

Runnymede Borough CouncilECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE12 June 2003 at 7.30 p.m.

Members of the Committee present: Councillors J.R. Furey (Chairman), A. Alderson, M.J. Brown, A.J. Davis, J.M. Edwards, C. Knight, R.J. Ray, and B.J. Relph

Members of the Committee absent: Councillors D.P. Easton and Ms C.M. Simmons

Councillors Mrs. P.I. Broadhead, P.A. Greenwood, Mrs C.Y. Jones, A.M. Moore, D.W. Parr, P.J. Poole and Mrs E.E. Price also attended.

89. NOTIFICATION OF CHANGES TO COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

The Conservative Group had notified the Chief Executive Officer of its wish that the changes listed below be made to the membership of the Committee. The changes were for a fixed period ending on the day after the meeting and thereafter the Councillors removed would be re-appointed.

| Remove from Membership | Appoint instead |
|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| Councillor J. E. Haas | Councillor J.M. Edwards |
| Councillor K.J.T. Walmsley | Councillor C. Knight |

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

90. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meetings of the Committee held on 13 March and 15 May 2003 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

91. REFERRAL FROM HOUSING AND COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEERedevelopment of Roakes Avenue Estate

At its meeting on 11 June 2003 the Housing and Community Services Committee had received a report detailing the current position with regard to the redevelopment of the Roakes Avenue Estate. Members were informed at that time that if the proposed housing development at the Painesfield allotment site took place, one option for Roakes Avenue would be a sale on the open market. In this eventuality there would be a planning policy requirement for at least 25% of the site to be made available for affordable housing. A successful application had therefore been made by the Apex Housing Association for Local Authority Social Housing Grant (LASHG) of £1.895m in respect of the development of the largely unused garage area, representing 25% of the site. This Committee had accordingly been asked to approve of the disposal of the garage area to Apex.

Members noted, however, that in order to secure the LASHG the Housing Association would have to draw down the first tranche of money by 30 June. The proposal to transfer a specific area of land by that date gave rise to a number of legal and procedural issues. Officers were still considering the best way to frame the documentation and whether it was possible to simplify the matter by avoiding an immediate land transfer in favour of a contractually binding commitment. The Committee therefore

RESOLVED that -

the Director of Administration and Leisure, in consultation with the Chairman, the Vice-Chairman, and the Director of Housing and Community Services, be authorised to dispose of the garage area at the Roakes Avenue

Estate as shown on the plan at Appendix 'A' (or any other appropriate land at Roakes Avenue Estate) to Apex Housing Association, or alternatively enter into other contractual documentation with the Housing Association, on such terms as he thinks will best secure the Council's intention of providing the required element of affordable housing with the benefit of LASHG when the Roakes Avenue Estate is redeveloped.

92. AIMS AND TARGETS 2002/03 - OUTTURN

Members received details of outturn performance against the Committee's Aims and Targets for 2002/03. Overall it was considered that the Council had maintained its good record on delivering its economic development priorities. Some of the more significant achievements during the year included the continuing work on the Action Addlestone initiative, including signalling improvements at the Church Road, High Street, Brighton Road traffic lights, and the active role played by the Business Partnership, particularly in relation to the Runnymede Travel Initiative. Work was expected to commence shortly on the construction of the final phase of the Chertsey Revitalisation Scheme.

The Committee noted that satisfactory progress had also been made in respect of the Civic Offices re-provision project. Discussions with Surrey County Council were still ongoing regarding the potential for the provision of joint facilities. It was in this context that proposals regarding the County Council's property holdings were outlined to Members in Part II of the meeting, following the exclusion of the press and public.

93. REVIEW OF CAR PARKING CHARGES

(Ref: Minutes of Economic Development Committee March 2003, page 1134, para. 696)

The Committee gave consideration to proposals for the revision of charges in the Council's off street car parks.

