



# RUNNYMEDE BOROUGH COUNCIL

## ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

11 NOVEMBER 2004

### APPENDICES

<u>APPENDIX</u>	<u>REPORT</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
A	SERVICE PLAN	1
B	BID PROPOSAL	12
C	BID BUSINESS PLAN	14
D	FARMERS' MARKET QUESTIONNAIRES	21

## SERVICE PLAN FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

This plan sets out the details of the actions that the Council has agreed must be taken to improve the services covered by the Economic Development Committee. It combines the targets that have been agreed within the –

- Leader's Position Statement - LPS
- Best Value Continuous Improvement Plans - CIP
- Best Value Performance Indicators - BVPI
- Community Strategy - CS

The last column of the attached tables indicates the origin of the action point.

Officer's titles have been abbreviated as follows –

Chief Executive Officer	CEO
Head of Engineering	HE
Policy & Implementation Manager	PIM
Director of Administration & Leisure	DAL
Director of Housing & Community Services	DHCS
Director of Technical Services	DTS
Principal Building Services Manager	PBSM

**ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

Target	Lead Officer	Implement by (including milestones)	Barriers to Implementation	Resources required/ Identified	Success Indicators	Progress	Target Origin
Ensure effective asset utilisation and manage asset acquisitions and disposals to achieve corporate objectives.	Valuer	ongoing	staff resources	Valuation staff	i) Implement the Asset Management Strategy. ii) Generate capital receipts to meet the corporate financial strategy target of £5.5 million by 2005/06 from land and associated receipts	ongoing	LPS
Seek to develop benchmarks and targets around corporate property management & associated activities	Valuer	Ongoing		Borough Valuer and Service Heads	i) Realistic targets ii) Continuous Improvement	National performance indicators reported	LPS
To complete the Action Addlestone Initiative	HE	November 2004	Consent for highways works from SCC	Contained within approved Action Addlestone budget	To implement the detailed proposals for Station Road	Work progressing on site - Opening scheduled for 27 November 2004	LPS

Target	Lead Officer	Implement by (including milestones)	Barriers to Implementation	Resources required/Identified	Success Indicators	Progress	Target Origin
Encourage and support the economic well-being of shopping parades in villages such as Englefield Green, Ottershaw, Pooley Green and others	PIM	i) October 2007	i) Resources being used to develop South East Plan and LDF  ii) Market availability  iii) Consent from County Highway Authority	i) Part of Local Development Framework using Policy staff  ii) / iii) To be identified  iv) £35,000 Agreed and included in budget	i) Undertake reviews of planning policies for the retail parades of the smaller settlements of Englefield Green, New Haw, Ottershaw, Pooley Green/Hythe, Virginia Water.  ii) Encourage, where appropriate, targeted strategic acquisitions of land.  iii) Bring forward, finances permitting, environmental improvement schemes.  iv) Obtain Secured Car Park status in remaining four car parks	To be undertaken as part of Local Development Framework  ongoing  ongoing  Status now confirmed for Gogmore & Chertsey Library, August 2004	LPS
To take a strategic view of public car parking.	HE	i) See individual targets  ii) November 2004	Staff recruitment & retention	ii) £30k consultancy agreed (£20k SCC/£10k RBC)	i) To discharge the 'challenges' of the Best Value Review of Car Parking agreed in January 2003, including a review of car parking charges.  ii) Decriminalised Car Parking introduced	Car parking charges reviewed and implemented  Due to start on 8 November 2004	LPS

Target	Lead Officer	Implement by (including milestones)	Barriers to Implementation	Resources required/Identified	Success Indicators	Progress	Target Origin
Participate in the Local Transport Review Process.	HE	ongoing	Funding constraints from government/ County Council Securing support of major new development schemes	Policy & Implementation and engineering staff Development Control staff	i) Continue to liaise with the Local Transportation Service. ii) Seek to secure funding and prioritisation for local transportation schemes especially in relation to Yellow buses	Weekly officer liaison meeting Funds negotiated through s.106 agreements	LPS
Seek to alleviate traffic congestion.	HE/ PIM	ongoing	RBC is not the highway authority	ii) Policy & Implementation staff iii) Development Control and County Engineers staff iv) Policy & Implementation and SCC staff	i) Continue to lobby Surrey County Council and public transport providers to improve services. ii) Continue to support the Runnymede Business Partnership's Runnymede Travel Initiative. iii) Seek funding from developers to support transportation improvements. iv) Work with businesses and schools to develop Green Travel Plans.	ongoing Yellow buses contract extension agreed for 6 buses Substantial sums received SCC staff taking over role	LPS

