

Runnymede Borough Council
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Thursday 12 June 2003, at 7.30 p.m.

in the Council Chamber
at the Civic Offices, Addlestone



Members of the Committee

Councillors J.R. Furey (Chairman), J.E. Haas (Vice-Chairman), A. Alderson, M.J. Brown, A.J. Davis, D.P. Easton, R.J. Ray, B.J. Relph, Ms. C.M. Simmons and K.J.T. Walmsley.

and all other Members for information

A G E N D A

Notes:

- i) Any report on the Agenda involving confidential information (as defined by section 100A(3) of the Local Government Act 1972) must be discussed in private. Any report involving exempt information (as defined by section 100I of the Local Government Act 1972), whether it appears in Part 1 or Part 2 below, may be discussed in private but only if the Committee so resolves.
- ii) The relevant 'background papers' are listed after each report in Part 1. Enquiries about any of the Agenda reports and background papers should be directed in the first instance to **Mr. G. Marson, Committee Section, Administration and Leisure Department, Civic Offices, Station Road, Addlestone (Tel. Direct Line: 01932 425625). (Email: gary.marson@runnymede.gov.uk).**
- iii) Agendas and Minutes are available on a subscription basis. For details, please ring Mr. B.A. Fleckney on 01932 425620.
- iv) in the unlikely event of an alarm sounding, members of the public should leave the building immediately, either using the staircase leading from the public gallery or following other instructions as appropriate.

COMMITTEE SECTION



LIST OF MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION

PART I

Matters in respect of which reports have been made available for public inspection

	<u>Page</u>
1. NOTIFICATION OF CHANGES TO COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP	3
2. MINUTES	3
3. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE	3
4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	3
5. AIMS AND TARGETS 2002/03 - OUTTURN	3
6. REVIEW OF CAR PARKING CHARGES (TO FOLLOW)	3
7. DECRIMINALISED PARKING ENFORCEMENT	4
8. THE FUTURE DEVELOPMENT OF AIR TRANSPORT IN THE UNITED KINGDOM - REVISED CONSULTATION PAPER	5
9. ECONOMIC STRATEGY	9
10. LAND DRAINAGE SERVICE - BEST VALUE SCOPING AND CHALLENGE REPORT	11
11. PLANNING POLICY AND IMPLEMENTATION - BEST VALUE CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT PLAN - PROGRESS REPORT	14
12. ADDLESTONE COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION CENTRE REPROVISION	22
13. URGENT ACTION - STANDING ORDER 42	23
14. REFERRAL FROM HOUSING AND COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE	23
15. PROVISION OF BUS SHELTERS	23
16. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC	25

PART II

Matters involving Exempt or Confidential Information in respect of which reports have not been made available for public inspection.

a) Exempt Information

17. PROPERTIES IN STATION ROAD, ADDLESTONE	27
18. 190 STATION ROAD, ADDLESTONE	30
19. SURREY TOWERS - TELECOMMUNICATIONS RENT REVIEW	31
20. 49 GUILDFORD STREET, CHERTSEY	32
21. 55 GUILDFORD STREET, CHERTSEY	33

b) Confidential Information

(No reports to be considered under this heading)

1. NOTIFICATION OF CHANGES TO COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

2. MINUTES

To confirm and sign as a correct record the Minutes of the meetings of the Committee held on 13 March and 15 May 2003. (The latter are attached at Appendix 'A').

3. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

If Members have an interest in an item please record the interest on the form circulated with this Agenda and hand it to the Legal Representative or Committee Administrator at the start of the meeting. A supply of the form will also be available from the Committee Administrator at meetings.

Members who have previously declared interests which are recorded in the Minutes to be considered at this meeting need not repeat the declaration when attending the meeting. Members need take no further action unless the item in which they have an interest becomes the subject of debate, in which event the Member must leave the room if the interest is personal and prejudicial.

5. AIMS AND TARGETS 2002/03 - OUTTURN (CEO)

1. Purpose of Report

1.1 **The purpose of this report is to inform Members of the outturn figures of the 2002/03 Aims and Targets for this Committee.**

2. Performance

2.1 Appendix 'B' outlines progress on the Aims and Targets in the period 1 April 2002 to 31 March 2003. Some of the significant achievements during the year are indicated in the following paragraphs.

2.2 Good progress has been made with the Civic Offices re-provision, with extensive negotiations with the Addlestone Community Association resulting in the submission of a planning application for the new building in Garfield Road.

2.3 Action Addlestone work is continuing with signalling improvements at the Church Road/High Street/Brighton Road traffic lights and detailed design work on traffic calming progressing.

2.4 Planning permission has been granted for the final phase of work in the Chertsey Revitalisation Area with construction anticipated shortly.

2.5 The Runnymede Business Partnership has continued to play an active role in economic development, with a prominent role in relation to the Runnymede Travel initiative.

3. Conclusions

3.1 The Council has maintained its good record on delivering its economic development priorities. There are many targets which are ongoing given the rolling nature of the work required, so good practice is still being made in other areas.

(FOR INFORMATION)

Background Papers

Leaders Position Statement 2002/03

6. REVIEW OF CAR PARKING CHARGES (DTS)

This item will follow under separate cover.

7. DECriminalISED PARKING ENFORCEMENT (DTS)
(Ref: Minutes of Economic Development Committee March 2003, page 1139, para. 702)

1. **Purpose of Report**

- 1.1 **The purpose of this report is to inform Members on the progress being made towards the introduction of Decriminalised Parking Enforcement (DPE) within the Borough and recommend a supplementary estimate for consultancy support.**

2. Background Information

- 2.1 Members have previously been advised of the withdrawal of Surrey Police from enforcing certain parking offences within Surrey with effect from April 2004. The responsibility for such enforcement will be assumed by Surrey County Council which, in turn, suggests that the 11 Borough/District Councils take on the function in their individual areas under an Agency Agreement.
- 2.2 Over the past months a number of meetings have been held between the County Council and the Borough Councils. These have identified 4 Districts which will be introducing DPE in April 2004 namely, Reigate and Banstead, Guildford, Epsom and Ewell and Woking, with the remainder following in 2005.

