



# RUNNYMEDE BOROUGH COUNCIL

## REVIEW BOARD

14 APRIL 2005

## APPENDICES

<u>APPENDIX</u>	<u>REPORT</u>	<u>PAGE NO.</u>
A	SURREY PENSION FUND – REPORT TO CORPORATE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 3 MARCH 2005	1
B	SURREY PENSION FUND – MINUTE OF CORPORATE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 3 MARCH 2005	8
C	SURREY PENSION FUND – ACTUARIAL VALUATION AS AT 31 MARCH 2004	SEPARATELY CIRCULATED
D	ANNUAL REPORT OF OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY FUNCTION	TO FOLLOW
E	PROPOSALS FOR REVENUE REDUCTIONS 2005/06 – 2006/07 – REPORT TO CORPORATE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 3 MARCH 2005	9
F	PROPOSALS FOR REVENUE REDUCTIONS 2005/06 – 2006/07 – MINUTE OF CORPORATE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 3 MARCH 2005	13
G	PROGRESS REPORT ON ENFORCEMENT OF PLANNING CONTROL	15
H	PLANNING FOR GYPSY AND TRAVELLER SITES – REPORT TO PLANNING COMMITTEE – 16 FEBRUARY 2005	27
I	PLANNING FOR GYPSY AND TRAVELLER SITES – MINUTE OF PLANNING COMMITTEE – 16 FEBRUARY 2005	30

**REPORT TO CORPORATE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 3 MARCH 2005**

**SURREY PENSION FUND (DF)**

(Ref: Minutes of Corporate Management Committee, December 2004, page 473, para. 379)

**1. Purpose of Report**

**1.1 The purpose of this report is to:**

- i) provide further information about the Actuary's valuation of the Surrey Pension Fund at 31 March 2004; and**
- ii) consider the case for making a further lump sum contribution to the Surrey Pension Fund.**

**2. Background Information**

- 2.1 The Surrey Pension Fund is administered by Surrey County Council on behalf of all the Councils in Surrey and other public sector bodies, such as further education colleges, as required by the Superannuation Act 1972.
- 2.2 Under the rules of the Local Government Pension Scheme, staff make a statutory contribution of 6% of their pay to the Pension Fund. The employer's contribution to the Fund is based on an actuarial calculation of the amount required to meet future liabilities of the Fund. Since 1995 the Actuary has calculated the position for each contributing body separately.
- 2.3 The Actuary is required to value the Surrey Pension Fund every three years. The Fund was last valued by the Actuary in 2001 using a valuation as at 31 March 2001. This information enabled the Actuary to determine the level of contributions required from each contributing authority for 2002/03, 2003/04 and 2004/05.
- 2.4 The 2001 actuarial valuation showed the following position for Runnymede:-
- |                      |   |
|----------------------|---|
| Funding level        | 84%   |
| Deficit              | £5,729,000  |
| Contribution rate    | 166% of employees' contribution (i.e. 9.96% of pensionable pay) |
| Deficit contribution | 2002/03: £587,000   |
|                      | 2003/04: £598,000   |
|                      | 2004/05: £608,000   |
- 2.5 The Council made a lump sum contribution of £5,729,000 in the 2002/03 financial year to reduce its share of the deficit, thereby removing the need to make annual deficit contributions in 2003/04 and 2004/05. This was the second occasion on which the Council had made a lump-sum contribution. A payment of £5,838,000 had previously been made in 1996/97 with a similar intention of eliminating Runnymede's share of the deficit.
- 2.6 An initial report on the likely outcome of the actuarial valuation was made to the Committee on 2 December 2004. A subsequent Surrey County Council report (to the County Council's Audit and Governance Committee), explaining the outcome of the actuarial review, was circulated to all Members of this Council. The draft Actuarial Report has now been circulated by the Actuary and a copy has been placed in the Members Room.
- 2.7 Following consideration of the last report on 2 December 2004, the Committee 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.
- 3. Report on the 2004 Actuarial Valuation**
- 3.1 The valuation at 31 March 2004 just completed by the Actuary will determine the level of contributions over the next three years. The position for Runnymede may be summarised as

follows:

- a funding level of 82.9%, representing a net deficit of £7.4 million.
- an employer's contribution for the next three years of 12.5% of pensionable pay.
- additional annual contributions to eliminate the deficit over the next 20 years, originally specifying an annual payment of £441,000 but now amended so that these are phased in, requiring nil in 2005/06, £220,500 in 2006/07 and £441,000 in 2007/08.

3.2 Extracts from the Actuary's report are reproduced at Annex '1'. These show:

- an analysis of the deficits for the County and Surrey Districts; and
- an analysis of the contribution rates required from the County and Surrey Districts for future employee service and funding the accumulated deficit.

3.3 As reported in December, the Actuary's analysis shows that Runnymede's funding level has reduced from 84% to 82.9% in the last three years. The most significant reason for the reduced funding level has been that investment performance has not achieved the returns anticipated in the 2001 valuation. The table below shows the main reasons for this change compared with the position for the Pension Fund as a whole:

	<b>Fund as a whole</b>	<b>Runnymede</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Funding Level 2001</b>	<b>70.8</b>	<b>84.1</b>
Change in actuarial assumptions	-3.4	-4.3
Investment performance	-10.1	-12.3
Salary increases	-2.3	-1.1
Pension increases	1.3	1.2
Contributions paid	4.9	14.3
Demographic experience	1.9	0
Miscellaneous	-0.2	1.0
<b>Funding Level 2004</b>	<b>62.9</b>	<b>82.9</b>

3.4 The issues raised by the valuation result, on which Officers have been seeking further information, are:

- has Runnymede received the full benefit for making a lump sum contribution of £5.7 million at a time when stock market values were low?
- has the valuation taken account of the transfer of the Highways Agency or is Runnymede still bearing the cost of some former agency staff?

The following paragraphs deal with these issues in more detail.

#### **Lump Sum Contribution made in 2002**

3.5 Following the last actuarial report, the Council started making monthly backfunding payments which were calculated to extinguish the 2001 deficit over a period of thirteen years. Six payments were made totalling £293,500. However, in September 2002 this Committee decided to make a lump sum payment of £5,729,000 which was intended to return Runnymede's element of the fund to 100% funded. The lump sum contribution was made in three instalments between October and December 2002.

3.6 The lump sum contributions were made at a time when the stock market was reaching the end of its 'bear run' and in hindsight Officers considered that there were prospects of achieving a good return for the Council as the stock market recovered some of its lost ground. However, the initial results of the actuarial valuation reported to the Committee in December revealed a larger deficit than had been anticipated, partly because Runnymede's

share of the fund assets were lower than expected. Taking Runnymede's share of the fund assets at the 2001 valuation as the starting point (£30.2 million), Officers have attempted to calculate a broad allocation of cashflows during the intervaluation period and this has produced an asset share for Runnymede in 2004 of £37.4 million. The Actuary has calculated the asset share in a different way. He has analysed the experience of each employer between 2001 and 2004 and compared this with what was projected when contributions were last set in 2001. He has then calculated each employer's liabilities (for Runnymede this has been assessed at £43.2 million) and deducted from this figure the difference between actual employer experience and the 2001 projections, producing an asset figure for Runnymede of £35.8 million (i.e a deficit of £7.4 million).

- 3.7 In theory, the way in which the Actuary has calculated Runnymede's asset share ought to produce the same answer as the analysis of cashflows. Officers suspect that it is different because it is not as sensitive to the timing of transactions as the cashflow approach. However, Officers also recognise that their calculation may not have included all the actuarial assumptions. This is currently being reviewed with the Actuary in order to reconcile the difference.

**Former Highways Agency staff**

- 3.8 At the time of the last actuarial valuation in 2001, the Council was still operating the Highways Agency on behalf of Surrey County Council. The staff employed to discharge this function were employees of Runnymede Borough Council and would have been taken into account in the Actuary's calculation of the Council's deficit. Further clarification is still being sought from the Actuary and will be reported verbally if received prior to the meeting.