Members noted that car parking charges had not been increased since 1997. The current charging regime varied across the Borough both in terms of the charge and the duration for which it was applicable. Short stay charges, which generated the most income, were typically either 30p for one hour where the car park was in close proximity to town centres, or 20p for two hours in more peripheral locations. In general, charges in Egham tended to be higher as most of the town's principal car parks fell into the higher band.

Medium term parking also varied. In some car parks the charge was 20p for each additional hour, others had a sliding scale depending on length of stay. All day parking was available in a limited number of car parks for £1. Two of these, the Waspe Farm and Bourne Car Parks, being located close to railway stations, were well used by commuters. The charges in these car parks were substantially lower than those in equivalent car parks elsewhere in Surrey. There were also a number of free car parks which were intended to overcome problems of illegal on-street parking in areas which had low levels of enforcement by the Police.

The Committee was of the opinion that an increase in charges was now appropriate. Not only was it six years since the last review, but the off-street car parks service operated at a considerable deficit, estimated at £216,000 in 2003/04. While the cost of the service was likely to be approximately £543,500, income under the current charging regime was expected to amount to only £327,500. The car parks were therefore effectively being subsidised by all local residents, including non-car drivers. It was felt that there was a need to establish a more equitable distribution of costs between motorists and the public generally.

The Committee recognised, however, that there was a delicate balance between raising income and maintaining the viability of the town centres. In a Borough such as Runnymede, the main towns and shopping centres served predominantly local need rather than drawing in trade from a wide area. If charges were increased to a level which the public perceived to be unacceptable, there would be a risk of driving people away to neighbouring centres such as Woking, Staines, Guildford or Kingston which offered a considerably wider range of shops and other facilities. Large increases might also tempt people to park illegally on-street, causing further obstruction and nuisance. Runnymede was due to assume responsibility for the enforcement of on-street parking from the Police in 2004.

Members, mindful of the need to balance the interests of Council Tax payers, motorists and local traders, as well the desirability of a simple and consistent charging structure, therefore agreed to set the short stay minimum charge at 50p for two hours. This would apply to all car parks in which charges were levied, thereby removing the inconsistency of higher charges in Egham. There was a view expressed that the new charge might deter people from making very brief shopping trips, perhaps for single purchases. However, it was felt that a standard initial two hour duration would encourage people to stay in the town centres for longer, thus ultimately benefiting traders. The maximum charge for long stay car parks would be increased from £1 to £2 (Appendix 'B' contains details of the existing and proposed charges across all bands). Charges would not be introduced to those car parks which were currently free in order to avoid problems with on-street parking. This position could, however, be reviewed if Decriminalised Parking Enforcement (DPE) led to an enhanced enforcement regime.

Amongst the other changes, Members agreed that the distinction between residents and non residents' season tickets/permits should be abolished in favour of a single fee of £200, equivalent to most current non residents' permits. Fines for all off-street parking offences were to be increased from £40, with a discount to £20 for prompt payment, to £60 with an early payment discount of £30. This was consistent with the level of fines proposed by the County Council for on-street parking offences under the DPE regime.

The Committee noted that these increases could potentially yield additional income of £112,400 in a full year, assuming a 20% reduction in car park usage. The costs of changing signage, ticket machines, software and stationery, estimated at £6,000, could be met from the increased income. The new charges would apply from 1 September in order to allow time for the necessary administrative arrangements to be made.

RESOLVED that –

- i) off-street car parking charges be increased as set out in the table in Appendix 'B', with effect from 1 September 2003;**
- ii) the charge for off-street parking offences be increased to £60, with £30 for prompt payment, with effect from 1 September 2003; and**
- iii) the cost of residential and non residential annual permits be set at £200 per annum with effect from 1 September 2003.**

94. DECRIMINALISED PARKING ENFORCEMENT

(Ref: Minutes of Economic Development Committee March 2003, page 1139, para. 702).