3. Joint Members Working Group

- 3.1 At the last meeting of this Committee, in March, it was agreed that a Joint Members Working Group should be formed in order to progress DPE as soon as possible.
- 3.2 The Group, which comprises two Members from both Runnymede and the County Council has met on two occasions (summaries of these meetings are attached at Appendix 'C'). At the first meeting, on 1 April 2003, two programmes relating to implementation were presented to the Group. The early programme reflected a November 2004 introduction of DPE and the late showed an April 2005 implementation. The view of the Group was that DPE needs to be introduced as early as possible. To this end, Officers were asked to develop a programme which would bring the implementation of DPE in Runnymede forward to April 2004. There are, however, constraints on this target date in terms of resources and provision of funds.
- 3.3 A second meeting of the Working Group was held on 13 May where the programme was once again discussed. The programme had been further developed to show the critical path activities and illustrated that DPE could not be introduced into the Borough any earlier than November 2004. Even if this date is to be achieved, outside resources would need to be taken on in the form of assistance from a consultant at a cost of approximately £30,000. The County Council has subsequently indicated that it is prepared to contribute £20,000 towards this sum.
- 3.4 Copies of the programme showing the activities and the critical path for a November 2004 introduction of DPE to Runnymede are set out in Appendix 'D'.

4. Financial Implications

- 4.1 The progression of an early implementation of DPE is likely to cost £30,000, of which the County Council will contribute £20,000. The shortfall will have to be borne by the Borough Council.
- 4.2 As has been indicated in earlier reports, the introduction of DPE will also require an enhanced staff resource, both in forms of inspection, administration and managerial inputs. Early introduction will of course bring these requirements forward.

5. Conclusions

- 5.1 The Council has endorsed the principle of DPE and this Committee has indicated its desire to see it introduced as soon as practicable.

- 5.2 County staff are constrained by the difficulties of introducing DPE across a number of Boroughs at once. Similarly, Borough staff are constrained by current workloads.
- 5.3 It is therefore recommended that to introduce DPE as soon as possible in the Borough a consultancy resource be used, at a cost to this authority not exceeding £10,000.

OFFICERS' RECOMMENDATION that -

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

(TO RESOLVE)

Background Papers

None

8. THE FUTURE DEVELOPMENT OF AIR TRANSPORT IN THE UNITED KINGDOM - REVISED CONSULTATION PAPER (DTS)

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

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 **The purpose of this report is to seek the views of the Committee on a revised consultation paper issued by the Department for Transport on 'The Future Development of Air Transport in the United Kingdom'. This report will focus on the South East and East of England.**
- 1.2 **Copies of the consultation paper were placed on the Intranet in March 2003. This report was considered by the Planning Committee on 4 June. Comments are requested by 30 June 2003.**

2. Background Information

- 2.1 The Council was consulted on a document entitled 'The Future Development of Air Transport in the UK: South East' in 2002. However, in tandem with the consultation process by the Department for Transport (DfT), the High Court held that it was wrong to exclude from the South East consultation document options for the development of new runways at Gatwick. The Government has now published a revised version of the document that takes account of the decision to consult on options for Gatwick.
- 2.2 The Consultation Paper seeks views on the future development of air transport in the South East over the next 30 years. Comments are invited on future airport capacity requirements and the location of any new airport capacity. The Government wishes to ensure that the long term development of aviation is sustainable. It considers that its policy for airports in the South East should aim both to maximise the significant social and economic benefit that growth in aviation would bring, whilst trying to minimise the environmental impact.
- 2.3 At present Heathrow's two runways operate at capacity for most hours of the day and the Airport experiences regular delays. Gatwick's runway is full for most of the day and Stansted's is coming close to its capacity in peak hours. The Government considers that demand for air travel is still increasing and new runway capacity will be needed soon.
- 2.4 The Planning and Economic Development Committees considered the earlier consultation paper at their respective meetings in November 2002. However, the Council, at its meeting in December, resolved to refer the merits of the comments of the Economic Development Committee and certain procedural matters to the Review Board in February. The Council, in April 2003, approved the subsequent recommendation of the Economic Development Committee, in the light of the comments of the Review Board, to maintain the original policy

position on the consultation paper, which was to 'on balance favour the expansion of Heathrow, subject to proper environmental protection measures'. The consideration of the consultation paper is set out in more detail in Appendix 'E'.

2.5 The remainder of the report examines the wider air transport issues, but focuses upon the implications for this area and in particular the proposals for Heathrow. The report does not differ significantly from the item considered in 2002 as the same material issues remain for consideration. Additional issues are highlighted on the implications of the Gatwick option.

3. Policy and Technical Considerations

3.1 The consultation on South East airports seeks to address three questions:-

- Should new airport capacity be provided in the South East over the next 30 years and, if so, how much? A particular issue is whether there is a case for having at least one major hub airport.
- Where should any new airport capacity be located? A particular issue is whether or not Heathrow should be developed further.
- What measures would be needed to control and mitigate the environmental impacts of any airport growth.

3.2 The report considers a number of options at different airports for dealing with the forecast demand for air travel. These include proposals for different amounts of new runway capacity as well as options that limit development in the South East. Striking a balance between the social and economic gains and the environmental impact is not easy, but choices have to be made. From the Government's viewpoint, doing nothing is not an option. It is necessary to decide what sort of airport capacity is needed, and in particular, whether there should be at least one major hub airport in the South East. This is particularly important for the South East because of the high demand for air travel and the large population.

3.3 Airports with substantial capacity are able to attract considerable numbers of passengers connecting from one flight to another. This makes it viable for airlines to operate services to a wider range of destinations and a greater frequency of services than could be supported by local demand alone. This brings direct benefits to travellers. Hub airports also benefit airlines by allowing them to organise schedules efficiently, thus minimising the transit times for connecting passengers. Typically, a hub airport needs to meet certain key requirements:- sufficient consumer demand to generate necessary levels of traffic; proximity to a large number of people who want to fly; good surface transport links; high local attractiveness to businesses and tourism; adequate airport infrastructure; and the presence of one or two airlines (or a strong alliance) to provide a large proportion of capacity, frequency and destinations in a co-ordinated way.

3.4 Heathrow is a key part of the Air Transport Strategy for the South East. However, there are a range of options for airport development over the next 30 years. The proposed options for major growth are summarised below :-

3.5 The options:-

Heathrow: a new runway with associated terminal development.

Gatwick: one or two new runways with new terminal development.