- 3.9 The County Council terminated the agency arrangements and assumed direct responsibility for the discharge of all highways activities with effect from 1 April 2002. Most of the staff employed by the Council on the highways agency were transferred to the County Council under the TUPE arrangements. The following table summarises the staff changes (excluding the Highways DSO redundancies):-

Transferred to Surrey County Council under TUPE March 2002	10
Retired on the grounds of ill-health	1
Appointed to Surrey County Council establishment December 2001	1
Transferred to Surrey County Council May 2001	1

- 3.10 The Actuary has made no adjustments in the valuation for these changes. Bearing in mind that each employer's liabilities are based on the position at 31 March 2004, it can be argued that this is not required. However, Officers believe that an adjustment is necessary for the following reasons:-

- i) The fact that there is a deficit on the Fund means that employers' contribution rates in previous years have been understated. This means that the reimbursement that the Districts received from the County for operating the Highways Agency was understated. The Council is therefore carrying a liability for the former employment of staff on highways agency work.
- ii) None of the backfunding contributions made since the 1995 valuation have been allocated to services on the grounds that these payments were paying for the deficit on past service rather the current cost of employing staff (so none of these costs were reimbursed by the highways agency agreement). The Council's decision to make a lump-sum contribution of £5.8 million in 1996/97 means that its share of the pension fund assets was proportionally higher than the County Council's. Officers believe that the way in which the Actuary calculates the deficit has had the effect of reallocating part of Runnymede's higher asset share as a result of staff transferring to the County Council.
- iii) Officers fear that the last point may also apply to the lump-sum contribution that was made in 2002. Although the payment of £5.7 million was made after the termination of the highways agency agreement, without the timing of this contribution being factored into the calculation, Officers believe that because former Runnymede staff are now employed by the County Council, a proportion may have been reallocated.

3.11 At the time of writing this report, Officers are still attempting to clarify and resolve these issues.

4. Report on the Case for Making a Further Lump Sum Contribution

4.1 At the meeting of the Committee in December 2004, Members expressed the view that the Council ought to consider the case for making a further lump-sum contribution to the Pension Fund in order to extinguish the Council's share of the deficit. The actuarial valuation at 31 March 2004 shows that a payment of £7.4 million would be required to make Runnymede 100% funded.

4.2 Until the Council can be satisfied that its lump-sum contributions are only going to benefit Runnymede, Officers cannot recommend making further lump-sum payments.

4.3 Officers also consider that the Council's resources shown in the Financial Forecast over the next five years do not provide sufficient flexibility to fund a lump-sum payment. The Council's revenue reserves are declining because they are being used to reduce the budget requirement that is funded by the Council Tax. Capital receipts are also declining and the latest forecast (reported to the Committee in the Budget Report) shows that the available balance at the end of 2009/10 will be £605,000. At this stage, therefore, Officers are of the view that the Council's resources should not be used to fund a lump-sum payment to the Pension Fund. Clearly, the position can be reappraised if the Council is able to generate additional capital receipts.

5. Resource Implications

5.1 The 2005/06 budget recently approved by Council includes the increased costs of current pension provision together with a back funding contribution of £441,000. Since the budget was produced, following discussions with Officers, the Actuary has amended the back funding contribution so that this is phased in over 3 years. If the Council chooses to make no backfunding contribution in 2005/06, in line with the Actuary's latest draft valuation report, this will increase the Council's deficit in future. Therefore, at this stage Officers remain of the view that the Council should make a backfunding contribution of £441,000 in 2005/06 in line with the approved budget.

6. Legal Implications

6.1 The Local Government Pension Scheme Regulations 1997 require the Actuary to report every 3 years on the value of the Surrey Pension Fund. The Council is required to make employer's contributions to the Fund in accordance with the Actuary's certificate.

**(FOR INFORMATION)**

Background Papers

Surrey Pension Fund – Draft Actuarial Valuation at 31 March 2004

Surrey Pension Fund – Annual Report 2004

Director of Finance's file on the Surrey Pension Fund (file ref. 48)

Summary of results by employer for membership up to 31 March 2004  
with analysis of changes since 31 March 2001

Employer	Surrey CC	Surrey Police Authority	Surrey Probation Committee	Elmbridge BC	Epsom & Ewell BC	Guildford BC	Mole Valley DC
Position at 31 March 2004							
Liabilities							
Active Members	£000	31,194	7,468	18,661	13,102	41,111	17,877
Deferred Pensioners	£000	8,582	4,123	9,628	5,397	15,870	6,290
Pensioners and Dependants	£000	14,889	7,912	36,499	21,484	29,824	19,695
Total Liabilities	£000	54,665	19,503	64,788	39,983	86,805	43,862
Assets Allocated at Market Value	£000	38,772	15,242	50,332	30,179	59,410	32,946
(Deficiency)		(15,893)	(4,261)	(14,456)	(9,804)	(27,395)	(10,916)
Funding Level	%	70.9	78.2	77.7	75.5	68.4	75.1
Change to Funding Level between 2001 and 2004							
Funding Level at 31 March 2001	%	79.0	73.0	82.0	74.0	75.2	78.6
Different Valuation Assumptions	%	(3.4)	(2.8)	(3.3)	(4.1)	(4.0)	(3.8)
SCC Investment Returns > LA Median Return	%	2.8	1.6	2.0	2.1	1.6	2.1
LA Median Returns < Expectations	%	(12.9)	(13.0)	(16.0)	(16.8)	(12.8)	(16.3)
Effect of Salary Increase	%	(2.3)	(1.3)	0.0	2.4	(0.4)	(0.7)
Effect of Pensions Increases	%	1.3	1.3	1.6	1.5	1.2	1.4
Effect of Contributions Paid	%	4.9	14.0	14.6	17.7	4.2	12.2
Effect of Demographic Experience	%	1.9	(0.2)	(0.1)	2.6	0.7	0.5
Miscellaneous Items	%	(0.2)	5.6	(2.2)	(4.0)	2.7	1.2
Funding Level at 31 March 2004	%	63.0	78.2	78.7	75.5	68.4	75.1

NB Figures in brackets serve to decrease the funding level

Summary of results by employer for membership up to 31 March 2004  
with analysis of changes since 31 March 2001

Employer	Reigate & Banstead BC	Runnymede BC	Spelthorne BC	Surrey Heath BC	Tandridge DC	Waverley BC	Woking BC
Position at 31 March 2004							
Liabilities							
Active Members	£000 25,362	20,500	16,745	20,137	17,898	28,706	25,176
Deferred Pensioners	£000 11,069	5,845	8,243	6,425	4,539	9,494	10,435
Pensioners and Dependants	£000 37,034	16,884	25,163	15,526	18,164	24,804	28,103
Total Liabilities	£000 73,465	43,229	50,151	42,088	40,601	63,004	63,714
Assets Allocated at Market Value	£000 52,187	35,825	40,042	33,772	24,446	46,812	39,027
(Deficiency)	(21,278)	(7,404)	(10,109)	(8,316)	(16,155)	(16,192)	(24,687)
Funding Level	% 71.0	82.9	79.8	80.2	60.2	74.3	61.3
Change to Funding Level between 2001 and 2004							
Funding Level at 31 March 2001	% 88.8	84.1	98.6	68.3	67.0	69.0	68.7
Different Valuation Assumptions	% (3.9)	(4.3)	(3.9)	(4.6)	(3.7)	(4.1)	(4.1)
SCC Investment Returns > LA	% 2.3	1.8	2.4	2.1	1.6	1.6	1.6
Median Return							
LA Median Returns < Expectations	% (18.0)	(14.1)	(19.0)	(16.2)	(12.9)	(12.5)	(12.6)
Effect of Salary Increase	% (0.8)	(1.1)	(0.6)	(1.7)	(0.2)	0.4	(0.3)
Effect of Pensions Increases	% 1.5	1.2	1.5	1.2	1.3	1.3	1.4
Effect of Contributions Paid	% 2.2	14.3	1.0	30.0	17.8	17.8	6.2
Effect of Demographic Experience	% (0.5)	0.0	(0.5)	0.8	1.0	1.0	(0.5)
Miscellaneous Items	% (0.6)	1.0	0.2	0.4	(0.2)	(0.2)	0.9
Funding Level at 31 March 2004	% 71.0	82.9	79.8	80.2	60.2	74.3	61.3

NB Figures in brackets serve to decrease the funding level

**Surrey Pension Fund**  
**Actuarial Valuation as at 31 March 2004**

**STATEMENT TO THE RATES AND ADJUSTMENTS CERTIFICATE**

The Common Rate of Contribution payable by each participating body under Regulation 77(3)(a) for the period 1 April 2005 to 31 March 2008 is 20.5% of payroll (342% of employee contributions).

