

Runnymede Borough Council
LEISURE AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE

Thursday 18 November 2004 at 7.30 p.m.

in the Council Chamber

at the Civic Offices, Addlestone



Members of the Committee

Councillors C.J. Norman (Chairman), M.J. Brown (Vice-Chairman), Mrs P.I. Broadhead, A.J. Davis, Mrs. C.E. Gant, Mrs E. Gill, Miss M. N. Heath, Mrs. S.E. Jacobs, A.M. Moore, and C.J. Ruane.

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 **Miss C. Pinnock, Committee Section, Administration and Leisure Department, Civic Offices, Station Road, Addlestone. (Tel. 01932 425627). (Email: clare.pinnock@runnymede.gov.uk).**
- iii) Agendas and Minutes are available on a subscription basis. For details, please ring Mr. B.A. Fleckney on 01932 425620. Agendas and Minutes for all the Council's Committees may also be viewed on www.runnymede.gov.uk.
- 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.

LIST OF MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION

PART I

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

	Page
1. NOTIFICATION OF CHANGES TO COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP	3
2. MINUTES	3
3. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE	3
4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	3
5. PROPOSED POND AT BOURNE MEADOW	3
6. REVIEW OF THE FENCE BETWEEN GOGMORE FARM PARK AND RIVERSDELL CLOSE	8
7. SUMMER PLAYSCHMES 2004 AND 2005	10
8. SUMMER SPLASH SCHEME 2004 AND 2005	14
9. SPORTS DEVELOPMENT AND SURREY YOUTH GAMES 2004 AND 2005	18
10. PROPOSED EXTENSION OF 'CLASSIC TRADITIONAL' SECTIONS IN THE BOROUGH'S CEMETERIES	25
11. EGHAM LEISURE CENTRE - TRADING ACCOUNT	26
12. RUNNYMEDE ARTS DEVELOPMENT STEERING GROUP - MINUTES	26
13. GRANT AID - COMMITTEE RESPONSIBILITIES	26
14. ANTI GRAFFITI AND STREET CARE TEAM - PROGRESS REPORT	27
15. PROPOSED WORKSHOP FACILITY AT CHERTSEY DEPOT - (TO FOLLOW)	30
16. AVIATOR PARK RECREATION GROUND – CAR PARK AND ACCESS ROAD CONSTRUCTION – FINAL ACCOUNT	30
17. RECYCLING UPDATE AND PROPOSAL FOR PILOT COLLECTION OF GREEN WASTE	32
18. SURREY LOCAL GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION – A JOINT WASTE STRATEGY FOR SURREY	34
19. RUNNYMEDE ACCESS LIAISON GROUP - APPOINTMENT	36
20. STANDING ORDER 42 - URGENT ACTIONS	36
21. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC	37

PART II

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

a) Exempt Information

(No reports to be considered under this heading)

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 meeting of the Committee held on 16 September 2004.

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. PROPOSED POND AT BOURNE MEADOW (DAL/DTS)

(Ref: Minutes of Leisure and Environment Committee, September 2004, page 285, para. 214, Review Board and Council, October 2004)

1. Purpose of Report

1.1 **The purpose of this report is to re-examine the proposal for a pond at Bourne Meadow, as requested by the Council at its last meeting.**

2. Background Information

- 2.1 In September 2004, the Committee received a report recommending the creation of a pond at Bourne Meadow, Chertsey. The Association for the Improvement of Runnymede (AIR), had procured a grant from SITA for the purposes of a flood alleviation project in the Bourne area, and assistance in kind was also anticipated from the Environment Agency, leaving the Council to fund the shortfall. A copy of the report is attached at Appendix 'A'.
- 2.2 The project was envisaged in two stages – first the creation of the pond and secondly its linking to the Bourne, subject to the consent of the Environment Agency. The first phase would be completed in the current financial year, and the second phase in 2005/6.
- 2.3 The report suggested proceeding with the project subject to local and Ward Member consultation, to the continued availability of external funding, and to planning permission. The Committee did not consider that there was sufficient benefit in terms of flood relief or amenity to justify the expenditure, and resolved, by a majority, that no further action be taken.
- 2.4 Two Members of the Review Board required the matter to be called in. At its meeting on 7 October, the Review Board considered the arguments for and against the pond and noted evidence from the Chairman of this Committee, the Chairman of AIR, the Chertsey Society, and Officers. After detailed debate and the loss of a motion to recommend that the project proceed, the Review Board agreed, by a majority that this Committee made the correct decision and recommended to the Council that no further action be taken.
- 2.5 The Council considered the matter on 14 October. In addition to the Minute of this Committee and the report of the Review Board, for which Members are referred to the last Minute book, it received a tabled note which sought to clarify various factual issues including the costings of the project, as these had given rise to some disagreement between Members. The Council declined to make a decision but asked this Committee to re-examine the matter in the light of the information now to hand and any other relevant information available to the Committee, and to determine the matter. A note of the Council discussion is at Appendix 'B'.

- 2.6 This Committee may resolve the matter and does not have to make a recommendation to Council.
- 2.7 The Council also instructed that the excavation of the contaminated soil from the site of the former Beomonds allotments be held up pending a decision on Bourne Meadow. The hope has been that if the project proceeds and the soil extracted from Bourne Meadow is clean, it can be used to fill the excavation at Beomonds, thereby saving on transport and landfill costs for the pond project.
- 2.8 Members have been presented with extensive information at the previous meeting of this Committee, from the Review Board papers, and at full Council. This report will seek not to repeat all of it, but to summarise the salient facts and assist with detail. There is also some new information about the timetabling and cost implications.

3. Report

3.1 The contribution of the scheme towards flood alleviation

- 3.1.1 The pond scheme at Bourne Meadow Park has been promoted on the basis that it will bring about environmental benefits as well as acting as a means of flood alleviation. Although the scheme will contribute to the overall flood alleviation of Chertsey on the margins, its main benefits would be on a local scale within Bourne Meadow Park.
- 3.1.2 Bourne Meadow Park lies within the functional flood plain, and floods every one or two years. Once the water has flooded out of the river into the park it is difficult for it to drain back into the river as the river levels drop, because the river bank is higher than the land in the park behind it. The water lying in the park over several weeks kills the grass and other vegetation and results in unsightly areas of mud/earth and dead vegetation. The provision of the pond with its connection to the river will enable floodwater in the park to drain back into the river more quickly and thus reduce the damage caused by the floods. Flooding does not do lasting damage; without the pond the ground recovers in a timescale of up to a month depending on the weather, and the grass area is normally allowed to become a wild flower meadow.
- 3.1.3 Any increase in volume of the flood plain is obviously of benefit in any flooding that may occur. However the scale of this benefit to Chertsey as a whole is small. No dynamic analysis of the actual effects of the contribution of the proposed pond is available. Rough calculations have been carried out based on the static contribution of the pond to the overall flood storage volumes.
- 3.1.4 The total volume of the pond will be approximately 900 cubic metres. It is proposed that the pond is a wet pond, and that it should contain water at all times. It is estimated that the depth of water in the pond will normally be about 700 mm with a freeboard of 800 mm. At times of normal flow in the river the available capacity of the pond will in fact only be about 600 cubic metres. At times of high river flows the available storage will be further reduced.
- 3.1.5 Based on the maximum available storage, the simple static analysis of the volumes concerned gives the following results. Spreading this volume over the whole of Bourne Meadow Park will give an approximate depth of water of 25 mm. Similarly spreading this same volume over the whole of the area of Chertsey that flooded in 2003 gives an approximate depth of water of 3 mm. These two measurements can be considered as representing the reduction in flood depth of the functional flood plain when a 1 in 2 year flood occurs, and the reduction in flood depth for the 2003 floods respectively. Further calculations for these two conditions indicate that the contribution of the pond to the flood storage might represent 5% of the functional flood plain volume, and 0.5% of the 2003 flood plain volume. It must be stressed that these figures, which represent a static comparison of flood volumes, are approximate, based on a theoretical maximum available storage volume. The dynamic behaviour of the river will in fact dictate the exact contribution of the additional storage volume from the pond. A dynamic analysis of the river flows would almost certainly indicate that the pond's contribution is less than the figures given above. It should further be noted that in reality the volume of the pond is smaller than the error that is likely to be made in the assessment of the flood plain volumes and that the "predicted" reductions in flood

depth are smaller than the accuracy with which the river levels can be recorded in flood conditions.

3.1.6 One of the options that the Environment Agency is considering in its feasibility study for the Chertsey Bourne Flood Alleviation Scheme is increased flood plain storage. However, the Agency's initial report indicates that it is looking at Virginia Water Lake and the Thorpe Lakes to provide this storage. There was no suggestion in that report that it would be looking at the land adjacent to the riverbanks within the functional flood plain to provide any of the additional storage.

3.2 The cost of the scheme

3.2.1 The estimated costs for the two scheme options are:

- a) If all excavated material from Bourne Meadow Park is disposed of to landfill - £56,614.
- b) If all the excavated material from Bourne Meadow Park is used as fill material for the land remediation at Beomonds allotments - £39,476. Tests have confirmed that the soil at Bourne Meadow is clean, and capable of re-use at Beomonds.

3.2.2 The Beomonds option gives a potential saving in the scheme cost of £17,138. The availability of this saving depends on the following assumptions:

- i) That the volume of fill required at Beomonds allotments will be greater than or equal to the volume of soil excavated at Bourne Meadow. Although the assessment at present is that this will be the case, until the remediation works start the actual volumes are unknown. It is only proposed to remove the contaminated soil from Beomonds.
- ii) That the soil from Bourne Meadow will be supplied by the Environment Agency to Beomonds at the rate required by Woodland Environmental to fulfil their programme. Any delay on the part of the Environment Agency could result in Woodland Environmental incurring additional cost that would be passed onto Runnymede Borough Council.
- iii) Similarly that Woodland Environmental will be able to receive the soil from Bourne Meadow at the rate that the Environment Agency is excavating it. Any delay on the part of Woodland Environmental could result in the Environment Agency incurring additional cost that would be passed onto Runnymede Borough Council. In particular, if the delay is significant, then it would be necessary to remove the soil from Bourne Meadow to land fill as it will not be possible to stockpile it on site, within the flood plain.

3.2.3 The Environment Agency has indicated that its commitment to match fund the works is only valid so long as the work is undertaken in the current financial year. Should the work over run into the next financial year then it will have to review the situation. However if the start has to be delayed beyond this financial year, the Agency will not be in a position to further honour its commitment to this project. The Agency is still indicating that it is prepared to fund up to £17,500 by works in kind. However, it has always stated that it is not prepared to contribute to the additional works associated with connecting the pond to the Bourne. The cost of the works for the basic scheme without the additional works is £34,663. This implies that the maximum contribution the Environment Agency might be prepared to make is £17,163 (£34,663 -£17,500 from SITA).

3.2.4 At the same time, the Environment Agency will need some warning to programme the works and will not now be able to start before Christmas.

3.2.5 It is understood from AIR that SITA are prepared to keep the funding for the scheme available until the end of March 2005.

3.2.6 Given the requirement for obtaining planning permission and the Environment Agency's timescale, it will not be feasible to start the scheme until January 2005. This is potentially the worst time of the year to undertake such works. When the original estimate for the scheme

was made it was based on the work being undertaken in late summer/early autumn. No provision was made in the estimate for providing a temporary haul road to enable vehicles to get in and out of the site. Such temporary works will be necessary to avoid vehicles getting bogged down in the mud if the work is carried out in the middle of winter. It is estimated that such temporary works would increase the cost of the scheme by approximately £3,000.