Stansted: one to three new runways and associated terminal development.

Cliffe: a new airport built on the south side of the Thames Estuary. Four/five runway airport with terminal facilities.

3.6 Heathrow:-

The proposals for Heathrow will be of particular interest to the Committee and comprise the following aspects:-

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

3.7 The Government's policy is to do everything practicable to improve the noise climate over time. The number of people affected by noise around Heathrow has in fact reduced sharply over the last 20 years. As a condition of approval for Terminal 5, the Government set a limit on the size of the 57dBA contour, to apply from 2016, of 145 square kilometres. The Government proposes that a contour limit of this nature, with the presumption that it would be of the same size, should apply if a third runway is built. This would require efforts by the industry to achieve rapid improvements in engine technology and for the fleet using Heathrow to include only the quietest available aircraft. There might also need to be specific controls on the types of aircraft allowed to use the new runway.

Noise Pollution

3.8 None of the options appraised lead to more night flights or any increase in night flights at any existing location (but it is assumed that there would be some night flights at new airports at Cliffe or Alconbury). Night noise is a completely independent issue since the number of flights by aircraft at night is a matter of regulatory policy rather than runway capacity. However, the Government does recognise the very serious concerns people have about night noise, and the possibility of tighter night flight restrictions will be considered as part of the periodic cycle of night noise consultations undertaken by the Government.

Air Pollution

3.9 EU legislation has set mandatory limits in relation to various air pollutants. The UK Government will be obliged to ensure that people are not exposed to levels of pollution that exceed these limits. In the case of airports, the limits in relation to two pollutants - nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) and particulate matter (PM₁₀) - are particularly relevant. The modelling shows that an extra runway at Heathrow would lead to homes being exposed to levels of NO₂ that exceed EU limits. Emissions from aircraft are, in this scenario, the main (but not the only) source of NO₂. There are uncertainties about modelling possible future concentrations of particular pollutants. However, it is clear that another runway at Heathrow could not be considered unless the Government was confident that it was feasible to contain the level of NO₂ and, if need be, other pollutants, at and around the airport within the EU limits.

The Options

3.10 To focus attention on the key issues the document sets out a series of options for the 'major airport' development. These are set out in Appendix 'F'.

3.11 Heathrow features in a number of the options and the report highlights that the biggest economic benefits come from combinations which create at least one hub and a large total amount of capacity in the South East.

Comment

Should additional air transport capacity be provided?

3.12 ***The first issue of principle that the Committee needs to consider is whether airport policy for the South East should aim both to maximise the social and economic benefits that growth in aviation would bring whilst trying to minimise the environmental impact. Historically the Council has adopted the view that airport expansion brings with it significant economic advantages. However, an important aspect of such support is that the environmental impact must be minimised. Officers' view is that whilst there are many economic and environmental issues to consider (see paragraphs 3.7-3.9), the principle of supporting airport expansion to maximise social and economic benefits should remain the view of the Council.***

The Regional Picture

- 3.13 *Whilst no new runways have been constructed in the South-East since the Second World War, airport development around London has been raised on a regular basis, both in terms of new runways and terminal capacity, but no long-term strategy has been accepted or approved by successive Governments.*
- 3.14 *At one level, a long-term solution of an entirely new hub airport at Cliffe, in Kent, is attractive in providing for projected growth whilst having perhaps the least impact environmentally on man (although greater impact on the natural environment). It can also be provided with good transportation links, and help regenerate land to the East of London. Fundamentally, however, it would need the backing of funders (presumably BAA) and a major airline or consortium (presumably BA) neither of whom appear inclined to enter into a long-term commitment for the scale of investment required.*
- 3.15 *The inclusion of Gatwick as an option brings with it the opportunity to increase the potential for higher passenger capacity in the South East than proposed in the earlier Consultation Paper. The potential expansion of Gatwick increases the options for consideration from 7 to 25 (see Appendix 'F').*
- 3.16 *If the principle of expansion of airport capacity is accepted, the second issue that the Committee needs to examine is whether such expansion is appropriate at Heathrow.*

Should Heathrow Airport expand?

- 3.17 *The expansion of the airport capacity at Heathrow gives rise to the same issues that the Council considered when examining the proposals for a Fifth Terminal. In that situation the economic impact was weighed against the environmental (traffic generation, noise and air pollution) issues. Previously the Council considered that the economic benefits to the area were an overriding issue so long as measures were introduced ameliorating the environmental concerns.*
- 3.18 *Of particular interest to the Council has been the impact of adding a significant generator of traffic into an already overloaded local motorway and road network. With T5 it was considered important to develop public transport links to the south and west of the Airport and particular emphasis was placed upon the development of Airtrack (the enhanced rail link from Guildford-Woking-Runnymede-Staines-Heathrow). The Council noted with some disappointment that this did not form part of the enhanced public transport links associated with the recent Government approval of the Fifth Terminal.*
- 3.19 *It is important to note that a decision on airport policy would take several decades to materialise. If future development is directed away from Heathrow it is possible that its role would only begin to change (after the completion and operation of T5) over a 15-30 year period as the proposals for an alternative 'hub' are developed. The impact over that timescale is difficult to predict. However, two of the major parties who would be involved with airport expansion, BA and BAA, have indicated previously that they have a preference for concentrating future growth at Heathrow. Furthermore, it is understood that they would be reluctant to endorse the proposals for the development of a 'hub' airport at Cliffe. It is unclear at this stage how the inclusion of Gatwick has influenced their preference. The issue will influence the outcome of the consultation if a pragmatic solution to airport expansion is to evolve.*
- 3.20 *The Council, as it develops its policy position on the proposals for additional airport development, will again need to balance the economic benefits with the environmental impact of the proposals for the Airport. Officers consider that on balance the Council's position should generally remain consistent with its approach to T5 but that guarantees are sought that support for an expansion of Heathrow must be linked to enhanced public transport to the South and West of the Airport (with the Airtrack project forming the core of the improvements). In addition, guarantees need to be obtained that strict controls on air and noise pollution will form a fundamental part of the planning permission. However, in view of the significance of this option the Committee will wish to consider if such an approach is still one they would endorse.*

