

Runnymede Borough Council
LEISURE AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE

Thursday, 20 June 2002 at 7.30 p.m.

in the Council Chamber
at the Civic Offices, Addlestone



Members of the Committee

Councillors C.J. Norman (Chairman), Mrs. C.Y. Jones (Vice-Chairman), A.G. Collins, A.J. Davis, P.C. Elding, Mrs. S.E. Jacobs, A.M. Moore, R.J. Ray, B.J. Relph and Ms. C.M. Simmons.

Co-opted Members for matters affecting Thorpe Green

Mrs. B. Miller and Mr. T. Watson

and all other Members for information

AGENDA

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 M. Bootes, Committee Section, Secretary's and Leisure Services Department, Civic Offices, Station Road, Addlestone. (Tel. 01932 425623).**
- iii) Agendas and Minutes are available on a subscription basis. For details, please ring Mr. B.A. Fleckney on 01932 425620.
- iv) In the unlikely event of an alarm sounding, members of the public should leave the building immediately, either using the staircase leading from the public gallery or following other instructions as appropriate.

COMMITTEE SECTION



LIST OF MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION

PART I

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

	<u>Page</u>
1. NOTIFICATION OF CHANGES TO COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP	3
2. MINUTES	3
3. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE	3
4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	3
5. AIMS AND TARGETS 2001/2002 – OUTTURN	3
6. KERBSIDE RECYCLING	3
7. PETITION FROM WOODHAM PARK WAY ASSOCIATION	8
8. HACKNEY CARRIAGE FARES	8
9. GARFIELD ROAD PUBLIC CONVENIENCES	11
10. LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE – MINUTES	12
11. PLAY AND SPORT DEVELOPMENT FOR RUNNYMEDE	12
12. PROMOTION AND TOURISM IN RUNNYMEDE	14
13. AVIATOR PARK	20
14. GOGMORE FARM PARK – USE OF THE PAVILION AND IMPROVED LIGHTING SCHEME	23
15. APPOINTMENTS TO LEISURE SUB-GROUPS	26
16. ABBEYLANDS SPORTS CENTRE JOINT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE - MINUTES	27
17. CHERTSEY MEADS MANAGEMENT LIAISON GROUP – MINUTES	27
18. RUNNYMEDE ARTS DEVELOPMENT STEERING GROUP – MINUTES	27
19. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC	27

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 meetings of the Committee held on 21 March and 16 May 2002 (the latter being attached at Appendix 'A').

3. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

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

5. AIMS AND TARGETS 2001/2002 – OUTTURN (BLSO, BESO, BTSO)

The progress reports on the Aims and Targets set for Leisure Services, Environmental Services and Safer Runnymede in the period from 1 April 2001 to 31 March 2002 are attached at Appendices 'B', 'C' and 'D' respectively.

(FOR INFORMATION)

Background Papers

Leader's Position Statement 2000/01

6. KERBSIDE RECYCLING (BESO)

(Ref: Minutes of Leisure and Environment Committee, January 2002, page 755, para. 513 and Minutes of Council, March 2002, page 922, para. 604).

1. Purpose of report

1.1 **To recommend the introduction of kerbside recycling in the Borough from 4 November 2002, subject to the confirmation of external funding.**

2. Background Information

2.1 On 24 January 2002 Members of the Leisure and Environment Committee resolved that, subject to adequate external funding being secured a further report on kerbside recycling and budgetary implications should be brought back to this Committee.

2.2 Members also resolved to support the appointment of a Temporary Recycling Officer, subject to adequate funding being secured. Officers were also instructed to pursue opportunities to increase recycling rates claimable against statutory recycling targets with Scouts and other local and voluntary groups.

2.3 The Government has set each local authority a statutory performance standard based on the Best Value Performance Indicator (BVPI) for the percentage of domestic waste recycled. The current recycling rate is 5%. The standard set for Runnymede Borough Council will require a doubling in the present rate of recycling to 10% in 2003/2004, and a further increase to 18% in 2005/2006. These are statutory targets and necessitate the introduction of kerbside recycling to supplement the existing 'bring' scheme.

3. Report

External Funding Bids

- 3.1 Bids have been submitted to the Sita Environmental Trust (SET) for Landfill Tax funding of £100,000 and to the Government Recycling Fund for funding of £143,000. The bid to SET has been successful, subject to approval from the Government's regulatory body 'Entrust'.
- 3.2 The Association for the Improvement of Runnymede (AIR) made the bid to the Sita Environmental Trust (SET) for Landfill Tax funding. Normally AIR would be funded by claiming 5% of the award. However, as SET have established their own body to administer their awards, this is not possible. In recognition of the work that AIR has undertaken to date and the work that it will have to carry out over the life of the project, reporting on the scheme to Entrust and SET, it is recommended that 2.5% of the award, equalling £2,500, is paid to AIR.
- 3.3 The bid to the Government Recycling Fund is for additional support for the remaining capital costs and running costs for the 2002/03 financial year. The Government has reported that it is unable to announce the outcome of bids to the Fund until mid June (the Government had aimed to notify local authorities of its decision by the end of May). A further bid will be made in July (in accordance with the Government timetable) for Recycling Fund monies to support the revenue costs of the scheme in 2003/04. There are presently no further Government plans to give financial support for recycling activities after 2003/04.

Scouts and Other Voluntary Groups

- 3.4 Officers have investigated the potential of working with Scouts and other voluntary groups that already recycle paper, in order to enable Runnymede to claim the amount of paper recycled against statutory targets. The increase in Runnymede's recycling rate would be approximately 0.5%, but this would involve administrative work by both Officers and the Scouts. It would also require an incentive payment of a minimum of £1 per tonne (£200 to £250 a year) to the Scouts to compensate them for having to change their current system. In view of this, Officers would not recommend pursuing this possibility, as it does not actually increase the amount of material recycled in the Borough.

Proposed Kerbside Recycling Scheme

- 3.5 Officers have taken the view that Members are now minded to introduce a kerbside recycling scheme in Runnymede, subject to a reasonable level of external funding becoming available. Without prejudicing a decision by Members, a project management group has, therefore, been established to put together a project timetable with a view to introducing a scheme by November 2002. A proposed timetable is outlined below:-

Expressions of interest requested in Official Journal of E.C. (European Community) for recycling contractors	22 April 2002
Invitations to selected recycling contractors	21 June 2002
Negotiation with selected contractors	June - July 2002
Closing date for receipt of tenders	9 August 2002
Award of contract	22 August 2002
Appointment of Recycling Officer	1 September 2002
Commencement of kerbside recycling	4 November 2002
Kerbside recycling service fully up and running	1 February 2003

- 3.6 To date nine external contractors, and Runnymede's own DSO, have expressed an interest in bidding for this contract. It is suggested that a shortlist of a maximum of four companies plus the DSO be drawn up in conjunction with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Committee. This will be followed up by interviews and/or visits to contractors on site as Members and Officers consider appropriate. Negotiations will then be held with contractors leading to firm bids from the selected contractors that will be considered in early August. The contract will be awarded in late August, with a commencement date for the service of 4 November 2002.