3.3 Approvals required

3.3.1 The project will require planning permission if it proceeds.

3.3.2 The Environment Agency would have to approve the second stage of the project - connecting the pond to the Bourne - under its byelaws. The Agency has expressed some reservations about this, as mentioned in 3.2.3 above, owing to the possible effect on the biosystem in the pond, but has not indicated that it will object.

3.3.3 If it is not possible to connect the pond to the Bourne, Officers advise against implementing stage one by itself. Although there would be little detriment to the flood relief element of the project without stage two, it would be impossible to maintain a reasonably stable water level in the pond. The result would be little or no water during periods of the summer and more than enough in winter. This would detract from its benefit both as an amenity and as a wildlife habitat.

3.4 Public Consultation

3.4.1 The original report to this Committee proposed that if were minded to proceed, residents in the vicinity of the site should first be consulted along with Ward Members before a final decision was made. This would still be Officers' advice.

4. Council Policy

4.1 The policy issues identified in the original report, along with the Council's consultation strategy, remain unchanged.

5. Resource Implications

5.1 As indicated under heading 3.2 above, the overall costs of the scheme, including the costs of a haul road, are estimated to be £59,614. A maximum of £34,663 will be funded by external sources. These costs are set out in Appendix 'C' along with a schedule of the costs falling on the Council, which are estimated to be approximately £27,400 or £10,300 depending on whether the soil is transported straight to Beomonds for re-use.

5.2 Owing to the nature of the proposed works, if Members decide to proceed with the scheme it can be capitalised. This will however, require the Council to approve an additional capital estimate of either £27,400 or £10,300 depending on whether the soil goes to Beomonds. In addition to this, there will be a need for a supplementary revenue estimate of approximately £4,600 for the annual maintenance and associated capital charges falling on the Parks and Open Spaces budget.

5.3 The figures relate only to new resources required for the project. In addition, there will be the opportunity cost of using Officer time for design, contractual matters, and supervision.

6. Relevance of Remediation at Beomonds

6.1 If the Committee decides that the Bourne Meadow scheme should not proceed, it may still be possible for Officers to make immediate arrangements to proceed with the work at Beomonds before the worst winter weather sets in.

6.2 If the Bourne Meadow scheme does proceed, and is linked with Beomonds, the position is more complicated.

6.3 The estimated cost of the work at Beomonds, taken by itself, has so far been the same whether soil from Bourne Meadow is used or not. However there are now a number of additional factors caused by the delay since September, and some conflict in timescales. The salient points are:

- i) The Beomonds scheme should be undertaken before the worst of the winter weather, which carries the risk of ponding and spread of contamination.
- ii) In addition, unless the Beomonds scheme can now proceed almost straightaway a temporary roadway is likely to be needed because of the softness of the ground. This would add approximately £3,000 to the cost.
- iii) A further issue with Beomonds is the cost of disposal of the contaminated soil. New regulations which come into force on 1 April 2005 will drive up the cost of the landfill as set out in paragraph 6.4 below.

6.3.1 Accordingly the Beomonds work should be undertaken at once if possible. However the Environment Agency can only assist the Bourne Meadow pond from January onwards, and the timescale for the Bourne Meadow work will also be subject to planning permission, and the proposed public consultation.

6.4 Therefore the estimated cost of the Beomonds project will increase by £3,000 if it is delayed to January to allow the soil from Bourne Meadow to be re-used. If the Beomonds work is delayed until April or later to await Spring/Summer weather, the cost of a haul road is avoided but the landfill cost rises by a figure between £4,500 and £9,000. In addition the Environment Agency's contribution in kind to the Bourne Meadow project is lost.

6.5 In broad terms, if the projects remain coupled, and proceed in the period January to March 2005, the combined cost is £6,000 more than was the case in September 2004, because of the winter weather measures for haulage.

7. Conclusion

7.1 The Committee has the task of assessing the flood alleviation and amenity benefit of the Bourne Meadow scheme against the potential cost.

7.2 If the Committee wishes in principle to proceed, Officers continue to recommend a public consultation exercise.

7.3 The timescale recently notified by the Environment Agency, together with the need for planning permission, creates a conflict of requirements if the scheme is to be linked with the Beomonds work, which must start as soon as possible. Decoupling the two projects will mean that the Bourne Meadow scheme will automatically forgo the £17,000 saving and put the cost at the more expensive figure, of approximately £27,400. Retaining the coupling and delaying the Beomonds work to January will increase the cost of the Beomonds project by £3,000.

7.4 The Committee is under no constraint one way or the other as a result of the request by Council to re-examine the proposal. Its task is to review the facts and determine the matter.

THE COMMITTEE IS ASKED which of the following two resolutions it wishes to pass:

Resolution A:

No further action be taken on the proposal to create a pond at Bourne Meadow, and Officers be instructed to continue efforts with AIR, the Environment Agency, and SITA to identify a suitable scheme for flood alleviation which can use the benefit of the SITA grant, so long as it remains available.

Resolution B:

- i) the principle of creating a pond at Bourne Meadow Park be approved, subject to public consultation and to the detailed views of Ward Members, and to the contributions from the Environment Agency and SITA remaining available;**

- ii) **The Director of Technical Services in consultation with the Director of Administration and Leisure be authorised to proceed with the project if the outcome of public consultation is favourable, subject to planning permission; and**
- iii) **Corporate Management Committee to be asked to approve an appropriate capital estimate (£27,400 or £10,300) subject to the outcome of (ii) above.**

(TO RESOLVE)

N.B. If the Committee passes resolution B it must also add a paragraph stating whether the Bourne Meadow project should be linked with the Beomonds remediation or whether the two should proceed separately according to their optimum timescales.

Background papers:

Interdepartmental e-mails and advice on the project.

6. REVIEW OF THE FENCE BETWEEN GOGMORE FARM PARK AND RIVERSDELL CLOSE (DAL)
(Ref: Minutes of Leisure and Environment Committee, November 2003, page 1053, para. 505, March 2004, page 1443, para. 798, May 2004, page 1646, para. 929, Council, December 2003, page 1144, para. 586, and page 1147, para. 596, April 2004, page 1512, para. 857 and Review Board, February 2004, page 1251, para 697).

1. **Purpose of Report**

- 1.1 **The purpose of this report is to seek a decision on the future of the fence between Gogmore Farm Park and Riversdell Close in Chertsey.**

2. **Background Information**

- 2.1 At its meeting in November last year, this Committee received a report proposing the erection of a fence which would close off an access linking Riversdell Close and Gogmore Farm Park. The Committee learned that this access, together with an alley at the far end of Riversdell Close, were used as a route between the Park and Chertsey town centre. The Committee also noted reports of anti social behaviour that the Council had received over a period of time, related to the use of this route. The Committee resolved that the fence be erected and associated planting be carried out and that the scheme be reviewed in November this year.
- 2.2 A petition was submitted to Council in December 2003, which urged Members to reconsider their decision and refer the matter to the Review Board.
- 2.3 The Labour Group formalised this request with a motion moved and seconded under Standing Order 25.11(c).
- 2.4 As a result, the Review Board in February 2004 recommended that the Leisure and Environment Committee consider constructing a path along the alternative route identified by the Board which, dependent on the location of existing trees and other vegetation, would be a fully accessible footpath between the footbridge over the drain on the north bank of the River Bourne to the corner of Riversdell Close and Gogmore Lane, and that if this route was approved it should be opened before the new youth facility opened at Gogmore Farm Park. In addition, the Review Board agreed that on balance the Leisure and Environment Committee made the right decision at its meeting on 20 November 2003.
- 2.5 Prior to its discussion by Council in April this year, the matter was discussed by this Committee in March 2004 and it was resolved to endorse the Review Board's recommendations, although they considered that the construction of a footpath should be deferred, pending the outcome of a decision being made on the closure of the Riversdell Close alleyway.
- 2.6 Council considered the issues again in detail in April of this year and resolved that –

- i) the Surrey County Council Local Committee be formally requested to make arrangements for a submission to the Secretary of State seeking the closure of the Riversdell Close alleyway as a matter of urgency, on grounds of anti-social behaviour;
- ii) Runnymede Borough Council Committees should always comply with the Council's new Consultation Strategy in future;
- iii) The Leisure and Environment Committee urgently reconsider constructing a path along the alternative route identified by the Board which, dependent on the location of existing trees and other vegetation, will be a fully accessible footpath between the footbridge over the drain on the north bank of the River Bourne to the corner of Riversdell Close and Gogmore Lane, and if this route is approved it should be opened before the new youth facility is opened at Gogmore Farm Park;
- iv) the police be urged to implement their new penalty notice powers under the Criminal Justice and Police Act 2001 as soon as possible, and

The Council then voted on recommendation (v), and

Resolved that - on balance, the Leisure and Environment Committee made the right decision at its meeting on 20 November 2003.

- 2.7 At its meeting in May this year this Committee resolved that Officers proceed with the construction of a new footpath through an adjacent area of woodland which would provide an alternative link between Riversdell Close and Gogmore Farm Park.

3. Report

- 3.1 The new path is now in place and is well used.
- 3.2 Safer Runnymede have been made aware of one incident involving egg throwing since the new path was laid. However, they are not aware of any other reports of incidents of anti-social behaviour in the area.
- 3.3 Earlier this year, the fence was breached so that contractors working for Three Valleys Water could gain access to the Park with large plant in order to make an emergency repair to a burst water main. Officers are currently pressing Three Valleys Water to reinstate the work area within the park and to make a permanent repair to the fence.
- 3.4 Evidence suggests that access is being gained from Riversdell Close to the park and vice versa, by climbing into and out of the Football Club's land nearby.
- 3.5 In respect of the closure of the alleyway an outcome from Surrey County Council is awaited.

4. Resource Implications

- 4.1 To form a 2 m wide gap in the fence line and reinstate the footpath would cost £3,215 (+ VAT).
- 4.2 To remove all of the fence and shrubs and make good and reinstate the footpath would cost £3,950 (+ VAT).

5. Human Rights/Crime and Disorder Considerations

- 5.1 In discharging its functions, the Council has a duty to do all that it reasonably can to prevent crime and disorder in its area.

OFFICERS' RECOMMENDATION that –

the fence between Riversdell Close and Gogmore Farm Park be retained until further notice.

(TO RESOLVE)

Background Papers

None.

7. SUMMER PLAYSCHEMES - 2004 AND 2005 (DAL)
(Ref: Minutes of Leisure and Environment Committee, November 2003, page 1054, para. 507)

1. **Purpose of Report**

- 1.1 **The purpose of this report is to inform Members of the performance of the 2004 Summer Playschemes, and to seek approval for the proposals for the 2005 Playschemes.**

2. Background Information

- 2.1 Leisure Services has run Summer Playschemes at six sites throughout the Borough for thirteen years. The number of sites increased to seven this year, to meet demand. The aim is to provide a stimulating, happy and safe environment for children during the summer holidays.
- 2.2 The schemes are open to all children. Non Runnymede Borough residents are charged double the standard rate and a reduction is made for families in receipt of income related benefit.
- 2.3 A referral scheme for children at risk and/or in need was introduced in 1996. In January 2000, the Council agreed to finance the cost of the referral scheme for the Playschemes, because the Safer Surrey Partnership had been dissolved and alternative sponsorship was not forthcoming. The Summer Playscheme referral scheme offers 50 places to children qualifying through the scheme. Referrals are made through Social Services and other professional bodies, as all children must have a professional referee who can be contacted throughout the summer to assist Playscheme staff. There is currently no other funding available but Officers have continued to investigate alternative sources.
- 2.4 Two Supervisors are employed at each site, one with responsibility for the Playscheme (for 5 to 7 year olds) and one with responsibility for the Play Plus scheme (for 8 to 11 year olds). The staff to child ratios at the sites are set out below:-
- Playscheme (5 to 7 year olds) - 1 member of staff to 7 children
 - Play Plus scheme (8 to 11 years olds) - 1 member of staff to 8 children.
- 2.5 Bookings for the Playschemes start in May each year and the majority of bookings are made in advance, on a week-by-week basis.