Target	Lead Officer	Implement by (including milestones)	Barriers to Implementation	Resources required/Identified	Success Indicators	Progress	Target Origin
Agree strategies and priorities for promoting economic development and well-being	PIM	ongoing	<p>i) Targets only established if resources identified</p> <p>ii) Resources available in relation to overall LDF and SE Plan programme</p>	Policy & Implementation Staff	<p>i) Work with the Runnymede Business Partnership to develop an Economic Strategy.</p> <p>ii) Develop regeneration, urban enhancement, retail and associated initiatives, through the Community Strategy and Local Plan processes</p>	<p>Strategy adopted 2003 Review undertaken September 2004</p> <p>To be addressed through Local Development Framework</p>	CS
Seek opportunities to work alongside partners to represent the Borough's interests, develop and fund activities that have a local impact.	CEO	ongoing	Co-operation of other agencies	Existing	<p>Work with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Runnymede Business Partnership</li> <li>• Spelthorne &amp; Runnymede Education Business Partnership</li> <li>• Chambers of Commerce</li> <li>• Business Rate Payers</li> <li>• Surrey County Council</li> <li>• GOSE, SEEDA, SEERA</li> <li>• Other institutions such as St Peter's Hospital, Royal Holloway and Brunel Universities</li> </ul>	ongoing formal and informal networking	LPS

Target	Lead Officer	Implement by (including milestones)	Barriers to Implementation	Resources required/Identified	Success Indicators	Progress	Target Origin
Finish Chertsey Revitalisation Scheme.	CEO	December 2005	Delays to commencement by development partner	Existing staff	Complete final phases of Chertsey Revitalisation.	Planning permission granted for final phase. Building works started September 2004	LPS
Pursue reprovision of the Civic Offices.	CEO	To be determined		To be determined	Progress the redevelopment of the Civic Offices and adjacent landholdings in Adlestone to achieve accommodation appropriate to the Council's future needs while enhancing the street scene and achieving value for Council Taxpayers.	New ACA under construction. Appointment of architects and QS for new civic offices being finalised	LPS
Work to meet housing needs targets for social and affordable housing.	DHCS/ DTS	ongoing	Current government thresholds do not apply to many small sites; funding of housing associations	Existing staff	i) Work with the Housing and Community Services Committee and ensure that best use is made of valuable land assets. ii) Work with the Planning Committee to promote best use of land under the Local Plan process. iii) Update Housing needs survey	457 units completed. Total target of 750 units to be provided by 2006	LPS
		Complete April 2005	Changes to guidance anticipated	Engage consultant (£45k in budgets)		Agreed by Housing Committee	

Target	Lead Officer	Implement by (including milestones)	Barriers to Implementation	Resources required/Identified	Success Indicators	Progress	Target Origin
Work towards partial development of BARRSBROOK FARM, Chertsey	DHCS	i) January 2006	Funding for housing association	Planning permission granted	i) Bring forward and sponsor a Registered Social Landlord scheme to include an element of shared equity, for the partial residential development of this site,	8/9/04 Planning permission granted. Awaiting confirmation of funding	LPS
We will review with the operators the viability and attractiveness of the Egham Farmers' Market to assess impact.	DAL	ii) April 2004 ongoing	Weather conditions	Already agreed Existing staff	ii) Provide allotments on some of the land to the rear. Continue to monitor the success of Egham Farmers' Market and bring forward any proposals for possible enhancement.	Work almost complete Street trading Licence issued to Egham Farmers' Market for 2004 French market held in May	LPS
To increase the percentage of buildings open to the public in which all areas are suitable for and accessible to disabled people	PBSM	1 October 2004 (to comply with Disability Discrimination Act)	Likely redevelopment of Civic Offices makes expenditure unwarranted. Listed Buildings pose problems where physical changes for access adversely affect character of building	To be determined	Achieve 100% accessibility	£0.5M budget allocated through strategic management plan. Works via appointed contractors	BVPI

