



RUNNYMEDE BOROUGH COUNCIL

CORPORATE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

6 JANUARY 2005

APPENDICES

<u>APPENDIX</u>	<u>REPORT</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
A	MINUTES OF 2 DECEMBER 2004 MEETING	1
B	ESTIMATES 2005/06	SEE SEPARATE DOCUMENT
C	FINANCE SETTLEMENT - GLOSSARY OF TERMS	17
D	FINANCE SETTLEMENT – FSS CALCULATION	18
E	PERSONNEL SERVICES MEMBER WORKING GROUP – MINUTES	19
F	INFORMATION STRATEGY MEMBER WORKING GROUP - MINUTES	20

Runnymede Borough CouncilCORPORATE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEEAPPENDIX 'A'2 December 2004

Members of the Committee present: Councillors N. Thewlis (Vice-Chairman), J.R. Furey, Mrs L.M. Gillham, P.A. Greenwood, H.W.V. Meares, C.J. Norman, Ms C.M. Simmons, P.B. Tuley, P.J. Waddell and G.B. Woodger.

Members of the Committee absent: None.

Councillor A. Alderson also attended.

(In the absence of the Chairman, Councillor N. Thewlis took the Chair).

NOTIFICATION OF CHANGE TO COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

The Conservative Group had notified the Chief Executive Officer of its wish that the Chairman, Councillor R. K. Habgood, be removed from the membership of the Committee and that Councillor H.W.V. Meares be appointed in his place for a fixed period ending on the day after the meeting. Thereafter Councillor Habgood would be reappointed.

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

MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 4 November 2004 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

GRANT AID – COMMITTEE RESPONSIBILITIES

The Committee considered future Committee responsibilities for dealing with grant aid. At their meetings on 3 November 2004 and 18 November 2004 respectively, the Housing and Community Services Committee and Leisure and Environment Committee had considered the way in which grant aid was administered at Committee level and whether the responsibility for grant aid should be brought together under one Committee to enable a strategic approach to grant aid to be taken. From 1989 until the first "interim" Constitution in May 2000, grants to voluntary organisations had been the responsibility of the Policy and Resources Committee (through Resources and IT Sub-Committee). For the past four years the Housing and Community Services Committee had assumed responsibility for the funding of health and social care type organisations, while grants to cultural and sporting organisations had come under the auspices of the Leisure and Environment Committee. Both Committees considered that in the light of current strategic priorities the Corporate Management Committee would be the most appropriate body to deal with grant aid, to ensure that the support given was consistent with Council policy and to provide a global, corporate perspective when determining grant support for organisations. The Corporate Management Committee concurred with this view.

RECOMMEND that -

grant support to leisure related voluntary organisations and health and social care organisations be administered centrally by the Corporate Management Committee with immediate effect.

COUNCIL TAX DISCOUNTS ON EMPTY AND SECOND HOMES

(Ref: Minutes of Corporate Management Committee, January 2004, page 1169, para. 619)

The Committee considered the case for exercising the Council's discretion to reduce Council Tax discounts on empty and second homes. The Local Government Act 1992, under which the Council Tax had been introduced, provided for dwellings that were empty or were second homes to be awarded a 50 per cent discount on the Council Tax. The Local Government Act 2003 gave billing authorities the discretion to reduce Council Tax discounts for second homes to 10% and empty homes to nil. Caravans, moorings or homes occupied in connection with employment did not count as second homes. While the discretion to change the rate of discount was exercised by the billing authority (i.e. Runnymede Borough Council), the additional tax raised by reducing discounts on second homes was shared by all the precepting authorities in proportion to their share of the Council Tax. In the case of empty homes, the additional tax was taken into account in the calculation of the Council's entitlement to Revenue Support Grant. The Committee had resolved in January 2004 to defer a decision on reducing discounts, pending discussions with Surrey County Council and other Surrey Districts on the possibility of the totality of the funds being used by the Districts on a suitable initiative such as key worker housing or affordable homes.

Most Surrey Districts had decided to exercise their discretion and the Committee noted the position across Surrey.

The number of properties in Runnymede that were currently second homes or long-term empty homes were as follows:-

Second and empty homes in Runnymede		
Band	Second homes	Empty homes
A	27	37
B	12	28
C	44	102
D	50	94
E	44	47
F	18	32
G	45	34
H	51	22
Total	291	396

The additional tax revenues from reducing discounts on second homes were retained locally. In the case of empty homes, the additional revenues were normally offset by a reduction in formula grant from the Government. An exception to this arrangement was when a Council received grant protection in its formula grant. This applied to Runnymede, and the expectation was that the Council would benefit from increased tax revenues because the change in the tax base would not change grant entitlement while it was below the grant floor.

The financial implications of the Council exercising its maximum discretion for both second homes and empty homes based on the level of Council Tax charged in 2004/05 were as follows:-

Additional revenues from reduced discounts		
	Second homes discount reduced from 50% to 10%	Empty homes discount reduced from 50% to nil
Runnymede BC	£15,000	£34,900
Surrey CC	£132,800	£308,400
Surrey Police	£22,000	£51,000
Total	£169,800	£394,300

If Surrey County Council and Surrey Police agreed to their share being transferred to Runnymede, the reduction in second home discounts could generate an additional £169,800 for affordable housing. As long as Runnymede's grant was unaffected, this could be supplemented by an additional £34,900 from the reduction in empty homes discounts. The additional revenues from empty homes that would be distributed to the County Council and the Police (totalling £359,400) would not be available because this would be offset by grant loss.

It was unfortunate that no County-wide agreement on these discretions had yet been reached to achieve a consistent approach across the County. However, the Committee agreed that the Council should exercise its discretion with effect from 1 April 2005 to reduce discounts to the minimum permitted and use the proceeds to fund affordable housing. This would promote the Council's housing objectives and would allow empty houses to be brought back into use. It was not envisaged that the definition of affordable housing in this context would be a narrow one. Officers at Surrey County Council had indicated that they would support a proposal for Runnymede to retain the County Council's share of the second-home discounts to fund affordable housing but this would need to be agreed by the County's Executive. No response had been received as yet from the police authority. Officers would endeavour to reach a formal agreement on this issue with both the County Council and the Police Authority before 1 April 2005 and the Committee agreed that their support for the discretion being exercised would be contingent upon such an agreement being achieved.

RESOLVED that -

- i) the Council exercise its discretion to reduce Council Tax discounts on second homes from 50% to 10% with effect from 1 April 2005 provided that both Surrey County Council and Surrey Police agree to their share of the income which will be generated from this reduction being transferred to Runnymede Borough Council;**
- ii) the Council exercise its discretion to reduce Council Tax discounts on empty homes from 50% to nil with effect from 1 April 2005; and**
- iii) the Director of Finance, in consultation with the Director of Administration and Leisure, be authorised to reach agreement with Surrey County Council and Surrey Police Authority to retain the additional tax revenues from the reduction in second home discounts for the purpose of funding the provision of affordable housing.**

DETERMINATION OF THE COUNCIL'S TAX BASE FOR 2005/06

The Committee considered the Council's Tax base for the 2005/06 financial year. It was noted that under Section 84 of the Local Government Act 2003, a full Council meeting was no longer required to adopt the Council Tax base that was used when setting Council Taxes. The determination could now be delegated by the Authority in accordance with section 101 of the Local Government Act 1972. The Committee accordingly agreed to recommend that the tax base be determined by the Director of Finance in future with a report being made to an appropriate meeting of the Committee for information.