- 3.7 An outline specification is given in Appendix 'E'. This will form the basis of negotiations with the contractors short-listed for this service. Members are invited to comment on this draft specification.
- 3.8 The specification is based on the Council purchasing and supplying appropriate collection vehicles in consultation with the successful tenderer. This is an unusual arrangement as the normal process for contracting out a service would be for the tenderer to purchase vehicles and plant as appropriate. However, the grant funding opportunities available to the Council are strongly geared towards supporting capital and start up costs. Therefore, the Council can gain long term savings by utilising these funding opportunities to supply vehicles and other capital equipment itself. Officers have had informal discussions with prospective contractors which suggest that this approach should not cause difficulties.
- 3.9 The originally agreed post of Recycling Officer was a temporary position for only 18 months. However, following discussions at the most recent Waste Management Group Meeting, involving the Chairman of this Committee and Surrey Waste Management, it is felt that a permanent Recycling Officer post will now be required from 1 September 2002 (provided external funding is confirmed). This will enable the Council to maintain the momentum built up over the first 18 months of the scheme, and achieve the even more challenging recycling target of 18% for 2005/06. An equally important aspect of the new post will be to promote waste minimisation. If the rate of growth of waste in Runnymede can be minimised, it will limit the amount of material to be recycled to meet the Best Value Performance Indicator targets.
4. Council Policy
- 4.1 The Council has sought a high quality, cost effective refuse collection service coupled with cost efficient extensions to recycling schemes.
- 4.2 The Leader's Position Statement for 2001/2002 has amended this to include a review of the Borough's Recycling Plan and an aim to work with Surrey Waste Management towards achieving targets set by the Government. The Council also aims to achieve a high rating in terms of Best Value Performance Indicators and operate in accordance with the Borough's Annual Environmental Policy and Activities Review.
5. Resource Implications
- 5.1 The introduction of the kerbside recycling scheme will be a major new service and financial commitment. Despite the potential availability of grant funding in this year and 2003/04, the long term funding liability and financial risks lie with the Council. In particular, the costs and incomes used in preparing the financial forecasts in this report are based on the best information available to Officers at this time.
- 5.2 The Council has made modest provision for the extension of recycling activities in the Revenue Budget for 2002/03 in the sum of £40,000 (including £20,000 carried over from 2001/02). The Revenue Forecast plans further increases to bring the total additional support up to £60,000 a year by 2004/05. A Capital Programme provision of £30,000 has also been made in 2002/03 for waste recycling initiatives.
- 5.3 The table below gives the estimated costs for the first three full years of the proposed new kerbside recycling service:

Revenue Costs

	2002/03 (5 months) £000	2003/04 £000	2004/05 Onwards £000
<u>Expenditure</u>			
Staffing – drivers and loaders	92	225	230
Vehicle running costs	21	50	50
Implementation and publicity	20	10	10
Recycling Officer	15	25	25
Total Expenditure	148	310	315
<u>Income</u>			
Sale of Recyclables	24	61	64
Recycling Credits	57	150	157
Other contributions	4	11	12
Total Income	85	222	233
Net Expenditure	63	88	82

5.4 The capital costs of establishing the scheme are set out below:

Capital Costs

Draft Budget for Recycling Scheme – Capital Costs	
	£000
Vehicles – 4 at £40,000 each	160
Containers – 30,000 at £2 each	60
Total	220

5.5 The bid to the Sita Environmental Trust (SET) is for £100,000 of the capital costs. The bid to the Government Recycling Fund is for the balance of the capital cost (£120,000) and support of £23,000 towards the revenue funding in 2002/03. If both of these bids are fully successful, it will be possible to introduce the scheme without further Runnymede budget provision being required in 2002/03.

5.6 The revenue costs are based on the capital costs being met by the bids to SET and the Government Recycling Fund. Should these bids be only partly successful, the need for the Council to finance the remainder of the capital investment will obviously add to the revenue cost.

5.7 A further bid will be made to the Recycling Fund for support towards revenue costs in 2003/04 to again bring the cost within planned provision by the Council. From 2004/05 it is hoped that the cost of the recycling service will be able to be substantially financed within approved budgetary provision (subject to the caveats explained earlier in this report).

Potential Savings on the Refuse Collection Service

5.8 A further medium term source of revenue funding could be generated by reviewing the current 'back door' collection of wheeled bins from residents' properties. Each refuse collection vehicle has an operative to perform this work, and a move to curtilage collection would save approximately £90,000 a year on the refuse collection contract. There are potential redundancy and other costs not included in this figure. Should the DSO be awarded the recycling contract, it would offer potential redeployment opportunities for refuse staff who would otherwise be declared redundant. There could also be employment opportunities with a private contractor for refuse staff made redundant should a private contractor be awarded the contract. As this option could involve potential staff

redundancies, employment legislation requires full consultation with the Trade Union and staff prior to any final decision being made. At the Council Meeting of 12 March 2002 it was resolved that this change in service be deferred to a suitable meeting of the Council during the 2002/03 Municipal Year. A further survey is taking place to ascertain residents' views on this proposal, before this matter is reconsidered.

5.9 Trade Union Consultation

The local branch of UNISON has been consulted on this report, and their comments are as follows:

"With regard to moving towards curtilage collection as a source of funding of kerbside recycling; Staff and UNISON would be looking for security for existing staff in terms of redeployment and TUPE opportunities with private contractors before making a commitment to reducing the service".

6. Legal Implications

- 6.1 The recycling targets set for the Council are mandatory. If the Secretary of State believes that the authority is not complying with its Best Value duties, he has powers under Section 15 of the Local Government Act 1999 to intervene. The possible action ranges from inviting the authority to submit an action plan setting out how it proposes to meet the prescribed standard, to taking over the function directly. The Secretary of State must first seek comment from the local authority. A formal protocol governs the exercise of the intervention power.
- 6.2 The nature and scale of the proposed project requires the E.C. procurement process to be followed in the seeking of bids. That process is underway. The timescale anticipates the awarding of the contract by the end of August 2002, with service commencement on 4 November 2002.

OFFICERS' RECOMMENDATION that -

- i) subject to the SET award of £100,000 receiving regulatory approval, the Borough Environmental Services Officer in consultation with the Borough Treasurer, Borough Secretary and Leisure Services Officer, and the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of this Committee be authorised to award a contract to the most advantageous tenderer to commence the kerbside recycling service on 4 November 2002;**
- ii) subject to the SET award of £100,000 receiving regulatory approval, the Corporate Management Committee be asked to approve the appointment of a Recycling Officer on a permanent basis from 1 September 2002;**
- iii) the outline specification for the service at Appendix 'E' be agreed as a draft for negotiations with contractors, subject to any amendments approved by this Committee;**
- iv) the process for the appointment of a suitable contractor be agreed as set out in the report and Standing Order C2.1 be waived accordingly in order to permit the process of interview and negotiation;**
- v) further reports be prepared on the outcome of the bid for Government funding and on the survey of residents' attitudes towards changing the 'back door' collection of wheeled bins;**
- vi) a payment of £2,500 be made to AIR, in recognition of their work in obtaining the grant from the Sita Environmental Trust and future administrative tasks;**

- vii) **the Corporate Management Committee be requested to note the potential financial implications of introducing the proposed kerbside recycling scheme in 2002/03 and for future years; and**
- viii) **the Corporate Management Committee be requested to approve a capital estimate in the sum of £220,000 to purchase suitable vehicles and containers for the recycling scheme, to be financed from contributions from SET and the Government Recycling Fund, or from capital receipts as appropriate.**

(TO RESOLVE)

Background Papers

Correspondence with SET, AIR and DEFRA on BESO's Kerbside Recycling Scheme File.

7. PETITION FROM WOODHAM PARK WAY ASSOCIATION (BESO)

1. **Purpose of report**

- 1.1 **To consider a petition from 45 residents (32 separate properties) of Woodham Park Way, urging the Council not to adopt the curtilage collection of refuse.**

2. **Report**

- 2.1 At the Council Meeting on 12 March 2002, former Councillor T. McGrath presented a petition submitted by the Woodham Park Way Association, the prayer of which is attached at Appendix 'F'. It stands referred to this Committee.
- 2.2 At the same meeting the Council deferred the recommendation of this Committee that "subject to full consultation with the refuse service workforce and trade unions and the introduction of curtilage recycling, the Council changes to the curtilage collection of refuse in wheeled bins, with a projected saving of £90,000 a year". This will be considered further by a suitable meeting of the Council, to be specified by notice given by the Chairman of this Committee to the Chief Executive Officer, during this Municipal Year. In the interim a survey is being organised to assess public opinion on this issue, as reported in the previous item.
- 2.3 Factually, Officers can add little to the report considered by this Committee on 24 January 2002. A copy of this report has been placed in the Members' Room, and further copies can be made available to Members on request.