3.21 *In addition, there are aspects of the economic benefits of airport expansion that need to be briefly explored. There is no doubt that Heathrow plays a significant role in the local economy, both directly and indirectly. Currently unemployment in the area is low (0.8% in Runnymede, August 2002) and people are drawn into the area to work and/or live. This creates pressure on the housing market and makes it difficult to recruit staff locally. This is a particular problem for some of the key public services. Expansion of the Airport may further highlight these issues. However, it is important to note that since the mid-nineties the South East has benefited from a prosperous local economy. If this level of economic buoyancy is not maintained or is reversed, the pressure on the local labour/housing market may ease (unemployment was 6.5% in April 1993). Whilst there is no easy way of assessing the impact of economic advantage and disadvantage of growth at the Airport, on balance maintaining the position of Heathrow would seem desirable. The Committee may wish to urge the Government to consider this issue in detail.*

4. Conclusion

4.1 The Government has invited comments on the future development of air transport over the next 30 years. Hitherto policy decisions on airport expansion have taken place in an ad hoc fashion on the basis of individual applications to develop airport facilities. The current approach attempts to examine the issues surrounding future airport growth and to set the context for identifying the options. Amongst the options are proposals for the expansion of Heathrow. This gives rise to a number of social, economic and environmental issues.

4.2 The agenda item has attempted to explore the wider issues of airport growth in the South East, but focuses on the local impact with particular attention to Heathrow. The recommendation is to support future growth at Heathrow, but to recognise the environmental issues that need to be resolved. Particular emphasis is placed upon the need to implement or enhance Guildford-Woking-Runnymede-Staines-Heathrow Rail Link (also known as Airtrack) to ease the impact of the increased traffic associated with airport growth.

OFFICERS' RECOMMENDATION that -

the comments set out above be conveyed to the Department for Transport as this Council's response to the consultation paper entitled 'The Future Development of Air Transport in the UK: South East'.

(TO RESOLVE)

Background Papers

None

9. ECONOMIC STRATEGY (DTS)

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

1. Purpose of Report

1.1 **The purpose of this report is to seek Members' approval for the adoption of an Economic Strategy.**

2. Background Information

2.1 The Committee approved the timetable for the production of the Economic Strategy at its meeting in November 2002.

2.2 The Committee approved an Issues and Options Paper at its meeting in January 2003 and a draft Economic Strategy at its meeting in March 2003, both for consultation purposes.

3. Consultation

- 3.1 The draft strategy was itself the result of extensive consultation on the issues facing local business and the options for tackling them. It has been prepared with significant input from the Runnymede Business Partnership.
- 3.2 Copies of the draft strategy were placed in local libraries and copies were sent to local and regional economic development organisations, the County Council and the adjoining Local Authorities. The draft Strategy was also provided to members of the relevant Runnymede Business Partnership groups and forums.
- 3.3 The Business Partnership has given further consideration to the detailed responses to the business questionnaire survey and may take on some of the points raised which are not appropriate for inclusion in the Council's Economic Strategy such as the preparation of lists of registered operators in particular trades such as tree surgery. There was not considered to be any need to change the Draft Strategy.

4. The Strategy

- 4.1 The Strategy is attached at Appendix 'G'.
- 4.2 The introductory section sets out its purpose and describes how the Strategy was derived (including reference to the Issues and Options Paper and the questionnaire consultation). It also identifies the Strategy's links to other Strategies and Plans at Borough, County and Regional level.
- 4.3 The Strategy itself is divided into two main themes:-
- Maintaining a Vibrant Local Economy; and
 - Issues Associated with the Prosperous Local Economy.
- 4.4 Each of the main themes contains a number of issues and targets are identified for each of these. These are set out in a similar format to the Community Strategy and to some extent reflect and build on the relevant Community Strategy targets.
- 4.5 The issues addressed under the theme of Maintaining a Vibrant Local Economy are:-
- Services for Businesses
 - Planning Policies
 - Town and Village Centres
 - Training and Skills
 - Tourism
- 4.6 The section on 'Issues Associated with a Prosperous Local Economy' includes:-
- Congestion/Public Transport
 - Affordable Housing
 - Minimising the Environmental Impact of Economic Activity
- 4.7 The targets have a completion date, and also identify where the Council will be working in partnership with other organisations (notably the Runnymede Business Partnership and the Chambers of Commerce) to secure their implementation.
- 4.8 It is proposed to launch the Economic Strategy to the local business community at the Runnymede Business Partnership September Breakfast Forum which is planned to be held at Thorpe Park.
- ### 5. Council Policy
- 5.1 The production of an Economic Strategy has been approved by the Committee as part of the Policy and Implementation Section's Best Value Performance Plan. It is also the first key target in the Economic Prosperity Section of the Community Strategy for Runnymede.

6. Resource Implications

- 6.1 The Economic Strategy will guide the Council's Economic Development activity, for which there is already an established budget. It is not anticipated that the implementation of the Strategy will require any additional funding.
- 6.2 Much of its implementation will be achieved in conjunction with the Runnymede Business Partnership which has been very successful in securing external grant aid and sponsorship for a wide range of initiatives. The potential for funding initiatives through Business Improvement Districts (BIDs) schemes as outlined in the Local Government White Paper will also be explored.
- 6.3 The adoption of the Economic Strategy, prepared in consultation with the local business community, may assist the Council in attracting Government and other funding to help achieve the identified targets.
- 6.4 Printing of the Strategy will cost approximately £1,320 which will be provided from the Local Plan Printing Budget (the Economic Strategy informs the planning policy development process).

7. Legal Implications

- 7.1 The Local Government Act 2000 empowers Local Authorities to do anything which they consider is likely to achieve the promotion or improvement of the economic well-being of their area.

8. Planning and Technical Considerations

- 8.1 The Economic Strategy will complement the current Local Plan and the Community Strategy. It will also inform the preparation of the forthcoming Local Development Framework (which will replace the Local Plan).

9. Environmental Implications

- 9.1 The Strategy includes a set of targets relating to minimising the environmental impact of economic activity in the Borough. Several targets under other headings, particularly those relating to congestion and planning policy, should help achieve environmental benefits. The Strategy fully acknowledges the importance of local environmental quality in making Runnymede an attractive business location and seeks to safeguard this quality.