Earlier in the meeting the Committee had resolved that the Council exercise its discretion to reduce Council Tax discounts on second homes from 50% to 10% with effect from 1 April 2005 provided that both Surrey County Council and Surrey Police agreed to their share of the income which would be generated from this reduction being transferred to Runnymede Borough Council. The outcome of this would affect the calculation of the Council tax base. Using the authority given, however, the Director of Finance would be able to adjust the Council's tax base figure if agreement had been secured.

RESOLVED that -

- i) the report of the Director of Finance for the calculation of the Council's tax base for the 2005/06 financial year be approved as set out in Appendix 'A' and it be noted that the final figure may change depending upon whether Surrey County Council and Surrey Police agree to their share of the income which would be generated from a reduction in Council Tax discounts on second homes for 50% to 10% being transferred to Runnymede Borough Council; and**
- ii) pursuant to this report, and in accordance with the Local Authorities' (calculation of the Council Tax Base) Regulations 1992, the amount calculated by Runnymede Borough Council as its tax base for the year 2005/06 shall be 32,776, subject to an appropriate adjustment being made if the agreement referred to at i) above is not obtained.**

RECOMMEND that -

the Director of Finance be authorised to determine the Council's tax base in future for report to an appropriate meeting of this Committee as a matter for information.

FUND MANAGER ARRANGEMENTS AND REVISION OF THE TREASURY MANAGEMENT AND ANNUAL INVESTMENT STRATEGIES

(Ref: Minutes of Corporate Management Committee, February 2004, page 1224, para. 684, and page 1226, para. 685)

The Committee noted the arrangements for the transfer of funds following the recent decision to appoint Alliance Capital as the Council's fund manager. They considered the investment parameters within which Alliance Capital would be required to operate along with revisions to the Council's Treasury Management Practices and Schedules, and the Annual Investment Strategy for 2004/05. The appointment of Sterling Consultancy Services as the Council's treasury management consultants for a further three-year term was also considered.

The Corporate Management Committee had approved the appointment of Alliance Capital as the Council's new fund manager, to replace Investec and Invesco, at its meeting on 30 September 2004. This decision followed a market testing exercise and deliberations carried out by the Member Working Group set up for this purpose. The transfer of funds to the new fund manager was expected to be complete by the end of January 2005. Alliance Capital would be asked to explain their treasury strategy in their quarterly reports to the Council and would make a presentation to the Corporate Management Committee twice a year to explain their performance and future strategy.

The amount under external management by Invesco and Investec currently stood at around £22.5 million. This had grown as interest earnings had been allowed to accumulate in the funds. With the prospect of the amount available for investment declining, it was proposed to place £20 million with Alliance Capital, thereby avoiding the need to withdraw any funds for the next twelve months. It was then anticipated that £5 million would have to be withdrawn in the last quarter of 2005/06. In order to avoid the need for the fund manager to make forced sales of investments (at what might be an inopportune time), any withdrawals would be carefully planned.

Alliance Capital's strategy of seeking to achieve performance in a wide range of financial instruments offered the Council the best prospect of outperforming money market rates with the minimum risk having regard to the reduced level of funds available for investments. However,

revisions were needed to the Council's Treasury Management Practices and Schedules and Annual Investment Strategy in order to implement this. The Committee also considered the investment parameters for Alliance Capital. Regulations required that all the investments were made in sterling rather than euros. The Council had supplied Alliance with a list of institutions which Officers considered appropriate for investment. The funds managed by the Fund managers were held by custodian banks. Time periods for investment were constrained by the life of the portfolio and the reduction in the total value of the fund (from £22.5 million to £20 million).

A copy of the Treasury Policy Statement was noted by the Committee. There would be no need to change this overarching statement. The Treasury Management Practices did not require major revision as these represented general principles and good practice in treasury activities. The Treasury Management Schedules contained the Council's detailed policies and these formed an integral part of the day-to-day treasury management activities. The Schedules had been revised to take into consideration the replacement of the old capital finance regime with the new Prudential Capital Finance System. This included removing references to terms such as Approved Investments and revoked Orders and Regulations, and the replacement of these with the new rules and terminology. Recognition of the new requirement for an Annual Investment Strategy was now included. In particular, Treasury Management Schedule 4 "Approved Instruments, methods and techniques" had been amended to refer to the Annual Investment Strategy rather than duplicating the contents of the Strategy. The various Government Orders and Regulations issued in 2004 had been taken into consideration and the terminology and completeness of the Schedules had been updated.

A treasury management consultant was required to advise on counterparty lists, investments, the performance of the Council's external fund manager and to provide interest rate and economic forecasts. These services had been tendered every three years. Sterling Consultancy Services had won the last tender in October 2001 and their contract had now expired. Officers had been very satisfied with the services provided by them. On the last occasion that tenders were invited, the tender submitted by Sterling Consultancy Services was the lowest and they had agreed to hold their price at the current level. The Committee therefore agreed that Sterling Consultancy Services should be reappointed as the Council's treasury management consultant until October 2007.

The Committee also considered an Annual Investment Strategy for 2005/06. The Government had issued statutory guidance to local authorities advising that local authorities should invest prudently with priority given to security and liquidity rather than yield. This approach was inherent in the Council's current treasury management strategy.

The guidance required local authorities to approve their credit ratings for specified Investments (those offering high security and high liquidity) and include monitoring arrangements and policies for non-specified investments and long term investments in their Annual Investment Strategy. Investments made with other local authorities or the Government automatically counted as specified investments. In addition, investments with counter parties that had high credit ratings would count as specified investments. It was for each authority to determine the credit ratings that were appropriate. All specified investments had to be made in sterling and with a maturity of no more than one year. Non-specified investments were all other types of investments apart from specified investments. For Runnymede, in-house managed investments that would fall under the non-specified investments category were those made with certain building societies and those which were occasional long-term investments. Not all building societies had obtained credit ratings. However, because the building society sector was highly regulated and well supervised by the Building Societies Commission, it was prudent to invest with those organisations.

Long term investments were those with a duration over 364 days. The Authority was required to set out its procedures for determining the maximum periods for which investments could be made. This requirement was intended to make the Council fully aware of the risks of investing funds over longer periods, particularly of the liquidity (how quickly they could be recalled and at what cost) of such investments. The guidance also required the Authority to decide on the proportion (or amount) of investments that were held short-term. The Annual Investment Strategy also applied to investments made by external fund managers and, therefore, the investment parameters agreed with fund managers had been drafted so that they were consistent with the Strategy.

The Annual Investment Strategy included a new power to invest in "Floating Rate Notes" (FRNs). The Council's newly appointed external fund managers, Alliance Capital, who were due to take

over in the New Year, had recommended that these instruments be made available to be used in the correct circumstances to enable returns to be enhanced commensurate with the minimisation of risk. However, under the current Government rules, FRNs counted as capital expenditure. This meant that these transactions would have to be accounted for as capital payments and (when repaid) as capital receipts. The Director of Finance would monitor the use of FRNs to ensure that the Council had sufficient capital resources (i.e. capital receipts) to avoid the need to use revenue resources or prudential borrowing to cover investments made in FRNs. Accounting for investments in FRNs as a capital item would also lead to a rather peculiar look to the Council's accounts if turnover in these instruments was high.