Individual Adjustments are required under Regulation 77 for the period 1 April 2005 to 31 March 2008 resulting in minimum total contribution rates expressed as a percentage of pensionable pay and/or a monetary amount. These are set out below.

Employer Code	Employer Scheduled bodies	Percentage of Payroll		Additional Monetary Amount		
		01-Apr-05 to 31-Mar-06	01-Apr-05 to 31-Mar-08	01-Apr-05 to 31-Mar-06 (£000).	01-Apr-06 to 31-Mar-07 (£000).	01-Apr-07 to 31-Mar-08 (£000).
45	Surrey County Council	11.6	193	16,720	16,720	16,720
20	Surrey Probation Board	11.6	185	254	254	254
359	Elmbridge Borough Council	11.7	195	493	677	861
361	Epsom & Ewell Borough Council	12.5	208	584	584	584
379	Guildford Borough Council	11.3	188	1,580	1,606	1,632
436	Mole Valley District Council	12.1	201	388	519	650
481	Reigate & Banstead Borough Council	12.0	200	794	1,031	1,267
494	Runnymede Borough Council	12.5	208	0	220.5	441
536	Spelthorne Borough Council	12.3	205	0	301	602
547	Surrey Heath Borough Council	12.8	213	0	248	495
553	Tandridge District Council	12.6	210	962	962	962
584	Waverley Borough Council	13.0	216	964	964	964
603	Woking Borough Council	11.6	193	1,470	1,470	1,470
966	Surrey Police Authority	10.1	168	931	931	931

## MINUTE OF CORPORATE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 3 MARCH 2005

SURREY PENSION FUND

(Ref: Minutes of Corporate Management Committee, December 2004, page 473, para. 379)

The Committee received further information about the recent actuarial valuation of the Surrey Pension Fund and the deterioration in the funding level of Runnymede's share of the Fund.

The Fund was administered by the County Council on behalf of all the Councils and other public sector bodies in Surrey. As previously reported, the actuarial valuation of the Fund at 31 March 2004, which would determine the level of the Council's contributions for the following three year period, had indicated that Runnymede's funding level had declined from 84% to 82.9% since the previous valuation in 2001. Whilst this compared favourably with the average for the Surrey Pension Fund as a whole, which had fallen from 70.8% to 62.9% over the same period, it represented a net deficit of £7.4m. The most significant reason for the reduced funding level had been the failure of investment performance to achieve the anticipated returns. The Actuary had set an increase in Runnymede's employers' contributions from 9.96% to 12.5% of pensionable pay for the next three year period in addition to the backfunding contribution required to recover the accumulated deficit. It was noted that one reason why the Council's ongoing contribution rate was higher than the fund average was because of Council policy to enhance pay in the final year of service prior to retirement.

The Committee noted that Officers had been seeking further information on two issues arising from the valuation, namely whether the Council had received the full benefit for its lump sum deficit contribution of £5.7m in 2002, and whether the valuation had taken account of the transfer of the Highways Agency back to Surrey County Council. The lump sum contribution, the second made by the Council in recent years with the intention of returning its funding levels to 100%, had been made at a time when the stock market was reaching the end of its 'bear run' and, as a consequence, had been expected to achieve a good return to the Authority. At the time of the latest valuation, however, the Actuary's assessment of Runnymede's share of the asset funds, at £35.8m, had proved to be lower than the £37.4m calculated by Officers. One possible explanation for the discrepancy was the differing methodology employed by the two parties. Officers had attempted to calculate a broad allocation of cashflows during the intervaluation period whereas the Actuary had deducted from each employers liabilities the difference between actual employer experience and the projections when the contributions were set in 2001. Members noted that the two methods should, theoretically, have reconciled but might have failed to do so because the Actuary's approach was not as sensitive to the timing of transactions. It was recognised, however, that the Officers' calculations did not necessarily include all the actuarial assumptions.

Members were also informed that the Actuary had made no adjustments in the valuation for those staff who had been transferred to Surrey County Council upon the termination of the Highways Agency agreement during the intervaluation period. This was considered to disadvantage Runnymede. One of the reasons for this was that the Council was effectively carrying a liability for the former employment of staff on highways agency work because the reimbursement it had received for operating the agency had understated the employers contribution rates. A further complication had arisen because the Council's lump sum contribution in 1996/97 meant that Runnymede's share of the Fund assets was proportionally higher than the County Council's. It was thought that the way in which the Actuary calculated the deficit had reallocated part of Runnymede's asset share as a result of the transfer of staff to the County Council. There was a possibility that this also applied to the lump sum contribution made in 2002. Although the payment had been made after the termination of the Agency Agreement, the timing of the contribution had not been factored into the calculation.

The Committee noted that Officers were still in discussions with the Actuary in an attempt to clarify and resolve the outstanding issues. Until the Council could be satisfied that any further lump sum backfunding contribution would only benefit Runnymede, no consideration could be given to this means of extinguishing the deficit. In any case, the decline in the Council's revenue reserves and capital receipts meant that there was unlikely to be sufficient flexibility to fund a lump sum payment. The position could, however, be reappraised if the Council was able to generate additional capital receipts. The Actuary was now prepared for the annual backfunding contribution of £441,000 to be phased in over three years but, as this would increase the Council's deficit, the payment would be made in 2005/06 in line with the approved budget. Members emphasised the inherent difficulty of managing a Fund the size of Surrey's which contained such a large number of employers. A single investment strategy could not be expected to meet the profile of all the contributing bodies.

## REPORT TO CORPORATE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE ON 3 MARCH 2005

## PROPOSALS FOR REVENUE REDUCTIONS 2005/06 – 2006/07 (CEO)

(Ref: Minutes of Corporate Management Committee 30 September 2004, page 336, para. 244 and January 2005, page 585, para. 437)

1. Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to seek in principle agreement to the proposed revenue reduction initiatives and authorise Officers to pursue the initiatives in the required timescale.

2. Background Information

- 2.1 The need for further revenue reductions has been acknowledged in the Five Year Financial Forecast considered by this Committee on 30 September and subsequently approved by Council. This is notwithstanding the very considerable progress made in earlier revenue reductions over the last three years.
- 2.2 Inevitable growth items, greater legislative burdens, a continuing wish to meet residents' aspirations, below inflation grant settlements from Government and the deficit funding of the Superannuation Fund have, however, put upward pressure on the medium term financial strategy.
- 2.3 The Leader of the Council's policy guidance, recommended by this Committee in January 2005, and due to be considered by the Council at its meeting on 8 March, sets out the principles that should be followed in subsequent reduction exercises. Essentially Officers are asked to have regard to demographic, social and technological trends, as well as actions by others in examining reviews of services and office processes. These will often, quite properly, drive service changes, but there has been a presumption, in proposing revenue reductions, that whenever possible services and policy priority areas are safeguarded.
- 2.4 As has been very adequately demonstrated in last year's forecast papers and the budget material considered at the last meeting of this Committee, Runnymede's budgeted spend per head of population in 2004/05 (at £157 per head) is the highest of all Surrey Districts and this has been achieved whilst taxing the least.
- 2.5 The General Fund policy initiatives of a discretionary nature explicitly pursued by Members over the last twelve years include Safer Runnymede, community services for older people (including the running of five Day Centres, of which two were newly built), new social centres (Hythe and Addlestone), town centre improvements/environmental schemes (Chertsey Revitalisation, Egham High Street and Action Addlestone), recycling, major grant programmes for voluntary/charitable sectors, land drainage projects, safeguarding/purchasing large areas of threatened Green Belt and amenity lands and multi-play areas for young people, together with holiday play schemes.