OFFICERS' RECOMMENDATION that -

subject to any comments the Committee wishes to make, the petition be taken into account by the Council when it considers the deferred recommendation regarding refuse collection.

(TO RESOLVE)

Background Papers

None.

8. HACKNEY CARRIAGE FARES (BESO)

(Ref: former Executive Committee, 6 September 2000, page 478, para. 242)

1. **Purpose of report**

- 1.1 **To consider an increase in Hackney Carriage fare rates.**

2. Background Information

- 2.1 The present Hackney Carriage fare rates were last reviewed in September 2000 and came into effect on 10 October 2000. A letter has recently been received from one of the larger Hackney Carriage operators, suggesting that a review of the Hackney Carriage Fare Tariff should be undertaken.
- 2.2 The operator pointed out that there has been no rate increase in the past 18 months and in that time fuel, repair and specifically insurance costs have increased significantly. The operator has suggested that the pull-off charge of £2.70 for the first mile should remain with an increase of 10p per mile on the second and subsequent miles.

3. Report

- 3.1 When considering an increase in the Hackney Carriage fare rate it is appropriate to take into account the rise in the cost of living and increases in the cost of vehicle insurance, fuel, insurance premium tax and maintenance. There have been significant increases in vehicle insurance costs in recent months. Comparisons with other local authority tariffs in Surrey can be made by reference to the Fare Table attached at Appendix 'G'.
- 3.2 Having considered the various increases in cost, it is thought that the suggestion to increase the mileage charge after the first mile is a reasonable proposal. This would result in an increase of 10p on a 2 mile journey and 20p on a 3 mile journey.
- 3.3 The following fare structure is proposed :-

	Proposed Rate	Current Rate
a) <u>Mileage</u> Any distance not exceeding 1609 metres (1 mile approx.)	No change	£2.70
b) If the distance exceeds 1609 metres (1 mile approximately) for each subsequent 107 metres (¹ / ₁₅ mile approx.)	10p	10p for 115 metres (¹ / ₁₄ mile approx.)
c) <u>Waiting Time</u> For each period of 30 seconds or uncompleted part thereof	11p for 30 seconds	10p for 30 seconds
d) For hiring commencing between midnight and 6.00 a.m. and bank holidays, (except Christmas Day, Boxing Day and New Years Day) the fare shall amount to the rate prescribed above multiplied by 1.5.	No change	
e) For hiring on Christmas Day, Boxing Day and New Years Day the fare shall amount to double the rate prescribed above	No change	
f) Supplementary charges (i) for each person in excess of 2 (ii) for each package or articles of luggage conveyed outside the passenger compartment (iii) for each animal (iv) for each assistance dog (e.g. guide dogs and hearing dogs)	No change No change No change No change	20p 20p 20p Free of Charge

- 3.4 The effect of this new fare structure will be to make no change to a 1 mile journey but increase the charge for a 2 mile journey by 10p and a 3 mile journey by 20p. In percentage

terms this equates to a 2.4% increase for a 2 mile journey, a 3.4% increase for a 3 mile journey and a 5.5% (90p) increase for a 10 mile journey.

- 3.5 The proposed changes have been circulated to all licensed Hackney Carriage drivers in the Borough with a request for their comments and observations. Five drivers responded to this consultation. One of these drivers thought that fares should not be increased at the present time as business is slow. The four other drivers generally supported the proposed fare increases. Of these, two also requested an increase in the pull-off charge. This charge was increased from £1.90 to £2.70 in October 2000 when the initial distance was increased from half to one mile. One respondent suggested an increase to the waiting time tariff and another respondent suggested that consideration could also be given to extending the "unsocial hours" rate (1½ times the normal rate) from midnight – 6 a.m., to 11 p.m. – 7 a.m.
- 3.6 The Best Value Continuous Improvement Plan for the Licensing and Registrations Service included a target to consider whether the unsocial hours rate is appropriate to discourage drink driving. From the Comparison Fare Table at Appendix 'G' it can be seen that, apart from Spelthorne, all other authorities have an earlier start time varying between 8.00 p.m. and 11.30 p.m. Drinkers are, therefore, able to use a Runnymede Taxi at closing time for a lower charge than taxis in other adjoining areas and it could be argued that this contributes to discouraging drink driving. Members may wish to consider whether or not the unsocial hours time period should be altered, for example to 11.30 p.m. to 7.00 a.m. If a change were to be made then (d) of the Fare Structure set out at paragraph 3.3 will require amendment.
- 3.7 The Waiting Time tariff at £12 per hour, whilst being the lowest in the County, is the same as that charged for taxis in Spelthorne, Surrey Heath, Tandridge, Waverley and Woking. It is £3 per hour less than Elmbridge. The County and Metropolitan average is approximately £14. A £2 increase is probably excessive and it is therefore suggested that the waiting time be increased to 11p for 30 seconds which equates to £13.20 per hour.
- 3.8 If approved, the fare structure could be effective from 23 July 2002 following the required advertisement in at least one local newspaper. However, if any public objections to the new fares are received, then the matter will need to be referred back to this Committee in September for further consideration.
4. Council Policy
- 4.1 It is appropriate to review Hackney Carriage Fares at the request of Hackney Carriage proprietors or in the event of significant increases in costs experienced by the trade. The last increase in fares was 10 October 2000.
5. Resource Implications
- 5.1 As a result of a fare increase, all Hackney Carriage meters and meters fitted to a limited number of Private Hire vehicles will have to be recalibrated by the trade and subject to checking and sealing by a Council Officer on the "measured mile". This is a routine part of the work undertaken by the Council's Licensing Officer and, although it will take two to three days of concentrated activity, it does not present an unrecognised resource implication.
6. Legal Implications
- 6.1 A local authority is required to set Hackney Carriage fare rates in accordance with the requirements of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 and must publicly advertise the proposals prior to implementation.

OFFICERS' RECOMMENDATION that -

- i) the "unsocial hours" period of midnight to 6 a.m. remain unchanged; and**
- ii) subject to no representations being received, the proposed Hackney Carriage fare rates set out at paragraph 3.3 be adopted by the Council with effect from 23 July 2002.**

(TO RESOLVE)

Background Papers

Letter from Mr. G. Harding, Gemini Cars, dated 25 March 2002 on BESO's File number L6/7/2002.

9. GARFIELD ROAD PUBLIC CONVENIENCES (BESO)

(Ref: Minutes of Leisure and Environment Committee, January 2002, page 757, para. 515).

1. Purpose of report

1.1 **To consider the future of the Garfield Road public conveniences in Addlestone.**

2. Background Information

2.1 At its meeting on 24 January 2002, the Committee received a detailed report on public conveniences and resolved to further consider the usage and condition of the public conveniences at Garfield Road after the Saturday market had been in operation for a reasonable period.

3. Report

3.1 Market operations began in February 2002 and Safer Runnymede were asked to observe usage during the Saturday operation and during the normal week. Usage of the conveniences was monitored over a three week period.

3.2 On Saturdays an average of 98 people were observed going into the public toilets, 46 women and 52 men. An average of 31 people used the conveniences on weekdays with the split being an average of 21 men and 10 women per day.

3.3 Clearly the Saturday market significantly increases the use of the Garfield Road conveniences. Customers would need to use commercial outlets or the alternative public conveniences outside the library in Church Road if they were demolished.

Graffiti/Vandalism

3.4 The Garfield Road conveniences were completely redecorated before the Saturday market started in February this year. To have left graffiti in place would have given visitors a very poor impression of Addlestone and the Council. At 7 May the main areas had survived reasonably well, but the WC compartments of the Gents were again extensively affected by obscene graffiti.

4. Council Policy

4.1 To maintain a limited number of public conveniences to a good standard and to provide them through appropriate major development schemes at no cost to the Council, where this accords with proper planning policy.

4.2 To consider the future provision of the Civic Offices, in conjunction with other land owned by the Council in central Addlestone. If Garfield Road car park was developed, it is likely that the public conveniences would need to be demolished.