The Committee noted that the revisions to the Annual Investment Strategy included reference to new investment facilities and opportunities (e.g. forward lending), and investments that constituted capital expenditure (e.g. Floating Rate Notes). There were also changes to recognise the appointment of Alliance Capital as fund managers, to up-date the terminology and completeness of the Strategy, and a new policy regarding accounting for possible credit losses (if any were to arise). At the time when Alliance Capital took over from Invesco and Investec as external fund managers, the document would be amended to reflect that change.

RESOLVED that -

- i) the investment parameters within which Alliance Capital will be required to operate as set out in Appendix 'B' be approved;**
- ii) the revised Treasury Management Practices and Schedules as set out in Appendices 'C' and 'D' be approved; and**
- iii) Sterling Consultancy Services be reappointed as the Council's Treasury Management Consultant until October 2007.**

RECOMMEND that -

the revised Annual Investment Strategy for 2004/05 as set out in Appendix 'E' be approved.

SURREY PENSION FUND

The Committee noted the publication of a draft Funding Strategy Statement for the Surrey Pension Fund by Surrey County Council and the initial results of the Actuary's valuation of the Surrey Pension Fund at 31 March 2004.

The Committee agreed that the publication of the draft strategy statement was a welcome development. Along with the statement of investment principles, it represented a clear and transparent statement of the way the Pension Fund would be managed. It included an evaluation of risks and the measures taken to control or react to those occurrences. While the statement had been drafted before the results of the 2004 actuarial valuation were known, it was written in the expectation that there would be a significant deterioration in the funding level. The steps taken to mitigate the impact of the actuarial valuation would have significant revenue implications for each of the employing bodies. The period over which deficits were recovered had been lengthened from 13 to 20 years and would spread the increased liability resulting from the actuarial valuation, as stated below.

While it was possible for each employing body to have a different funding policy, this would require each employer to take its own funding advice. This would be a major departure from current practice. Although the Actuary had reported separate valuations and contribution rates for each contributing employer to the Fund since 1995, a common strategy had always been applied to the whole Fund. In view of the poor results reported below, the Committee wished to keep open the option of operating a Pension Fund independently or with one or more other local authorities.

The Actuary had just released some initial data to Officers which disclosed a position that was much worse than was anticipated. Rather than withhold this information to the next Committee cycle, by which time more details would be available, the position for Runnymede's element of the Fund was summarised so that the Committee was aware of the position in advance of receiving a full report on the fund valuation.

The Actuary's latest calculations showed that the portion of the fund allocated to Runnymede had declined from a funding level of 84.1% at 31 March 2001 to 82.9% at 31 March 2004. This compared with a funding level of 68.2% for the fund as a whole.

The Actuary anticipated an increase in employer's contributions in order to pay for the future costs of current employees as well as the accumulated deficit. For Runnymede, the current figures indicated meant an increase in the total employer's contribution rate from 17.6% at the 2001 valuation to 18.3% in 2004 as shown below:-

	2001	2004
Future Service Rate	9.96%	12.5%
Backfunding Rate	7.68%	5.8%
Total Contribution Rate	17.64%	18.3%

The Council had made a lump sum contribution of £5,729,000 to the Fund in 2002/03 in order to fully fund the Runnymede element of the Fund on the basis of the 2001 valuation. As a result, no further annual deficit payments had been required in 2003/04 or 2004/05. On the latest actuarial calculations, these would have to resume in 2005/06. Assuming an annual contribution of £441,000, it meant that the Council's total pension costs were likely to be £1,519,000 in 2005/06. This represented an increase of £668,000 on the amount included in the 2004/05 Budget. The recent Financial Forecast assumed that pension costs would increase General Fund expenditure by £100,000 in 2005/06, and the increase in prospect for the General Fund was £466,000 more than the amount reflected in the Council's financial plans. The figures quoted were provisional at this stage and further information was expected from the Actuary in December for the purposes of compiling the Council's 2005/06 Budget.

The Committee was most concerned about the detrimental effect of the actuarial valuation on the Council's finances and agreed to receive a full report to a future meeting. Members would need a proper understanding of the actuarial assumptions that had produced such a poor valuation result and an assurance that the Actuary had taken account of the timing of Runnymede's lump sum payment in 2002.

RESOLVED that -

the Director of Finance report back to a future meeting of the Committee with a full analysis of the reasons for the deterioration in the funding level of Runnymede's share of the Surrey Pension Fund.

STAFF SURVEY

(Ref: Minutes of Corporate Management Committee, November 2003, page 922, para.439)

The Committee was apprised of the results of the recent Staff Survey. The last comprehensive Staff Survey had been undertaken in 2003. The Corporate Management Committee at its meeting in November 2003 had called for a further Staff Survey to be undertaken in 2004. As before, Surrey Social and Market Research (SSMR) at the University of Surrey had been selected to undertake the Survey on behalf of the Authority. UNISON comments on the survey were noted. A 49% response rate had been achieved, identical to 2003. SSMR confirmed that this was a very satisfactory response rate. Following consultation with the Member Working Group, the areas surveyed and the questions asked were similar to those included in the 2003 Survey. In general, the Survey covered staff's views on employment terms and conditions, training and development, performance appraisal and performance related pay, internal communications and understanding of core values. Whilst the report indicated generally a high level of satisfaction by Runnymede staff some aspects appeared to offer the potential for further improvement. At its meeting on 11 November 2004, the Personnel Services Member Working Group had noted the generally positive responses by staff but recognised that in some areas there remained scope for improvements particularly in terms of certain respects of communications.

Whilst Runnymede as an employer was still rated highly in its provision of training opportunities for staff, it was disappointing to note that the level of training activity had declined since the 2003 survey. There was no obvious explanation for this result as training continued to feature as a high priority. Anecdotal evidence had suggested that this could be due in part to the enormous amount of additional work involved in the preparation for CPA which precluded some staff involvement in

training activities. It was hoped that normal levels of training could be restored. The Committee agreed that the Personnel Member Working Group investigate sharing good practice on training with other Surrey districts, to develop and foster a holistic approach.

A decrease in job satisfaction had been recorded since 2003. This appeared to be linked to the volume of work being expected of staff and the stress this was causing. Directors would continue to bring to Members' attention in the Annual Report on Personnel any staffing issues that needed to be addressed that had been identified in the annual appraisal programme. Training would be made available for managers in the identification and resolving of stress issues of their staff.

Whilst a marginal improvement had been recorded in staff's perception of the effectiveness of internal communications there was still scope for further improvement. It was anticipated that the imminent appointment of the Communications Officer would have a positive effect on this issue. The Committee agreed that the Personnel Services Member Working Group look at giving the Communications Officer targets in relation to internal communications.

There continued to be a perception amongst a sizeable number of Runnymede staff that salaries were not competitive but the work which Members had authorised to be undertaken on salary benchmarking and job evaluation should result in a more objective approach which would demonstrate more clearly to staff how their salaries compared in the general marketplace.