3. Report

Venues

- 3.1 Seven sites ran for a period of four weeks this year between 26 July and 20 August, Monday to Friday from 9.15 a.m. to 3.15 p.m. Extended hours were offered at three sites from 8.30 a.m. to 5 p.m.
- 3.2 The Ottershaw Venue was based once again this year at the Memorial Fields on Foxhills Road using the Pre-school and scout hut buildings. The scheme accommodated a maximum of 88 children. Six extra spaces were provided for children with disabilities, in partnership with the White Lodge Centre. The Ottershaw site also offered extra hours (8.30-5).
- 3.3 The Egham venue, at the Hythe Centre, attracted maximum occupancy and was the busiest site in 2004. The Addlestone venue once again was held this year at St Paul's School in School Lane and also attracted increased numbers due to the venue's popularity. All three

sites introduced extra hours this year successfully, increasing the Council's provision for residents and generating additional revenue.

- 3.4 The New Haw venue moved this year from Heathervale Recreation Ground, where Portacabins had been traditionally used for indoor play facilities to All Saints Church near the entrance of the Veterinary Laboratory in New Haw Road. Numbers slowly increased indicating that the majority of users were happy with the move, making the New Haw Playscheme safer and more comfortable. This also allowed the under 5's group "Teddies on a Rainbow" that operates from Heathervale Recreation Ground to extend their services for younger children into the school.
- 3.5 The Englefield Green venue also moved this year from Egham Rugby Club on Kings Lane Playing fields, where Portacabins had been used for indoor play facilities to the Jurgen Centre, Harvest Road. Again, numbers increased illustrating that the majority of users were happy with the move, making the Englefield Green Playscheme location central, safer and more comfortable.
- 3.6 The Chertsey Playscheme remained at Chertsey Recreation Ground in Guildford Road, with the use of Portacabins to provide adequate indoor space for the children.
- 3.7 This year an additional venue was introduced in the Borough at Lyne and Longcross School. This extension to the playscheme was made in response to local demand expressed by the school for Children's activities during the summer months in Lyne and the lack of space at Ottershaw and Chertsey to accommodate more children. Initially this venue was piloted for a small amount of children (32) and was so successful that it filled up very quickly. Therefore, the proposal for next summer is to relocate some staff members from quieter sites so the venue in Lyne can be extended. The playscheme was also able to take children who had already attained the age of 4 years and 6 months and who were in full time education which users had requested for a long time. The school was very supportive and co-operative throughout the summer and made a valuable partner to the Playscheme.

Places and Bookings

- 3.8 The Ottershaw and Egham Playschemes had an advanced booking uptake of 63% and 97% of spaces available respectively. These figures increased with daily bookers. Every day at Egham was fully booked. Therefore, Officers plan to increase the Playscheme at Egham by another sixteen spaces per day next year to cater for more children, making it the largest venue accommodating 96 children per day.
- 3.9 The Addlestone and Chertsey Playschemes had an advanced booking uptake of 57% and 72% of spaces available respectively. As with the other venues, these figures also increased with daily bookers. The main hours were very popular at Addlestone but the extra hours had a slow take up. As a result, costs were covered but no additional revenue was produced.
- 3.10 The New Haw and Englefield Green Playschemes had an advanced booking uptake of 29% and 54% of spaces available respectively. These figures increased with a large amount of daily bookers. Officers have reduced the spaces available next year to ensure these schemes are more cost effective.
- 3.11 The new Lyne Playscheme had an advanced booking uptake of 64% of spaces available and the Playscheme for 4 ½ - 7 years was completely full. However, the Play Plus for 8 –11 year olds was considerably quieter.
- 3.12 There were 472 places available in each of the four weeks of the scheme, giving a total of 1,888 places for the whole scheme.
- 3.13 62% of spaces were booked in advance of the summer holidays. Once the scheme had commenced a further 25% were taken up, giving a total of 87%.
- 3.14 Chertsey Playscheme was the only site fully inspected by OFSTED in 2004 and received a "good" grade (grades vary from unsatisfactory – satisfactory – good being the highest possible). OFSTED's feedback was extremely positive; and the reason for gaining the highest award was due to the work done by Officers in training staff in order to meet

OFSTED's recommendations from 2003 where a "Satisfactory" rating at the sites inspected had been received.

- 3.15 Members are asked to note that due to the purchase of Reserve4, a booking system for Playschemes and Leisure; it will now be possible to enhance the service further.
- 3.16 Internet bookings will go Live in early 2005, in readiness for the summer. This is the first service in Leisure to go live. The system also enables telephone bookings to be made. In a recent survey 62% of current users said they would use on-line bookings.
- 3.17 People will also be able to make daily bookings in advance, and in a recent survey 72% of current users said they would use this service. It is proposed to introduce a modest charge for this service.
- 3.18 Now that the system is up and running and most of the initial teething problems have been resolved, Officers will be more visible on the lead up to the summer months and administration duties will be alleviated with the help of a temporary post.
- 3.19 Officers will also investigate the feasibility of extending hours at other sites where there is a demand, in order to increase revenue for the Council in line with the last two years.
- 3.20 Extra hours can only be offered in the morning or afternoon. In a recent survey 24% of current users said they would use extra hours in the morning and 24% extra hours in the afternoon.

Provision for children with Special Needs

- 3.21 In 2003 the schemes benefited from a grant of £4,000 from the Early Years and Childcare Partnership, which was awarded to the White Lodge Centre over three years from 2001. The funding contributed to the provision of a specialist scheme for children with special needs. Officers have reapplied for a similar grant for next year. However if the application is unsuccessful the Council will be requested to make provision of approximately £4,000 to support children with special needs on the scheme. This would comply with the Council's obligation to provide services for children with disabilities.

Referrals and Concessions

- 3.22 This year 46 children benefited from the referral scheme. On the whole this worked very well, because these children could socialise with children of their age. The referral scheme is worthwhile and it is recommended that it be continued at an approximate indirect cost to the Council of £3,000 in 2004. Following improvements to the referral scheme the number of users doubled in 2004.
- 3.23 This year 76 children were booked onto the scheme at the concessionary rate. This is a worthwhile scheme that supports people on low incomes. Evidence is required to prove eligibility such as income support, housing benefit or council tax relief.

Staffing and Staff Training

- 3.24 89 staff were employed to run the Playschemes in 2004. Each new member of staff attended a full day of training covering operating procedures, accident and emergency situations, and activity organisation and programme preparation. All staff also attended first aid training delivered by St John Ambulance and refresher training was provided for retained staff.
- 3.25 The Leisure Development Officer is now trained to train Playscheme staff to a recognised level. This year 32 members of staff participated in a 3 ½ day course to further themselves and improve the standard of the team. This training assisted in the achievement of the good OFSTED report.

Scheme Organisation

- 3.26 The schemes are currently run by the Leisure Development Officer with assistance from the Sports Development Officer and Assistant Leisure Development Officer, overseen by the Projects and Support Manager and Head of Leisure.
- 3.27 During 2004 the Borough PCSOs (Police Community Support Officers) played an active role in assisting with the Playschemes. This was a very strong partnership, built during the summer months, and Surrey Police have confirmed that they will continue to participate in future children's facilities in the Borough.
- 3.28 It is recommended that the Summer Playschemes in 2005 be held from Monday 1 August to Friday 26 August. This is a week later than usual, as London schools break up the week after those in Surrey, which could leave the Council short staffed because a number of staff on the Runnymede Playschemes work in the Greater London area.

Feedback

- 3.29 Questionnaires from users of the 2004 Playschemes are currently being analysed. Feedback is generally very good, with no major complaints to date. A cross section of a balanced comparison from users of the playscheme is attached at Appendix 'D'.

Financial Implications

- 3.30 Sponsorship income of £4,300 (plus VAT) was raised from Procter & Gamble Community Matters, based in Egham and Weybridge. Procter & Gamble have supported the Playschemes for eleven years and have confirmed they will sponsor the Playschemes for yet another year. The Tussauds group has also offered sponsorship in the form of Theme Park tickets valued at over £3,000 to enhance the children's programme.

Charges

- 3.31 Non-Runnymede residents whose children do not attend school in the Borough are charged double fees. Although this number has reduced the number of families outside the Borough using the schemes, this is in line with other Boroughs providing Playschemes.
- 3.32 Set out at Appendix 'E' are the recommended charges for 2005. These amount to an increase of £1 a day for the average family.
- 3.33 This year a reduction on the fees of 50% was offered to Runnymede Borough Council employees. Approximately 20 staff members took advantage of this service and it is recommended that this be offered again next year.
- 3.34 The net cost of the scheme in 2004 and proposed expenditure for 2005/06, excluding central costs are set out below:-

	2004/05 Original Estimate £	2004/05 Probable Outturn £	2005/06 Proposed Estimate £
<u>Expenditure:</u>			
Wages	72,000	77,200	73,000
Other Costs	<u>40,800</u>	<u>42,300</u>	<u>43,800</u>
Total Expenditure	112,800	119,500	116,800
<u>Income:</u>			
Fees and Charges	47,000	50,000	50,000
Advertising	1,000	300	500
Sponsorship	<u>4,300</u>	<u>4,300</u>	<u>4,300</u>
Total Income	52,300	54,600	54,800
Net Cost	60,500	64,900	62,000

Expenditure

- 3.35 The on-site staff costs recommended for the Playschemes in 2005, have been reduced by reallocating staff to busy sites and only recruiting on some sites if bookings make it viable. The 2004 expenditure covered one off additional staff training costs. Also included in the wages budget is an allowance for additional office staff during the 2 ½ months leading up to the playscheme to help staff with bookings and recruitment including personnel checks (EU, CRB, References, D2 for OFSTED), as this has nearly doubled in the last two years.

4. Council Policy

- 4.1 The Leader's Position Statement 2004/05 states:

- 4.1.1 *"The popular Play and Splash Schemes operated in our parks and elsewhere will continue and we will work in partnership with sponsors in order to ensure adequate funding is in place. Investigation of extended provision will continue"*

OFFICERS' RECOMMENDATION that -

- i) provision be made in the draft estimates for 2005/06 in the net sum of £62,000 in respect of the Summer Playschemes;**
- ii) the Playschemes be run at seven sites in 2005, between the hours of 9.15 a.m. and 3.15 p.m. from 1 August to 26 August with Officers selecting suitable sites opening their doors for "Extra Hours, bookable by morning and afternoon only" and daily booking in advance;**
- iii) free child places be given to staff working directly on the scheme during the hours of work to encourage more experienced staff to join;**
- iv) Council staff not working on the schemes receive a 50% discount on the price which residents pay for the playschemes for their children's places to add to the "Staff Benefits Package";**
- v) Officers continue to encourage the inclusion of children with special needs, subject to funding and the appointment of suitable staff; and**
- vi) the referral scheme be continued, whereby children at risk can attend the schemes free of charge, at an approximate cost to the Council of £3,000 in 2005.**

(TO RESOLVE)

Background Papers

Relevant papers on Leisure Services file: 8.3 and Leisure Development Officer's files including Questionnaires and feedback forms from Play 2004.