3. Report

- 3.1 The following table outlines the proposed areas of revenue reductions:

(i)	Restructuring -	£
	Committee and DAL administration – (1 fte)	
	Annual Personnel Report refers	50,000
	Leisure Division - (1 fte)	
	Annual Personnel Report refers	35,000
	Egham Sports Centre recovery plan	50,000
(ii)	Re-engineering savings –	
	DMS/Workflow related	15,000

	Review of WP resources	15,000	
	CMS introduction and IT review	8,000	
	Greater use of SurreyJobs info – e recruitment (saving in media adverts)	15,000	
	Reduced printing volumes through greater electronic usage	2,000	
	Telephone canvas usage for electoral registration and auto distribution	7,000	
	Greater electronic distribution – agendas and press cuttings and Information Directory	3,000	
	Greater use of direct debit and online payments with closure of cash office	50,000	
(iii)	Procurement –		
	Potential <u>minimum</u> savings following new post, etc	50,000	
	Consequential additional rental income following depot rationalisation	10,000	
	Renegotiation of telephone tariffs	2,000	
	Meals – new contract savings	20,000	
(iv)	Property Related Betterment –		
	(a) Rental income above that anticipated:		
	Rent reviews (potentially)	25,000	
	Larger Yellow Bus usage at Depot	15,000	
	Literary Institute, Egham – achieve some rental replacement for Bournewood	10,000	
	Station Road, Addlestone – flats	10,000	
	Precinct, High Street, Egham – share in rental uplift secured by long lessee	10,000	
	Other (including existing telecoms masts)	<u>15,000</u>	95,000
	(b) Additional capital receipts:		
	Blays Lane, Englefield Green	)	
	Barrsbrook Farm – site of former buildings only	)	
	Ferndale Avenue, Chertsey	)	circa £6,350,000
	Virginia Water Station	)	
	Covenants and easements	)	
	Electricity sub stations	)	
	Therefore revenue betterment assuming 5.0% investment income		305,000
(v)	Grant Aid –		
	Cash limiting – post 2007/08	10,000	
	Reduction in grant to Magna Carta Trust, etc	3,000	
(vi)	Miscellaneous items -		
	Delete corporate enforcement provision	10,000	
	Reduce specialist consultancy provision for environmental assessments	20,000	
	Delete corporate traveller removal expenses (separate provision in Planning budget)	5,000	
	Rephasing of land drainage special works	50,000	
(vii)	Discretionary fees and charges –		
	Planning – rise in fee scales	20,000	
	Car parking:		
	Beomonds/Library extension	15,000	

Precinct Tesco extension, Egham	10,000
Cemetery and associated charges (above 3% assumptions)	20,000
(viii) Other Financial Provisions –	
End of year betterment	250,000
Medium Term Benefit of Planning Delivery Grant	
Resulting from meeting particular targets	55,000
Medium Term Benefit of Recycling Improvement Grant	30,000
Withdrawal of Post Office subsidy/credit card administration charge	20,000
	<hr/>
	PROVISIONAL TOTAL   £ 1,250,000
	=====

4. Legal and Resource Implications

- 4.1 As can be seen from the previous paragraph, there are various staffing implications in these proposals. Some of these are dealt with in the departmental sections of the Annual Personnel Report, elsewhere on this Agenda. For the remainder consultations with individual staff affected and branch representatives of Unison have taken place. Their comments are detailed in Annex '2'.
- 4.2 The new target for revenue reductions of £2 million is to be achieved by 2006/07. The tranche of proposals detailed in this report total £1.25m in a full year. They therefore make a major contribution to the new target. Further detailed scrutiny of budgets is taking place and proposals will come forward to service committees or this Committee over the next six months. Careful monitoring of progress will be undertaken by the Chief Executive Officer and Directors. In the meantime it is essential to contain requests for new initiatives not already in the Forecast assumptions and justifications for supplementary General Fund revenue estimates will need very detailed scrutiny.

5. Policy Implications

- 5.1 The approved Leader's Position Statement for 2004/05 states:

"We will complete the current programme of reduction in net revenue expenditure by the end of 2005/06.

We will balance income and expenditure without recourse to reserves by 2008/09 subject to further Government funding shortfalls or additional centrally imposed local tax burdens."

- 5.2 As mentioned in paragraph 2.3 above, Officers have sought to bring forward proposals consistent with the policy guidance recommended at the last meeting.

**OFFICERS' RECOMMENDATION that -**

- i) the revenue reductions detailed at paragraph 3.1 of the report be approved in principle and the Chief Executive Officer and Directors be instructed to seek to implement them in the most effective manner possible;**
- ii) the views of UNISON detailed at Annex '2' be noted; and**
- iii) further proposals be brought forward to this Committee or appropriate service Committees in order to achieve the remainder of the revenue reductions target.**

**(TO RESOLVE)**

Background Papers  
Revenue Forecast Papers 2005/06 – 2009/10  
Budget Papers 2005/06



ANNEX '2'

*Runnymede Branch  
Civic Offices  
Station Road  
Addlestone  
Surrey  
KT15 2AH*

*Tel: 01932 838383  
ext. 5946 or  
01932 425946 (24hrs)*

**Branch Secretary**  
*Claire Pinnock*

*Our ref:*

*Your ref:*

*When telephoning  
please ask for*

**Proposals for Revenue Reductions 2005/06 – 2006/07**

Runnymede Branch of Unison has had detailed discussions with the Chief Executive Officer in respect of this report in order to gain clarification on a number of the headings listed in the proposals.

Unison appreciates the context in which the proposals are being put forward, and the constraints placed upon the Council in terms of the options it has for Revenue Reductions. It is understood that some of the areas of spend in the authority are Government led, for example e-government, the stock options appraisal and recommendations made under CPA, and consequently there is little scope for manoeuvre in these areas, however frustrating that is for staff who are constantly under pressure from new initiatives, changes in legislation and new ways of working.

The majority of Council expenditure is on discretionary services, and Unison would not like to see reductions in these areas where there are sound reasons for continuing them.

Where there are areas of specific concern, for example the proposed closure of the Cash Office, and reductions in WP resources across the Council, these have been discussed with the Chief Executive and Unison will continue to do all it can to assist its members who may be concerned about job security.

Unison is pleased to have been assured that, where appropriate, the Technology Agreement, which protects otherwise vulnerable posts from compulsory redundancy, will be applied, and that where staff reductions are a definite possibility, the consultation protocol will be followed.

In all cases, Unison will continue to press for no compulsory redundancies being made, and that where gaps are left in the organisation, they are promptly addressed to ensure the well being of staff who are left to maintain the service at a high standard.

It has been agreed that Personnel will issue a newsletter to staff setting out the background and what the proposals mean for staff and the service which will be followed by informal section based discussions between staff and the Chief Executive. Unison welcomes these initiatives and hopes that staff will engage in the process in order to gain a better understanding of the Revenue Reduction process and use the opportunity to discuss issues of concern.

Runnymede Unison Branch Committee  
February 2005.

## MINUTE OF CORPORATE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 3 MARCH 2005

PROPOSALS FOR REVENUE REDUCTIONS 2005/06 - 2006/07

(Ref: Minutes of Corporate Management Committee 30 September 2004, page 336, para 244 and January 2005, page 585, para 437)

The Committee gave consideration to a series of proposals for net revenue reductions in 2005/06 and 2006/07 as part of the ongoing savings exercise.