The initiatives introduced by Members as a result of the 2003 survey had clearly been appreciated by staff. The only exception had been the introduction of a Childcare Vouchers scheme. Despite initial interest there had been no take up on this facility. Possibly, with changes in tax concessions in 2005 this facility might become more attractive. Some interest had been expressed in the reintroduction of the Personal Computer (PC) Loan scheme which had been withdrawn last year. In recent months a Government sponsored 'Home Computers Initiative' scheme had been introduced which offered staff the opportunity to purchase home PCs at preferential rates by way of a tax efficient methodology. A number of providers offered such a scheme, including 'Futuremedia' which ran a joint scheme for Surrey Authorities. The Committee agreed that these latest options should be investigated and if appropriate and subject to no direct cost falling on the Authority, the Chief Executive Officer in conjunction with the Director of Administration and Leisure and the Director of Finance be authorised to approve the introduction of a suitable scheme.

The provision of staff catering, shower facilities and lockers would be dealt with as part of the new Civic Offices project. Satisfaction with the Appraisal and Performance Related Pay schemes continued to decline. This was a matter that was being dealt with by the Member Working Group and recommendations would come forward in due course. This was an issue which had been highlighted by UNISON.

The Committee agreed that it would be appropriate to conduct another Staff Survey in 2006. Otherwise staff would tire of continually filling in surveys and this would also allow the results to be reported to the Council's next Comprehensive Performance Assessment inspection in 2007.

The staff's overall perception of Runnymede had improved since 2003. This had no doubt been aided by the excellent Comprehensive Performance Assessment result. Whilst rating of employment in Local Government generally had declined, the rating of Runnymede had seen a marginal improvement. However, staff perception that Runnymede Councillors had a clear vision of aims and priorities continued to decline as did the numbers of staff who thought that the Members of the authority understood their needs. It was agreed that the Personnel Member Working Group should look at ways of disseminating Member objectives through the appraisal process so that staff had a clearer understanding of what the Council Members required. It was also agreed that the Member Working Group should examine ways of encouraging new staff to attend Committee meetings so that staff could see the decision making process in action.

RESOLVED that -

- i) if appropriate, and subject to no direct cost falling on the Authority, the Chief Executive Officer in consultation with the Director of Administration and Leisure and the Director of Finance be authorised to approve the introduction of a suitable Home Computer Scheme;**

- ii) **the Personnel Member Working Group look at ways of implementing the following action -**
- a) **giving the Communications Officer specific targets in relation to internal communications;**
 - b) **exploring the possibility of sharing good practice on training with other Surrey districts;**
 - c) **making Member objectives clear through the appraisal process; and**
 - d) **encouraging new staff to attend Committee meetings.**
- iii) **a further Staff Survey be undertaken in two years time to ascertain the level of improvement that has been achieved during the intervening period.**

FLEXIBLE WORKING HOURS

(Ref: Minutes of Corporate Management Committee, November 2003, page 922, para.439)

Members were apprised of the results of a pilot extension to the Flexible Working Hours Scheme at the Civic Offices. The Corporate Management Committee had approved the trial of a pilot scheme to review the extent to which current Flexitime arrangements could be varied without an adverse effect on services and Directors had approved the circulation of a staff survey on the matter circulated to all Civic Offices staff in January 2004. A 54% response rate had been achieved for the survey with good representation from all categories of Civic Office staff. When the results of the survey had been circulated to staff, 87% of respondents supported the results.

Following further discussion in April 2004 between staff and the Civic Offices Reprovision Flexible Working Sub-Group, the Directors had agreed that the following arrangements would be trialed throughout the Civic Offices for a period of up to six months, commencing 1 July 2004 and that after three months the trial would be evaluated and a report submitted to Members via Directors:-

- Bandwidth to be extended to 7 a.m. - 7 p.m.
- Coretime to be reduced to 10 a.m. - 4 p.m.
- Lunch Period to be amended to a maximum of 2 hours to be taken between 11.30 a.m. - 2.30 p.m. (minimum 30 minutes break unaffected).
- Carry Forward time to be increased to 15 hours per month debit/credit.

A further survey of Civic Offices staff had been conducted in September. The results were noted by the Committee. There appeared to be overwhelming support for the continuation of the trial arrangements on a permanent basis as the additional flexibility was a facility that was valued by staff and there was little evidence that services had been affected adversely. As evidenced in the September survey, there was strong general support for increasing the extent of flexibility of the current Flexitime Scheme and bringing Runnymede's Scheme in line with neighbouring Authorities. Both staff and managers were confident that (as required by the policy), such extensions would not have an adverse effect on services and, on the contrary, would provide better opportunities for the public to be met by appointment outside normal office opening hours as necessary. Increased flexibility combined with extended homeworking would also contribute to resolving the potential (and current) car parking problem. The extent, however, to which staff could work flexibly or were able to work from home would be largely dependent on the nature of their duties.

UNISON had welcomed the proposal to continue the arrangements on a permanent basis, but as not all staff were able to benefit from these arrangements had urged the Committee to determine some appropriate form of compensation for those members of staff. Officers did not consider that this was appropriate and the Committee concurred with that view.

RESOLVED that -

- i) **with effect from 1 January 2005, the Flexitime Scheme at the Civic Offices be amended as follows, subject to a core customer service time of 8.30 a.m. to 5.00 p.m. Mondays to Thursdays and 8.30 a.m. to 4.30 p.m. on Fridays being maintained:-**

- **Bandwidth to be extended to 7 a.m. to 7 p.m.**
- **Coretime to be reduced to 10 a.m. - 4 p.m.**
- **Lunch Period to be amended to a maximum of 2 hours to be taken between 11.30 a.m. - 2.30 p.m. (minimum 30 minutes break unaffected)**
- **Carry Forward time to be increased to 15 hours per month debit/credit; and**

- ii) **extension of flexitime and flexileave be reviewed in 2006 or earlier if Officers deem it appropriate.**

REVIEW OF STAFF TERMS AND CONDITIONS

(Ref: Minutes of Corporate Management Committee, 30 September 2004, page 341, para.248)

The Committee received a report on progress regarding the introduction of a formal Job Evaluation Scheme in the Authority and considered further action needed to implement the Scheme. The recommendations contained within the report had been supported by the Personnel Services Member Working Group at its meeting on 11 November 2004.

At the meeting of the Corporate Management Committee in September 2003, Members had considered a report recommending the introduction of a job sizing/ranking system. Members had decided to appoint a consultant to undertake a more comprehensive review including, inter alia, the introduction of a formal Job Evaluation Scheme. Following a tendering exercise, Tribal GWT HR Consulting had been appointed. A considerable amount of work had been undertaken by Tribal, Council Officers and UNISON in the development of an in-house Job Evaluation Scheme. However, it had become apparent that the original objective of designing a "simple" scheme that met equal pay standards was not achievable. After reviewing potential suitable products, which had already been developed and were tried and tested at other authorities and might be adapted for use at Runnymede, Members had decided that the Greater London Provincial Council (GLPC) Job Evaluation scheme offered the most satisfactory solution for the Authority and the services of Tribal Consulting were accordingly terminated.