8. SUMMER 'SPLASH' SCHEME 2004 AND 2005 (DAL)
(Ref: Minutes of Leisure and Environment Committee, November 2003, page 1056, para. 508)
- 1. **Purpose of Report**
 - 1.1 **The purpose of this report is to inform Members of the performance of the 2004 Runnymede 'Splash' programme, and to seek approval for the proposals for 2005.**
 - 2. **Background Information**
 - 2.1 'Splash' was set up in 1993 to offer the 11 to 16 age group a range of leisure activities during

the school summer holidays. The main objective of the scheme is to provide activities for young people that alleviate boredom, which might lead to anti-social behaviour.

- 2.2 The Runnymede scheme has always operated from a central venue with transport being provided from major communities around the Borough for young people who need it.
- 2.3 The number of spaces available in 2004 was 200 per week for three weeks and 30 spaces on the specialist weeks in drama, art and specific sports weeks run in advance of the main scheme. This year's scheme was hosted by St George's College.

3. Report

- 3.1 This year the main 'Splash' scheme ran for three weeks from 26 July to 13 August 2004. A team of staff was employed to organise on-site activities and supervise the off-site activities. The full charge for one week was £42 (same as 2003) with a concessionary charge of £21 (£16.50 in 2003) a week for families receiving benefits. Free places were also offered through the referral scheme to young people who were identified as being either 'at risk' from crime, in vulnerable home circumstances, a previous offender or at risk of offending. The Surrey Youth Development Service contributed £2,500 towards the cost of employing staff to work with these young people. Charges of between £1 and £20 were made for some of the off-site activities.

Venue

- 3.2 St George's College, was a very popular venue for families, staff and the young people who attended the scheme. The facilities used were football pitches, large outdoor grassed areas, playground, athletics track, sports hall, gymnasium, main hall, two classrooms, drama studio and three car parks. The enhanced facilities offered a lot more variety with new activities on-site. The move this year was due to building works at Abbey Fit and Officers will seek the use of St George's again for 2005.

Attendance

- 3.3 In 2002 and 2003 the scheme attracted 240 and 248 young people respectively. This year 306 young people attended, and it is considered that the increase in numbers was assisted by the decision to extend the "speciality week" conducted by the Sports Development Officer.

Attraction of Target Groups

- 3.4 This year the 'Splash' referral scheme benefited sixteen young people, a slight increase on last year, attributable to an exercise which promoted the scheme to professionals working in the area (Social Services, Children Services, Health Visitors, Police, Community Safety, Schools and the Youth Service).

Charges

- 3.5 'Splash' charges were frozen during 2004, with a slight increase in the concessionary rate to 50% of the full rate to be in line with neighbouring Boroughs including Spelthorne and Elmbridge. Income targets were exceeded beyond expectations this year, therefore it is proposed that for 2005 only a small increase of £3 and £1.50 respectively be made to the charges to ensure that families on lower incomes are not excluded. It is proposed to keep the full daily rate at £10, but in response to demand for the service to introduce a modest charge of £5 for the concessionary daily rate.
- 3.6 To encourage mature members of staff it is proposed that free weekly places for the children of staff working directly on the scheme be offered to mirror the Playschemes arrangements, although this would not apply to off-site trip supplements.
- 3.7 It is the Officers' recommendation that, as last year, Council staff be offered a discount of 50% of weekly fees (not supplements), to assist staff with childcare concerns over the summer holidays. This benefit was taken up by seven members of staff in 2004.

3.7.1 The proposed charges for 2005 are set out below:-

	2005 Charges (per week)	2004 Charges (per week)	2003 Charges (per week)	2002 charges (per week)	2001 charges (per week)
Full charge	£45.00	£42.00	£42.00	£40.00	£38.00
Concession	£22.50	£21.00	£16.50	£15.75	£15.00
Full charge	(per day) £10	(per day) £10			
Concession	£5	-			

Staffing

- 3.8 A full complement of staff, largely drawn from the previous year, was appointed well before the 'Splash' scheme started. Each new member of paid staff attended two days of training addressing operating procedures, accident and emergency procedures, activity organisation and programme preparation. Returning staff members attended a one day refresher training course. The Scheme Co-ordinator conducted most of the training this year, making a large saving to the Council who would have otherwise had to employ external trainers.
- 3.9 This year's 'Splash' Scheme employed 21 staff comprising 1 Co-ordinator, 2 senior instructors and 16 Instructors and 2 special needs "buddies". It is recommended that this year's ratio of 1 Instructor to 10 young people be maintained in the future. Initially 21 staff will be recruited to run the scheme for 200 young people and this number will be increased if bookings warrant it.

Scheme Organisation

- 3.10 The Leisure Development Team contributed much time and effort to the scheme. Splash ran very smoothly as endorsed by staff, young people and parents' feedback on the post-scheme questionnaires.

Transport

- 3.11 Free transport was available to all participants to and from the main venue at St George's College as part of the scheme. There were two coaches, each collecting from pickup points around the Borough at Englefield Green, Virginia Water, Hythe, Thorpe, Chertsey, Ottershaw, Egham and New Haw. These coaches were also used to transport participants and staff to all the off-site activities.

4. Resource Implications

- 4.1 The estimated net cost of the 2004 'Splash' scheme and proposed expenditure for 2005/06, excluding central costs are set out below:-

	2004/05 Original Budget £	2004/05 Probable Outturn £	2005/06 Proposed £
<u>Expenditure:</u>			
Wages	26,300	25,800	27,800
Other Costs	<u>35,700</u>	<u>41,200</u>	<u>37,200</u>
Total Expenditure	62,000	67,000	65,000
<u>Income:</u>			
Fees and Charges	24,000	28,000	30,000
SCC Contributions	0	2,500	-
Donations	500	0	0
Sponsorship	4,300	4,300	4,300
Advertising	<u>1,000</u>	<u>300</u>	<u>500</u>
Total Income	29,800	35,100	34,800
Net Cost	32,200	31,900	30,200

- 4.2 In previous years, Surrey Youth Development Service has provided funding of £5,000 towards the cost of employing staff to assist with disadvantaged or disabled young people on the scheme. In 2003 and 2004 this was reduced £2,500, reflecting the Youth Development Service's priorities. The County Council has not yet confirmed whether it will be able to fund this provision in 2005.
- 4.3 Procter & Gamble became the main sponsors for Splash in 2003 and contributed £4,300 (plus VAT), which meant that income targets were achieved. Procter & Gamble have confirmed sponsorship again for 2005. Also after working closely with the Tussauds group they assisted Splash this year with the provision of 260 complimentary tickets to both parks in the area, a saving in expenditure of over £3,000. The Tussauds group has confirmed the same offer again for 2005. The sponsors were thanked for their contributions. This is the most income from sponsors Splash has received for many years and Officers will continue to seek further external support for the Splash Scheme.
- 4.4 It is recommended that 'Splash' staff wages be increased by 3% for 2005, in line with equivalent schemes, and as participants are increasing, to employ a deputy post once again.
5. Council Policy
- 5.1 The Leader's Position statement 2004/05 states:
- 5.1.1 *"The popular Play and Splash Schemes operated in our parks and elsewhere will continue and we will work in partnership with sponsors in order to ensure adequate funding is in place. Investigation of extended provision will continue"; and*
- 5.1.2 *We will continue to work with other agencies to widen the range of leisure activities as a contribution to the Surrey Youth Strategy and continue our support of the Duke of Edinburgh Award Scheme, the scout and guide movement and other organised youth groups and the Runnymede Splash Scheme.*

OFFICERS' RECOMMENDATION that -

- i) the 2005 'Splash' scheme be operated as in 2004 with 200 places per week on the main scheme with additional places available for the speciality week;**
- ii) subject to budgetary approval, the 2005 'Splash' scheme be operated at a net cost to the Council of £30,200 and appropriate provision be included in the 2005/06 estimates;**
- iii) the draft budget provide for 'Splash' charges of £45 a week per participant or £22.50 a week per participant for families receiving benefits or £10 per day per participant;**
- iv) free spaces be given to the children of "Splash" staff; and**
- v) Council staff receive a 50% discount on the price which residents pay for their children's places to add to the "Staff Benefits Package".**

(TO RESOLVE)

Background Papers

Relevant papers on Leisure Services file: 8.3 and Leisure Development Officer's files including Questionnaires and feedback formed from Play 2004

9. SPORTS DEVELOPMENT AND SURREY YOUTH GAMES 2004 AND 2005 (DAL)

1. Purpose of Report

1.1 **The purpose of this report is to update Members of Runnymede's involvement in the 2004 Surrey Youth Games and to seek approval for proposals for the preparation of Runnymede teams for the Surrey Youth Games 2005.**

2. Background Information

2.1 Sports Development is essentially about providing children with the opportunity to get involved in a variety of sports activities and sustain their participation by enhancing links between schools, coaching courses and clubs. The sports activities provided in Runnymede are either linked into existing clubs or subsequently develop into new junior clubs, wherever possible. Sports development therefore aims to provide the local community with sporting opportunities that build on and increase the existing infrastructure. By encouraging involvement in sport through local participation and competition, it enables each individual to maximise their potential and reach their chosen ability level.

2.2 Runnymede Borough Council has been involved in the Surrey Youth Games for eight years. The event is organised by the Surrey Sports Partnership which comprises Surrey County Council, Surrey's 11 Borough and District Councils, Sport England, National Governing Bodies of Sport and the University of Surrey and Royal Holloway University and an events consultancy company.

2.3 In the past two years, the Youth Games trials and training sessions have been linked with partnership work such as Active Surrey (AS) training and coaching courses to further increase the effectiveness of the developmental aspect of the Games.

Active Surrey and Surrey Sports Partnership

2.4 The Council's annual contribution of £2,000 to the Active Surrey programme facilitates a great deal of the current sports development work in Runnymede. Active Surrey then provides the finance, resources and coaches to allow the Council to run sports specific coaching courses and activities, either as stand alone development initiatives or as links with existing clubs in the Borough. The focus sports are those originally stipulated by Sport England through the original Active Sports programme and serve to support some of the Borough's less developed sports, for example Athletics and Basketball. The programme can be adapted to develop initial interest and progress selected sports to junior club level, as well as support and enhance the coach/volunteer base in Runnymede.

2.5 The Surrey Sports Partnership and Active Surrey provide regular resources, training and workshop opportunities in all areas of Club and Coach development, volunteer training, young coaches and official's courses and sports specific qualification opportunities. These courses are open to all and include concessionary rates and specialist courses for teachers, which further enhances the school club link concept, which is key for sports development work to be effective locally. There are a variety of courses available for coaches to develop their own personal skills and knowledge in their chosen sport. All coaches inducted with Active Surrey are trained in a number of generic areas such as good practice and child protection and sports specific first aid. Active Surrey also ensures that junior sports clubs are safe, effective and child-friendly through their Clubmark induction scheme, the national club accreditation scheme from Sport England which is awarded in conjunction with existing governing body schemes. Clubmark ensures that clubs can continue to develop and offer children the best possible sporting opportunities, whilst allowing parents and carers to be confident that their children are attending a quality club.

2.6 Active Surrey enhances the Surrey Youth Games training programme and maintains the interest and participation levels for much longer than other schemes, therefore improving the chances of developing junior clubs at a faster rate, subject to current demand.

2.7 The Active Surrey programme currently consists of four stages:- Local coaching schemes and competitions/festivals, Club Development, Assessment and Selection and finally Development Squads. The Surrey Youth Games provides part of the competition element of

the programme and is an excellent pathway for those who have been involved in the coaching process at a local level.