The Committee noted details of the continuing preparations for the introduction of Decriminalised Parking Enforcement (DPE) in the Borough. A Joint Member Working Group, comprising two representatives from both the Borough and County Council, had been established with the aim of securing implementation as quickly as possible. However, constraints on staffing resources at both authorities meant that it would not be possible to introduce DPE in Runnymede immediately upon the withdrawal of Surrey Police from enforcement responsibilities in April 2004. The earliest possible implementation date now appeared to be November 2004. In order to achieve this, consultancy support would be required at a cost of approximately £30,000. The County Council had indicated that it was prepared to contribute £20,000 towards this sum but supplementary budgetary provision would be required for the balance. Officers emphasised that there were further costs associated with introduction of DPE that would have to be borne in the future.

RESOLVED that -

- i) subject to formal confirmation that Surrey County Council will contribute £20,000, consultants be appointed to advise and assist with the introduction of Decriminalised Parking Enforcement in Runnymede at the earliest opportunity; and**
- ii) the Corporate Management Committee be asked to agree a supplementary estimate of £10,000 for this purpose.**

95. THE FUTURE DEVELOPMENT OF AIR TRANSPORT IN THE UNITED KINGDOM - REVISED CONSULTATION PAPER

(Ref: Minutes of Economic Development Committee, March 2003, page 1136, para. 698)

The Committee gave consideration to a revised Government consultation paper on the future development of air transport in the South East of England over the next 30 years. The document had been reissued following a High Court judgement that the original had wrongly excluded options for the development of Gatwick Airport. The material issues, however, particularly those relating to the impact on Runnymede of any expansion of Heathrow Airport, were largely unchanged.

Members recalled the Government's position that the demand for air travel was still increasing and that there would shortly be a need for new runway capacity in the south east. The Government sought a sustainable long term development of aviation which maximised the social and economic benefits of growth while minimising the environmental impact. The paper once more sought views on future airport capacity requirements, the location of any new capacity, whether there should be one major 'hub' airport in the south east and measures needed to control and mitigate the effect on the environment. The proposed options for major growth in south east airports were:

- | | |
|-----------|---|
| Heathrow: | a new runway with associated terminal development. |
| Gatwick: | one or two new runways with new terminal development. |
| Stansted: | one to three new runways and associated terminal development. |
| Cliffe: | a new airport built on the south side of the Thames Estuary. Four/five runway airport with terminal facilities. |

Members noted, however, that the Cliffe proposals were unlikely to secure the backing of funders and a major airline or consortium in view of the scale of investment required. Two of the key players, British Airways and the British Airports Authority, had previously expressed a preference for concentrating future growth at Heathrow. The specific proposals for Heathrow were:

- a new 2,000m long runway to the north of the existing Airport;
- new terminal facilities to service the third runway;
- enhanced public transport (maybe including Airtrack);
- additional motorway road infrastructure adjacent to the Airport;
- 230 hectares of agricultural land acquired and 260 residential properties demolished.

The development of Heathrow in this manner would give rise to a range of social, economic and environmental issues. In considering an appropriate form of response, Members took account of the views expressed by the Planning Committee on 4 June and a Council resolution of 10 June which drew attention to the serious impact on the local quality of life that further expansion would bring, particularly in respect of pollution, transport and housing problems.

Some Members again expressed concern over the adverse environmental impact of additional development in terms of noise and air pollution, traffic generation, infrastructure problems and the increased pressure for housing. Equally, it was recognised that Heathrow played a significant role in the local economy, both directly and indirectly. While the economic impact of growth at the airport was difficult to assess, on balance the Committee concurred with the view of the Planning Committee that the maintenance of Heathrow's position as a 'hub' airport was desirable. This was, however, subject to enhancements of public transport to the south and west of the airport to ease the impact of increased traffic (with the Airtrack project forming the core of the improvements) prior to any development of a third runway. It was also conditional upon guaranteed strict controls on night flights, air and noise pollution and water run off forming a fundamental part of any planning permission. The Committee wished to reiterate the Council resolution of 10 June as a preface to these further views.