Following a meeting of a cross party Member Working Group in May 2004, presentations had been made to staff and Members by the GLPC and the appropriate Management, UNISON and Personnel representatives had been trained as evaluators in the scheme. Once trained, panels of evaluators had worked in tandem during July, August and September 2004 undertaking trial evaluations of a 10% sample of jobs across the Authority. The trials had identified a number of problems. The scheme had proved to be very labour intensive, both from the aspect of completion of questionnaires by staff and their managers and the actual evaluations by the panels. It had been estimated that in rolling out the scheme, up to 1500 staff hours would be required for completion of questionnaires and in excess of 1000 staff hours would be required for evaluations. The questionnaires were complex and difficult to complete. This often resulted in incomplete, misleading or incorrect data being used by evaluators, which in turn resulted in incorrect evaluations. Supporting Job Descriptions were often incomplete, out of date or missing completely. A sample quality check by GLPC of the evaluations had suggested that Runnymede evaluators (who were trained by GLPC) were not always applying the scheme correctly, resulting in a number of jobs being undervalued. One reason for this might be the difference in scale and individual staff duties and responsibilities between London Boroughs (for whom the scheme was originally designed) and smaller Districts such as Runnymede.

The September 2004 Committee had been advised that the matters referred to above would need to be resolved before the scheme could be recommended for rolling out across the Authority and that a further report would be submitted in due course. Further consultation had therefore taken place between staff, management and UNISON. Conventions had been drafted for use by evaluators that would contribute to a better understanding of the criteria for the various factor levels in the scheme. All Job Descriptions were to be reviewed, updated and reformatted as part of this year's appraisal programme. Revised guidance notes had been produced, and the Job Evaluation Questionnaire had been redrafted and redesigned. A Procedural Agreement and Code of Practice had been drafted and agreed at Officer level and further discussions had taken place with GLPC.

The Committee agreed that the services of a trained job analyst would be used in future to interview staff and managers and to prepare reports for use by the evaluation panels. This would save time and ensure that questionnaires were completed accurately and consistently. The GLPC would be able to provide this support together with ad hoc consultancy and training as necessary. Once the

evaluations had been completed and scored, recommendations could be brought forward on an appropriate points/grading matrix and salaries structure that would determine the actual salary scales to be applied in each case.

Ideally, the introduction of a Job Evaluation Scheme should not result in too much cost or disruption and changes of grade (both up and down) should be minimal. It was therefore agreed that once the evaluations had been completed, the points/grading schedule should be constructed so that no more than 10% of staff suffered a downgrading of their posts.

The GLPC Scheme recommended the adoption of a Code of Practice for use by participating Authorities. The detail of the Code had been discussed with UNISON and the joint proposals had been considered by the Member Working Group. The Committee accordingly considered the Code.

In accordance with national UNISON's requirements, the Runnymede Branch of UNISON had conducted a 'quick ballot' of all its Members, asking them whether they wished to accept the GLPC scheme in principle prior to the determination of a points to grading relationship. 46% of the membership voted. 72% voted to accept the scheme in principle and 25% voted not to accept it. 3% abstained. Therefore, the Runnymede branch of UNISON accepted in principle the introduction of the GLPC job evaluation scheme.

UNISON was very keen for the GLPC scheme to be implemented successfully, and was continuing to work with the Personnel Officer to ensure that this could be done, through training, the drawing up of suitable conventions, a draft Procedural Agreement and Code of Practice and by making information on the scheme readily available to staff, and being available to answer queries on it. The Branch Committee would seek more UNISON volunteers to become evaluators. UNISON accepted the recommendations in the report but stated its wish, which was supported by the Regional branch of UNISON, for elected Members to be trained in the scheme so that they would be better qualified to consider any appeals made on the process. UNISON thought Member training might also lessen the incidence of employees taking claims to Employment Tribunals. In response to these comments, it was suggested by a Member of the Committee that a Member of the Standards and Audit Committee of the Council might be trained in the scheme. UNISON was confident that the scheme could be properly applied and hoped that the number of appeals would be very low as a consequence.

Staffing resources within the Personnel section were already stretched and were the lowest amongst the Surrey Districts. Current staffing resources within the section would need to be enhanced in order to accommodate the additional workload and the Committee agreed an increase of an additional seven hours per week on a permanent basis for the part time post of Senior Personnel Assistant at a cost of £5,000 per annum. The situation would need to be reviewed once the system had bedded in. In addition, a temporary administrative support resource would be required in order to accommodate the considerable additional workload during implementation. A budgetary provision of £7,000 for this was agreed.

Furthermore, it was agreed that in order to compensate those staff involved in the evaluation and appeals panels who were needing to accommodate this additional work over and above their existing workload with no additional support or assistance, a special job evaluation allowance equivalent to the individual's hourly rate of pay be paid for all time spent on the evaluation of posts and subsequent appeals. For other staff the additional workload might also require some overtime working. On the basis of two panels meeting each week for a half day session each, the exercise could be completed in 40 weeks at a cost of around £22,000 for job evaluation allowances and overtime payments. Apart from the two Personnel representatives who would need to participate each week, the other panel members drawn from a trained pool of Management and UNISON representatives would each participate on average for one half day every three weeks. It was agreed that additional training be provided to increase the pool of trained evaluators at a cost of £1,500.

The services of a trained job analyst were needed in order to achieve a consistency of approach, provide more reliable data for the panels and reduce time spent by staff and their Managers. The GLPC were able to provide such an analyst who was very experienced in the scheme and would provide an independent element that would provide reassurance for staff. Budgetary provision of £25,000 was agreed for this work at a rate of £300 per day. In addition budgetary provision of up to £10,000 was agreed to meet GLPC consultancy support as necessary and a sum of £5,000 was approved for the purchase and tailoring of a suitable database system for recording, cross referencing and reporting on evaluation results.

The setting up and associated costs totalled £70,500 and would be incurred over the next two years. An ongoing resource totalling £5,000 per annum, relating to additional staffing hours in Personnel to support/maintain and review the scheme was also agreed. The one-off costs could be met from the Leader's Position Statement provision.

RESOLVED that -

- i) the GLPC Job Evaluation Scheme be introduced for all relevant posts up to and including Director level;**
- ii) the code of practice detailed at Appendix 'F' be adopted;**
- iii) once all evaluations have been completed a points/grading schedule and salary structure that results in no more than 10% of staff suffering a downgrade of their post be brought back to this Committee for consideration;**
- iv) the services of a trained job analyst be utilised in the gathering of data for the evaluation panels at a cost of £25,000;**
- v) a provision of £30,500 be made to meet the staff related costs of implementation;**
- vi) GLPC consultancy support be made available as necessary up to a maximum cost of £10,000;**
- vii) a sum of £5,000 be approved for the purchase and tailoring of a suitable database system for the recording, cross referencing and reporting of evaluation results;**
- viii) a sum of £70,500 be made available from the Leader's Position Statement provision to meet these one-off costs in 2004/05 and 2005/06; and**
- ix) budgetary provision in relation to the ongoing Personnel resource of £5,000 per annum be made in 2005/06 and thereafter.**

OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH PROVISION

Approval was sought to reappoint Ashford and St. Peter's Hospital NHS Trust as the Council's Occupational Health provider. The Council required the services of a trained Occupational Health Physician for various purposes. This service had been provided since 1996 by the Ashford and St. Peter's Hospital NHS Trust. The current contract at a cost of £5,964 per annum, expired on 31 March 2005. The Ashford and St. Peter's Hospital NHS Trust had provided an excellent service to the Authority and following recommendation by Runnymede were now also employed by some neighbouring Authorities. Suitably qualified Occupational Health Physicians were scarce and the Authority was most fortunate to have secured this service from a local provider. The Ashford and St. Peter's Hospital NHS Trust had provided a quotation to continue to provide an Occupational Health Service to the Authority for a further three years from April 2005 of £6,453 per annum inclusive of 20 hours of counselling and all current services.