- 2.8 The aim of the Games is provide all children who have not currently achieved County standard, with the opportunity to access free qualified coaching sessions and take part in a County scale competition to represent their borough.
- 2.9 The initial trials and training are open to any child aged between 5 and 15yrs, who live or attend a school in the Borough. Strict checks are carried out on all teams, prior to the competition events, to ensure that no county standard players have been entered.
- 2.10 Trials and training sessions are offered free of charge to all who attend, as is their involvement in the final competition.
- 2.11 It is recommended that this be continued to ensure access to all is maintained.
- 2.12 Paid and voluntary qualified sports coaches run the trials and training sessions at a variety of venues across the Borough, in conjunction with a number of schools, clubs and other sports courses that may have been organised through the Active Surrey Partnership work.
- 2.13 It is also recommended that coaches continue to be paid for their services to ensure that experienced and qualified coaches are employed.
- 2.14 Trials and training commence in Runnymede in April/May (depending on the Easter academic holidays). This is generally six weeks prior to the Closing Date for Entries (in order for eligibility checks to be completed) and the two day competition takes place in June at Guildford Spectrum, The Varsity Centre, Stoke Park and St Georges College, Addlestone (Tennis).

3. Report

Advertising and Publicity

- 3.1 Presentations about the Games and how to get involved took place in assemblies at 12 out of 14 primary and 2 out of 7 secondary schools throughout April and May this year. All schools were offered the opportunity to have an assembly presentation and others chose to deliver their own.
- 3.2 Flyers were delivered to all schools, clubs, sports centres, libraries, youth centres and all on mailing lists, detailing the trials and training dates for all sports and further information about the Games.
- 3.3 Posters were also distributed to all sports centre, libraries, youth centres, schools and displayed on public notice boards in the Borough.
- 3.4 Press releases were submitted to all local papers.
- 3.5 Banners were designed and displayed at four different sites around Runnymede, in the weeks leading up to the trials and training.
- 3.6 Increased publicity and promotion is needed to ensure that Runnymede's track and training sessions are well advertised and to raise the profile of the game as a whole.

Coaching

- 3.7 Fifteen coaches were involved in training the various squads, only four of whom were volunteers. Seven different venues were used for the trials and training, only three of which were free of charge, namely, Egham Leisure Centre, Pyrford Judo Club and Ottershaw Memorial Fields. Athletics, Basketball and Girls Football training was linked in with Active Surrey coaching courses organised in Runnymede and the following schools and clubs were involved in either providing coaches, players or full teams:-

- Salesian School – Basketball Coaches
- Pycroft Grange – Boccia Team and Coach

- The Hythe Primary – Junior Hockey Teams
 - Philip Southcote – Boys Football Team and Coach
 - Abbey Fit Junior Badminton Club – Coach and players
 - Ottershaw Girls Football Club - Players
 - Pyrford Judo Club – Coach and players
 - Fullbrook Juniors Netball Club – Coaches and players
 - MM Tennis Academy - Coaches
- 3.8 All coaches must have a recognised qualification for insurance purposes, these are endorsed by the individual Governing Body of each sport. Depending on the qualification level, hourly rates are variable but they vary between £10 - £25 per hour. In addition, all coaches are subject to a check by the Criminal Records Bureau.
- 3.9 Team Managers on the day of the competition are all voluntary. No mileage allowance is paid for travel to or from any training sessions or competition venues.

Trials Attendance Figures

- 3.10 Set out below are the attendance figures for this year's trials:-

Sport	Number of Children at initial Trials
Athletics	55
Badminton	23
Boccia	Pyrcroft Grange Team
Basketball	22
Girls Football	24
Boys MLD Football	Philip Southcote Team
Junior Hockey	The Hythe School
Senior Hockey	8
Judo	30
Netball	25
Mixed Rugby	12
Girls Rugby	10
Squash	No trials.
Boys Tennis	12
Girls Tennis	1
TOTAL:	222

- 3.11 Following the trials, selection letters were sent out where necessary in order to reduce the numbers attending the squad training sessions (e.g. athletics).
- 3.12 Where trial attendance was poor, schools or clubs were given the opportunity to enter teams to represent Runnymede at the competition.
- 3.13 The 2004 Youth Games included 11 sports, with a total of 27 possible team entries. Runnymede entered 20 out of 27 teams.

Athletics

- 3.14 Indoor Athletics courses are held throughout the winter months in conjunction with Active Surrey. The Youth Games trial was then held at St George's College, followed by six weeks of training sessions for the squad. After the competition, the training reverts back to the indoor sessions. With over 100 children on the athletics database and a number of loyal coaches in this sport, the plan is to launch Runnymede's Junior Athletics Club at St George's College in preparation for the 2005 Youth Games trials.

Badminton

- 3.15 Trials and training sessions were held at Abbey Fit as it has a junior club which meets regularly on a Saturday morning. Since the Youth Games, the Club has expanded, officially registered with the Governing Body and is now entered into three different leagues for competition.

Boccia (Adapted bowls activity for children with severe learning and physical disabilities)

- 3.16 Pycroft Grange Primary School has hosted the Boccia trials for the past three years. Each year local schools with special needs students are invited to attend and Pycroft Grange hosts the training and provides a team manager for the competition. Following an increase in this sport generally and in the number of teams participating in the Games, there are now plans to start up a Boccia league in the County.

Basketball

- 3.17 A 10 week Active Surrey Coaching course ran at Abbey Fit in the lead up to the Youth Games. As there is no junior Club in Runnymede there is no base for holding an open trial. Basketball is another sport that, subject to demand, needs a junior club in Runnymede but for the moment the Active Surrey courses facilitate regular coaching sessions. Both Abbey Fit and Egham Leisure Centre are keen to host junior basketball clubs as the activity sessions develop.

Girls' Football

- 3.18 An Active Surrey Kick Start Course was run with Ottershaw Girls' Football Club, prior to Youth Games trials and training. As a result of continued club development with Ottershaw, attendance at the trials was excellent and the club has retained a number of new players since June.

Football (for boys with moderate learning difficulties)

- 3.19 Philip Southcote School has hosted the trials and training for this sport every year since its inception. Geoff Rogers coaches and manages the team each year and the school has its own links with clubs for continued participation.

Hockey

- 3.20 With no junior hockey club in the Borough, fielding teams for hockey has always relied heavily upon schools in the Borough and coach availability. A lack of astro turf facilities also hinders the development of hockey but an application through the New Opportunities Fund (NOF), supported by the Borough's Sports Development Officer, has been accepted for a floodlit pitch at Salesian School, Chertsey, subject to planning permission. Thames Valley Hockey Club is working in partnership with the school to obtain this facility and junior hockey development plans are a focal part of the application. Hockey teams for the Youth Games are therefore sought from local schools at present and a qualified coach provides some training leading up to the competition.

Judo

- 3.21 Due to the nature of this sport, only club players can enter the competition and links with Pycroft and Egham Judo clubs provide the selection and training of the Runnymede squad each year. Many players use the Youth Games as a warm up competition to the County trials.

Netball

- 3.22 Links with a junior club based at Fullbrook School provide a host for the netball trials and training each year and the club has been further developed through Active Surrey activity. In response to demand, there are now plans to set up a new junior club at Egham Leisure Centre.

Rugby (Mixed & Girls)

- 3.23 Egham Rugby Football Club (Egham RFC), is inducted by Active Surrey and is working towards Clubmark status but currently has little involvement in the Youth Games due to coach availability. An independent coach was therefore recruited to hold open trials and training at Egham Leisure Centre and the mixed squad then had the option to join Egham RFC to continue their participation. There is currently no provision for girls' rugby at Club level but it is fairly well established in most secondary schools as part of the curriculum.

Squash

- 3.24 Squash was introduced to the Games in 2003 and Runnymede has yet to enter any squash teams due to a lack of qualified coaches and clubs in the Borough. Surrey University has made an application for a Community Racket Sports Coach for the County. Runnymede has agreed a contribution for this bid in order to develop some junior coaching sessions in the future at one of the Sports Centres.

Tennis

- 3.25 Open trials and training were held at St George's College, in partnership with MM Tennis Academy. All clubs with junior players were invited to attend. Tennis development in Runnymede is difficult due to the diversity of the club structure. There are two very exclusive clubs (Foxhills and Wentworth) and a mixture of adult clubs (some with Junior sections), who play on courts based at out local parks. To date, only Knowle Hill Tennis Club has shown an interest in the Youth Games. MM Tennis Academy, which is currently based in Addlestone but with no permanent playing location, specialises in junior match play and coaching. There is a possibility of basing the Academy at Aviator Park, allowing it to develop junior tennis and provide a hub for future tennis activity.

Competition Preparation

- 3.26 In preparation for the competition, entry details of every Runnymede team member are checked. In addition, consent is required from all parents of those participating or who may be photographed during the course.
- 3.27 Team Managers for each squad are needed on the competition days to supervise and coach the teams. No coaches are paid for their time, as the budget is currently insufficient for these costs. Leisure Services staff act as team managers in the absence of a volunteer coach.
- 3.28 Squad t-shirts are provided for all players entering the competition and all team managers are issued with polo shirts. The total cost in 2004 for the provision of t-shirts and polo shirts was £966.

Competition

- 3.29 Transport to and from Guildford is provided on the second day of competition as an option to all Runnymede squads. This year, a charge of £5 per child was made to assist with the cost.
- 3.30 Part of the contribution of £250 from Runnymede Sports Council is often used to provide the squads with refreshments at the competition weekend. This year however, this contribution was put towards the presentation evening and cost of squad t-shirts.
- 3.31 Runnymede's final position in the score table has fluctuated between 9th & 11th position every year since initial involvement. Many other boroughs simply approach their local schools and clubs for teams or hold open trials at schools or clubs where the better club athletes will be selected from what is termed an open trial.
- 3.32 The different approaches taken by each of the 11 boroughs in preparing and selecting their teams for the Youth Games, coupled with the existing infrastructure of clubs and facilities, is a fundamental reason for larger boroughs such as Guildford, Elmbridge and Woking always topping the table and smaller boroughs such as Reigate & Banstead, Epsom & Ewell and Runnymede finishing towards the bottom. However, the Games acts as a valuable focus for sports development in encouraging young people who might never play at County standard to participate in sport and have the opportunity to compete at a high profile competition.

- 3.33 In many of the mainstream sports, such as athletics and basketball, the lack of junior clubs and facilities in Runnymede hinders the selection of strong teams, but provides the opportunity to allow young people in Runnymede to take part in coaching and competition in these sports.

Event Venue for 2005

- 3.34 St George's College currently hosts the Tennis event for the Youth Games whilst the rest of the events are held in Guildford. The Surrey Youth Games (SYG) Management Group is currently investigating the possibility of hosting more sports at St George's College and Egham Leisure Centre for the 2005 Youth Games.

Presentation Evening

- 3.35 A presentation evening was held at Chertsey Hall on 1 July and approximately 250 people attended, including Councillors C. J. and Mrs J. Norman, the Chief Executive Officer, Head of Leisure Services and Leader of the Council. Medals and certificates were presented to all competitors and teams managers on the night and posted to anyone who was unable to attend.
- 3.36 The Mayor presented medals and certificates and also praised the children's achievements and thanked all volunteers who had been involved in training the Runnymede teams.
- 3.37 The 2004 Runnymede Surrey Youth Games Presentation evening was better attended than in any of the previous years.

Feedback

- 3.38 Feedback forms were sent out to all competitors of the 2004 Youth Games (approx 160). The response rate was approx 35% and a summary of the analysis is attached at Appendix 'F'.
- 3.39 The majority of responses described the Surrey Youth Games as a very positive and rewarding experience for their children. Many parents commented on the need to have more training sessions and establish the teams much earlier.
- 3.40 As a result of feedback, Officers propose that an extended training programme be offered to the 2005 squads. The trials for all sports could also be held at two separate sports festivals at each of the sports centres, similar to the annual Have A Go Day's run by Runnymede Sports Council.