Members noted that substantial progress had already been made in respect of net revenue reductions during the previous three years. At the same time the Council had managed to enjoy the highest budgeted spend per head of population in Surrey in 2004/05 (£157) while taxing the least. Nevertheless, as highlighted in the most recent five year Financial Forecast, considerable pressure continued to be placed on the Council's medium term financial strategy by greater legislative burdens, growth items, the ongoing desire to meet residents' aspirations, below inflation grant settlements and the deficit funding of the superannuation fund referred to earlier in the meeting. There was, as a consequence, a continuing requirement for net revenue reductions, with some £2m presently needing to be achieved by 2006/07.

The Committee therefore received details of a substantial programme of additional net revenue reductions (set out in full at paragraph 3.1 of the Agenda report) which would make a significant contribution, provisionally estimated at £1.25m, towards the target. The proposals brought forward were consistent with the Leader of the Council's policy guidance, endorsed at the January 2005 meeting of the Committee, and had been formulated with regard for demographic, social and technological trends. Whilst these often properly drove service changes there had been a presumption that services and policy priority areas were to be safeguarded wherever possible. The reductions largely arose from IT led changes in working practices, an anticipated betterment on capital receipts and rental income, staff restructuring, procurement driven savings, increases in discretionary fees and charges and the forecast end of year betterment.

Members recognised that some of the proposals were liable to change and they would also be partly offset by the need for new and necessary expenditure which would inevitably occur during the course of the exercise. Nevertheless, the Committee was of the opinion that the proposals represented a positive response to the considerable challenge facing the Council and particularly welcomed the efforts to protect expenditure on discretionary services. It was acknowledged that the process was not easy and there would be uncertainty amongst those staff potentially affected by the proposals. Members were sympathetic to the circumstances of the Officers concerned, emphasising the constraints and pressures they considered had been placed upon the Council by Government led measures. It was noted that consultation had taken place with the relevant staff and branch representatives of UNISON. Where appropriate, such as in the case of the proposed closure of the cash office, it was intended to apply the Council's longstanding 'Technology Agreement' which provided for the redeployment of staff that would otherwise be vulnerable to compulsory redundancy as a result of new information technology. Officers were thanked for their co-operation with the exercise and the constructive and thoughtful representations received from UNISON and those sections directly affected by the proposals. It was emphasised that the £50,000 identified in respect of the Egham Sports Centre Recovery Plan represented a forecast improvement in income and not staff reductions.

The Committee noted that further detailed scrutiny of budgets was currently taking place in order to achieve the remainder of the target and proposals would be presented to Members over the following six months. Careful monitoring of progress would be undertaken by the Chief Executive Officer and Directors. Members acknowledged that in the meantime it would be essential to contain requests for new initiatives not already in the forecast assumptions and requests for Supplementary General Fund revenue estimates would need close scrutiny.

**RESOLVED that -**

- i) the net revenue reductions detailed at paragraph 3.1 of the Agenda report be approved in principle and the Chief Executive Officer and Directors be instructed to seek to implement them in the most effective manner possible and report back in 6 months;**

- ii) **the views of UNISON be noted; and**
- iii) **further proposals be brought forward to this Committee or appropriate service Committees in order to achieve the remainder of the target.**

PROGRESS REPORT ON ENFORCEMENT OF PLANNING CONTROL AS AT 5 APRIL 2005 (DAL)

APPENDIX 'G'

SITE AUTHORISATION DATE AND FILE REF	CONTRAVENTION	ACTION TAKEN	HISTORY	NEXT STEPS	TIMESCALE
The Conifers 111A, Almners Rd Lyne (20.11.92)  (8.1.93)  (File 53.14.227)	Residential Caravan Site hardstanding and roadway  Walls and tarmacadam of site	(i) Enforcement and Stop Notices issued.  (ii) Enforcement Notice issued.	Enforcement Notices effective. Final Injunction obtained: 16.06.95. Subsequent appeal to European Court. Judgement of European Court received and found in favour of RBC and UK position. Report to Committee regarding committal proceedings following determination of fresh application and consideration of occupiers circumstances in addition to changed circumstances on site. Reassessment of personal circumstances made following site visit.	Committee report to be prepared for April 2005.	April 2005.
Padd Farm Hurst Lane Egham (10.5.99)  (20.2.02)  (File 53.14.103)	Various changes of use of land and buildings and operational development	Six Enforcement Notices issued.	Notice A - Appeal allowed and Notice quashed and permission granted. Notice C - Appeal dismissed and Notice upheld, complied. Notice D - Appeal dismissed and Notice upheld, complied. Notice E - Appeal dismissed and Notice upheld. High Court challenge lodged by appellant. Notice upheld. Compliance period expired 04.08.01. Notice F - Appeal dismissed and Notice upheld, complied.  Authority given on 20.02.02 to initiate further enforcement and legal proceedings and to investigate compulsory acquisition of part of Padd Farm. Agent previously discussing future use of land - possible planning application, not received as yet. Waste transfer being investigated in liaison with Surrey County Council.	Committee report to be prepared for April 2005.	April 2005.

SITE AUTHORISATION DATE AND FILE REF	CONTRAVENTION	ACTION TAKEN	HISTORY	NEXT STEPS	TIMESCALE
Greenacres, Hardwick Lane Chertsey (6.3.00)  (File 53.14.295)	Siting of mobile homes and touring caravans in residential use	Enforcement Notices issued.	Appeal dismissed/allowed in part. Compliance period expired 15.11.01. Application refused in October 2002 and injunction proceedings authorised. Occupier circumstances being assessed prior to proceedings. Fresh planning application for new dwelling refused. Regular site visits being made to assess livestock levels/use of site. Personal circumstances assessed.	Committee report for April 2005	April 2005.
Willow Farm, Chobham Road Ottershaw (31.5.00)  (File 53.14.232)	Non-compliance with conditions of planning permissions - landscaping	Breach of Condition Notice issued.	Notice effective - compliance period expired 20.01.01. Partially complied. Previous owner informed that no more materials should be imported and that materials on site needed to be redistributed. Part of bunding removed. Site being monitored. Quotes obtained for possible direct action. See later entries.	Awaiting vacation of site.	June 2005.
Double S Stonehill Road, Ottershaw (5.9.01)  (File 53.13.70)	Caravans	Enforcement Notice issued.	Notice effective - compliance period expired 22.02.02. Prosecution pending - Instructions being prepared. Planning Contravention Notice issued and returned. Details checked by interviews under caution. Certificate of Lawfulness application for commercial use not received. Planning application for retention of mobile home being considered.	Application report being prepared.	May 2005.
Edenvale Docket Eddy Chertsey (7.11.01)  (File 53.14.314)	Siting of two caravans and pergola	Enforcement Notices issued.	Appeals dismissed and costs awarded to the Council. Notice re caravans upheld subject to extension of compliance period from 3 to 6 months expiring 27.02.03. Notice re pergola upheld. Compliance period expired 27.09.02. High Court challenge dismissed. Fresh evidence of full time residential use being obtained.	Prosecution statement to be prepared.	April 2005.

SITE AUTHORISATION DATE AND FILE REF	CONTRAVENTION	ACTION TAKEN	HISTORY	NEXT STEPS	TIMESCALE
The Annexe Hatch Farm Chertsey Road, Addlestone (19.12.01) (File 53.14.316)	Erection of brick wall	Enforcement Notice issued.	Appeal dismissed - Notice upheld. Compliance period expired 08.11.02. Application to be submitted for retention of wall.	Direct action if application not received.	April 2005.
54 Wey Meadows Weybridge (6.3.02) (File 53.14.320)	Mobile Home	Enforcement Notice issued.	Appeal dismissed - Notice upheld subject to extension of compliance period to 5 months expired 06.4.03.	Prosecution statement prepared and submitted to Legal Section.	April 2005.
85 Woodham Park Road, Woodham (8.5.02) (File 53.14.323)	Erection of single storey office and storage building	Enforcement Notice issued.	Appeal dismissed, Notice upheld subject to revised compliance period which expired 18.08.03. Site visit made. Breach still ongoing.	Building being demolished. Site being monitored.	April 2005.
Crockford Bridge Farm, New Haw Road, Addlestone (8.5.02) (File 53.14.324)	i) Non-compliance with conditions; ii) Erection of timber framed irrigation system (pergola)	Enforcement Notice issued in respect of pergola.	Appeal dismissed. Notice upheld subject to revised compliance period which expired 15.06.03. Revised planning application refused. Action in abeyance pending expiry of appeal period.	Report to Committee to be prepared on breach of conditions. Prosecution statement to be prepared in respect of pergola.	April 2005.