The revised cost represented an increase of 8.2% over the three year period which was in line with inflation. Normally, contracts of this size required competitive tenders. The Committee agreed that the quotation provided by Ashford and St. Peter's Hospital NHS Trust represented excellent value for money and that alternative local providers would be difficult to source (if indeed they actually existed). The Committee therefore agreed to waive Standing Orders in this case.

RESOLVED that -

Standing Orders requiring competitive tendering be waived and that Ashford and St. Peter's Hospital NHS Trust be appointed as the Council's Occupational

Health provider for the period 1 April 2005 to 31 March 2008 at a cost of £6,453 per annum.

PROPOSED WORKSHOP FACILITY AT CHERTSEY DEPOT

Approval was sought to make a Planning Application for the construction of a workshop building at Chertsey Depot if, on assessment of the tenders, it proved to be a viable option in procuring the new vehicles for the Council's Direct Services Organisation. This issue would normally be submitted to the Economic Development Committee but in view of the possible need to obtain Planning Permission before the Economic Development Committee met, it was considered by the Corporate Management Committee with the agreement of the Chairman of the Economic Development Committee.

In order to comply with the Council's Standing Orders and legislation an advertisement had been placed in the European Journal in June 2004 inviting vehicle supply companies to express their interest in submitting tenders for the supply of vehicles to the Council's DSO based at the Chertsey Depot in Ford Road. Approximately twenty-five vehicles were required. Twenty-one companies had responded to the European Journal advertisement. A questionnaire and the required vehicle specifications were sent to these companies to gain specific information about the parts of the required services that they could supply. Officers used a selection criteria model to assess the resulting submissions for quality and value for money and chose seven preferred tenderers. At its meeting on 16 September 2004 the Leisure and Environment Committee approved the shortlist of seven companies and the tender documents had been sent to these companies during the week beginning 22 November 2004. Tenderers were being asked to specify the maintenance arrangements they would prefer and their effect on the tender price. Their attention was being drawn to the possibility of creating a proper maintenance workshop at the Chertsey Depot. A broad range of options for provision and use was identified, including Council build and contractor build.

There were a number of reasons why a maintenance workshop might be required. The servicing and maintenance of the vehicles were key elements of the service as the vehicles had to undergo frequent safety checks and servicing. The equipment on the vehicles was becoming increasingly sophisticated and was vulnerable to breakdown. It was vital that the time in carrying out the checks, servicing and repairs was minimal but experience had shown that servicing facilities in the Runnymede area were difficult to find. The DSO vehicles were currently serviced at Spelthorne Borough Council's Depot. Staff time and vehicle use was lost in delivering vehicles to and collecting them from that depot and this arrangement could not be guaranteed in the future. Maintaining vehicles at Chertsey Depot would avoid the added pollution and contribution to congestion that the DSO vehicles would make in their journey to and from a remote facility. Routine safety checks were currently carried out in the open in all types of weather and often at night. Having a covered workshop facility at the Depot would improve the standard of these checks and would improve working conditions for the technicians that carried out the checks.

If the Council provided it, the proposed building would be a standard manufactured unit located at the eastern end of the Depot adjacent to the adjoining scrap metal site and away from neighbouring residential properties. Planning Permission would be required for the new unit and an application would need to be made as soon as possible so that time could be saved in erecting the building if this proved to be the most favourable option when the tenders had been assessed. In the event that the most favourable tenderer did not wish to use such a workshop facility and wanted to make other arrangements, then the provision of the workshop would not be made. The estimated cost of erecting such a building at the Depot was approximately £110,000. An Options Assessment and a business case would be prepared when the tenders had been assessed, if the workshop proved to be a viable option.

RESOLVED that -

a Planning Application be submitted for the erection of a workshop building of the type described in the report in case, on assessment of the tenders, this proves to be a viable option in procuring the new vehicles for the Refuse and Street Cleansing fleet.

Note: Councillor G.B.Woodger asked Officers to record that he would maintain an open mind on the consideration of any future planning application on the matter which may arise, and would reach a view based on the material considerations, professional advice and the law.

CALENDAR OF MEETINGS 2005/2006

The Committee considered the proposed Calendar of Meetings for the Municipal Year 2005/2006 and a full list of Licensing Sub-Committee dates. A return had been made to the usual May – May Municipal Year on the assumption that if a General Election was called it would be on the same day as the County Council Election in 2005 or Borough Election in 2006. 65 meetings of Licensing Sub-Committee had been programmed from 21 March 2005 – 29 July 2005, to be held on Monday (2 pm – 5 pm), Wednesday (10 am – 1 pm) and Friday (10 am – 1 pm). The volume of licensing workload was uncertain at this stage but it was likely to be heavy during the initial 4 months of operation. Other dates might need to be added from August onward, hopefully not on the same frequency, but Officers and Members would be in a better position to judge this once the new licensing regime had started. A suitable date in June for Members Training was discussed and the date for this was fixed for 14 June 2005.

RECOMMEND that –

the Calendar of Meetings for the Municipal Year 2005/2006 and schedule of Licensing Sub-Committee meetings, as set out in Appendix 'G', be approved.

PILOT COLLECTION OF GREEN WASTE - ADDITIONS TO THE ESTABLISHMENT

Approval was sought to establish four posts, initially to undertake a pilot scheme for the collection of green waste in part of the Borough and to waive Contract Standing Order C2 in order to purchase a suitable green waste collection vehicle which had already been identified by Officers.

At its meeting on 18 November 2004, the Leisure and Environment Committee approved the introduction of a pilot green waste scheme. For the pilot scheme to be effective an Assistant Recycling Officer was needed within the Environmental Protection division at the Civic Offices to co-ordinate it. A part-time administrative post was also required to deal with the additional enquiries and associated administrative work generated, along with a Driver and a Loader, all of whom would be employed at Chertsey Depot. Officers had identified a suitable green waste collection vehicle for use in the pilot scheme. The waiving of Contract Standing Order C2 was sought in order to purchase the vehicle without undertaking a tendering exercise as there would not be time to undertake this in view of the timescale imposed by DEFRA who required the scheme to be operational by February 2005. The scheme, which was supported by UNISON, would assist in meeting the Council's biodegradable municipal waste and Best Value Performance Indicator waste targets.

Participation in the green waste kerbside scheme would be voluntary and chargeable. Experience of other authorities providing a chargeable scheme was that between 10 and 20 percent of residents would be prepared to pay for a kerbside collection service. The charge would be set at a level, in the region of £30 a year, which would ensure that the service broke even. All other local authorities who operated the scheme charged for it. There appeared to be a demand for the service, judging by the level of subscribers achieved in Guildford. It was envisaged that the service would be fortnightly and up to 26 collections a year would be made to residents taking part in the scheme. The scheme would reduce the amount of residual waste collected in the wheeled bin, enabling savings to be made on existing household refuse collection rounds and landfill deposits would also be lessened as a result.