Target	Lead Officer	Implement by (including milestones)	Barriers to Implementation	Resources required/Identified	Success Indicators	Progress	Target Origin
To produce the fifth edition of the Runnymede Business Directory (sponsored)	PIM	April 2005	Lack of sponsorship; response from business community	External sponsorship and Policy & Implementation Staff	i) Achieve sponsorship ii) Publish fifth directory	Fifth directory to be published April 2005	CS
To produce three business newsletters per year (sponsored)	PIM	ongoing	Lack of sponsorship	External sponsorship and Policy & Implementation Staff	Target met	Target met (ongoing)	CS
To arrange four RBP breakfast meetings per year (sponsored)	PIM	ongoing	Lack of sponsorship	External sponsorship and Policy & Implementation Staff	Target met	Target met (ongoing)	CS
Continue to increase numbers of organisations on the Runnymede Business Partnership data base	PIM	January 2005	Response from business community	Policy & Implementation Staff	1700 organisations	Database for business directory currently 1526 (end September) The database will be updated as part of the Business Directory	CIP

Target	Lead Officer	Implement by (including milestones)	Barriers to Implementation	Resources required/identified	Success Indicators	Progress	Target Origin
Target major employers for Runnymede Business Partnership sponsorship/involvement	PIM	ongoing	Response from business community	Policy & Implementation Staff	Seek to achieve funding for 3 newsletters and 4 forum events per year Seek to run business seminars	Sponsorship secured Sponsored work experience leaflet produced. Funding received for award for Spelthorne & Runnymede Education Business Partnership annual awards	CIP
Attract new firms to the 'Loyalty Card' scheme and promote scheme	PIM	December 2004	Response from business community	Policy & Implementation Staff	Attract 20 new firms (currently 92 - was 76 last quarter) Attract new cardholders (currently 2783 - was 2500)	Newsletter to all retailers January 2004	CIP/ CS
Extend provision of cycle shelters to stations & Royal Holloway	PIM	April 2004	Demand/co-operation from partners; funding	External grants/funds	Provision of shelters	Project now completed. Matter now part of Local Transport Plan	CIP
Prepare and adopt Economic Strategy	PIM	October 2003		Policy & Implementation Staff	Economic Strategy adopted	Strategy adopted in 2003 and reviewed September 2004	CIP

Target	Lead Officer	Implement by (including milestones)	Barriers to Implementation	Resources required/Identified	Success Indicators	Progress	Target Origin
Consult Chambers of Commerce to establish views on the need for greater liaison and what form it might take	PIM	ongoing	Willingness of Chambers to co-operate with each other	Policy & Implementation Staff	Greater interaction and co-operation between Chambers	Joint meeting of chambers has taken place - agree to work together as part of RBP	CIP
Encourage at least 10 schools to prepare and adopt Travel Plans	PIM	July 2004		Policy & Implementation Staff /SCC Schools liaison staff	Target Met	12 schools finalising plans and government funding secured; Discussions taking place with other schools to receive phase 2 funding	CIP
Secure six articles per year in the local press relating to Business Partnership activities and events	PIM	ongoing		Policy & Implementation Staff	Six articles per year appearing in local press	Target exceeded (ongoing)	CIP

Target	Lead Officer	Implement by (including milestones)	Barriers to Implementation	Resources required/Identified	Success Indicators	Progress	Target Origin
Seek to examine the benefits of Business Improvement Districts (BID's)	PIM	Government Regulations now issued (September 2004)	Negative vote from business community Lack of identifiable benefits	Policy & Implementation staff Business Partnership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Identification of non-domestic ratepayers to include in BID levy</li> <li>ii) Runnymede Business Partnership promoting the BID</li> <li>iii) Business Plan agreed</li> <li>iv) Positive Vote</li> <li>v) Collection of Levy</li> <li>vi) Extended fleet operational by September 2005</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Primary legislation and Regulations approved</li> <li>List of non-domestic ratepayers finalised</li> <li>Yellow bus project agreed to be target for funding to provide 12 buses for a 5 year period</li> </ul>	LPS

**DRAFT BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT PROPOSAL**

**1. THE BID Proposal**

The bid proposal aims to assist the Runnymede Travel Initiative to further ease traffic congestion in the Borough by encouraging a reduction in the number of dedicated car journeys to 10 local schools and colleges. This will be achieved by raising a levy each year for five years. The funds raised will provide students with **12 American style yellow buses** for their daily journeys.

**The BID Proposal**

The BID proposer is the Runnymede Business Partnership comprising representatives of local businesses, schools, colleges, and university, Surrey Police and Runnymede Borough Council. The BID will operate as the Runnymede Travel Initiative and be guided by a Runnymede Travel Initiative board.

**The Runnymede Travel Initiative Board**

A board will oversee the operation of the Runnymede Travel Initiative. The membership of the Runnymede Travel Initiative board will comprise representatives from; those businesses who directly fund and/or benefit from the scheme, the schools/colleges and the students/parents/guardians who use the service, and the Runnymede Business Partnership and Runnymede Borough Council. Leadership of the RTI may come from a Chairman of the Runnymede Travel Initiative Board.