SITE AUTHORISATION DATE AND FILE REF	CONTRAVENTION	ACTION TAKEN	HISTORY	NEXT STEPS	TIMESCALE
11 Wilson Drive, Ottershaw (4.9.02) (File 53.14.329)	Change of use from woodland to residential garden.	Enforcement Notices issued.	Appeal dismissed and Notice upheld subject to minor variation. Compliance period expired 15.08.03.  Section 78 Appeal dismissed. Site visit to be made and, if appropriate, prosecution statement to be prepared. PCNs to be served on other residential properties in the Drive.	Site Visit	May 2005.
Capital House Woodham Park Road Woodham (12.3.03 - SO42) (File 53.14.335)	Erection of a single storey steel portal framed building.	Enforcement Notices issued.	Appeal withdrawn. Notice took effect 03.01.2004. Planning application for waste transfer station submitted and objection raised.  Action in abeyance pending determination of planning application by Surrey County Council.	Await S.C.C. decision	Ongoing
Willow Farm Chobham Road Ottershaw (21.3.03 - SO42) (File 53.14.232)	Laying of hardcore to form hardstanding.	Enforcement and Stop Notices issued.	Stop Notice took effect 28.03.03. Interim injunction obtained 29.04.2003. Appeal dismissed and Notice as varied upheld. Compliance period expires 22.04.05. Proceedings for full Injunction continue in the High Court. Site being monitored.	High Court Hearing 13.06.05.	June 2005.
Willow Farm Chobham Road Ottershaw (16.4.03) (File 53.14.232)	Storage of caravans.	Enforcement Notice issued.	Interim injunction obtained 29.04.03. Appeal dismissed and Notice as varied upheld. Compliance period expires 22.04.05. Proceedings for full Injunction continue in the High Court. Site being monitored.	High Court Hearing 13.06.05.	June 2005.

SITE AUTHORISATION DATE AND FILE REF	CONTRAVENTION	ACTION TAKEN	HISTORY	NEXT STEPS	TIMESCALE
Land r/o South Lodge Chobham Road Ottershaw (16.4.03 - SO42) (File 53.14.232)	Storage of caravans, trailers and mobile homes	Enforcement Notice issued.	Interim injunction obtained 29.04.03. Notice took effect 04.06.03. Compliance period expired. Not complied with.	Direct action to be taken in conjunction with previous entries re Willow Farm.	June 2005.
Thorpe Waterski, Thorpe Road, Chertsey (30.7.2003) (SO42 - 12.09.2003) (File 53.14.339)	Various unauthorised structures and changes of use.	Enforcement Notices issued.	Appeal submitted and withdrawn on 05.01.05. 8 new applications submitted and withdrawn. Two applications outstanding. Compliance period extended to nine months. Enforcement Notices now effective and compliance period expires 06.10.05.	Awaiting composite planning application	October 2005.
Land adj. 91 Chertsey Lane, Staines (3.9.03) (File 53.14.341)	Storage of caravans	Enforcement Notice issued.	Notice effective 17.11.03. Compliance period expired 17.02.04. Planning application for temporary retention of six caravans refused. Appeal dismissed. Access denied by owner. Site to be reinspected	Site inspected 31.03.05. All caravans removed.	April 2005.
21A and 22A Station Parade, Virginia Water (5.11.03) (File 53.14.343)	Change of use of first floor to office use for a temporary period of 2 years.	Enforcement Notice issued.	Appeal withdrawn. Notice effective. Compliance period expired 16.11.04. Tenant in Liquidation. Negotiations with freehold owner continue.	Owner taking possession.	May 2005.

SITE AUTHORISATION DATE AND FILE REF	CONTRAVENTION	ACTION TAKEN	HISTORY	NEXT STEPS	TIMESCALE
40 Crockford Park Road Addlestone (3.12.03)  (File 53.14.345)	i) Use of site for industrial and commercial purposes. ii) Operational development. : buildings and hardstanding.	Two Enforcement Notices issued.	i) Notice effective regarding uses. Compliance period expired 17.08.04. ii) Appeal lodged regarding operational development. Appeal dismissed and Notice upheld. Compliance period expired 19.01.05. iii) Outline planning permission granted for replacement dwelling following referral to GOSE.	i) Complied. ii) Site to be monitored. iii) Site to be monitored. Detailed application awaited.	-  May 2005.  Ongoing.
Abbey Chase Lodge Bridge Road Chertsey (3.12.03)  (File 53.14.344)	Siting of mobile home.	Enforcement Notice issued.	Notice effective - compliance period expired 08.09.04. Planning permission granted for extension to house. Caravan considered 'permitted development' during completion of works. Site being monitored.	Site being monitored.	Ongoing
Oak Farm Thorpe Green Egham (21.1.04)  (File 53.14.346)	Erection of wendy house, shed and creation of hardstanding, fencing, gates, brick piers, driveway.	Two Enforcement Notices issued.	Appeals lodged. Public Inquiry adjourned and then held on 13.01.2005. Appeals dismissed. Other breach being investigated.	Notices take effect 16.09.05	Nov 2005.

SITE AUTHORISATION DATE AND FILE REF	CONTRAVENTION	ACTION TAKEN	HISTORY	NEXT STEPS	TIMESCALE
Great Grove Farm Murray Road Ottershaw (31.3.04)  (File 53.14.350)	Portacabin, metal clad store/garage, steel framed building, storage of materials, plant and equipment and parking of vehicles.	Two Enforcement Notices Issued.	Appeals withdrawn. Notices now effective. Compliance period expires 02.07.05.  3 Certificates of Lawfulness Applications granted for steel framed storage building and commercial storage/parking on western part of site.  Metal clad store/garage and portacabin to be removed. No commercial storage/parking on eastern part of site.	Site being monitored to ensure compliance.	Ongoing
Bridge Autos 262-264 Chertsey Lane, Staines (26.5.04)  (File 53.14.353)	i) Fencing. ii) Parking of cars and storage of materials and scrap. iii) Storage/parking of vehicles in connection with car sales business.	Three Enforcement Notices issued.	i) Notice effective - compliance period expired 23.09.04. ii) Appeal lodged. iii) Notice effective - compliance period expired 23.09.04	i) Complied. ii) Awaiting outcome of appeal. iii) Complied.	ii) Ongoing.
Trys Hill Farm, Lyne Lane, Chertsey (28.6.04)  (File 53.14.356)	i) Mobile home and Menage. ii) Storage unit, Lean-to structure, fencing, wendy house	Four Enforcement Notices issued.	Four Appeals lodged and two withdrawn.  i) Public Inquiry date awaited. ii) Notices effective, compliance period expires 17.06.05.	i) Inquiry to be monitored. ii) to be monitored.	Ongoing. Ongoing.
Foxwoods, Trumps Green Road, Virginia Water. (28.6.04)  (File 53.14.354)	Fencing	Enforcement Notice issued.	Enforcement Notice effective. Compliance period expires 22.12.04. Quotes obtained for possible direct action. Some fencing erected on Highway land. Liaison with County Council Officers will be required.	Site visit to be made.	April 2005.