The cost of the additional staff needed to implement the scheme would be covered by the charge to residents. In order to attract staff of sufficient quality, the posts would be permanent. Current levels of staff turnover would enable staff to be redeployed to other posts in the event that the pilot service was not successful and had to be withdrawn. If the pilot scheme was successful the potential to extend the service to other parts of the Borough would be considered. The possibility of joint working with neighbouring Spelthorne Borough Council was being investigated.

Government funding of £225,000 had been secured for this project from the Department for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) consisting of £200,000 capital costs for the purchase of a refuse collection vehicle and re useable polypropylene bags and a further £25,000 for the revenue start up costs for the current financial year. Costs of publicity were included. No funding would be available from April 2005 onwards. Financial details of the proposed service and the funding required were noted by the Committee.

The Council had the ability to withdraw or suspend the service if there was a poor take up which would make the service unviable and reallocate the resource to another project of like kind. It was unlikely that DEFRA would seek the return of the funding, particularly if another project could be agreed, but the standard conditions of grant provided that if the grant was used for any purposes other than those for which it was approved, DEFRA might, at its sole discretion, terminate the agreement forthwith and recover all or any part of the grant previously paid.

RESOLVED that -

- i) **the establishment of four posts, initially to undertake a pilot scheme for the collection of green waste in part of the Borough be approved as set out below:-**
- an Assistant Recycling Officer, to be recruited within the Environmental Protection division, on pay scale C/D to co-ordinate the scheme;**
- a part-time administrative post, on pay scale B, based at Chertsey Depot to deal with the additional enquiries and associated administrative work which will be generated by the pilot scheme; and**
- a driver and loader, each on standard DSO refuse collection service pay scales, also based at Chertsey Depot; and**
- ii) **Contract Standing Order C2 be waived in order to purchase a suitable green waste collection vehicle without undertaking a tendering process, to comply with the timescale set down by DEFRA.**

COMMUNITY MEALS SERVICE

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 discussions would be likely to involve disclosure of exempt information of the description specified in paragraph 9 of Schedule 12A of Part 1 of the Act.

The Committee considered options for the continuation of the Council's Community Meals Service which had been operating in its present format since 1999. The service consisted of delivery of hot meals to vulnerable people in their homes and was currently undertaken by a contractor (Apetito) responsible for the purchase and delivery of around 165 meals a day and the collection of the charges. The current contract expired in March 2005. The Council needed to finalise new arrangements for the service from April 2005 and to avoid any disruption in the provision of the service it was important that the contractual matters were settled in the near future to enable operational arrangements to be made in good time.

The service had recently been reviewed as part of the Best Value Review of Community Services. The Review concluded that the service should continue but that a report should be submitted to Members outlining the detailed financial and other implications of bringing the service back in-house. The Review also asked that consideration be given to extending the service to include delivery of meals at weekends.

Staff employed by the current contractor (Apetito) would be entitled to protection under the Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment) Regulations (TUPE). Therefore if the service was transferred to a new contractor, time would be needed to consult with staff on the proposed new arrangements before the contract commenced. In the event that a decision was made to proceed with an in-house service there was also a need to allow for time to secure the provision of vehicles and meals from a supplier and to make the necessary other personnel arrangements.

In order to provide adequate information regarding the likely cost of both external and internal provision of the service a formal tendering exercise had been undertaken. Unfortunately, however, it had not been possible for all of the tendering information to be received in time for the last Housing & Community Services Committee. As a result of the time constraints outlined above Officers advised that it would not be advantageous for a decision on this issue to be made at the next Housing & Community Services meeting in January. The Housing & Community Services Committee had

therefore agreed that the decision on the future provision of the service should be approved by the Corporate Management Committee.

The contract had been advertised in the European Journal on the basis of the provision of either a fully managed service or the Council managing the service but buying in meals and leasing delivery vehicles. Officers had produced a detailed evaluation of the three bids which had been made from outside companies as well as the in-house bid. The Committee noted technical and financial appraisals of the bids, assessed the risks in providing the service in-house, considered the extension of the service to cover weekends and the financial and personnel implications of different courses of action. The Committee concluded that the item should be deferred so that the option of delivering the service in combination with another Surrey based local authority could also be assessed. Officers advised that this was unlikely to be a more cost effective option and that it was not envisaged that any further economies of scale could be achieved. It was noted that it might be necessary to lengthen the current Apetito contract as a result of the deferral of a decision on the matter.

Members also considered which Committee should receive the further report now required. In view of time constraints, it was agreed that in order to give Housing Officers the flexibility to report on this as soon as possible, the report should be submitted to either the Housing and Community Services Committee or the Corporate Management Committee, after discussion with the relevant Chairmen. The resource implications which would arise would, in any case, need to be reported to the Corporate Management Committee.

RESOLVED that -

- i) the item be deferred for a further report as soon as possible to the Housing and Community Services Committee and/or the Corporate Management Committee, as selected after discussion with the relevant Chairmen;**
- ii) the further report at i) above should examine the possibility of providing the service in partnership with another local authority; and**
- iii) the Director of Housing and Community Services be authorised to agree an extension to the existing contract if required, in consultation with the Chairman of Housing and Community Services Committee.**

Note: Councillor P.B. Tuley and G.B. Woodger wished to be recorded as having abstained from voting on this item.

Chairman

(The meeting ended at 9.45 p.m.)

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Assumed National Council Tax (ANCT)	The difference between Total Assumed Spending and Aggregate External Finance is approximately the amount that would be raised in Council Tax if local authorities as a whole spent at the level of their Formula Spending Shares . Dividing this total amount by the total Council Tax base produces an assumed national tax rate. This then gives the standard level of Council Tax for a band D property if all authorities spent at the level of their Formula Spending Share. This amount is used to work out how the Revenue Support Grant should be shared between authorities. Formerly known as 'Council Tax for Standard Spending'.
Business Rates	Business rates are collected by the Council from business premises in the Borough and paid over to the national pool. This is redistributed to all Authorities on a population basis.
Council Tax	The Council Tax replaced the Community Charge from 1st April 1993. It is charged on all domestic properties in the Borough and will vary according to which Band the property has been placed in. Discounts will be applied to the charge if there are less than two liable adults living in the property.
Formula Grant	The amount paid by the Government in support of the Council's annual budget requirement. It comprises Revenue Support Grant and redistributed Business Rates .
National Non Domestic Rates (NNDR)	See Business Rates .
Revenue	Income and expenditure relating to the day to day running costs of the Authority.
Revenue Support Grant (RSG)	A Government grant to make up the shortfall between a local authority's Formula Spending Share and the amount it would receive from Assumed National Council Tax and redistributed business rates. The total amount is set out in Section 2 of the Local Government Finance Report.
Formula Spending Share (FSS)	The amount calculated by the Government which is a way of dividing up the national Total Assumed Spending between local authorities. This is not an assessment of the Council's real need to spend but an assessment of its relative entitlement to Formula Grant compared with all other authorities.
Tax Base	The amount of money that is raised for every £1 of Council Tax levied in the area. The tax base information used by the Government in the Grant Settlement is based on the actual position in October 2001. This differs from the tax base determined by the Council because the Council is required to take into account projected variations (new properties etc.) over the course of 2005/06.