5. Resource Implications

5.1 Demolition of the Garfield Road conveniences would cost around £7,000 and there would be annual revenue savings of around £4,700 as a result.

6. Planning, Technical, Environmental and Community Safety Implications

6.1 There is a need to balance the need for public conveniences in suitable locations with the advantages and disadvantages they bring to an area. It is also necessary to consider what other facilities are provided locally by businesses.

- 6.2 Clearly there are alternative commercial conveniences quite close to Garfield Road, other public conveniences at Church Road and in the foyer of the Civic Offices.
- 6.3 If it were not for the Saturday market, it would be difficult to justify retaining the Garfield Road conveniences, given the low usage of around 30 people a day, the availability of other conveniences and the vandalism/graffiti problem. However, on market days usage rises to nearer 100 and some of those will be market traders, who also need toilets, hot and cold water and washing facilities in order to maintain hygiene.

OFFICERS' RECOMMENDATION that -

closure and demolition of the Garfield Road conveniences be carried out if the Saturday market ceases to operate in the car park and in conjunction with any proposed development of the car park area.

(TO RESOLVE)

Background Papers

Reports from Safer Runnymede for the period 16 February 2002 to 22 March 2002, on the Depot Public Conveniences File – M8.

10. LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - MINUTES (BSLSO)

The Minutes of the meeting of the Sub-Committee held on 18 April 2002 are attached at Appendix 'H'.

OFFICERS' RECOMMENDATION that -

the Minutes of the meeting of the Licensing Sub-Committee held on 18 April 2002, attached at Appendix 'H', be received and adopted.

(TO RESOLVE)

Background Papers

None

11. PLAY AND SPORT DEVELOPMENT FOR RUNNYMEDE (BSLSO)

(Ref: former Leisure Services Committee, September 1999, page 469, para. 327)

1. **Purpose of Report**

1.1 **To seek Members' approval for the proposed Play and Sport Development policy which provides a framework for the development of play and sporting opportunities in the Borough. This policy is attached at Appendix 'I'.**

2. **Background Information**

2.1 Direction for the development of leisure activities in the Borough is currently derived from the Leader's Position Statement and Best Value Performance Plans. Officers have drawn together the draft policy in order to give a more comprehensive framework for leisure development activities.

2.2 The intention is to avoid writing separate policies for play, sport and pitch development, which are increasingly required by external governing and funding bodies. Instead, the attached draft policy acknowledges the three main means by which the Borough supports leisure services and offers a written framework to support future development. The policy will, therefore, replace the "Sports Development beyond 2000" policy, adopted by the Council in 1999. It will also act as a framework for play service development and as a standard for play area and pitch provision in parks and open spaces.

- 2.3 The focus of the draft policy is on activities for young people, but the policy also applies to work the Council does with schools and voluntary organisations, especially sports clubs, which are fundamental to opportunities available in the Borough.
3. Report
- 3.1 Pages 2 to 8 of the policy set out the principles for the development of play and sport facilities and services in Runnymede given the context of:
- i) The demographic structure of the Borough and existing services for young people;
 - ii) The statutory framework for services for young people;
 - iii) The value base for the development of services; and
 - iv) The Council's principal aims and objectives and those relating to leisure and sports development.
- 3.2 Pages 9 to 11 identify the current level of service provision within the Borough and the strategies within which that provision is set locally. The Borough currently facilitates some services through direct service provision from revenue (page 9), some through grant aid or advice (page 10) and some through the development of capital projects for play and pitch provision (page 10).
- 3.3 Pages 12 to 14 identify specific actions for the next three years, derived from existing objectives and from national and local priorities, as defined in governing body plans and the Council's Best Value Continuous Improvement Plans.
- 3.4 The policy is being presented to Members of this Committee first, for their views. It will also be considered by Runnymede Sports Council, and by partnership meetings (such as the Surrey Youth Strategy Action Group) sports club representatives and the appropriate task force of the Local Strategic Partnership. Any changes recommended by these groups will be reported back to this Committee for agreement.
4. Resource Implications
- 4.1 The policy in itself has no resource implications, but sets a standard for the quality of service. However, there will be service developments and capital projects arising from its recommendations that will be reported to Members as separate items, in the same way as has traditionally happened.
- 4.2 External agencies are increasingly requiring local authorities and groups to demonstrate a strategic need for funding for service and facility improvement. This policy is considered to provide an adequate background for funding applications to organisations such as the "Football Foundation".
5. Planning and Technical Implications
- 5.1 The Borough Local Plan is currently being reviewed and a whole range of issues are being considered that may have implications for the provision of leisure and recreation facilities in the Borough. Liaison will take place on the development of the policy guidance that will be prepared for those land use issues that will influence the emerging leisure policies.

OFFICERS' RECOMMENDATION that -

the draft Play and Sport Development Policy be approved as a statement of the Council's intentions with regard to the development of play and sport opportunities in the Borough and a framework in which to develop services.

(TO RECOMMEND)

Background Papers

Relevant papers on Leisure Services files: 7.22 and files for individual parks and open spaces, 8.1 to 8.6 and 10.1 to 10.14

"Playing out" – ILAM/NSPCC/LGA

Play Safety Guidelines – National Playing Fields Association

Surrey County Football Association – draft pitch strategy ("REFF")

Runnymede Borough Council Local Plan

12. PROMOTION AND TOURISM IN RUNNYMEDE (BSLSO)
(Ref: Minutes of Leisure and Environment Committee, March 2002, page 959, para. 657 and Minutes of Council, April 2002, page 1092, para. 714)

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 **To identify and seek approval for means of implementing the actions resulting from the promotion and tourism elements of the Cultural Strategy, and the Leader's Position Statement aim to review how the Borough might benefit from Leisure and Tourism initiatives focusing on its sites of natural beauty and historic interest.**

2. Background Information

- 2.1 The Cultural Strategy approved by the Leisure and Environment Committee on 21 March and subsequently by full Council on 25 April 2002, highlighted promotion as a main theme. Promotion in this context included the promotion of existing clubs, services and facilities to residents and businesses based in Runnymede and also the external promotion of Runnymede to potential visitors (tourism).
- 2.2 This report identifies the implications of each of the policy objectives and actions related to tourism identified in the Cultural Strategy. Each of the recommendations is considered in section 3 below.
- 2.3 A number of residents who responded to the Borough's Community Strategy consultation felt that the tourism market could be better exploited through promoting the Borough's historical importance more effectively.
- 2.4 An economic impact study commissioned by Surrey County Council and a number of Surrey districts in 2001, estimated that the economic value of tourism to Surrey was £800 million per annum and that tourism supported just under 26,000 jobs across the County. Runnymede Borough Council did not participate in this study. However, if the Council is to review how Runnymede might benefit through initiatives to encourage tourism and leisure, an economic impact study would give a statistical basis for the cost-benefit analysis of such initiatives.
- 2.5 The May 2002 Members' Bulletin highlighted the proposed re-structuring of the South-East and Southern Tourist Boards into one organisation, with sub-regional groups. Increasingly, regional development agencies are working through tourist boards to fund initiatives. Some areas in the southern and south-eastern regions already have strong representation on these forums. If Runnymede and North Surrey are to benefit from development grants, the time is ripe to consider how the needs of the area can be presented effectively to the Regional Development Agency.
- 2.6 Tourism presents a dilemma in Runnymede, as it does across the county of Surrey. Whilst there are sites of beauty and historical significance that could be promoted more effectively for the benefit of the local economy and community, there is also local concern about congestion and pressure on the infrastructure.

3. Report

- 3.1 Paragraphs 3.2 to 3.24 below set out options for implementing the actions identified by the Cultural Strategy, each of which is highlighted in bold type. Paragraphs 3.25 to 3.29 identify means of improving the information base from which decisions about tourism initiatives can be made.

Encourage the provision of lower cost hotel accommodation in the Borough.