SITE AUTHORISATION DATE AND FILE REF	CONTRAVENTION	ACTION TAKEN	HISTORY	NEXT STEPS	TIMESCALE
Plots 14B, 15 & 16, The Moorings, Abbey Chase Chertsey (28.6.04) (File 53.14.355)	Residential occupation of boat.	Breach of Condition Notice issued.	Notice effective – compliance period expired 13.01.05. Application received and refused.	Site visit to be made. Prosecution to be prepared.	April 2005.
The Cattle Park St Anns Hill Road, Chertsey (14.7.04) (File 53.14.357)	Siting of mobile home. Erection of decking.	Enforcement action authorised.	Notices drafted. Owner has given undertaking to comply. Other breaches being investigated.	Site being monitored.	April 2005.
New Bungalow Ruxbury Farm St Anns Hill Road Chertsey (4.8.04) (File 53.14.358)	Storage and repair of vehicles.	Enforcement Notice issued.	Enforcement Notice issued. Notice effective – compliance period expired 28.02.05.	Site visit to be made.	April 2005.
Amberwood and Lone Pine Christchurch Road Virginia Water (4.8.04) (File 53.14.333)	Erection of fence.	Enforcement Notice issued.	Notice quashed on appeal. Report submitted to Planning Committee. New authorisation given to take fresh enforcement action. New Enforcement Notice issued 22.09.04 and Appeal lodged.	Informal Hearing 15.03.05.	Ongoing.
Holly Farm Cottage, Brox Lane, Ottershaw (15.9.04) (File 53.14.359)	Use of building as single self-contained dwelling house.	Enforcement Notice issued 26.01.2005.	Enforcement Notice issued. Section 78 Appeal lodged. Notice in abeyance. Enforcement Appeal lodged.	Notice in abeyance.	Ongoing.

SITE AUTHORISATION DATE AND FILE REF	CONTRAVENTION	ACTION TAKEN	HISTORY	NEXT STEPS	TIMESCALE
Rosefield, Hurst Lane, Egham (29.9.04) (File 53.14.361)	Use of building for independent residential occupation.	Enforcement Notice issued 28.01.2005.	Enforcement Notice issued. Notice took effect on 07.03.05. Compliance period expires 07.07.05.		July 2005.
Brown Gables, 3 Trumps Green Road, Virginia Water (29.9.04) (File 53.14.360)	Extension and conservatory	Enforcement Notice issued 28.01.05.	Enforcement Notice issued. Section 78 Appeal lodged. Enforcement Appeal lodged.	Notice in abeyance.	Ongoing.
The Lane, Stroude Road, Virginia Water (24.11.04) (File 53.14.176)	Storage of portacabin, storage and repair of vehicles, plant and machinery and industrial vehicles	Enforcement Notice issued 04.02.2005.	Enforcement Notice issued. Enforcement Appeal lodged.	Notice in abeyance.	Ongoing.
39 Nightingale Shott, Egham (24.11.04) (File 53.14.362)	Breach of Conditions - conversion of garage	Breach of Condition Notice issued 02.02.2005.	Breach of Condition Notice issued and effective. Compliance by 02.06.2005.		June 2005.
24 Riverside, Egham (8.12.04) (File 53.13.364)	Erection of rear outbuilding	Enforcement action authorised and Enforcement Notice drafted.	Enforcement Notice drafted.	Awaiting results of Enforcement Section's site inspection.	April 2005.

SITE AUTHORISATION DATE AND FILE REF	CONTRAVENTION	ACTION TAKEN	HISTORY	NEXT STEPS	TIMESCALE
Land adjacent to Stroude Road and Clockhouse Lane West, Egham (08.12.04) (File 53.14.363)	<p>i) Storage of builders waste. Siting/storage of caravans. Residential use of caravans/structures. Retail sales of plants/shrubs &amp; associated goods.</p> <p>ii) Erection of buildings/structures Construction of hardstandings. Creation of vehicular access.</p>	Two Enforcement Notices issued 23.03.05.	2 Enforcement Notices issued. Notices take effect 29.04.05. Compliance period expires 28.07.05.		Ongoing.
11 Riverside, Egham (22.12.04) (File 53.14.365)	Erection of metal railing and gate.	Enforcement Notice issued 08.03.05.	Enforcement Notice issued. Planning Application refused. Notice takes effect on 12.04.05. Compliance period expires 12.07.05		Ongoing.
Pleasant View, Woodham Park Road, Woodham (22.12.04) (File 53.14.331)	Erection of Conservatory extension.	Enforcement Notice issued 23.02.05.	Enforcement Notice issued. Notice takes effect 01.04.05. Compliance period expires 01.08.05		Ongoing.

SITE AUTHORISATION DATE AND FILE REF	CONTRAVENTION	ACTION TAKEN	HISTORY	NEXT STEPS	TIMESCALE
Warren Yard, Lyne Lane, Lyne (05.01.05) (File 53.14.366)	i) Site office, storage containers, the open storage of materials, vehicles, caravans, plant, machinery.  ii) Electricity meter boxes	2 Enforcement Notices issued 16.03.05.	Enforcement action authorised following the grant of Lawful Use Certificates. 2 Enforcement Notices issued. Notices take effect on 26.04.05. Compliance period expires 25.07.05.		Ongoing.
Bridge Autos 262-264 Chertsey Lane, Staines (02.02.05) (File 53.14.353)	i) Portacabin. ii) Fencing	Land Registry details obtained.	Enforcement Notice to be drafted.		April 2005.
Thorpe Car Sales 262-264 Chertsey Lane, Staines. (02.02.05) (File 53.14.353)	i) Car Sales ii) Fencing	Land Registry details obtained.	Enforcement Notice to be drafted.		April 2005.
Capital House, Woodham Park Road, Woodham (16.02.05) (File 53.14.335)	Storage Containers	If Surrey County Council refuse waste transfer station application issue Enforcement Notice		Monitor situation.	Ongoing.

SITE AUTHORISATION DATE AND FILE REF	CONTRAVENTION	ACTION TAKE	HISTORY	NEXT STEPS	TIMESCALE
'Kupida', Coach Road, Ottershaw. (16.02.05) (File 53.14.367)	Structure with brick base in residential use.	Enforcement Notice issued 03.03.05.	Enforcement Notice issued. Notice takes effect on 11.04.05. Compliance period expires 11.08.05		Ongoing.
Bourne Valley Garden Centre Woodham Park Road, Woodham (16.03.05) (File 53.14.368)	Unauthorised Storage Uses and Hardstanding	Land Registry details being obtained.			Ongoing.

## REPORT TO PLANNING COMMITTEE ON 16 FEBRUARY 2005

## PLANNING FOR GYPSY AND TRAVELLER SITES – CONSULTATION PAPER (DTS)

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 **To seek the Committee's view on this Consultation Paper regarding a proposed Circular from the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM).**

2. Background Information

2.1 The Government is committed to ensuring that members of the Gypsy and Traveller communities should have the same access to decent and appropriate accommodation as every other citizen and that there are sufficient sites available to meet their needs.

2.2 It is suggested that a new Planning Circular is necessary because evidence shows that the advice set out in the existing Circular (1/94) has failed to deliver adequate sites for Gypsies and Travellers in many parts of the country. Since the repeal of the Local Authority's duty to provide Gypsy sites, there have been a number of applications for private sites, many of which have been refused.

2.3 The Government has indicated that its main intentions for the new Circular are as follows:-

- To increase significantly the number of Gypsy and Traveller sites
- To recognise, protect and facilitate the traditional lifestyle of Gypsies and Travellers
- To identify and make provision for the resultant land and accommodation requirements
- To help avoid Gypsies and Travellers becoming unintentionally homeless
- To reflect the status of Gypsy and Traveller accommodation as part of wider housing provision
- To create and support sustainable integrated communities where Gypsies and Travellers have a quality of access to suitable accommodation, education, health and welfare provision and where there is mutual respect between all communities for the rights and responsibilities of each community and individual
- To promote more private Gypsy and Traveller site provision in appropriate locations whilst recognising that there will always be those who cannot provide their own sites
- To underline the importance of assessing needs at regional and sub-regional level and for Local Authorities to develop strategies to ensure that needs are dealt with fairly and effectively
- To ensure that Development Plan documents include fair, realistic and inclusive policies to ensure identified need is dealt with fairly and effectively
- To reduce the number of unauthorised encampments and developments and the conflict and controversy they cause and also to make enforcement more effective where Local Authorities have complied with the guidance in this Circular.