RESOLVED that -

the Council resolution of 10 June 2003 be reiterated and the comments set out in Appendix 'C' be conveyed to the Department for Transport as the Council's detailed response to the consultation paper entitled 'The Future Development of Air Transport in the UK: South East'.

A requisition having been made in accordance with Standing Order 39.2 that the votes of the Committee be recorded; there voted:

For: Councillors M.J. Brown, A.J. Davis, J.M. Edwards and J.R. Furey (4)

Against: Councillors A. Alderson, C. Knight, R.J. Ray and B.J. Relph (4)

The Chairman exercised his second vote in accordance with Standing Order 39.8 to carry the motion.

96. ECONOMIC STRATEGY - DRAFT FOR CONSULTATION

(Ref: Minutes of Economic Development Committee, March 2003, page 1137, para. 700)

The Committee gave consideration to the final form of an Economic Strategy for the borough. The strategy had evolved following extensive consultation on the issues facing local business and the options for tackling them and had been prepared with the assistance of the Runnymede Business Partnership. A draft document, approved at the previous meeting, had been circulated to local and regional economic development organisations, the County Council, neighbouring Districts and relevant Business Partnership groups and forums, and had been placed on public deposit in local libraries. The responses had not identified any new issues of significance.

The Strategy, which linked into the strategic planning framework at borough, county and regional levels, was divided into two main themes, "maintaining a vibrant local economy" and "issues associated with a prosperous local economy". A number of issues and targets had been identified in each category which, to an extent, reflected and built on the relevant Community Strategy targets. The issues addressed under the theme of "maintaining a vibrant local economy" were services for businesses, planning policies, town and village centres, training and skills and tourism. Meanwhile the section dealing with "issues associated with a prosperous local economy" referred to congestion/public transport, lack of affordable housing and minimising the environmental impact of economic activity. The targets all had a set completion date. Much of the implementation would be achieved in conjunction with the Business Partnership, which had been successful in securing external grant aid and sponsorship for a wide range of initiatives. The potential for funding projects through Business Improvement Districts would also be explored.

Members noted that the strategy would be launched to the local business community at the Business Partnership Breakfast Forum to be held at Thorpe Park in September.

RECOMMEND that -

the Economic Strategy attached at Appendix 'D' be adopted.

97. LAND DRAINAGE SERVICE - BEST VALUE SCOPING AND CHALLENGE REPORT

The Committee received details of the Best Value scoping and challenge exercise undertaken in respect of the Drainage Service. Members were asked to consider whether the objectives for the provision of the service continued to meet the Council's aspirations and to satisfy themselves that there had been sufficient rigour in completing the challenge phase of the review.

The Council's land drainage functions could be divided into five categories, namely: flood defence, planning and development, flood warning, public health and enforcement and riparian responsibilities for the watercourses within its ownership. The service was provided by a mixture of in-house and contractual arrangements in accordance with the approved Land Drainage Strategy. Three drainage engineers undertook the management and administration duties, together with feasibility studies and design for improvement works. The actual maintenance, improvement and inspection works were carried out by the drainage contractor, currently E. Tobin and Co Ltd.

The aim of the review was to identify ways in which the service could be improved and efficiencies achieved and determine whether the scope should be altered in any way. To this end a number of suggestions for challenge had been proposed which would be examined during the remaining stages of the review. Consideration would be given to the implications of proposed changes in the organisation of land drainage responsibilities announced recently by the Government once the full implications and timescale for implementation were known.

Members noted that the next stage of the review would involve a comparison of the service with those authorities which had comparable land drainage networks and equivalent levels of expenditure. Direct comparison with neighbouring Councils was difficult since they tended to have less extensive land drainage networks, but efforts would be made to examine the variation in the service. A questionnaire issued every six months to residents and Council staff to which a service was provided would be used as the prime source for the collection of customer satisfaction data for the 'consult' element of the review.