- 3.2 Surrey County Council has identified overseas staying visitors, business tourists, short breaks and local residents as the main segments of the tourist market to target, from work undertaken for the Surrey Tourism Strategy. The availability of suitably priced accommodation is recognised as a need throughout the County.¹

¹ Surrey Tourism Strategy: 2000 - 2005

- 3.3 The north-west of the County benefits from excellent communication links: Heathrow, the M25, M4 and M3. However, businesses and visitors struggle to find suitably priced accommodation for short stays. Woking Borough Council has recently attracted a Holiday Inn to the town centre, which is proving popular with local businesses. Members of the Runnymede Business Partnership have mentioned that facility in their discussions about the need for accommodation in the Runnymede area.
- 3.4 The Leisure Services Division publishes a “Where to stay” guide and there is also a limited list of accommodation in the Runnymede Information Directory. Although regularly updated and advertised in the local paper, there are only 16 facilities (590 rooms, of which 165 are available in university vacations only) within the Borough and a further 42 facilities (455 rooms) within 10 minutes’ travelling time.
- 3.5 The Local Plan Review will be considering a wide range of issues and will provide policy guidance for determining development proposals. It is proposed that the Planning Committee will be provided with background papers that will consider a number of Recreation/Leisure/Tourism related matters and it is anticipated that the issues of hotel provision will be examined. Other Committees will be invited to comment on the emerging issues.

Encourage projects that broaden the appreciation of the area’s natural environment and heritage, including reviewing options for a visitor centre and guided walks at Runnymede.

- 3.6 A significant proportion of the Borough (about 68%) is designated Green Belt. The Council manages about 300 hectares of open space, complemented by five staffed parks. Runnymede Meadow, the site of the sealing of Magna Carta, is managed by the National Trust, the Magna Carta Trust and the Borough Council. The Borough also includes two Sites of Special Scientific Interest (these being Runnymede Meadow and Thorpe Meadow). The Rivers Thames and Wey border the Borough and the River Bourne, Wey Navigation and Basingstoke Canals flow through it, enhancing leisure opportunities for boating, canoeing, cycling and walking.
- 3.7 Two local schools have worked with Council Officers on allotment projects, to encourage children to explore and understand the natural environment.
- 3.8 A set of 14 “Runnymede Rambles” through footpaths and open spaces in Runnymede is in the process of being re-written. Additional walks have been added to the existing set of 12 rambles which range in length from 2 to 15 miles. The rambles are shown on the Borough Council’s website.
- 3.9 The Runnymede website now has links into River Thames sites in order to encourage visitors to the River to explore the countryside within easy reach of it. The site of the sealing of the Magna Carta is very popular with tourists and local people alike. There has been much discussion about the relative benefits of improved interpretation on the site and retention of the natural aspect of Runnymede Meadows between the Council, the Magna Carta Trust and The National Trust over a number of years.
- 3.10 The National Trust have undertaken some improvement works to the land around the memorial and also to the two lodges (which are located either side of the A308 as one enters the Borough from Windsor) over the past few years. One of the lodges is run as a café, the other is used as a store and office for the Head Warden. One option is to improve the latter lodge for use as an interpretation centre, but the National Trust is keen to establish whether there is a demand from visitors before committing large sums to its improvement.
- 3.11 The Countryside Agency have employed a project officer to identify sustainable tourism projects in Surrey. One of these projects aims to “promote the full potential of the Thames between Windsor and Hampton Court to residents and visitors and to enhance the access, services, facilities and information available to visitors.” The Countryside Agency and The National Trust have developed a similar project in the Surrey Hills area which integrates public transport for tourist use. It is hoped that a similar model could be adopted for the Runnymede area, using a combination of public transport and river craft. A copy of the project proposal is attached at Appendix ‘J’. The Surrey Hills project has received significant

contributions from local tourist attractions and it is envisaged that a project focusing on the River Thames would act as a good medium for advertising by local attractions.

Use all possible means to maintain the character of smaller settlements through the development of locally-based facilities and services.

- 3.12 The importance of maintaining the identity of small communities is already recognised in the Council's Local Plan policies concerning green belt, conservation areas and pitch provision. The importance of local identity came across clearly in the Cultural Strategy consultation. Maintaining the character of small towns and villages is recognised as one of the characteristics of Surrey and is the focus of work in other towns across Surrey, such as Dorking, Haslemere and Staines. The Policy and Implementation Team have been working with the Runnymede Business Partnership to develop town centre maps to promote the town centres to local residents and businesses. These will focus on the different characteristics of each of the main Borough towns.
- 3.13 The consultation undertaken as part of the Community Strategy process drew a number of positive comments about the regeneration that has occurred in the main town centres in Runnymede over the past 10 years.² There is a limit to the ability of the local authority to influence the development of other agencies and commercial organisations to maintain a presence in relatively densely populated areas. The broader mandate of the Community Strategy enables the Local Strategic Partnership to exercise greater influence over external organisations to bring about actions which align with the wishes of local communities.
- 3.14 In addition to the Local Plan policies, a number of the Council's own services are already governed by the principle of maintaining the character of local settlements:
- i) Enabling each settlement to have access to a community hall;
 - ii) A project to increase the parkland in the north of the Borough at Pooley Green;
 - iii) Replacement of the Hythe Social Centre;
 - iv) The provision of a public sports centre in the north and south of the Borough; and
 - v) Grant Aid to sports clubs and individuals in the Borough.

Promote the harmonised accommodation scheme as a means of encouraging overnight stays in the Borough.

- 3.15 Surrey County Council, Tourist Information Centres, the British Tourist Authority, South East England Tourist Board and at least two other boroughs in Surrey are now only publishing details of accommodation that is registered and inspected under the Harmonised Accommodation Scheme.
- 3.16 The Harmonised Accommodation Scheme has standardised criteria relating to the AA (Crown and highly commended) RAC and English Tourist Board schemes in 1999/2000. There is now one set of criteria for hotels (star rating) and one for Bed and Breakfast accommodation, guest accommodation and inns (diamond rating). There is a fee to join the scheme, based on the cost per head/night or number of bedrooms, which averages £120 per annum for a small accommodation provider. Surrey Tourism and Runnymede Officers hosted a seminar to consider the implications for accommodation providers in North Surrey at the Civic Offices in March 2001. Very few establishments attended. Officers were unable to ascertain whether this was because of the small number of businesses, a lack of interest or a lack of knowledge about the scheme.
- 3.17 The Borough does not have the resources to inspect accommodation and small providers might be deterred by the annual membership fee. The lists published in the Borough's "Where to Stay" guide, website and Runnymede Information Directory make the point that the Council has not inspected any of the accommodation. A point is also made of not publishing tariffs or recommendations, but referring directly to the accommodation's own information. However, any poor standards encountered by visitors may still reflect on the area. Members may wish to consider limiting Council publications to inspected accommodation, although this could also reduce publicity for the lower cost accommodation that is currently available.

² Community Strategy Consultation Report, April 2002

- 3.18 Surrey Tourism is currently offering a discount of up to 25% to establishments wishing to join the scheme and this will be notified to accommodation providers when the "Where to Stay" guide is updated later this year. Surrey Tourism have also produced guides for small businesses (accommodation) about their obligations under the Disability Discrimination Act, which will be distributed to known local accommodation providers.

Work with Surrey County Council to promote the cycleways through the Borough and links with public transport and heritage sites.

- 3.19 A plan showing cycle ways in the Borough is available on the website. Public transport in the Borough is relatively limited, but where possible, links are made between cycle routes and public transport routes. The Council has its own transport plan and encourages developers and companies within the Borough to invest in the local public transport infrastructure and to encourage employees to use methods other than the car for travel to work.

Enhance the profile of leisure and tourist opportunities on the Runnymede website, along with links into facilities run by other agencies and organisations.

- 3.20 Leisure services and facilities have been recently upgraded on the Borough's website, with graphics highlighting places of interest and links into accommodation and tourist attraction websites where possible.

Increase the profile of the River Thames, River Wey and Basingstoke Canal as recreational resources in the Borough.