Organisation

- 3.41 The preparations, advertising, supervision of the trials and training sessions and team entries into the competition are currently the responsibility of the Sports Development Officer. The Leisure Team provides assistance and support where needed over the competition weekend. The Sports Development Officer currently organises the Borough presentation evening.

4. Financial Implications

- 4.1 Annual sponsorship income of £250 from Runnymede Sports Council is a welcome contribution towards the costs of t-shirts and medals for the presentation evening. Foxhills Golf & Country Club was also invited to sponsor the squads this year and their contribution of £100 enabled their logo to be advertised on each of the t-shirts.
- 4.2 Officers will investigate the possibility of obtaining further sponsorship for the 2005 Games, offering Foxhills the opportunity to increase their funding or approaching Proctor & Gamble (P&G) for sponsorship, building on the success of our current partnership with P&G.
- 4.3 Increased publicity and advertising of the Youth Games is needed in order to ensure heavy promotion of the Games but more importantly for early promotion of the trials and training

sessions within Runnymede. This would serve to raise the profile and encourage more young people to get involved in representing Runnymede at the competition.

- 4.4 Following on from the feedback, a larger budget would be needed in order to increase the trials and training period for all sports. The suggested format is to hold two main trial events at each of the sports centres, followed by 10 weeks of training for all sports squads. This will inevitably increase the venue and coach wage costs with an extended training programme.

Charges and Expenditure

- 4.5 No charges were made for any of the trials and training sessions. Income was only generated through the competition transport charge and photograph orders, simply to cover those costs, not to make a profit.
- 4.6 The net cost of the 2004 Youth Games, compared with those in 2003 and the proposed expenditure for 2005, are set out below:-

	2003	2004	2005
	£	£	£
Expenditure	5,778	6,500	6,000
Income	(0)	(500)	0
Net Expenditure	5,778	6,000	6,000

5. Council Policy

- 5.1 The Council's medium term financial strategy is a commitment to a programme of net reductions in revenue expenditure together with stepped increases in Council Tax.
- 5.2 However, if this policy is to be followed no higher level of service can be provided such as more training or extended training sessions.
- 5.3 The Leader's Position Statement 2004/2005 states:-
- 5.3.1 *We will further the interests and facilities for the youth of our Borough, in partnership with other agencies involved in this field.*
- 5.3.2 *We will continue to progress the availability of sports activities in our area with a focus on our Sports Centres and with a particular interest in provision in the south of the Borough.*
- 5.4 *The Surrey Sports Strategy 2001 – 2006 aims to achieve:*
- 5.4.1 *the provision of sporting opportunities in Surrey, which encourage lifelong participation from school into an active retirement*
- 5.4.2 *the placement of the sports club at the very heart of sports development*
- 5.4.3 *the most effective delivery of sport, particularly through improved co-ordination and communication amongst all our sporting agencies.*
- 5.5 Sport & Play Policy 2002-2005 (approved by Leisure & Environment Committee in June 2002)
- 5.5.1 The Council recognises the roles of play and sport in tackling broader issues such as developing and sustaining healthy and safe communities, combating social exclusion, diversion from anti-social and criminal activity and improving people's living environments.
- 5.6 The Borough's Sports Development objectives are to work in the most effective way possible to develop sporting opportunities for the local community, with specific emphasis on encouraging young people and people with disabilities to participate in sport, via work with local clubs and facility providers. The main sports development tools used in order to achieve this are Active Surrey, the Surrey Youth Games and the newly established RAZ programmes.

- 5.7 Sports Development Action Plans 2002-2005:-
- 5.7.1 *Continue to develop accessible sports courses using existing parks, school and sports centre facilities.*
- 5.7.2 *Continue to support national programmes and local groups in sports development policies to increase long-term participation in sport by members of the community.*
- 5.7.3 *Investigate the feasibility of making tennis free of charge to children at certain times by the end of May 2002*
- 5.7.4 *To develop sports such as hockey through the NOF provision of an ATP facility.*
- 5.7.5 *Continue to seek and support local coaches and look to establish new clubs where there is currently no provision e.g. athletics and basketball.*

THE COMMITTEE IS ASKED to indicate whether it wishes to support an enhanced service at an increased cost of £2,000 in light of the Council's medium term financial strategy, and if so for provision to be made in the draft estimates for 2005/06 in the net sum of £8000 in respect of the Surrey Youth Games budget accordingly.

(TO RESOLVE)

Background Papers

Relevant papers on Sports Development Officer's files including Questionnaires and feedback forms from Surrey Youth Games 2003 and 2004.

10. PROPOSED EXTENSION OF CLASSIC TRADITIONAL SECTIONS IN THE BOROUGH'S CEMETERIES (DAL)
(Ref: Minutes of the Leisure and Environment Committee, May 2004, page 1651, para. 936)

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 **The purpose of this report is to seek approval to allow Officers to extend the "Classic Traditional" grave space concept as appropriate.**

2. Background Information

- 2.1 At its meeting in May 2004 this Committee approved the creation of a "Classic Traditional" section in Englefield Green Cemetery. This was restricted to approximately 50% of Plot 23.
- 2.2 "Classic Traditional" spaces are larger than standard spaces (10' x 5' versus 8' x 4') and larger memorials are permitted. In addition these spaces can accommodate a brick-lined vault if required.

3. Report

- 3.1 Four burials (all with brick-lined vaults), have taken place in the "Classic Traditional" section and an additional five families have made reservations for the future purchase of spaces.
- 3.2 A number of the families showing interest are connected and no doubt this early 'rush' of interest will subside. However, Officers consider that others will favour the concept and therefore greater flexibility will be required to create other sections as appropriate.

4. Council Policy

- 4.1 This proposal will help maintain increased options available from the Borough Cemetery Services.

5 Resource Implications

- 5.1 The number of "Classic Traditional" spaces that can be accommodated reduces the overall number of grave spaces in the cemetery, but historically two standard spaces were used to accommodate a brick-lined vault and this used more total space. Higher charges are applied to "Classic Traditional" spaces and therefore income is not compromised.

OFFICERS' RECOMMENDATION that –

the Director of Administration and Leisure be authorised to approve the provision of further "classic traditional" sections in the Council's cemeteries as deemed necessary to satisfy demand.

(TO RESOLVE)

Background Papers

None.

11. EGHAM LEISURE CENTRE TRADING ACCOUNT (DF)

At the meeting of the Leisure and Environment Committee in November 2003, Members requested that they may be kept informed of Egham Leisure Centre's trading position.

Appendix ' G' shows the current trading account for the period April to October 2004.

(FOR INFORMATION)

Background Papers

None.

12. RUNNYMEDE ARTS DEVELOPMENT STEERING GROUP - MINUTES (DAL)

The Minutes of the meeting of the Steering Group held on 5 October 2004 are attached at Appendix ' H'.

(FOR INFORMATION)

Background Papers

None.

13. GRANT AID - COMMITTEE RESPONSIBILITIES (DAL)

1. **Purpose of Report**

- 1.1 **The purpose of this report is to consider the future Committee responsibilities for dealing with grant aid.**

2. **Background Information**

- 2.1 At its meeting on 3 November 2004, the Housing and Community Services Committee considered a report, which amongst other things considered the way in which grant aid is administered at Committee level.

- 2.2 Until a review of the departmental and service groupings in March 2002, grants to voluntary organisations had been the responsibility of the Corporate Management Committee and its predecessors. Thereafter Housing and Community Services Committee assumed responsibility for the funding of health and social care type organisations, while grants to cultural and sporting organisations came under the auspices of this Committee.

3. Report
- 3.1 Members were advised that when decisions are made about grant applications they should be made in the knowledge of the overall budget and the level of grant needed by others. It was also important that an assessment be made of the extent to which the recipients of a grant were assisting the Council in meeting its strategic priorities.
- 3.2 The Housing and Community Services Committee, was asked to give consideration to bringing together under one Committee the responsibility for grant aid. The purpose of this was to enable a strategic and consistent approach to grant aid.
- 3.3 It was suggested that the Corporate Management Committee might be the most appropriate body to deal with grant aid. In addition, Members were asked whether having transferred the duty to that Committee it should consider all the applications at one given point in the year. These measures would ensure that the work of, and support given to, the voluntary, charitable and other sectors would be consistent with the policy priorities of the Council.
- 3.4 The Housing and Community Services Committee resolved that subject to agreement of Leisure and Environment Committee grant support should be administered by the Corporate Management Committee.
- 3.5 This Committee is asked whether it wishes to concur with the views of the Housing and Community Services Committee to transfer responsibility of leisure related grant aid back to Corporate Management Committee.

OFFICERS' RECOMMENDATION that –

the Committee considers whether grant support to leisure related voluntary organisations should be administered centrally by the Corporate Management Committee with immediate effect

(TO RECOMMEND)

Background Papers

None.

14. ANTI-GRAFFITI AND STREET CARE TEAM - PROGRESS REPORT (DTS)
(Ref: Minutes of Leisure and Environment Committee, June 2003, page 195, para. 133 and Council, July 2003, page 299, para 210)

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to:-

- i) update Members on the progress of the DSO's Anti-Graffiti and Street Care Team; and
- ii) seek the Committee's views in respect of a charging policy.

2. Background Information

- 2.1 The Annual Personnel Report 2002/2003 referred to the growing problem of graffiti in the Borough and recommended that a new two-man team dedicated to graffiti removal across the Borough would do much to improve the quality of the environment.
- 2.2 This Committee resolved at its meeting on 19 June 2003 that:
 - i) the graffiti removal service be offered free of charge for private property belonging to residents and businesses in the Borough, subject to the prior signing of a waiver in respect of damage; and
 - ii) Officers report back to Committee on progress in removing graffiti and, if necessary, review the need for a future charging regime.

- 2.3 In July 2003, the Council approved a virement of £60,000 from various council services to fund the annual operational costs of the Anti-Graffiti Team.
3. Report
- 3.1 The team has been operating since May 2003 and consists of two staff who are part of a six strong Street Care Task Group. The Group also deals with other tasks including the installation of litter and dog bins, carrying out repairs to bus shelters and street furniture and car park maintenance.
- 3.2 Each member of the Task Group has been trained to use the anti-graffiti equipment to enable coverage of staff holidays and other absences.
- 3.3 The team members have developed their skills in selecting the appropriate methods of removal from the various surfaces and in different environments.
- 3.4 The team removes graffiti from both public and private property free of charge.
- 3.5 The team receives notification of graffiti from the public, via telephone reports and the Anti-Social Behaviour Reporting Form on the Council's website, and from Council Officers as they travel around the Borough. The Borough's Parking Attendants, who deal with parking enforcement, are also required to report street care issues such as graffiti.
- 3.6 The van containing the cleaning equipment carries prominent markings to publicise the team and to invite the public to report the presence of graffiti by telephoning the depot's Freephone number which is displayed on the van.
- 3.7 The maximum response time for removing normal graffiti is 7 days and 24 hours for obscene or racist graffiti. However, the team has achieved a position where they are dealing with graffiti much more quickly than this. If obscene or racist graffiti is reported within the working day it is treated as a priority and dealt with within that day.
- 3.8 Since the Anti-Graffiti Team has been operating they have had a significant effect in reducing graffiti in the Borough.
- 3.9 It is now very rare to see graffiti in the Borough. This is due to the team's ability to respond very quickly when graffiti is reported and to their pro-active approach in finding and removing graffiti.
- 3.10 It is likely that the speed with which the team responds has deterred potential graffiti vandals from operating in the Borough.
- 3.11 The team has dealt with approximately 1,500 incidences of graffiti in the last year. The property from which graffiti has been removed includes traffic signs, street nameplates, recycling banks, walls and fences, footpaths and subways, street furniture, bus shelters, litter and dog bins, utility cabinets, post boxes, garage doors, play equipment in parks and public conveniences.
- 3.12 The team supplies photographs and other information about graffiti that has been removed to Surrey Police in order to attempt to identify specific 'tags' and those who regularly cause graffiti damage.
- 3.13 The Police have not achieved any convictions in respect of graffiti as a direct result of information received from the team, but there appears to be very few regular culprits operating in the Borough.
- 3.14 In addition to removing graffiti from various surfaces the equipment used by the team is also capable of performing other cleaning tasks. It is used on town centre paved areas, such as Guildford Street in Chertsey, for removing chewing gum, oil and various other types of staining from the paving.