OFFICERS' RECOMMENDATION that -

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

(TO RECOMMEND)

Background Papers

None

10. LAND DRAINAGE SERVICE - BEST VALUE SCOPING AND CHALLENGE REPORT (DTS)

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 **The purpose of this report is to consider a summary of the scoping and challenge exercise undertaken for the drainage service. The full scoping and challenge report is attached at Appendix 'H'.**

2. Scope of the Service

- 2.1 The Council's land drainage service can be divided into five categories of responsibility with powers and, where relevant, duties provided by various legislation.

- i) Flood Defence: The Land Drainage Act 1991 empowers the Council to enforce the provisions of the Act and to carry out maintenance and improvement works on the ordinary watercourse network within the Borough. The use of these powers is permissive. Under the Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs' "Flood and Coastal Defence High Level Targets" all district council's are expected to produce a Flood and Coastal Defence Policy Statement.
 - ii) Planning and Development: Under planning and development legislation local authorities must consult with the Environment Agency in respect of proposed development within the flood plain or other areas where there is significant runoff which may result in flooding. The Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order 1995 and the Planning Policy Guidance Note 25 specify the categories of development on which consultation must take place.
 - iii) Flood Warning: The Environment Agency has powers to provide a flood warning service on main rivers, and the standard for this service is laid down in the Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs' Flood and Coastal Defence High Level Targets. These flood warnings are issued to the relevant emergency services and councils to take "appropriate action". Although district council's have a duty to produce a civil emergency plan, there is no statutory duty imposed on a council to take action to protect life or property. There is however considered to be an implied "Duty of Care" on a council to take such action, and the Local Government Act 1972 allows councils to incur expenditure to avert the effects of an emergency or disaster.
 - iv) Riparian Responsibilities: Owners of the banks of watercourses have under common law riparian rights and responsibilities. These are reinforced by the Land Drainage Act 1991. As a significant owner of land with watercourses running over it, the Council is expected to maintain and improve the watercourses within its ownership.
 - v) Public Health and Drainage Enforcement: The Public Health Act 1936 defines statutory nuisances associated with watercourses, and gives the Council discretionary powers to deal with such nuisances if it considers necessary. Under this Act it is unlawful to culvert or cover a watercourse without the method of such works being approved by the Council and the Act imposes a duty on the Council to undertake an approval procedure. The Land Drainage Act 1991 gives the Council permissive powers to serve notice on persons requiring them to remove obstructions to the flow in an ordinary watercourse.
- 2.2 The main powers under which the Council operates its land drainage service are permissive. The Council has a duty under planning legislation to consult with the Environment Agency on flooding issues, and this requires technical support. There is also a duty imposed on the Council for approving the method culverting a watercourse.
- 2.3 The aim of this Best Value Review is to define ways that the service can be improved and where efficiencies can be achieved. The review will also try to identify whether the scope of the service should be altered in any way.
3. Current Provision of the Service
- 3.1 The present service is provided by a mixture of in-house and contractual services. The Technical Services Department provides the management and administration of the service, and carries out feasibility studies and design for improvement works. The staff consists of a Principal Assistant Engineer and two Assistant Engineers. The Drainage staff are also available to give advice to other Sections and Departments within the Council. The maintenance works and improvement works are carried out by the Drainage Term Contractor. The current contract runs from October 2002 to October 2005, and is held by E. Tobin and Co, Ltd. Inspection works are also carried out under this contract, and there is allowance within the contract for the provision of additional engineering resources for feasibility or design works.

- 3.2 The current Land Drainage service is carried out under the Land Drainage Strategy, which was approved by the Highways and Works Committee at its meeting in January 1998. The Council's approved Flood Defence Policy Statement required by Defra commits the Council, subject to the availability of resources, to utilise its permissive powers to assist with the maintenance of the ordinary watercourses within the Borough.
- 3.3 There are three alternatives available to the Council for the future provision of the land drainage service.
- a) A reduced service.
 - b) Maintain the existing service.
 - c) An enhanced service.
- 3.4 There are a number of ways in which the provision of the land drainage service could be changed, these are:
- a) All the engineering expertise could be provided by consulting engineers.
 - b) The service could be provided by a reduction in Council staff combined with additional engineering expertise.
 - c) The Council could offer its services and expertise to neighbouring Councils which are less well resourced than Runnymede. Alternatively there could be some form of partnering arrangement to carry out the land drainage service with adjacent Councils.
 - d) The Council could carry out public awareness campaigns to make riparian owners aware of their legal responsibilities for the watercourses running through their land, and encourage local residents groups to carry out maintenance works themselves.
 - e) The Council could offer a reimbursable maintenance service to riparian owners.
- 3.5 Defra has recently announced proposed changes in the organisation of land drainage responsibilities. The Environment Agency is at present unsure of the implications of these changes or the timescale for them. It is considered that it may require legislation for them to be implemented. It is not possible at the present time to included these changes in the review, but they will obviously be taken into account once the implications are known.

4. The Challenge Exercise

- 4.1 The Challenge Workshop took place on Wednesday 16 April 2003 and the attendees were:

Peter Sims	Director of Technical Services
Steve Fuggles	Head of Engineering
Bob Etheridge	Policy and Implementation Manager
Peter Winfield	Parks and Amenities Manager
Gerald Cole	Local Transportation Service, Surrey County Council
Keith Ward	Elmbridge Borough Council
John Godden	Principal Assistant Engineer (Drainage)

Apologies from:

Councillor R. Habgood	
Laura Curling	Administrative Officer, Chief Executive Office
Peter Lee	Development Control Officer
David Van Beeston	The Environment Agency

5. The Next Stages of the Review

- 5.1 The next stages to follow the "Challenge" review are the "Compare" and "Consult". Runnymede provides a greater land drainage service to its residents than neighbouring councils in Surrey. With the River Thames, River Wey, the Chertsey and the Addlestone Bourmes running through it, there is a more significant land drainage network than some of the other neighbouring councils in Surrey. Many councils have incorporated their land drainage service within a larger service head, and the land drainage service itself forms a comparatively small element of the overall Best Value Review of that service head. There is no land drainage group set up within the North West Surrey Benchmarking Group. It is therefore proposed to try to compare the service provided with councils with comparative land drainage networks and comparative levels of expenditure, as well as the variation of the

service provided in neighbouring councils. This comparison could be undertaken with member local authorities of the Association of Thames Drainage Authorities.

- 5.2 The "Consult" stage will include the results of the questionnaire issued every six months to appropriate residents and personnel within the various sections of the Council to whom a service is provided.