- 3.21 Officers have linked the River Thames graphic on the Runnymede website with the Environment Agency's "Visit Thames" site, to encourage visitors to the River Thames to take advantage of local attractions, such as riverside open spaces, the Magna Carta Memorial and local walks. Officers have also had some discussion with the Environment Agency about their plans to develop the River Thames for amenity or leisure use in addition to the project with the Countryside Agency referred to in paragraph 3.11.

Consider the appointment of a PR officer or retaining a PR agency in partnership with local business to raise the profile of the Borough and improve its links with the media.

- 3.22 This Cultural Strategy recommendation will be reviewed as part of the Public Relations Best Value Review in 2003/2004.

Promote and support existing arts venues.

- 3.23 Runnymede Borough Council supported The Magna Carta School Arts Centre lottery bid. The School now runs a successful community facility, which a number of local drama and community groups use regularly. The Borough's "Splash" scheme has also used the facility for its drama week when it has been available. Community groups using the Arts Centre advertise free of charge on the Borough's public notice boards and are eligible to receive grant aid for specific activities. The Borough also supports the Village Hall scheme in most years.

Consider the implications and benefits of a quarterly "What's on" publication to every home in the Borough.

- 3.24 This Cultural Strategy recommendation will also be reviewed as part of the Public Relations Best Value Review in 2003/2004.

Means of improving the tourism information base

- 3.25 Spelthorne Borough Council and the Runnymede and Spelthorne Business Partnerships have also been considering means of promoting tourism sensitively in the area. Officers from Runnymede and Spelthorne have concluded that a good basis is the development of projects focused on the River Thames. Initially this has been undertaken within existing staff and financial resources and links have been set up from the Runnymede website which highlight opportunities for leisure activities near or on the River Thames.

- 3.26 In order to improve co-ordination and understanding between attractions, accommodation providers and infrastructure and a clearer idea of ways in which the Borough Councils, Business Partnerships or County Council might be able to assist, it is proposed that a tourism sector group be established among attractions and accommodation providers in Spelthorne and Runnymede. The Runnymede Hotel, French Brothers, Thorpe Park and Kempton Park have already shown an interest in this sort of forum, as long as it brings business benefits.
- 3.27 If the group is found to be beneficial, it might then be split into accommodation and attraction groups and/or between the Boroughs. There will be some administrative staffing costs associated with establishing and running the group. Both Windsor and Maidenhead, and Guildford have models for groups which Officers will review if Members endorse the proposal.
- 3.28 In developing a policy towards tourism, Members may wish to consider membership of the South East England Tourist Board (SEETB). SEETB has offered this authority membership for 2002/03 at £1,000, although the average cost for local authorities is currently £4,000. The benefits of membership include:
- i) Free editorial inclusion in the 2002/03 domestic marketing campaign;
 - ii) All relevant public sector-owned facilities and attractions featured free of charge in the Group Organiser's Guide;
 - iii) One elected Member on the Tourism Officers' Forum;
 - iv) Receipt of up-to-date information on new initiatives; and
 - v) Distribution of the Council's tourism/leisure literature.
- 3.29 As stated in paragraph 2.4, the commissioning of an Economic Impact Study would enable Members and local residents to have a better appreciation of the economic and social value visitors bring into the Borough. The Cambridge Model, used by the South East England Tourist Board, is most commonly used and, therefore, has the greatest number of comparators. A report setting out the potential benefits of an Economic Impact Study will be available at the meeting.
4. Council Policy
- 4.1 "We will seek opportunities to work alongside partners to develop and fund activities that have local impact such as promoting business enterprise, competitiveness and innovation, listening to and working with:
- i) Runnymede Business Partnership
 - ii) Chambers of Commerce
 - iii) Business ratepayers
 - iv) SEEDA and SEERA
 - v) Other institutions such as St Peter's Hospital, and Royal Holloway and Brunel Universities"
- [Council Leader's Position Statement 2001/02].
- 4.2 "We will be reviewing how the Borough might benefit through initiatives to encourage tourism and leisure, taking advantage of the Borough's particular assets such as its location, Runnymede Meadows and the River Thames"
- [Council Leader's Position Statement 2001/02].
- 4.3 The Runnymede Cultural Strategy policy objectives relating to tourism and promotion are highlighted in bold type in section 3 above.
5. Resource Implications
- 5.1 The current tourism budget totals £3,300 and forms part of the Leisure Development budget. The budget is generally used for revising and re-printing publications or displays, such as the

Leisure Guide (2000), Runnymede Rambles, display boards and advertisements in “Discover Surrey” or other media which are thought to be of benefit.

- 5.2 A one year subscription to the South East England Tourist Board for 2002/03 would cost £1,000. However, the average Borough Council membership fee is £4,000, which would be the annual revenue cost if the Council wished to continue in Membership.
- 5.3 The development of a tourism forum would need administrative support. Whilst the Council has employed an Officer who has qualifications and an interest in tourism and would be keen to assist with the development of this project, her time and that of her manager, is already committed to existing tasks. Some additional administrative support would, therefore, be required. The costs of the forum would be shared with Spelthorne Borough Council. The benefit would be reviewed with members of the forum after one year’s operation.
- 5.4 The costs of the joint project with the Countryside Agency and Environment Agency and with Spelthorne Borough Council to “promote the full potential of the Thames between Windsor and Hampton Court to residents and visitors and to enhance the access, services, facilities and information available to visitors” are unknown at this stage. Much of the information is also scattered amongst different organisations. The Countryside Agency can offer 50% match funding for research into existing facilities and public transport routes which would be fundamental to the development of any project.
- 5.5 The cost of running the Cambridge Economic Impact Model to authorities who are members of the South East England Tourist Board is £2,000. The cost to those who are not members is £2,500.

6. Planning and Technical Considerations

- 6.1 References to the Local Plan process are made in paragraphs 3.5, 3.12 and 3.14 of this report.

7. Trade Union Consultation

- 7.1 UNISON endorse the view that if the authority wishes to develop tourism initiatives they must be adequately resourced, particularly in terms of staff time.

OFFICERS’ RECOMMENDATION that -

- i) Officers continue to establish a tourism forum for Runnymede and Spelthorne, initially focusing around the promotion of tourism from the River Thames;**
- ii) expenditure of £10,000 be approved from the provision made in the current year for Leader’s Position Statement initiatives, to fund membership of the South East England Tourist Board for 2002/03, the commissioning of an Economic Impact Study, staff time to administer the tourism forum and to provide match-funding for research into the River Thames Project with the Countryside Agency; and**
- iii) Officers continue to work with the Countryside Agency, the Environment Agency, Spelthorne Borough Council and Windsor and Maidenhead Borough Council to identify means of promoting the area around the River Thames.**

(TO RESOLVE)

Background Papers

Relevant papers on Leisure Services file: 13.2

13. AVIATOR PARK (BSLSO)
(Ref: Minutes of former Planning and Regulatory Committee, October 2000, page 869, para. 384).

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To agree the provision of public recreation facilities at Aviator Park, Addlestone and to propose the allocation of monies for that purpose from funds received from a Section 106 Obligation Agreement.**

2. Background Information

2.1 In order to support the grant of planning permission for the redevelopment of the old Marconi site in Station Road, Addlestone, the applicants offered to fund the enhancement of the old Marconi sports facility on the western part of the site, adjacent to Addlestone Railway Station, and to transfer that land to the Council pursuant to a Section 106 Obligation Agreement.