3. Report

3.1 The proposed Circular introduces a new definition of Gypsies and Travellers as follows:-

*"A person or persons who have a traditional cultural preference for living in caravans and who either pursue a nomadic habit of life or who have pursued such a habit but have ceased travelling, whether permanently or temporarily, because of the education needs of their dependant children, or ill health, old age, or caring responsibilities (whether of themselves, their dependants living with them, or the widows and widowers of such dependants) but does*

*not include members of an organised group of travelling show people or circus people, travelling together as such."*

- 3.2 Recent counts indicated there are around 15,000 Gypsy caravans with around three quarters of these on authorised sites. The overall need for sites is therefore small. It is suggested that there is a need to provide sites, including transit sites, in locations that meet the current working patterns of Gypsies and Travellers. It is recognised that in view of changes in work patterns, these may not be in the same areas that they have been traditionally located in.
- 3.3 As part of the Local Development Framework, Local Authorities are required to carry out local housing assessments. It is confirmed that these will need to take into account the needs of Gypsies and Travellers. Attention is also drawn to Local Authority's obligations in respect of homelessness and race relations legislation.
- 3.4 It is suggested that Local Authorities should allocate sufficient sites in Development Plan documents to ensure that the pitch requirements identified in the regional spatial strategy can be met. It is expected that the regional planning bodies will reflect likely housing requirements within the regional spatial strategy and will liaise with Gypsy and Traveller representatives. Similarly, with Local Development Framework preparation, consultation with Gypsies and Travellers should be reflected within the statement of community involvement. In the interim, it is recommended that a range of existing data should be used to judge Gypsy related matters before more detailed evidence is available.
- 3.5 The Circular indicates that where there is an assessment of unmet need for Gypsy accommodation in an area, development plan documents should identify suitable locations for sites. In addition, these documents should set out fair, reasonable, realistic and effective criteria for suitable locations in site provision policies. It further indicates that where a Local Authority is unable to meet all assessed future needs through specific site locations, they should give a reasoned explanation why that has not been possible and why the use of criteria is necessary to ensure adequate provision. Criteria based policies will be required whether or not there is any current need identified in the area. It specifically indicates that planning policies that rule out or place undue constraints on the development of Gypsy and Travellers sites should not be included in development plan documents.
- 3.6 The Circular confirms that new sites within the Green Belt are likely to be inappropriate development. However, it suggests that criteria based policies should not impose a total, blanket ban on the establishment of such sites in the Green Belt. It indicates that it may still be appropriate to grant permission if the applicant is able to demonstrate very special circumstances.
- 3.7 The Circular does recognise that the presence of Green Belt is likely to constrain and limit opportunities for identifying sites in some areas. However, it suggests that where a Local Authority's area contains a high proportion of Green Belt land and no other suitable sites outside the Green Belt exist, an Authority may, exceptionally, wish to consider a limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary to meet a specific identified need.

#### **4. Comment**

- 4.1 ***The detailed guidance relating to the processing of individual planning applications does not vary greatly from current guidance. The main thrust of this Circular is to aim to ensure that new sites are provided across the country to meet the current unmet need.***
- 4.2 ***It is clear that the Government expects that housing needs assessments, statements of community involvement, and development plan documents which form part of the Local Development Framework will make specific references to Gypsies and Travellers, in terms of the local need, local provision, and proposals to meet any identified shortfall.***
- 4.3 ***The Council has recently commissioned a housing needs survey and included in the brief a requirement to assess the needs of the Gypsies and Travellers. However, none of the consultants (who are leaders in this field) were able to provide a mechanism for such work and it is not to be included in the study. This illustrates the potential difficulties with such a project on a district wide basis.***

- 4.4 *The indication that it will be a responsibility of the regional planning bodies to produce data on need on a regional basis is welcomed. Clearly, persons of a nomadic habit do not recognise individual Local Authority boundaries and in the past it has been argued that assessing need on an individual Borough or District basis is too narrowly defined. A regional assessment will enable a wider view to be taken of needs and existing provision.*
- 4.5 *It is widely recognised that an accurate assessment of Gypsy numbers, and existing sites is very difficult to define. Equally it is accepted that the bi-annual count of Gypsies is not particularly accurate. It is essential that new sites are provided on the basis of accurate information and that double counting is minimised.*
- 4.6 *Within Surrey, the County Council has recently undertaken some research into the number of sites and number of Gypsies resorting or residing to the County. This will be a useful document which will inform the Local Development Framework process, and also feed into the regional Planning Authority's deliberations.*
- 4.7 *In Runnymede, there is already a range of provision of Gypsy sites, both publicly provided and privately owned. In the most recent Appeal decision against the refusal of planning permission for a new site, the Inspector accepted that the provision for such a small Borough was adequate and that no further provision was required. Clearly, this position will need to be monitored in relation to estimates and counts of Gypsy numbers following a local housing needs assessment. It is plain, however, assuming that this Circular is agreed by the Government that there will be a requirement to both consult with Gypsies and Travellers in the preparation of the framework and also to include specific policies relating to such sites within the adopted documents.*

**OFFICERS' RECOMMENDATION that -**

**the comments contained in the above report be forwarded to the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister as this Authority's formal comments on this Consultation Paper.**

**(TO RESOLVE)**

Background Papers

Planning for Gypsy and Traveller Sites Consultation Paper, ODPM, December 2004

## MINUTE OF PLANNING COMMITTEE ON 16 FEBRUARY 2005

PLANNING FOR GYPSY AND TRAVELLER SITES – CONSULTATION PAPER

The Committee considered a report on a Consultation Paper from the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) regarding a proposed Circular which sought to ensure that members of the Gypsy and Traveller communities had the same access to decent and appropriate accommodation as every other citizen and that there were sufficient sites available to meet their needs.

The Circular suggested that there was a need to provide sites, including transit sites, in locations that met the current working patterns of Gypsies and Travellers.

As part of the Local Development Framework, Local Authorities would need to take into account the needs of Gypsies and Travellers in undertaking local housing assessments. Attention was also drawn to Local Authority's obligations in respect of homelessness and race relations legislation.

The Circular suggested that Local Authorities should allocate sufficient sites in Development Plan documents to ensure that the pitch requirements identified in the regional spatial strategy could be met. These documents should also set out fair, reasonable, realistic and effective criteria for suitable locations in site provision policies.

The Circular confirmed that new sites within the Green Belt were likely to be inappropriate development unless very special circumstances could be demonstrated. The Circular suggested that where a Local Authority's area contained a high proportion of Green Belt land and no other suitable sites outside the Green Belt existed, an Authority could, exceptionally, consider a limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary to meet a specific identified need.

Assessment of the needs of gypsies and travellers would be difficult on a district-wide basis. The Council had recently commissioned a housing needs survey and included in the brief a requirement to assess the needs of the Gypsies and Travellers. However, none of the consultants, who were leaders in this field, were able to provide a mechanism for such work and it was excluded from the study.

The Committee welcomed the proposal that regional planning bodies would be responsible for production of data on need on a regional basis. A regional assessment would enable a wider view to be taken of needs and existing provision.

The Committee recognised that an accurate assessment of Gypsy numbers, and existing sites was very difficult to define, and acknowledged that the bi-annual count of Gypsies was not particularly accurate. Therefore, the Committee considered it was essential that new sites were provided on the basis of accurate information and that double counting was minimised.

Within Surrey, the County Council had recently undertaken some research into the number of sites and number of Gypsies resorting or residing to the County. This would be a useful document which would inform the Local Development Framework process, and also feed into the Regional Planning Authority's deliberations.

The Committee welcomed the safeguarding of Green Belt land from inappropriate development. The Committee also stressed its wish that applications made by persons in settled communities and gypsies for any development in the Green Belt had to be dealt with consistently and fairly.

**RESOLVED that -**

**the above-mentioned comments be forwarded to the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister as this Authority's formal comments on this Consultation Paper.**