- 3.15 The team will shortly be cleaning the existing paving in Station Road, Addlestone, in order to complement the adjacent new paving that has been installed as part of the environmental improvement scheme.
4. Council Policy
- 4.1 One of the Leisure and Environment Committee's Principal Objectives in the 2004/05 Leader's Position Statement is that the Council will deal with the graffiti problem in the Borough by offering a removal service to private owners, by removing graffiti speedily and by working with Surrey Police to apprehend those causing graffiti damage.
5. Environmental Implications
- 5.1 The Runnymede Community Strategy identifies a key priority of tackling anti-social behaviour and a key target of improving the quality of life and feeling of reassurance by dealing rapidly with issues as they arise and, where possible, improving the local environment.
6. Financial Implications
- 6.1 Capital funding for the team came from a grant of £31,200 from the Crime Reduction Team (CRT) at the Government Office of the South-East (GOSE) to acquire the van and cleaning equipment.
- 6.2 The total annual operational costs, including staff salaries and running and maintaining the vehicles and equipment, is estimated to be £75,700 in 2004/05. These costs are partially offset by contributions from Surrey County Council's Local Transportation Service and Network Rail, both of whom contribute £3,500 to bring the net cost of the service down to £68,700.
- 6.3 Utility companies such as BT, NTL and the Post Office have been approached to make a contribution towards the cost of removing graffiti from their roadside equipment. They have declined so far as they claim that they make their own provision.
- 6.4 In order to preserve the Borough's appearance the Council's Anti-Graffiti Team normally removes graffiti from this equipment so Officers are currently trying again to secure contributions from these companies.
- 6.5 The graffiti removal service is offered free of charge for private property belonging to residents and businesses in the Borough. The cost of staff, equipment and materials in operating the service is approximately £40 (plus VAT), per hour.
- 6.6 Most cases of graffiti take less than 4 hours for the team to remove and it is considered that the cost of removal would be less than the administrative costs and staff time in arranging and securing payment from the property owner.
- 6.7 There have been very few cases to date where the graffiti could be described as extensive. However, if extensive graffiti occurs in future, taking several hours and large quantities of materials to remove, the Council's costs would be significant.
- 6.8 Therefore, it is proposed that the graffiti removal service remains free to private property owners, with the exception that the Director of Technical Services be authorised to seek to make a reasonable charge in the case of extensive graffiti, where appropriate, where it is estimated that it will take more than four hours to remove the graffiti.
7. Legal Implications
- 7.1 The owners of private property, such as walls and fences are required to sign a disclaimer absolving the Council of responsibility for any damage that might result from the normal process of removing graffiti from the property.

OFFICERS' RECOMMENDATION that -

the graffiti removal service continue to be offered free of charge in normal circumstances but the Director of Technical Services be authorised to seek to make a charge in the case of extensive graffiti, as described in the report above.

(TO RESOLVE)

Background Papers

Annual Personnel Report 2002/2003.

15. PROPOSED WORKSHOP FACILITY AT CHERTSEY DEPOT (DTS)
(TO FOLLOW)
16. AVIATOR PARK RECREATION GROUND - CAR PARK AND ACCESS ROAD CONSTRUCTION – FINAL ACCOUNT (DTS)
(Ref: Minutes of Leisure and Environment Committee, June 2002, page 234, para. 128 and September 2003, page 684, para. 355)

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 **The purpose of this report is to inform Members that in accordance with the Council's Standing Orders, that the total cost of the contract to construct the access road and car park in respect of the Aviator Park recreation ground exceeded the contract sum by more than 5%.**

2. Background Information

- 2.1 In order to support the case for planning permission to be granted, the developer of the old Marconi site, Station Road, Addlestone, offered to fund the enhancement of part of the former Marconi sports facilities and to transfer this land to the Council, under a Section 106 Agreement. The land would be given over to the following facilities: football pitch, ball stop fencing, street skating zone, multi-use games area, CCTV, access road and car park. This area became Aviator Park Recreation Ground.
- 2.2 Out of a total sum of £615,000 the developer also paid for CCTV cameras, refurbishment works to Addlestone Station and funding towards the Runnymede Travel Initiative. In addition, this Committee approved the allocation of £235,000 to the Recreation Ground scheme at its meeting in June 2002.
- 2.3 As part of a joint project, Technical Services Officers managed the design and construction of the car park and access road and installation of the CCTV and Leisure Services Officers managed the construction and installation of the other facilities.
- 2.4 This Committee approved the select list of tenders for the construction of the car park and access road at its meeting in September 2003. Following the tender process Surrey Bituminous Services Limited was awarded the contract.

3. Report

- 3.1 During the period that the industrial premises were unoccupied the car park had become overgrown and neglected. Piles of soil and rubble had been deposited around the entrance to prevent vehicles from entering the site.
- 3.2 Site surveys and investigations were carried out during the design stage but access was limited. Officers considered that, with some maintenance, the existing surface water drainage system could be used to drain the new access road. However, when the site clearance and excavation began it was discovered that this was not possible and a new drainage system had to be designed.
- 3.3 It was decided that the most effective and efficient solution was to partly seal up and partly break out the old system and to raise and re-profile the new carriageway. This affected

other aspects of the scheme, including the vehicle entrance to a property that is approached from the road and associated kerbs and fencing.

- 3.4 The total additional cost of re-profiling the access road and the changes to the drainage system was approximately £21,718.
- 3.5 Due to wet weather during construction it was necessary to construct a temporary haul road from the car park to the playing field to allow the contractor's plant access to construct the playing field and install the leisure equipment. This resulted in additional costs of £1,040.
- 3.6 As a result of the access road re-profiling, the kerbs and carriageway levels at the Station Road junction had to be altered at a cost of approximately £1,000.
- 3.7 The cost of other minor additional tasks totalled approximately £800.

4. Resource Implications

- 4.1. Surrey Bituminous Services was appointed to construct the access road and car park for a Contract Sum of £83,397.

- 4.2 The additional costs consisted of the following items :-

Tasks	Cost (£)
Works to re-profile the access road and house access, kerbing, fencing and installation of drainage components for the new surface water drainage system	21,719
Temporary haul road for playing field and leisure area construction	1,040
Tie-in works to Station Road	1,000
Other minor works	800
Total	24,559

- 4.3 The total cost of the measured works was £83,369 and the additional sums totalled £24,559. The total of the measured and additional sums was, therefore £107,927. This total exceeds the Contract Sum by more than 5% but is less than the total budget allocated for this part of the project, which was £121,000.

5. Legal Implications

- 5.1 Contract Standing Order 18.5 requires that where the total cost of any contract exceeding £30,000 in value exceeds the approved contract sum by more than 5%, the relevant Chief Officer must report on the cost to the relevant committee, after agreement of the final account.

6. Lessons Learnt

- 6.1 With every project a decision has to be made on the extent of the site investigation to be carried out before preparing the design. In this case existing site plans and other information were studied, level surveys were carried out and trial holes dug to check the existing car park construction. Despite this, unforeseen problems were uncovered when the excavation started, resulting in the additional costs.
- 6.2 A more extensive site investigation might have identified these additional costs earlier. Alternatively, in recognition of the limited access available at the design stage, a larger contingency sum could have been made available in anticipation of additional costs.
- 6.3 Poor weather during winter construction can result in difficult working conditions. This can result in difficulties in accessing the site and additional costs and delays in constructing the scheme. The shorter working days available can also mean that the construction takes longer than it would in summer. Where possible, it is recommended that schemes are constructed nearer the summer.

- 6.4 The only access to the playing fields is via the access road. Time constraints meant that the leisure scheme was being constructed at the same time as the access road and car park. This resulted in difficulties for the access road contractor in having to allow passage across the site for the contractors constructing the leisure part of the scheme. Ideally, a temporary access could have been provided and the leisure scheme completed before the construction.

(FOR INFORMATION)

Background Papers

Aviator Park Recreation Ground – Car Park and Access Road Project File.

17. RECYCLING UPDATE AND PROPOSAL FOR PILOT COLLECTION OF GREEN GARDEN WASTE (DTS)

1. **Purpose of Report**

1.1 **The purpose of this report is to update Members on progress with recycling in the Borough and propose a pilot collection of green garden waste for composting.**

2. Background Information

2.1 In the last year, 14.72% of household waste in the Borough was recycled, an increase of 10% on the previous year's total of approximately 5%. This was due to the introduction of kerbside recycling for the majority of residents. There was also a slight decrease in the amount of household waste collected by the refuse collection service.

2.2 Runnymede's Best Value Performance Indicator (BVPI) target for last year of 10% was therefore comfortably exceeded. However, the BVPI target for Runnymede increases to 18% in 2005/06, the next financial year.

3. Report

3.1 There has been a slight decrease in the recycling rate in the first half of this financial year, mainly due to an increase in the amount of household waste being produced. However, Officers are satisfied that the current schemes in place, both the kerbside scheme and the 'bring' scheme consisting of various banks for depositing bottles, newspapers, etc, will enable the Council to exceed next year's target of 18%. This is because there are plans to introduce cardboard and mixed paper banks at bring sites across the Borough. A scheme for recycling plastic bottles is also being investigated, but whereas the mixed paper scheme can be introduced at little or no cost to the Council, any scheme for plastics would run at a loss.

3.2 The Government has recently announced limits on the amount of Biodegradable Municipal Waste (BMW) that Surrey County Council, the Waste Disposal Contractor for Surrey, will be able to landfill from next April. The majority of BMW is green waste. If Surrey County Council exceeds its allowance then it will have to 'purchase' landfill allowances from other Waste Disposal Authorities under the Landfill Allowance Trading Scheme (LATS). A fee of up to £200 a tonne is considered likely and this is in addition to the actual disposal costs of approximately £40 a tonne.

3.3 At present, LATS primarily affects Surrey County Council. However, there are implications for Boroughs/Districts in the medium term in that Surrey County Council will be seeking to ensure that it does not have to pay up to £200 a tonne for disposing of any municipal waste. In addition, from 2006 onwards, the Government will probably be seeking to increase the Council's BVPI above the 2005/06 recycling rate of 18%.

3.4 Runnymede has promoted the sale of subsidised home composters for several years and over 6,000 have now been sold to residents. Home composters can take 200 to 400 kg of green waste a year, and play a significant role in waste minimisation, as green garden waste does not enter the household waste stream.

3.5 Approximately 20% of household waste in Runnymede is green garden waste that could be composted, either in a home composter, or centrally via a collection scheme. It is the largest

single component of household waste. Given LATS and the need to reduce biodegradable waste going to landfill, a kerbside scheme for green garden waste is the next logical step in dealing with household waste.