2.2 The Agreement was drawn up requiring the transfer of this land to the Council together with the payment of a sum of £615,000 to be spent on the following basis:

- i) £5,000 towards costs incurred by the Highway Authority in converting the existing Pelican crossing on Woburn Hill to a Toucan crossing. (This sum has been paid directly to Surrey County Council).
- ii) £15,000 towards the costs incurred by the Council for the provision of a CCTV camera and related equipment.
- iii) £10,000 towards the costs incurred by the Council in relocating the CCTV camera in Station Road.
- iv) £35,000 towards the cost of monitoring and maintaining the cameras mentioned above for five years.
- v) £550,000 towards the costs incurred by the Council for the provision of:

Provisional allocation

a)	Access into the Recreational Development.	}	£121,000
b)	A parking area for the Recreational Development.	}	
c)	A footpath/cycleway to link the Office Development with the Railway Station.		£20,000
d)	A multi-play area as part of the Recreational Development.		£67,000
e)	A grass football pitch as part of the Recreational Development.		£47,000
f)	A Scout facility as part of the Recreational Development. *		See * below
g)	Refurbishment works to Addlestone Railway Station.		£45,000
h)	Funding of the Runnymede Travel Initiative.		£150,000
i)	Future maintenance costs of items a) to f) above. *		See * below

* The remaining £100,000 is to be allocated for future maintenance of the site subject to any grant which may be awarded for provision of a scouting facility.

There were no conditions as to how the £550,000 was to be expended, nor have the developers any direct control over this. They have simply allocated this sum for the Council to provide the above community benefits, and Officers have agreed the above subdivision of the £550,000.

- 2.3 The Council has received the sum of £610,000, although the transfer of the land has yet to be completed.
- 2.4 As proposed above, it is suggested that £235,000 of the £550,000 be earmarked for the provision of leisure facilities at the site as set out in section 3 below. The remaining £215,000 being for the footpath/cycleway, Addlestone Station refurbishments and Runnymede Travel initiative.
- 2.5 The local Scouts have requested that space be made available for a Scout facility and this could be accommodated within the site. The provision of this facility will be the subject of a future report to the appropriate Committee or Committees.
- 2.6 The land to be transferred to the Council forms only part of the old Marconi sports facilities. It does not include all of the previous football pitch or the clubhouse.
- 2.7 A copy of the Planning and Regulatory Committee report considered on 25 October 2000 and the relevant Minute are attached at Appendix 'K'.

3. Report

- 3.1 Leisure Officers have received representations from a cross section of young people in Addlestone and have consulted them, through the development of the Cultural Strategy, regarding the recreational facilities they would most like provided in Aviator Park and in the area generally.
- 3.2 They have indicated support for a football pitch, a street skating facility (as opposed to a skate ramp), a multi-use games area and a teen shelter (a covered seating area) at this site.
- 3.3 The condition of the piece of land being transferred to the Council and its location next to the railway means that a sum of money will have to be spent on making it suitable for recreational use. This is to include ball-stop fencing adjacent to the railway, removal of derelict tennis courts, and repairs and repositioning of the football pitch. There will also be an access road and car park. The cost of these works, together with the leisure facilities listed at 3.2 above, is estimated at £235,000.
- 3.4 The land to be transferred is of limited size and this means that the leisure facilities will need to be tailored to fit. The maximum size of football pitch that can be accommodated is 90 metres by 45 metres, the minimum recommended by the Football Association for senior use.
- 3.5 Because of the demand for street skating facilities, the proposed multi-use games area, originally envisaged under the Section 106 Obligation Agreement, has been reduced to a sports wall incorporating a basketball ring and five-a-side football goal and associated hard surface. This allows a skating facility to be incorporated into the scheme within the original budget estimate and space available. This proposal appears acceptable to representatives of local young people.
- 3.6 A plan of the proposed layout is attached at Appendix 'L'. Illustrations of a sports wall, a street skating facility and a teen shelter will be displayed at the meeting.
- 3.7 Officers are considering including lighting of the skating facility and sports wall, any decision being subject to further consultation with residents and Ward Members. Should lighting be included, an internal time switch and movement detectors would be included to restrict the operation of the lights.
- 3.8 It is proposed that the installation of a teen shelter be held back as an option to be included should funds allow.

- 3.9 Once the transfer of land is complete, it is proposed that local Ward Members and young people are further consulted on the details of the design prior to tenders for the installation being sought.
4. Council Policy
- 4.1 Ensuring we play our role in enhancing the quality of life of all our residents and assist those who conduct their business in the Borough.
- (Statement of Policy, Leader's Position Statement 2001/02)
- 4.2 Engaging with and being responsive to public opinion through consultation on important issues, ensuring clear explanation and communication of our policies.
- (Core Value, Leader's Position Statement 2001/02)
- 4.3 Planning policies need to be interpreted to safeguard the environmental quality, make best use of land resources, promote economic activity, provide recreational facilities and encourage an integrated approach to issues of traffic and transportation management.
- (Planning Committee, Leader's Position Statement 2001/02)
5. Resource Implications
- 5.1 The cost of preparing the new open space and installing the new equipment, as described in this report, is estimated to be £235,000 and a completed capital project evaluation form is attached at Appendix 'M'.
- 5.2 The capital cost of this scheme is within the sum proposed to be set aside from the community benefit monies received from the developer.
- 5.3 The ongoing revenue costs, including capital charges, set out in the project evaluation form are estimated to be £11,800 in 2002/03 and will require a supplementary revenue estimate.
6. Planning and Technical Implications
- 6.1 Planning permission for these leisure facilities was granted as part of the original outline planning application. A condition does however have to be discharged giving details of the layout of the site.
7. Community Safety Implications
- 7.1 The Section 106 Obligation Agreement includes £15,000 towards the cost of a CCTV camera and related equipment that will be able to monitor the new recreational facilities proposed for this open space. A further £10,000 is also being provided towards the cost of relocating the existing CCTV camera in Station Road to another location in Station Road, yet to be determined, and £35,000 towards the cost of monitoring and maintaining these cameras for five years.

OFFICERS' RECOMMENDATION that -

- i) the Committee agree the proposed allocation of monies received under the Section 106 Obligation Agreement for the provision of recreational and other facilities at Aviator Park, Addlestone;**
- ii) the Corporate Management Committee be asked to approve this allocation and the disposition of the receipt generally;**
- iii) the range of facilities to be provided be approved as described in paragraph 2.2 of the report, so far as they lie within the remit of this Committee;**

- iv) **the Corporate Management Committee be asked to include a provision in the capital programme for this scheme and to approve a supplementary capital estimate in the sum of £235,000;**
- v) **the Corporate Management Committee be requested to approve a supplementary revenue estimate in the sum of £11,800 for the associated capital charges and ongoing revenue costs;**
- vi) **the Economic Development Committee be asked to approve the appropriate dispositions of the acquired land in due course; and**
- vii) **subject to the outcome of ii) iii) and v) above, Officers be authorised to finalise and implement the scheme.**

(TO RESOLVE)

Background papers

Relevant papers on Leisure Services files 7.25 and Aviator Park project file.

14. GOGMORE FARM PARK – USE OF THE PAVILION AND IMPROVED LIGHTING SCHEME
(BSLSO)
(Ref: Minutes of former Executive Committee, December 2000, page 1034, para 490).

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 **To consider an extension to the use of Gogmore Farm Park pavilion by the Surrey Youth Service; and**
- 1.2 **To seek Member approval for a capital estimate to fund the installation of improved lighting along the footpaths in Gogmore Farm Park and flood-lighting for the multi-use games area.**

2 Background Information

- 2.1 In December 2000 the former Executive Committee decided to licence a small room in the café at Gogmore Farm Park (which forms part of the pavilion) to the Surrey Youth Service. This room was to act as a base for the detached youth work project which had started in Chertsey in 1999 (a plan showing the location of the room in the Gogmore Farm Park pavilion will be displayed at the meeting). The findings of the research project undertaken in Chertsey had identified Gogmore Farm Park and Abbeyfields as the places where young people met in Chertsey. Gogmore Farm Park was the place where young people most wished to have a permanent base.
- 2.2 At the same meeting, Members agreed a sum of £1,500 to employ a consultant to write a specification for a scheme to improve the lighting in Gogmore Farm Park. Improved pathway lighting had been requested by local young people, who had identified dark areas in the Park where they felt unsafe. This issue was highlighted at the Runnymede Youth Debate in October 2000. The young people had also requested the installation of floodlighting on the multi-use games area.
- 2.3 Gogmore Farm Park is well used by local residents and particularly by local young people in the evenings. The proposed lighting scheme gives a potential benefit to the local community by providing an illuminated walk with catchments from Gogmore Farm Park, Riversdell and Cowley Avenue.