RESOLVED that -

- i) the objectives of the land drainage service identified in the challenge report be endorsed as reflecting the Council's aspirations for the provision of this service at the current level;**
- ii) the proposal to examine the following matters further during the remaining stages of the review be endorsed;**
 - a) Investigate the implications of providing a reduced or enhanced service in comparison with the current service.**
 - b) Investigate the use of consultants in the provision of some or all of the services currently provided by the drainage section staff.**
 - c) Investigate the possibility of carrying out works for riparian owners on a chargeable basis.**
 - d) Investigate the viability of providing land drainage services to adjacent Councils, or alternatively the setting up of partnership arrangements with them.**
 - e) Investigate the viability of an awareness campaign to inform riparian owners of their responsibilities for the watercourses running over their land.**
 - f) Investigate methods of raising general public awareness of the different agencies responsible for the different elements of drainage.**
 - g) Bring forward proposals for setting up service level agreements between the Drainage Section and the other sections within the Council to which a service is provided;**
- iii) the use of the Land Drainage questionnaire as a prime source for the collection of customer satisfaction data for the "Consult" element of the review be endorsed;**
- iv) the use of the proposals set out above for the "Compare" element of the review be endorsed; and**
- v) the scope of this review, and the "Challenge" phase be endorsed.**

98. PLANNING POLICY AND IMPLEMENTATION - BEST VALUE CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT PLAN - PROGRESS REPORT

(Ref: Minutes of Economic Development Committee, September 2002, page 517, para. 276)

The Committee received a progress report on the Continuous Improvement Plan of the Planning Policy and Implementation Section (formerly Forward Planning), with specific reference to those elements of the Plan which related to Runnymede Business Partnership activities.

Members noted that the implementation date for the adoption of Travel Plans by local schools was to be amended from March to the end of June 2003. Ten School Travel Plans had been completed and

two more were in preparation but only one had so far been formally adopted. It was agreed to delete the target to seek long term sponsorship for the Business Partnership's running costs since the Yellow Bus Service was now considered to represent a better sponsorship opportunity. The target to review the potential for a 'Meet the Buyers' event had now been met, a survey having established that there was insufficient support to justify the initiative. Other means of encouraging local purchasing were being explored. A new target had been added relating to the preparation of a baseline 'State of Runnymede' environmental study.

RESOLVED that -

- i) the target date for adoption of School Travel Plans be amended to June 2003;**
- ii) the target to seek long term sponsorship for Runnymede Business Partnership running costs be deleted; and**
- iii) the new target for the preparation of a baseline 'State of Runnymede' environmental study be endorsed.**

99. ADDLESTONE COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION CENTRE REPROVISION

(Ref: Minutes of Economic Development Committee, September 2002, page 521, para. 283)

Members noted that Dewhurst MacFarlane and Partners had been appointed to replace Adams Kara Taylor as the structural engineering consultants for the reprovision of the Addlestone Community Centre. The fee, combined with that for the mechanical engineers, would increase from 3.5% to 3.95% as a consequence, but this would not significantly affect the overall scheme costs.

100. URGENT ACTION - STANDING ORDER 42

Members noted details of the following action which had been taken after consultation with the Chairman of the Committee under Standing Order 42:

| <u>Officer</u> | <u>Action Taken</u> | <u>Central Index No.</u> |
|--|---|--------------------------|
| Director of Administration and Leisure | Authorisation to acquire a property in Harrow Close, Addlestone for £120,000, together with £80,000 to secure replacement premises for the occupiers. The additional sum was to be secured by way of a legal charge on the replacement property. | 519 |
| Director of Administration and Leisure | Removal of restrictive covenants in respect of former Council owned properties in Barker Road, Chertsey to facilitate a development which would provide four affordable housing units. The Corporate Management Committee had previously approved similar action in respect of other properties at the site (April 2003). | 511 |

101. PROVISION OF BUS SHELTERS

The Committee gave consideration to the award of a new contract for the provision of bus shelters in the Borough.

