LSP	14	21	28
Tue	1	SA	15	LC/RC	ADSG
Wed	2	HCS	PL	(PL)	30
Thr		CM	10	ED	LE
Fri	4	11	18	25	
Sat	5	12	19	26	
Sun	6	13	20	27	

OCTOBER

Mon		5	12	19	26
Tue		6	ALC	20	27
Wed		PL	14	21	PL
Thr		CM	RB	C	22 CM
Fri	2	9	16	23	30
Sat	3	10	17	24	31
Sun	4	11	18	25	

NOVEMBER

Mon	2	9	16	23	30
Tue		EG	10	LC/RC	24
Wed	4	(PL)	PL	25	
Thr		HCS	LE	ED	CM
Fri	6	13	20	27	
Sat	7	14	21	28	
Sun	1	8	15	22	29

DECEMBER

Mon		LSP	14	21	BH
Tue	1	8	15	22	29
Wed	2	PL	16	23	30
Thr		RB	10	C	24 31
Fri	4	11	18	BH	
Sat	5	12	19	26	
Sun	6	13	20	27	

JANUARY 2010

Mon		4	11	18	25
Tue		5	12	19	26
Wed		PL	HCS	20	PL
Thr		CM	LE	ED	LC/RC
Fri	BH	GT	15	22	29
Sat	2	9	16	23	30
Sun	3	10	17	24	31

FEBRUARY

Mon		1	8	15	22
Tue		ADSG	SA	16	ALC
Wed		RB	10	PL	EG
Thr		CM	C	18	(PL)
Fri		5	12	19	26
Sat		6	13	20	27
Sun		7	14	21	28

MARCH

Mon	1	8	15	22	29
Tue		CMLG	C	16	23 30
Wed	3	PL	HCS	24	PL
Thr		CM	11	LE	ED
Fri	5	12	19	26	
Sat	6	13	20	27	
Sun	7	14	21	28	

APRIL

Mon		BH	12	19	26
Tue		ADSG	13	20	27
Wed		7	LC/RC	PL	28
Thr	1	CM	RB	C	29
Fri	BH	9	16	23	30
Sat	3	10	17	24	
Sun	4	11	18	25	

MAY

Mon		BH	10	17	24/ BH
Tue		4	11	18	25
Wed		5	PL	AC	EA
Thr		BE	13	20	CM
Fri		7	14	21	28
Sat	1	8	15	22	29
Sun	2	9	16	23	30

LEGEND

AC	-	Annual Council
ALC	-	Addlestone Leisure Centre JMC
ADSG	-	Arts Development Steering Group
GT	-	Cabrera Trust Management Committee
CMLG	-	Chertsey Meads Management Liaison Group
C	-	Council
CM	-	Corporate Management Committee
EA	-	External Appointments Sub-Committee
ED	-	Economic Development Committee
EE	-	European Election
EG	-	Englefield Green (7pm in Jurgen Centre)
HCS	-	Housing & Community Services Committee
LC	-	Licensing Committee
LE	-	Leisure & Environment Committee
LSP	-	Local Strategic Partnership
PL	-	Planning Committee
RB	-	Review Board
RC	-	Regulatory Committee
RWAC	-	Riverside Walk Advisory Committee
SA	-	Standards and Audit
CE	-	County Elections
BE	-	Borough Elections
BH	-	Bank Holiday

- The meetings shown in brackets and light typeface for the Planning Committee are provisional and will only be held if there is any business to transact.
- The dates for Arts Development Steering Group (ADSG), Chertsey Meads Management Liaison Group (CMLG), and the 24 February meeting of Addlestone Leisure Centre JMC (ALC) are provisional at the time of going to print. These dates will be confirmed by the respective bodies in due course.
- All meetings of Council and the Service Committees commence at 7.30 p.m. and are held in the Council Chamber or Committee Room at the Civic Centre, Addlestone, unless otherwise stated.
- The Council Meeting on 11 February 2010 is held solely to approve the Council Tax.

COUNCIL MEETINGS MAY 2009 / MAY 2010

May 2009

13th Planning Committee
14th (Review Board)
20th Annual Council
27th External Appointments Sub-Committee
28th Corporate Management Committee

June 2009

2nd Addlestone Leisure Centre JMC
3rd Planning Committee
4th European Elections
4th County Elections
8th Local Strategic Partnership
9th Standards and Audit Committee
10th Licensing Committee
10th Regulatory Committee
11th Economic Development Committee
16th Housing and Community Services Committee
17th Cabrera Trust AGM
18th Leisure and Environment Committee
23rd Englefield Green Committee
24th Planning Committee
25th Corporate Management Committee
30th Arts Development Steering Group

July 2009

1st (Planning Committee)
2nd Review Board
6th Riverside Walk Advisory Committee
15th Planning Committee
16th Council
24th Cabrera Trust Management Committee

August 2009

5th Planning Committee
26th Planning Committee

September 2009

3rd Corporate Management Committee
7th Local Strategic Partnership
8th Standards and Audit Committee
9th Housing and Community Services Committee
16th Planning Committee
17th Economic Development Committee
22nd Licensing Committee
22nd Regulatory Committee
23rd (Planning Committee)
24th Leisure and Environment Committee
29th Arts Development Steering Group

October 2009

1st Corporate Management Committee
7th Planning Committee
8th Review Board
13th Addlestone Leisure Centre JMC
15th Council
28th Planning Committee
29th Corporate Management Committee

November 2009

3rd Englefield Green Committee
5th Housing and Community Services Committee
11th (Planning Committee)
12th Leisure and Environment Committee
17th Licensing Committee
17th Regulatory Committee
18th Planning Committee
19th Economic Development Committee
26th Corporate Management Committee

December 2009

3rd Review Board
7th Local Strategic Partnership
9th Planning Committee
17th Council

January 2010

6th Planning Committee
7th Corporate Management Committee
8th Cabrera Trust Management Committee
13th Housing and Community Services Committee
14th Leisure and Environment Committee
21st Economic Development Committee
27 Planning Committee
28th Licensing Committee
28th Regulatory Committee

February 2010

2nd Arts Development Steering Group
3rd Review Board
4th Corporate Management Committee
9th Standards and Audit Committee
11th Council
17th Planning Committee
23rd Addlestone Leisure Centre JMC
24th Englefield Green
25th (Planning Committee)

March 2010

2nd Chertsey Meads Management Liaison Group
4th Corporate Management Committee
9th Council
10th Planning Committee
17th Housing and Community Services Committee
18th Leisure and Environment Committee
25th Economic Development Committee
31st Planning Committee

April 2010

6th Arts Development Steering Group
8th Corporate Management Committee
14th Licensing Committee
14th Regulatory Committee
15th Review Board
21st Planning Committee
22nd Council

May 2010

6th Borough Elections
12th Planning Committee
19th Annual Council
26th External Appointments Sub-Committee
27th Corporate Management Committee