THE COMMITTEE IS ASKED to -

- i) endorse the objectives of the land drainage service identified in the challenge report as reflecting the Council's aspirations for the provision of this service at the current level;**
- ii) endorse the proposal to examine the following matters further during the remaining stages of the review;**
 - a) Investigate the implications of providing a reduced or enhanced service in comparison with the current service.**
 - b) Investigate the use of consultants in the provision of some or all of the services currently provided by the drainage section staff.**
 - c) Investigate the possibility of carrying out works for riparian owners on a chargeable basis.**
 - d) Investigate the viability of providing land drainage services to adjacent councils, or alternatively the setting up of partnership arrangements with them.**
 - e) Investigate the viability of an awareness campaign to inform riparian owners of their responsibilities for the watercourses running over their land.**
 - f) Investigate methods of raising general public awareness of the different agencies responsible for the different elements of drainage.**
 - g) Bring forward proposals for setting up service level agreements between the Drainage Section and the other sections within the Council to which a service is provided;**
- iii) endorse the use of the Land Drainage questionnaire as a prime source for the collection of customer satisfaction data for the "Consult" element of the review;**
- iv) endorse the use of the proposals in paragraph 5.1 above for the "Compare" element of the review; and**
- v) endorse the scope of this review, and the "Challenge" phase.**

(TO RESOLVE)

Background Papers

None

11. PLANNING POLICY AND IMPLEMENTATION - BEST VALUE CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT PLAN - PROGRESS REPORT (DTS)

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

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to review progress with the Planning Policy and Implementation (formerly known as Forward Planning) Best Value Continuous Improvement Plan.**

2. Background Information

- 2.1 The Forward Planning Best Value Service Review and Continuous Improvement Plan were approved by the Planning Committee on 19 September 2001. Progress with the**

Improvement Plan was initially considered by the Planning Committee at its meeting on 4 September 2002 and the Economic Development Committee on 12 September 2002. The Planning Committee received the report below at its meeting on 16 April 2003 in respect of those elements of the Plan which relate to the Section's Local Plan functions. Although the full Continuous Improvement Plan is set out below, Members are asked to consider only those elements which fall within the remit of this Committee.

- 2.2 Thirteen targets have been identified, together with specific actions with timescales to monitor their achievement.
- 3. Report
- 3.1 The following table sets out progress on each of the targets.
- 3.2 A number of changes are proposed to the targets to reflect the completion of certain targets, revised target dates for certain actions and new targets to reflect new areas of the Section's work.
- 3.3 Completion dates for the targets relating to the introduction of the Document Management System (DMS) have had to be put back to reflect the revised introduction date for this system.
- 3.4 It is proposed to revise references to the Local Plan Review to reflect the Planning Committee's resolution to undertake the next review in the format of a Local Development Framework as set out in the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Bill. This means that the first review consultation document should be published in the Summer of 2004.
- 3.5 Targets relating to community involvement in the development of planning policy are proposed to be revised to reflect the adoption of the Community Strategy and the work of the Local Strategic Partnership and the Task Groups.
- 3.6 From October 2002 the Section took on the part-time post of Environmental Policy Officer (previously in the Environmental Services Department). A new target has been added to reflect the work of this post.

a) Target :- Review Procurement Options

Action	Timescale
Monitor market for service provision by consultants	Meet with Atkins by end 10/01 and Ongoing
Progress Meeting held with Atkins and rates for various levels of staff input obtained.	
Liaise with adjoining Local Authorities on resource sharing.	By end 12/01
Progress The use of a Conservation Consultant has been secured through liaison with Spelthorne/Elmbridge. This commenced Jan 2002 for a six month trial period. This was completed successfully and the contract has been extended.	

<p>Pursue 'e' routes for information provision of all publications</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>
<p>Progress Adopted Plan text now available on the Internet. CD version of Proposals Map and plan text available May 2002. Proposals Map available on Internet summer 2002. Draft Supplementary Planning Guidance now available on Internet including comments forms. Provide Runnymede Local Plan via the Planning Inspectorate National Planning Portal.</p>	<p>Implemented Implemented Sept 2003</p>
<p>Improve publicity by prioritising resources to those channels identified in the questionnaire survey</p>	<p>For next LP Review – ongoing</p>
<p>Progress The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Bill proposes significant changes to the planning policy framework. In light of the forthcoming changes it has been resolved to undertake work under the proposed new system leading to the preparation of a Local Development Framework (LDF). It is anticipated that the first consultation documents will be produced in Summer 2004. Publicity on LP Review to commence Spring 2003.</p>	
<p>Involve the Community effectively in planning policy development <i>Previously this target was to consider Residents Panel survey of environmental priorities</i></p>	
<p>Progress The adoption of the Community Strategy and the operation of the Local Strategic Partnership have provided a context for setting priorities for policy development. This forms an integral part of the community's involvement with the LDF process. It is also proposed to use the Planning Liaison Group (involving representatives of local amenity groups) to consider planning policy matters.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>
<p>Review Section and post titles to better reflect work undertaken. <i>Propose deletion of this target now it has been implemented</i></p>	<p>By end 12/01</p>
<p>Progress Completed. Review of Section carried out. Section and post titles amended.</p>	

d) **Target:- Use DMS to Improve Efficiency/Service Delivery**

Action	Timescale
Adopt DMS to deal with all correspondence	June 2003
Progress Awaiting introduction of DMS – now programmed for pilot exercise June 2003. Change target date to June 2003.	
Use DMS to track consultations from Development Control	
Progress Awaiting introduction of DMS – see above.	
Link to LDF database for representations	Prior to publication of Deposit Draft
Progress Awaiting introduction of DMS and 'Workflow' software in June 2003 to enable automated tracking and retrieval.	

e) **Target:- Develop Better Indicators of Planning Policy Performance**

Action	Timescale
Include indicators and targets in next version of the Local Plan	New Target Date for LDF (Precise date depends on legislation)
Progress To be included in consultation draft of LDF.	
Continue to work with the North West Surrey Benchmarking Group to develop better performance indicators for Forward Planning Sections	Ongoing
Progress Ongoing.	

f) **Target:- Improve Environmental Performance of the Local Plan**

Action	Timescale
Prepare an Environmental Appraisal of the Deposit Version of the next Local Plan Review	New Target Date Summer 2004
Progress Ongoing in tandem with Local Development Framework Preparation.	
Proposed New Action Prepare a 'State of Runnymede' baseline environmental study of the Borough	Target Date June 2003
Progress New Target.	