The Council's previous 15 year contract, with Adshel, for the supply and maintenance of 30 shelters with advertising displays had expired in 1999. The shelters, although of good quality, were beginning to look worn and dated and now required frequent maintenance.

Following a full tendering exercise, Adshel had again emerged as the only company prepared to provide shelters at no cost to the Council. Negotiations were still ongoing with a view to securing the most advantageous terms. The present offer envisaged the provision of 71 advertising shelters (including replacements for the original 30) and 23 non advertising shelters. The costs of installation,

together with inspection, cleaning and maintenance over a 13 year term, would be met by advertising revenue. The 30 existing Adshel shelters would be replaced within 10-12 weeks of the contract award, with the remainder being installed over an 18 month period. All of the shelters would be capable of connecting to a real time bus information system should the County Council choose to introduce such a facility in Runnymede in the future. It was noted that the proposals were more favourable than those offered to neighbouring Councils as they featured a higher proportion of non advertising shelters.

The Committee, mindful of Adshel's good reputation and the satisfactory manner in which it had undertaken the previous contract, authorised Officers to conclude terms with the company. Members would subsequently be given the opportunity to comment on and approve the proposed locations for the additional shelters, some of which would be used to replace the Council's own stock. Planning consent would be required at new sites.

RESOLVED that -

the Director of Technical Services, in consultation with the Director of Administration and Leisure, be authorised to negotiate and conclude terms with Adshel for the future provision of bus shelters in the Borough.

102. PROPERTIES IN STATION ROAD, ADDLESTONE

(Ref: Minutes of Economic Development Committee, March 2003, page 1144, para. 709)

By resolution of the Committee, the press and public were excluded from the meeting during the consideration of this matter under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 on the grounds that the discussion would be likely to involve the disclosure of exempt information of the description specified in paragraphs 7 and 8 of Schedule 12A to Part 1 of the Act.

The Committee gave consideration to outline proposals for a redevelopment scheme in respect of land at 131-175 Station Road, Addlestone.

The Council had been engaged in a land assembly exercise in which it had acquired premises at 131-137 and 153/155 Station Road, and 1-5 Manton Terrace, with a view to redevelopment of what was a run down part of the town centre. It was now noted, however, that efforts to purchase 147/149 Station Road had been unsuccessful, despite making an unconditional offer at the asking price. Officers had also been unable to acquire 151 Station Road, authority for the purchase having been conditional upon the exchange of contracts on 147-149.

Three options were considered by the Committee, namely the disposal of all existing landholdings, the acquisition of the remaining properties, together with the adjoining block at 159-175 Station Road, through the use of compulsory purchase powers and a joint undertaking for the redevelopment of 131-175 with the Wilky Group, owners of adjoining property.

Members felt that the sale of the properties would represent the loss of an opportunity for significant and much needed physical and environmental improvements. Relatively high rental values, disparate ownerships and the cost of refurbishment meant that any substantial private investment was unlikely and the area could be expected to continue its long term decline. Disposal was also the least financially attractive option since the loss of rental income would exceed interest earnings on the capital receipt.

Of the two options for redevelopment, Members favoured a joint scheme with the adjoining block. A much larger developable area was likely to prove more financially viable, with the potential for a comprehensive and attractive mixed use scheme which could have a significant impact on the town centre and act as a catalyst for further investment and improvement. It would also have the advantage of limiting the Council's financial exposure to those resources already committed to the scheme. There was the possibility of compulsory purchase powers being required to back the proposals. The Committee instructed Officers to explore the potential for a joint development with the Wilky Group and report on the outcome to the next meeting.