**2. The existing baseline service**

- 2.1 There are currently six yellow buses operating at four local schools. They provide a journey to school for almost 500 students. The service is promoted by the Runnymede Business Partnership but administered by the Borough Council. The Council is neither an education or transport authority and does not normally provide school transport services. The service is funded by fares collected, section 106 contributions, and some business sponsorship. The monies from section 106 agreements enable the service to be maintained on a year on year basis, but does not provide the certainty for a long-term commitment and expansion.
- 2.2 The BID proposal would enable the service to be expanded to provide 12 buses serving approximately 10 schools, and enable long-term provision to be made.
- 2.3 At present in the order of 20 million car journeys p/a are made by those travelling to work or school in Runnymede. Almost 50% of students currently travel to school or college by car. The target is to move 20% of the predominantly car based journeys to school to the Yellow School Bus or cycling by 2010 (i.e. 20% of 2.5 million trips made to school by car as the primary reason for the journey). This equates to 15% of the school age resident population (1600 of 10300) being carried by the Yellow School Bus or being encouraged to cycle.

**3. The geographical area of the BID arrangements**

The BID arrangements will have effect in relation to whole hereditaments in the Borough of Runnymede.

**4. The BID Levy and Liability**

- 4.1 The bid levy will be charged in respect of all hereditaments within the Borough of Runnymede and listed in the local non domestic rate list with a rateable value of £350,000 or more.
- 4.2 Where a hereditament is occupied and is subject to the bid levy then the non domestic ratepayer in occupation shall be liable for the bid levy.

Where a hereditament is unoccupied and is subject to the bid levy then the non domestic ratepayer who owns the hereditament shall be liable for the bid levy.

- 4.3 The bid levy shall be payable for the whole year at the 1st April in each year.
- 4.4 There will be a fixed rate levy of £7,500 per hereditament per annum for the 5 year period of the BID. The cost of developing the proposal, and implementing it will be recovered from the BID levy.

5. **Alteration of BID arrangements**

Save for alterations to the geographical area, none of the BID arrangements may be altered without an Alteration Ballot.

6. **Result of Ballot and duration of arrangements**

The result of the ballot will be published on 10 January 2005 and the BID arrangements will commence 81 days later. The BID arrangements will operate for a five year period commencing on 1st April 2005 and ending 31st March 2010.

The Runnymede Travel Initiative – Business Improvement District Business Plan

The Aim

THE BID LEVY WILL ASSIST THE RUNNYMEDE TRAVEL INITIATIVE TO FURTHER EASE TRAFFIC CONGESTION IN THE BOROUGH BY ENCOURAGING A REDUCTION IN THE NUMBER OF DEDICATED CAR JOURNEYS TO LOCAL SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES BY PROVIDING STUDENTS WITH 12 AMERICAN STYLE YELLOW BUSES FOR THEIR DAILY JOURNEYS.

F

The Objectives

The Runnymede Travel Initiative and the Yellow Bus Service

The Yellow Bus concept forms the core of the Runnymede Travel Initiative, with cycling and walking providing a complementary focus.

1 Project Objective

At present in the order of 20 million car journeys p/a are made by those travelling to work or school in Runnymede. Almost 50% of students currently travel to school or college by car. The target is to move 20% of the predominantly car based journeys to school to the Yellow School Bus or cycling by 2010 (i.e. 20% of 2.5million trips made to school by car as the primary reason for the journey). This equates to 15% of the school age resident population (1600 of 10300) being carried by the Yellow School Bus or being encouraged to cycle.

## 2 Business Objectives

Local businesses are a valued and play an important part in daily activity within the Borough. They not only create local economic prosperity but they make a significant contribution to wider economy of the region and the importance this plays in the economy of the UK.

The initiative to reduce traffic congestion will have direct benefits to local businesses. Those depending upon deliveries would benefit from a reduction in the delays that congestion brings. In addition, employees will directly benefit by having a less congested journey to work, and for parents it may change the nature of their journey if they are currently involved in the school run.

## 3 Travel Objectives

The operation of the yellow bus provides a safe, secure and reliable journey to school for students who would have either travelled to school by car (a majority) or by bus services whose reliability was affected by peak hour delays (a minority). The students benefit directly and their parents/guardians are saved the time and stress of taking their children to school. Providing a safe, reliable and convenient journey to school has had positive impact on students from those parts of the Borough where public transport has historically not been reliable and where there is no alternative transport for the school run.