RUNNYMEDE BUSINESS PARTNERSHIP

a) **Target:- Increase Business Awareness of the Partnership and its Activities**

Action	Timescale
Continue to increase numbers of organisations on the Partnership data base Target 1 – 1500 organisations Target 2 – 1600 organisations	By 12/01 By 12/02
Progress Target 1 completed. Target 2 date to be put back to September 2003 to tie in with preparation of next Business Directory.	September 2003
Target major employers for sponsorship/ involvement (seek to secure funding for 3 newsletters and 3 forum events per year)	Ongoing
Progress Funding secured for 3 newsletters and 4 forum events in last year. Sponsorship agreed for next newsletter and 3 forum events (April/June/ September 2003).	

b) **Target:- Double the Number of Businesses Participating in the Loyalty Scheme**

Action	Timescale
Attract 46 new firms to the scheme	By end October 2003

<p>Progress 61 firms in scheme (net gain of 15 firms). Comment – further promotional push planned for late summer/autumn.</p>	
---	--

c) **Target:- Review the Potential for Running a 'Meet the Buyers' Event**

Target effectively completed – propose deletion of target.

Action	Timescale
<p>Complete questionnaire survey of all businesses on data-base to establish level of interest/support</p>	Completed 02/02
<p>Progress Survey completed – insufficient support to justify holding event – other means of encouraging local purchasing being explored.</p>	

d) **Target:- Seek long-term sponsorship for Partnership running costs.**

Target emphasis has changed – propose deletion of this target

Action	Timescale
<p>Approach 10 major potential sponsors</p>	By end 03/02
<p>Progress Not completed – major companies approached to support Yellow Bus Scheme instead as this is seen as a better sponsorship opportunity.</p>	

e) **Target:- Continue to Develop the Runnymede Travel Initiative**

Action	Timescale
<p>Establish dedicated Operational School Bus Service for one year pilot at two local Secondary Schools</p>	By end 01/02
<p>Progress Completed – scheme launched on 25 February 2002. Contract extended to 2003/04. New 'trial' service has been launched at Jubilee High School (initially from 4 March to 11 April 2003). Formal launch of service for remainder of school year – 8 April 2003.</p>	
<p>Extend provision of cycle shelters to Junior Schools</p>	By end 09/02

<p>Progress New cycle shelters completed (Dec.'02) at: Royal Holloway, University of London Pycroft Grange Primary School, Chertsey Christ Church Junior School, Ottershaw Manorcroft Primary School, Egham Englefield Green Infant School.</p> <p>New cycle shelters installed at: Royal Holloway, University of London (additional shelters) Jubilee High School (additional shelter) New Haw Junior School St Ann's RC School, Chertsey Stepgates Community School, Chertsey.</p>	<p>Completed 12/02</p> <p>Completed 03/03</p>
---	---

<p>Encourage at least 10 Local Schools to prepare and adopt Travel Plans</p>	<p>By end 12/02</p>
<p>Progress 10 School Travel Plans completed, and 2 in preparation.</p>	
<p>Comment Only 1 of the Travel Plans has been formally adopted. Target should be set for adoption of all other Travel Plans, by end June 2003</p>	<p>By end 06/03</p>

f) **Target:- Prepare an Economic Development Plan for the Borough**

Action	Timescale
<p>Prepare Draft Strategy</p>	
<p>Progress An Economic Strategy has been prepared in line with the target in the Community Strategy. It is presently out to consultation.</p>	<p>Complete Consultation by end 05/03</p>
<p>Adopt Economic Strategy</p>	<p>By end 10/03</p>
<p>Progress Report elsewhere on this agenda recommends adoption.</p>	

Note

The following item was proposed by Members of the Planning Committee when considering the Best Value – Forward Planning Service, Scoping and Challenge Report on 20 June 2001

g) Target:- Investigate greater liaison between the three Chambers of Commerce

Action	Timescale
Consult the Chambers to establish their views on the need for greater liaison and what form it might take	Ongoing liaison through Business Partnership
Progress Chambers have held joint meeting and work together on Business Partnership (all Chambers are represented on Sub-group B and on Steering Group).	

h) New Target:- Promote Business Partnership Activities in Local Media

Action	Timescale
Secure publication of six articles per year in the local press relating to Partnership activities and events	Ongoing
Progress Press releases issued on travel initiatives, town plans and economic strategy.	

OFFICERS' RECOMMENDATION that -

- i) the target date for adoption of School Travel Plans be amended to June 2003; and**
- ii) the new target for preparation of a baseline 'State of Runnymede' environmental study be endorsed.**

(TO RESOLVE)

Background Papers

None

12. ADDLESTONE COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION CENTRE REPROVISION (DAL)
(Ref: Minutes of Economic Development Committee September 2002, page 521, para. 283)

1. The purpose of this report is to advise Members that the structural engineering consultants for the Addlestone Community Centre project will be Dewhurst MacFarlane and Partners of London.
2. The Committee was advised in September 2002 that the structural engineers for the project would be Adams Kara Taylor of Camden. The appointment has been reviewed however, and the lead consultants, Fielden Clegg Bradley, who have previously worked with Dewhurst's, have recommended Dewhurst as providing high quality work and an intelligent, professional service.
3. The recommendation of the lead consultant has been accepted. The fee combined with the mechanical engineers' fee will be 3.95% rather than that previously notified of 3.5% but this will not have significant financial implications in terms of the overall scheme costs.

(FOR INFORMATION)

Background Papers

None

13. URGENT ACTION - STANDING ORDER 42 (DAL)

The following actions have been taken after consultation with the Chairman of this Committee under Standing Order 42:

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

(FOR INFORMATION)

Background Papers

Proformas dated 10 March and 21 May 2003 on Head of Corporate Administration's file

14. REFERRAL FROM HOUSING AND COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE

Redevelopment of Roakes Avenue Estate (DHCS)

At its meeting on 11 June 2003 the Housing and Community Services Committee is due to consider a report detailing the current position with regard to the redevelopment of the Roakes Avenue Estate. The report seeks this Committee's approval for the disposal of the garage area within the estate to the APEX Housing Group. The full report to be considered by the Housing and Community Services Committee is attached at Appendix 'I' along with a plan of the estate showing the area of land in question.