Calculation of 2005/06 Formula Spending Share

1

Client Group	Additive Top-Ups				Density Top-Up £'s	Sparsity Top-Up £'s	Additive Top-Up Sub-Total £'s	Area Cost Top-Up %	Total Per Client £'s	Total Allocation	
	A	B	C	D							E
Total Resident Population	Basic Amount £'s	Deprivation Top-Up £'s	Visitors and Commuters Top-Up £'s	Density Top-Up £'s	Sparsity Top-Up £'s	Additive Top-Up Sub-Total £'s	Area Cost Top-Up %	Total Per Client £'s	Total Allocation		
SURREY											
Elmbridge	125,884	74.02	12.10	1.27	21.15	2.15	13.23%	110.68	14.64	125.33	15,776
Epsom and Ewell	67,710	74.02	12.29	1.47	22.56	0.95	13.23%	111.29	14.72	126.01	8,532
Guildford	130,978	74.02	11.81	1.55	17.82	7.86	13.23%	113.07	14.96	128.03	16,769
Mole Valley	80,760	74.02	11.15	1.55	13.56	10.61	13.23%	110.88	14.67	125.55	10,140
Reigate and Banstead	126,155	74.02	12.93	0.93	19.58	3.16	13.23%	110.62	14.63	125.25	15,801
Runnymede	78,238	74.02	12.16	1.82	18.85	3.98	13.23%	110.84	14.66	125.50	9,879
Spelthorne	88,993	74.02	14.50	1.54	24.38	1.57	13.23%	116.00	15.35	131.35	11,689
Surrey Heath	80,738	74.02	9.41	1.42	17.82	3.94	13.23%	106.61	14.10	120.71	9,746
Tandridge	79,270	74.02	12.25	1.34	11.76	11.32	13.23%	110.69	14.64	125.33	9,935
Waverley	116,115	74.02	11.97	1.03	12.59	10.58	13.23%	110.18	14.58	124.75	14,486
Woking	89,734	74.02	13.33	1.05	24.27	2.15	13.23%	114.83	15.19	130.02	11,667

18

2

Client Group	Additive Top-Ups		Total £ million	Flood Defence Top-Up £ million	Sum of Other EPCS Top-Ups £ million	TOTAL FORMULA SPENDING SHARE £ million
	A	B				
SURREY						
Elmbridge	0.3	0.138	0.438			16.102
Epsom and Ewell	0.3	0.025	0.325			9.034
Guildford	0.3	0.275	0.575			17.332
Mole Valley	0.3	0.039	0.339			10.354
Reigate and Banstead	0.3	0.068	0.368			15.998
Runnymede	0.3	0.315	0.615			10.281
Spelthorne	0.3	0.068	0.368			11.883
Surrey Heath	0.3	0.469	0.769			10.657
Tandridge	0.3	0.034	0.334			10.154
Waverley	0.3	0.116	0.416			14.780
Woking	0.3	0.140	0.440			12.333

RUNNYMEDE BOROUGH COUNCIL

PERSONNEL SERVICES MEMBER WORKING GROUP

6.15 p.m. Thursday 11th November 2004, Members Room, Civic Offices

In attendance: Councillors Roger Habgood, Rod Pate, Cherith Simmons & Peter Waddell.
Chief Executive Officer, Tim Williams & Personnel Officer, David Thomas

1. Apologies for Absence
Councillor Linda Gillham
2. Minutes of Meeting 29th July 2004
Agreed
3. Matters Arising from the Minutes
None
4. The Greater London Job Evaluation Scheme
The Personnel Officer had drafted a report for the Corporate Management Committee on 2nd December which recommended the adoption of the GLPC Job Evaluation Scheme and identified the resources required.

Members supported the recommendations and suggested that the report could also usefully rehearse the background to the project for the benefit of Members of the Committee.

5. Competencies and Performance Pay
The Personnel Officer provided a brief verbal update to Members on progress since the last meeting.

Essentially, the Director of the South East Employers Organisation had been invited to prepare a costed options report for Members consideration and this would be brought forward in due course.

6. Staff Survey
The Personnel Officer had drafted a report for the Corporate Management Committee on 2nd December based on the findings of the recent staff survey.

Members were pleased to note the generally positive responses by staff but recognised that in some areas there remained scope for improvement, particularly in terms of certain aspects of communications. It was hoped that the new Communications Officer, when in post, would be able to advise on ways in which this could be addressed

7. Any Other Business
None

8. Date of Next Meeting
The Personnel Officer would convene a meeting when sufficient progress had been made on Evaluations or when the report from South East Employers was available. He would in the meantime keep Members of the Working Group updated on progress.

**Runnymede Borough Council
Information Strategy Member Working Group**

Agreed Action Notes of meeting held on Thursday 2nd December 2004

	Action By:
<p>Present: Cllrs Niall Thewlis, Lynda Gillham, Robert Ray, Hugh Meares Tim Williams, Nigel Watson, Basia Dobrzalska,</p> <p>Apologies: Cllrs Roger Habgood, Adrian Tollett, John Dean Siobhan Treacy,</p>	
<p>1. Vision and Mission Statement for Corporate Systems</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BD presented the Vision and Mission statement for Corporate IT systems. • HM said that this statement supports service continuity and quality • TW said that in order to be successful in the rollout of Corporate Systems RBC would have to continue to make significant investment on an annual basis in the rollout of systems • LG asked about the investment of training. TW confirmed that investment for training would also have to be found • NT said that he would like to see high level road map, but although it was available, it was not presented due to time constraints, and will be presented at the next IT Working Group Meeting • CRM was briefly discussed- new building will have a large impact on the investment and time resource spent on corporate systems • The Vision and Mission statement was agreed by all 	BD/NW
<p>2. Housing Benefits- Presentation of the case for Back Scanning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BD presented an overview of the Housing Benefits Trial, which has now been completed. Various issues have been raised which are being worked on • BD also presented a cost analysis for back-scanning of Housing Documents. The analysis did not include a benefit analysis, which BD has requested from the Housing Benefits department. BD to request this to be prepared by the Housing Benefits section for the next meeting • The sum of the finances required for back scanning (in-house costs only), including extra hardware and human resources will amount to approximately £80k • HM questioned the need to scan such a large number of documents and said that the figures should be examined. BD to ask Housing Benefits to do this • HM asked that outsourcing options, including the use of off-shore resources, be considered and that costs be presented • TW said consideration needs to be given to how this should be financed 	BD BD BD
<p>3. Content Management- Contract and Update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NW gave overview of the CMS system. The selection of the service provider has been delayed so that more information could be extracted from the companies including how IEG outcomes and WC3 standards compliance will be met . • Potential suppliers have expressed an interest in potentially using RBC as a reference site 	

4. Skills Gap Analysis- IT <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This topic will be presented at the next meeting. • NW has asked for Councillors to review the Skills Gap Analysis and that comments to be sent to him in the next 10 days so that they could be incorporated into the document for the next meeting 	
5. Any Other Business <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None 	
6. Date of Next Meeting The date of the next meeting will be at 6.00pm on Thursday 6 th January 2005	All to note

Circulated by e-mail to:

Cllrs Niall Thewlis, Roger Habgood, Hugh Meares, Robert Ray, Lynda Gilham, Adrian Tollett and John Dean
Tim Williams, Nigel Watson, Basia Dobrzalska and Siobhan Treacy