Adults who use the local bus service would be able to access less crowded buses at the school run times avoiding some of the conflicts that can occur.

## 4 Environmental Objectives

A reduction in the number of cars on the local roads at peak times gives rise to help reduce congestion, reduce air and noise pollution, and reduce road accidents.

## 5 Social Inclusion Objectives

To provide an adequate, reliable and safe form of transport for students who live more than 1 mile from their school or college but who are unable to access such facilities for their journey.

### The Organisation Plan

#### The BID Board

A board will oversee the operation of the BID.

The membership of the BID board will comprise representatives from; those businesses who directly fund and/or benefit from the scheme, the schools/colleges and the students parents/guardians who use the service, and the Runnymede Business Partnership and Runnymede Borough Council.

Leadership of the BID will come from a Chairman of the BID Board.

#### The BID Manager

A BID manager will undertake the day-to-day operation of the BID project. This will involve serving the needs of both the BID Board and the operation of the BID project.

The main area of work will focus on the organisation of the Yellow Bus Service. This will include liaison with the schools, colleges and Bus Company, developing the routes, and administering the scheme.

### **Monitoring**

The project will be subject to an annual review and monitor of progress. This will be set within the context of the arrangements being established for undertaking sustainability audits.

### **Risk Assessment**

The main issue that needs to be anticipated is the potential for the full levy not to be collected each year. This will result in a shortfall in funding for the year. Whilst there will be procedures in place for collection of the levy, a contingency is required if the monies are not immediately forthcoming. The arrangement will be to create a surplus contingency fund from the levy and to employ monies secured through associated 'development projects'. This arrangement will also recognise the potential shortfall arising from a number of premises falling outside the defined categories during the levy period.

In view of the potential for a reduced levy to be collected in any one year, the number of new buses will be introduced on a phased basis. In the first year of operation the number of buses operating will be increased to nine. The full 12-bus service will be phased in over the subsequent year.

Consideration will also need to be given to the provision of the bus service and appropriate arrangements will be incorporated into the contract with the bus company to consider short and long-term issues.

### **The RTI Finance Plan**

See attached sheet for the implications of collecting from 45 or 50 employers

## Business Improvement District

### Cash Flow Predictions

<u>Expenditure</u>	£	
Set Up	3,000	Estimated
General	46,000	(to increase by 3% per year)

<u>Income</u>	
BID Levy	7,500
Number of Employers	45

	05/06	06/07	07/08	08/09	09/10
Number of Buses	6	9	12	12	12
Cost per bus per day	200	200	210	220	230
Number of Days	62	123	185	185	185

	04/05	05/06	06/07	07/08	08/09	09/10
	£	£	£	£	£	£
<u>Expenditure</u>						
Set Up Costs	3,000	-	-	-	-	-
Hire of Buses	-	295,800	408,600	466,200	488,400	510,600
Salaries & Admin	-	46,000	47,380	48,801	50,265	51,773
	3,000	341,800	455,980	515,001	538,665	562,373
<u>Income</u>						
BID Levy	-	337,500	337,500	337,500	337,500	337,500
Fares Collected	-	97,600	134,200	147,200	147,200	162,000
	-	435,100	471,700	484,700	484,700	499,500

Surplus / (Deficit)	(3,000)	93,300	15,720	(30,301)	(53,965)	(62,873)
Cashflow	(3,000)	90,300	106,020	75,719	21,753	(41,120)

**Note**

Any deficits in cashflow will be offset by income generated by the Council from Section 106 Contributions

**Business Improvement District  
Cash Flow Predictions**

<b>Expenditure</b>	£
Set Up	3,000 Estimated
General	46,000 (to increase by 3% per year)

<b>Income</b>	
BID Levy	7,500
Number of Employers	50

	05/06	06/07	07/08	08/09	09/10
Number of Buses	6	9	12	12	12
Cost per bus per day	200	200	210	220	230
Number of Days	62	63	185	185	185