RESOLVED that -

- i) the Borough Valuer be instructed to open negotiations with the Wilky Group to explore the potential for a joint development of 131-175**

Station Road, Addlestone, and adjoining lands, including consideration of the use of compulsory purchase powers; and

- ii) the outcome of these negotiations be reported back to the September meeting of this Committee.**

103. 190 STATION ROAD, ADDLESTONE

By resolution of the Committee, the press and public were excluded from the meeting during the consideration of this matter under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 on the grounds that the discussion would be likely to involve the disclosure of exempt information of the description specified in paragraphs 7 and 8 of Schedule 12A to Part 1 of the Act.

Members gave consideration to the disposal of 190 Station Road, Addlestone. The property, which had been derelict for a number of years, had been purchased in May 2002 with a view to either a social housing scheme, utilising an existing planning consent, or the assembly of a larger development site. However, a social housing scheme was no longer considered to be viable owing to the site constraints and the lack of available grant funds while negotiations regarding land assembly had been unsuccessful.

The Committee noted that terms had therefore provisionally been agreed for the disposal of the property to the adjoining landowner for the original purchase price. In the circumstances this was considered to represent the best achievable price for the property. The new owner would be contractually bound to the redevelopment of the site within nine months from the exchange of contracts. Although holding costs of approximately £10,000 had been incurred during the period of the Council's ownership, the primary aim of redeveloping a derelict and unsightly building would thus have been achieved.

RESOLVED that -

subject to contract and all necessary consents, the Director of Administration and Leisure be authorised to complete the disposal of 190 Station Road, Addlestone on the terms reported and subject to such other terms and conditions as he sees fit.

104. SURREY TOWERS - TELECOMMUNICATIONS RENT REVIEW

By resolution of the Committee, the press and public were excluded from the meeting during the consideration of this matter under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 on the grounds that the discussion would be likely to involve the disclosure of exempt information of the description specified in paragraph 7 of Schedule 12A to Part 1 of the Act.

The Committee noted the outcome of a rent review in respect of Cable and Wireless telecommunications equipment situated on the roof top of Surrey Towers. Following protracted negotiations, provisional agreement had been reached on a retrospective increase in the rent due for the period between April 2001 and March 2003. There would, however, be an overall net reduction in the rent from March 2003 as a number of redundant microwave dishes had recently been removed from the site. Officers were currently in discussions with another telecommunications company with a view to replacing the lost income and would report further to the Committee in due course.

RESOLVED that -

- i) the outcome of the rent review in respect of Cable and Wireless be approved and the financial implications resulting from a reduction in the number of microwave dishes noted; and**
- ii) the Borough Valuer be authorised to seek replacement of the lost income and report back to Committee in due course.**

105. 49 GUILDFORD STREET, CHERTSEY

By resolution of the Committee the press and public were excluded from the meeting during the consideration of this matter under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 on the grounds that the discussion would be likely to involve the disclosure of exempt information of the description specified in paragraph 7 of Schedule 12A to Part 1 of the Act.

The Committee approved terms proposed for the sale of 49 Guildford Street, Chertsey to the existing tenant. It was noted that the return on the capital receipt was likely to match the current level of rental income.

RESOLVED that -

subject to contract and all necessary consents, the Director of Administration and Leisure be authorised to dispose of the freehold interest in 49 Guildford Street in the sum reported and subject to such other terms as he sees fit.

106. 55 GUILDFORD STREET, CHERTSEY

By resolution of the Committee, the press and public were excluded from the meeting during the consideration of this matter under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 on the grounds that the discussion would be likely to involve the disclosure of exempt information of the description specified in paragraph 7 of Schedule 12A of Part 1 of the Act.

The Committee agreed to revise the lease arrangements at 55 Guildford Street, Chertsey in order to reflect a change in the ownership of the business trading at the premises.

RESOLVED that -

the Director of Administration and Leisure be authorised to accept the surrender of the lease of 55, Guildford Street, Chertsey and grant a new seven year lease to the individual identified in the agenda on the terms reported and subject to such other terms as he sees fit.

Chairman

(The meeting ended at 10.13pm)