OFFICERS' RECOMMENDATION that –

the disposal of the garage area at the Roakes Avenue Estate, as shown on the attached plan, to the APEX Housing Group be approved.

(TO RESOLVE)

Background Papers

None

15. PROVISION OF BUS SHELTERS (DTS)

1. Purpose of Report

1.1 **The purpose of this report is to inform Members of the outcome of a recent Bus Shelter (Advertising) tendering exercise and to seek approval for the award of a new contract covering such shelters.**

2. Background Information

2.1 In 1984 the Council entered into a 15 year contract with Adshel for the supply and maintenance of 30 advertising bus shelters, located in Addlestone, Chertsey and Egham. The contract, which expired in 1999, covered the erection of bus shelters fully inclusive of maintenance and a repair service.

- 2.2 The existing Adshel shelters are of good quality but are beginning to look worn and dated and are in need of more frequent maintenance.
- 2.3 Over the period of the contract Adshel have provided a good service. There have been no significant problems.
- 2.4 The expiry of the original contract provides the opportunity to secure improved contract terms and obtain new shelters.

3. Report

3.1 In order to comply with European Law an advertisement was placed in the Official European Journal on 6 February 2003. Six companies made approaches, namely:-

Adshel
 JC Decaux
 Trueform Group
 Sepco Holdings
 Bus Shelters Ltd
 Armada Outdoors.

- 3.2 It is intended that the shelters be provided be provided at no cost to the Council. Advertising revenue will cover all the costs associated with any new shelters, including inspection, cleaning and maintenance. Only two of the six companies were in a position to meet this requirement. One of these, J.C. Decaux, subsequently confirmed that they had decided not to put forward a proposal due to the current conditions in the advertising market. Adshel was therefore the only company asked to make a submission.
- 3.3 Officers have subsequently been in discussions with Adshel seeking clarification of, and improvements to, the original offer and programming of the work. Adshel offer to provide 23 non-advertising shelters and 71 advertising shelters, in the ratio of 1 to 3. Other considerations. such as shelter style, company reliability and the schedule for installation have been given consideration. References taken up from other Boroughs where Adshel shelters are already installed have contained no adverse comments.
- 3.4 Adshel have a good reputation, and the Council has experienced no major problems with the existing contract over the course of the last 15 years. The company's response to shelter cleaning, graffiti removal and glass repair has been very good. This assessment is confirmed by other authorities comments. Most of the adjoining Boroughs have recently awarded their Bus Shelter contracts to Adshel, namely Elmbridge, Woking, Mole Valley, Surrey Heath and Spelthorne. Adshel's offer to this Council is more favourable as it contains a better ratio of advertising to non-advertising shelters.
- 3.5 Adshel appear to have sufficient backing and local infrastructure to manage any work awarded by this Authority.
- 3.6 All of the bus shelters on offer will have facilities for connecting up to a 'real time' (bus information) system in the future. This will be dependent on when such facilities are introduced in Runnymede by the County Council and bus operators.
- 3.7 Adshel intend to replace their existing 30 shelters within 10-12 weeks of the contract award. The remaining number will be installed over an 18 month period starting on the date of award. There could, therefore, be 20-30 new shelters installed within the Borough by the autumn.
- 3.8 A summary of the final Adshel offer is set out below :-

	Agreement Term	Existing Shelters	New Advertising Shelters	Non-Advertising Shelters
Adshel	13 years	30	41*	23*

* = These figures are subject to planning approval.

- 3.9 The Council is free to place the non-advertising shelters at locations of its choice around the Borough, in order to replace the old stock of shelters. Adshel will take responsibility for the erection and maintenance of these new shelters.
4. Resource Implications
- 4.1 Adshel will fund all new installations and be responsible for continuing maintenance.
- 4.2 There will be a reduction in the Council's own maintenance costs as some of the Council's existing shelters will be replaced with new shelters, which will need no maintenance by the Council. Wherever this is agreed there would be a pro rata saving in maintenance costs. There will be some resource implications in supervising the construction work over the 18 month installation period. This can be accommodated within the existing staff establishment in the Engineering Services Section.
- 4.3 It is suggested that the current small Borough budget allocated for bus shelter maintenance be retained in order to cover the Council's remaining stock of shelters.
- 4.4 Planning approvals, etc., will be carried out under the present arrangements, with costs paid by Adshel.
5. Council Policy
- 5.1 Bus shelter advertising arrangements of this nature are consistent with previously approved Council policy.
6. Technical Implications
- 6.1 All new shelters will require Planning consent and possible consultation with the occupiers of adjacent properties.
- 6.2 All Adshel bus shelters will be built in accordance with the latest Access/Disability Regulations. If there is a change in these Regulations within two years of the award of the contract, Adshel will adapt the shelters at no cost to the Council.
7. Legal Implications
- 7.1 A full tendering exercise has been completed but as only one tenderer, Adshel, has submitted a tender it is intended to negotiate further with Adshel in order to achieve the most cost effective result for the Council.

OFFICERS' RECOMMENDATION that -

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

(TO RESOLVE)

Background Papers

None

16. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

OFFICERS' RECOMMENDATION that -

the press and public be excluded from the meeting during discussion of the following reports under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 on the grounds that the reports in question would be likely to involve disclosure of exempt information of the description specified in paragraphs 7 and 8 of Part I of Schedule 12A of the Act.

(TO RESOLVE)

PART II

Matters involving Exempt or Confidential Information in respect of which reports have not been made available for public inspection.

- | a) | <u>Exempt Information</u> | <u>paras</u> |
|-----|--|--------------|
| 17. | PROPERTIES IN STATION ROAD, ADDLESTONE | 7 and 8 |
| 18. | 190 STATION ROAD, ADDLESTONE | 7 and 8 |
| 19. | SURREY TOWERS - TELECOMMUNICATIONS RENT REVIEW | 7 |
| 20. | 49 GUILDFORD STREET, CHERTSEY | 7 |
| 21. | 55 GUILDFORD STREET, CHERTSEY | 7 |
- b) Confidential Information
- (No reports to be considered under this heading)