	04/05 £	05/06 £	06/07 £	07/08 £	08/09 £	09/10 £
<b>Expenditure</b>						
Set Up Costs	3,000	-	-	-	-	-
Hire of Buses	-	295,800	408,600	466,200	488,400	510,600
Salaries & Admin	-	46,000	47,380	48,801	50,265	51,773
	3,000	341,800	455,980	515,001	538,665	562,373
<b>Income</b>						
BID Levy	-	375,000	375,000	375,000	375,000	375,000
Fares Collected	-	97,600	134,200	147,200	147,200	162,000
	-	472,600	509,200	522,200	522,200	537,000
<b>Surplus / (Deficit)</b>	<b>(3,000)</b>	<b>130,800</b>	<b>53,220</b>	<b>7,199</b>	<b>(16,465)</b>	<b>(25,373)</b>
<b>Cashflow</b>	<b>(3,000)</b>	<b>127,800</b>	<b>181,020</b>	<b>188,219</b>	<b>171,753</b>	<b>146,380</b>

**Note**

Any deficits in cashflow will be offset by income generated by the Council from Section 106 Contributions

**EGHAM FARMERS' MARKET  
RESULTS OF PUBLIC CONSULTATION OCTOBER 2004**

**APPROXIMATELY 130 QUESTIONNAIRES DESPATCHED TO BUSINESSES IN HIGH STREET AND STATION ROAD, EGHAM, 37 RETURNED (28%)**

Do you think that the introduction of a weekday Farmers' market (in addition to the Saturday market) will be worthwhile?

Yes 34 No 3

Do you think that the proposed weekday market should replace the existing Saturday market rather than be in addition to it?

Yes 4 No 27

Have you been adversely affected by the market?

Yes 4 No 30

Do you think that a weekday market will exacerbate that problem?

Yes 0 No 23

Do you believe that a Thursday market will be more successful?

Yes 13 No 11

Other observations:

"You need more stalls to make it worthwhile to attend as a customer"

"Saturday is no longer the best shopping day in Egham. The Saturday market is so small now, it no longer draws the public. No market will succeed unless we have more stalls and diversification"

"Will also attract office workers in area who do not work at weekends"

"The market would be a lot better if there were more stalls and a better variety"

"Generally more people around town due to businesses etc"

"The Saturday market generates good business for us. We would love to have an additional Thursday market and more than once a month"

"It will attract more stallholders – there are not enough at the farmers' market. Would like to see more stalls"

"More people around midweek – office workers etc."

"As we are an employment agency this will not affect us one way or another"

"People who work Mon-Fri 9-5 can also benefit. Would really like to see it happen because it sells wonderful English cheese"

"Many people work outside Egham and do not travel in on a Saturday"

"Only problem I can foresee is companies which may have goods delivered by couriers"

"Attract more people to come to the town"

"The existing businesses that do not work Saturdays will be attracted. Also people tend to go further afield at weekends"

"Egham can only benefit by having a weekday farmers' market"

"Give the public a choice"

"Lots of office and workplaces in Egham"

"More people around on weekdays than Saturdays, particularly office workers"

"As a business (like many in Egham) our staff would use the market unlike the Saturday when they are not at work"

"Markets will be successful if they are high quality and wide ranging. The current Saturday market is poor on both counts. Would need high quality cleaning also"

"Needs to be an additional market on Thursday, different people in town compared with Saturday. Market very worthwhile, unfortunately stalls have gone down so hopefully an additional day would help as long as not Wednesday with Staines Market"

"Once established (with advertising backup) would make the High Street busier. I think the Council need to look at ways of bringing more people back to Egham for shopping – also I would like to know if the Farmers Market is limited to just selling farm produce or can anything else be sold?"

"I was never happy about the market and do not approve of it. I am not supporting it at all as we have lost out by it. I am not happy with either day but my opinion was never considered – when we are there all the time. Our sales are really bad on Saturday morning of the market so I do not want it at all when expenses are very high. No one comes into our shop on that Saturdays morning of the market. We are usually very busy on Saturday – it makes up for quiet times in the week but the market spoils that. I do not agree with the market at all – our sales drop completely on Saturday of the market and when we pay a lot in rent and rates I am not happy about the market. Rent and rates are very high – all difficult to manage already"

"There is nothing inherently unsuitable or undesirable about a Thursday market, but if managed by the same person who currently manages the Saturday market it is questionable whether it can be any more successful. In my view, a weekday market will achieve little in attracting more shoppers to other shops in the town as they will not have as much time. Parking .... Thursday may be successful but if the organiser can find sufficient suppliers for a critical mass, why can't she bring them in on Saturdays? The Saturday market is failing because a) there are very few suppliers; b) the range of produce is extremely limited; c) the prices are very high so they appeal to a fairly limited client base who are widely dispersed through the local area and can access other larger markets; d) the suppliers are not local so do not engender the sort of customer loyalty that supporting one's local small trader would"