- 3.6 Government funding has been secured for the capital expenditure involved in purchasing a suitable refuse collection vehicle and re-useable polypropylene bags. The funding will also cover all revenue costs incurred in establishing the service in this financial year. However, from April 2005 onwards no further funding will be available.
- 3.7 It is proposed that participation in the green waste kerbside scheme should be voluntary and chargeable, as a considerable number of residents do not have a garden and would therefore not benefit from the scheme, and many residents compost their green waste at home, and this is the best environmental option as the green waste does not enter the waste stream. However, experience of other authorities providing a chargeable scheme is that between 10 and 20 percent of residents would be prepared to pay for a kerbside collection service. The charge would be set at a level which would ensure that the service breaks even. It is envisaged that the service would be fortnightly and up to 26 collections a year will be made to residents taking part in the scheme.
- 3.8 Unless green waste is banned from wheeled bins the scheme will lack credibility and is not likely to be successful, and the Government expectation is that this course would be followed. Apart from Runnymede, only one other District / Borough in Surrey now accepts green waste as part of household waste collections. The other nine Districts / Boroughs collect garden waste separately in either disposable plastic sacks (8) or re-useable polypropylene bag (1). All of the authorities charge for the service, with the price of the sack varying from 15p to £1. The one authority providing re-useable bags charges £10 a year for the service. The annual cost to residents purchasing the disposable plastic sacks varies from £5 to £30 a year depending on how many sacks individual residents purchase.
- 3.9 The situation across England as a whole is similar to Surrey, with the majority of authorities that provide a separate green waste service charging for it. Preliminary calculations show that a charge of approximately £30 a year will need to be made to ensure the service operates at no cost to the Council taxpayer.
- 3.10 At least one composting site has been identified that is able to take the green waste collected at the kerbside. Officers have visited authorities providing different types of collections. The three main types of containment used are disposable plastic sacks, wheeled bins and re-useable polypropylene bag. The containment method specified by the compost company is the re useable polypropylene bag, as it enables a sufficiently high quality of green waste to be collected.
- 3.11 It is proposed that the scheme be carried out as an extension to the refuse collection service. The introduction of a kerbside scheme for green waste, in addition to the kerbside scheme already in place for glass, cans, newspapers and textiles, means there will be a reduction in the amount of residual waste collected in the wheeled bin. This could enable savings to be made on existing household refuse collection rounds. The cost of employing a Recycling Assistant, who would promote participation in the scheme, would be included in the annual charge of the scheme to residents. Part-time administrative assistance will also be required by the Depot to deal with green waste enquiries, and these costs would also be covered by the charge to residents.

4. Council Policy

- 4.1 The Leader's Position Statement for 2004/2005 states that the Council aims:-

'to investigate the viability of extending the (recycling) scheme to additional materials including green waste.'

5. Resource Implications
 - 5.1 Government funding of £225,000 has been secured for this project from the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA). £200,000 for the purchase of a refuse collection vehicle and re-useable polypropylene bags and a further £25,000 for the start up and revenue costs for the current financial year. No funding will be available for future years. Financial details of the funding and the proposed service are attached at Appendix ' I'.
 - 5.2 It is proposed that the green waste kerbside scheme be voluntary and chargeable, and that a charge is set which covers the running costs of the scheme. The Council has the ability to withdraw or suspend the service if there is poor take up which would make the service unviable. DEFRA will not be seeking the return of the funding, and the vehicle would be retained and used as part of the refuse fleet pending use in a future green waste collection service.
6. Legal Implications
 - 6.1 The BVPI recycling targets set for the Council are mandatory. The Government's Landfill Allowance Trading Scheme for Surrey which limits the amount of biodegradable waste going to landfill from next April is also mandatory. The maximum level for Surrey for 2005 has been set at 308,000 tonnes and the permitted amount decreases over the next few years to ensure that the UK will meet the EU Directive target of Biodegradable Municipal Waste going to landfill by 2009/10. This represents only 75% of the amount that went to landfill in 1995/96. The penalty for Surrey if the amounts are exceeded is £200 per tonne.
 - 6.2 Under the Environmental Protection Act 1990, the Council is able to dictate what materials residents can place in their wheeled bins. Runnymede can therefore instruct residents not to place green waste in their wheeled bins in the future, and a charge can be made for provision of containers for waste and the collection of green waste.
 - 6.3 It is anticipated that the BVPI target of 18% for Runnymede after 2005/06 will be increased further.

OFFICERS' RECOMMENDATION that -

- i) **a chargeable kerbside recycling scheme be introduced for the collection and composting of green waste in a part of the Borough to be determined in consultation with Ward Members; and**
- ii) **Corporate Management Committee be requested to approve the recruitment of four posts: a Recycling Assistant, a part-time administrative post at the depot, a driver and a loader for the green waste collection vehicle.**

(TO RESOLVE)

Background Papers

None.

18. SURREY LOCAL GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION – A JOINT WASTE STRATEGY FOR SURREY (DTS)

(Ref: Minutes of Leisure and Environment Committee, November 2003, page 1059, para. 514)

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 **The purpose of this report is to formally adopt a Waste Management position statement which will enable work to commence on progressing a unified waste strategy for all the Surrey Authorities.**

2. Background Information

- 2.1 No single organisation has total responsibility for the management of waste produced in Surrey. Instead there are a number of bodies including local authorities, the waste industry

and the community sector who have an impact on the waste management activities. Good communications and partnership working are vital to ensure that waste management practices can be improved.

2.2 Central Government has set a number of standards in the National Waste Strategy that will influence how local authorities deal with waste management. In addition, Members will recall that local authorities within Waste Disposal Areas such as Surrey, are now required to produce Joint Waste Management Strategies.

2.3 Surrey Local Government Association (SLGA), through a special Member/Officer Working Group, has sought to agree an Integrated Waste Management Strategy for Surrey. Following the publication of the draft strategy in September 2003 and extensive consultation it was agreed that a position statement would be adopted by all the Districts in Surrey and the County Council as a means of moving the process forward. The original strategy will be updated to include the principles within the position statement and subsequent worked into a living document as a developing, working statement of all the partner's intentions.

3. Report

3.1 Since March 2002, a Working Group comprising both Officer and Member representatives of the Surrey Borough and Districts, and Surrey County Council has been meeting regularly to develop a draft strategy. Runnymede's Member representative is the Chairman of the Leisure and Environment Committee, Councillor C.J. Norman, and the Officer representative is the Head of Environmental Protection. The preparation of the position statement was carried out by the Working Group. The position statement has now been agreed by SLGA and adoption by the all Boroughs and Districts will assist all parties to meet the standards required for waste reduction, recycling and composting.

3.2 Officers consider that the strategy, as amended by the position statement, provides a way forward for improved co-operation, providing all partners recognise the importance of their individual contributions and seek to work together for the common good.

3.3 This statement has now been endorsed by SLGA and has therefore been conveyed to all members for approval and adoption. This is reproduced at Appendix 'J'. The statement sets out succinctly the common principles which can be agreed by all the authorities in Surrey and has also sought to clarify concerns in respect of the size and nature of some of the earlier disposal options.

3.4 Working groups have been set up by the Officer team to progress the various areas of co-operation that need to be developed. These currently include Public Relations, Education; Investigation of the Treatment Technologies; Funding Implications of the Landfill Allowance Trading Scheme and working with Community Groups.

3.5 It is anticipated that a visit to continental Europe for all the partners in the Working Group will be arranged at some stage to improve understanding of the treatment technologies that will be needed in the future to deal with material that would otherwise go to landfill. These technologies were set out within the Strategy document. It is proposed that up to two Members and an Officer from each Council would take part in the visit. It is hoped to gain a better understanding of the implications of the technology and how it could be applied within Surrey, whilst adhering to principles agreed within the position statement.

3.6 The Council is not obliged to endorse the waste management principles recommended by SLGA. However, they accord with the wishes expressed by the Council previously and embodied in its consultation response.

4. Legal implications

4.1 Both the Districts and Boroughs (Waste Collection Authorities), and Surrey County Council (the Waste Disposal Authority), are required by Section 32 of the Waste and Emissions Trading (WET) Act 2003, to have a joint strategy in place by April 2005 and to submit the Joint Waste Strategy to the Department for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs by the end of March 2005.

5. Resource Implications

- 5.1 Adoption of the position statement does not require new resources from the Council. However, it is not possible at this stage to determine to what extent redirection and new resources would be needed to carry forward the strategy. The intention is that through improved co-operation and joint working the net costs to Surrey residents will be less than what could occur through duplication of effort and friction between partners.

OFFICERS' RECOMMENDATION that –

the agreed position statement from Surrey Local Government Association, as attached at Appendix 'J' on Surrey's Integrated Waste Management Strategy be adopted.

(TO RESOLVE)

Background Papers

Minutes of the SLGA

19. RUNNYMEDE ACCESS LIAISON GROUP - APPOINTMENT (DAL)
(Ref: Minutes of Leisure and Environment Committee, September 2004, page 290, para. 221)

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 **The Purpose of this report is to ask the Committee to appoint one Member to serve on the Runnymede Access Liaison Group for the remainder of the Municipal Year 2004/05.**

2. Background Information

- 2.1 At the last meeting of the Leisure and Environment Committee on 16 September 2004, Members agreed to defer the appointment of one Member of the Leisure and Environment Committee to serve on the Runnymede Access Liaison Group to the next meeting of the Committee.

3. Report

- 3.1 The Runnymede Access Liaison Group considers the access needs of disabled people in Runnymede. The Group meets between four and five times a year at the Civic Offices. Another Member is also appointed to this Group from the Housing and Community Services Committee. At its meeting on 21 July 2004 Councillor R. Pate was appointed to serve on the Group from the Housing and Community Services Committee. The retiring Member from the Leisure and Environment Committee is Councillor B.J. Relph.
- 3.2 Officers have been informed that Councillor Mrs E. Gill has indicated that she would be willing to serve on the Group.

OFFICERS' RECOMMENDATION that –

Councillor Mrs E. Gill be appointed to serve on the Runnymede Access Liaison Group for the remainder of the Municipal Year 2004/05.

(TO RESOLVE)

Background papers

None.

20. STANDING ORDER 42 - URGENT ACTIONS (DAL)

The following actions have been taken since the Committee's last meeting after consultation with the Chairman under Standing Order 42.

<u>Officer</u>	<u>Action Taken</u>	<u>Central Index No.</u>
Chief Executive Officer	Formally concurring with the Surrey Police request to designate a geographical area of Hythe/Pooley Green under Section 30 of the Anti-Social Behaviour Act 2003, granting discretionary powers to Surrey Police to disperse groups for a six month period	557

<u>Officer</u>	<u>Action Taken</u>	<u>Central Index No.</u>
Chief Executive Officer	Formally concurring with the Surrey Police request to designate a geographical area of Woodham/New Haw under Section 30 of the Anti-Social Behaviour Act 2003, granting discretionary powers to Surrey Police to disperse groups for a six month period	560

<u>Officer</u>	<u>Action Taken</u>	<u>Central Index No.</u>
Director of Administration and Leisure	<p>Capital grant aid in the sum of £4,532 has been awarded to Runnymede District Scout Council to help fund a new scout headquarters in Kings Lane, Englefield Green to replace the existing wooden scout hut which was in a poor state of repair and had no disabled access. The sum is subject to the grant of full planning consent and the usual conditions set out in the approved grant aid criteria.</p> <p>The Scouts raised funds of approximately £110 – 115,000 and had secured a grant of £45,321 from Biffaward under the Landfill Tax Credit Scheme. However, their grant was subject to confirmation of third party funding of 10% of the Biffaward which was required by 19 October 2004, hence the need for urgent action.</p>	561

(FOR INFORMATION)

Background Papers

Proformas dated 31 August, 11 and 15 October 2004 on Head of Corporate Administration's file.

21. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

If the Committee is minded to consider any of the foregoing items in private session, it is the

OFFICERS' RECOMMENDATION that -

where appropriate the press and public be excluded from the meeting during discussion of 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 appropriate paragraphs of Part 1 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) Exempt Information

(No reports to be considered under this heading).

b) Confidential Information

(No reports to be considered under this heading).