3. Report

Lease of the Pavilion

- 3.1 Surrey Youth Service were granted a licence for use of the room in the pavilion in July 2001. They now employ four part-time youth workers to cover four three hour sessions a week in the Park. Most of the work takes place during the evening and at weekends, depending on the needs of the young people.
- 3.2 The Surrey Youth Service workers are in direct contact with over 20 local young people on a regular basis. As a direct result of the project, 15 young women have attended residential courses with staff from the detached youth work project. These courses have focused on building their own self-esteem and learning how to deal with their own emotions and other people. Other residential projects are planned for the Summer focusing on young people's relationships with their community and the Law.
- 3.3 The café at Gogmore Farm Park is proving impossible to let on a long-term basis as a concession, due to a combination of low usage and difficulties with local young people. The last tenant surrendered the lease three months before it was due to expire as they were unable to make sufficient income to cover their expenses and were losing staff. The previous tenant also gave up the concession due to similar problems. The Parks Supervisor, who had lived in the house as a service tenancy, moved out in June due to the disturbance caused by living in the Park. This was both from noise generated by legitimate use of the facilities late into the night and early morning, and from the perceived threat from mischievous groups. The property is not currently considered suitable for Council tenants or for supported living accommodation.
- 3.4 It is proposed that the whole pavilion be leased to the Surrey Youth Service at a nominal rent plus running costs, for work with young people in the Park. The neighbourhood youth worker is proposing to set up a training project, so that young people could operate the café themselves, gaining experience and qualifications in retail and catering fields.
- 3.5 The proposal is that the house would be used by the young parents' group, (currently meeting on a monthly basis in Chertsey Hall) and for small group work with targeted young people. This would be in accordance with the ethos of the new national "Connexions" framework in which the Surrey Youth Service will operate from September 2002. It is also proposed that the neighbourhood youth workers for north and south Runnymede have temporary offices in the house. These will only be used until Chertsey Library is re-built as the Library will include Surrey Youth Service office space. These changes may require authority for change of use from the Planning Committee and Economic Development Committee.
- 3.6 No alternative use has been found for the pavilion and café.

Improved Lighting scheme

- 3.7 Officers have continued to work on the scheme, although the design work has been hampered by difficulty in finding consultants wishing to work on small municipal projects and the limited resources available to the authority to develop such a lighting scheme.
- 3.8 The proposed lighting scheme would consist of nine additional five-metre columns for general pathway lighting and four six-metre columns for floodlighting the multi-use games area. The scheme proposed for the multi-use games area would be similar to that installed at Kings Lane Playing Field, Englefield Green and would be controlled by infra red movement detectors and a time switch with battery back-up. A planning application will be submitted for the scheme.
- 3.9 Expressions of interest have been invited from suitable contractors. Should the funds be approved to complete the scheme, it is proposed that tenders will be returned by the end of July and the scheme installed during September 2002.

4. Council Policy

4.1 Both schemes are consistent with the Leader's Position Statement objective:

"We will work with other agencies to widen the range of leisure activities within the Surrey Youth Strategy and continue our support to the Duke of Edinburgh's Award scheme, the Scouts and Guides movement and the Runnymede Splash scheme."

5. Resource Implications

5.1 The 2002/03 revenue estimates include net income of £3,300 for the rental of the pavilion house, of which only £800 will have been collected. The proposals outlined in this report would, therefore, mean foregoing this income and a supplementary estimate would be required to make up the shortfall of £2,500 in the current year. No income was included in the estimates for catering rights due to the problems referred to in paragraph 3.3 above.

5.2 Surrey Youth Service will meet the running costs for the property, these being staffing, power, phone, and rating on the areas used for meetings or offices.

5.3 The proposed lighting scheme, which will enhance public safety in Gogmore Farm Park for residents and visitors, is estimated to cost in the region of £33,000 for which a capital estimate will be required. A full set of costings for this project is shown on the capital project evaluation form attached at Appendix 'N'.

5.4 The revenue implication of the capital spend for the lighting scheme at a notional 6% per annum is £990 in the current financial year and £1,980 per annum thereafter. Officers estimate that the on-going energy and maintenance costs of the lighting scheme will be £1,000 per annum. These costs will be met from the Parks revenue budget.

6. Planning and technical Implications

6.1 Planning permission will be required for the lighting scheme around the multi-use games area.

6.2 A planning application for the change of use from a house to offices and meeting rooms will also be needed, should the principle of Youth Service operation be accepted.

7. Community Safety Implications

7.1 The accommodation is currently lying empty and it is therefore at risk of damage.

7.2 The Council has had CCTV in the Park for six years and, whilst there have been a number of incidents, the cameras have reduced the previously existing problems of damage and under age consumption of alcohol. There have been a number of incidents and the cameras have been able to provide evidence and enable the Police to take any necessary action.

7.3 The Safer Runnymede Manager and the local Police Officer have been meeting regularly with a group of local business people who were concerned at the levels of damage and nuisance. They are very supportive of such diversionary activity.

7.4 The Park is well used by young people and families during the weekends and summer months. The café is appreciated, but does not bring sufficient income to sustain a commercial enterprise. A project run by local young people would both continue to provide a service to the general public and give some ownership of the service to the young people who use the park.

OFFICERS' RECOMMENDATION that -

- i) the Economic Development Committee be requested to authorise a lease of the café and house in the Gogmore Farm Park Pavilion for use by the Surrey Youth Service at a low or nominal rent, subject to the Surrey Youth Service meeting running and staffing costs;**

- ii) **subject to the necessary planning permission, the Corporate Management Committee be requested to include a capital programme provision for this scheme and approve a capital estimate in the sum of £33,000 for additional lighting to the footpaths and around the multi-use games area in Gogmore Farm Park;**
- iii) **the Corporate Management Committee be requested to approve a supplementary revenue estimate in the sum of £1,000 to cover the associated capital charges in the current financial year; and**
- iv) **the Corporate Management Committee be requested to approve a supplementary revenue estimate in the sum of £2,500 to cover the loss of income from the rental of the house.**

(TO RESOLVE)

Background papers

Relevant papers on Leisure Services files: 7.6, 8.4.

15. APPOINTMENTS TO LEISURE SUB-GROUPS (BSLSO)

THE COMMITTEE IS ASKED to consider the following appointments to the Council's Leisure Sub-Groups for the Municipal Year 2002/2003:

1. **Two Officers** to serve on the **Cabrera Trust Management Committee**. The Management Committee comprises the three Virginia Water Councillors ex officio, and two Officers acting as the Honorary Secretary and Honorary Treasurer for the Trust. The term of these appointments runs from the end of the Cabrera Trust's Annual General Meeting on 24 June 2002 to the end of the said same meeting in 2003. The retiring Officer appointees are the **Borough Secretary and Leisure Services Officer and the Borough Treasurer** both of whom have indicated that they are willing to undertake another term.
2. **Two Members** to serve on the **Chertsey Meads Management Liaison Group**, one of whom must be the Chairman of the Leisure and Environment Committee who chairs the meetings of this Group. The Group meets once a year in March and the next meeting is scheduled to take place on 25 March 2003. It is recommended that Councillor C.J. Norman continue to serve as Chairman of the Management Liaison Group. The other retiring Member is Councillor G.J. Thomas.
3. **One Member** of the Leisure and Environment Committee to serve on the **Runnymede Access Liaison Group** which considers the access needs of disabled people in Runnymede. Another Member is also appointed to this Group from the Housing and Community Services Committee. The Group meets between 4 and 5 times a year at the Civic Offices. The next meetings of the Group are scheduled for 15 July and 16 September 2002. The retiring Member from the Leisure and Environment Committee is Councillor Mrs L.M. Gillham.
4. **Two Members** of the Leisure and Environment Committee to serve on the **Runnymede Arts Development Steering Group**. The Group meets four times a year in July, September/October, February and April. The next meeting of the Group is scheduled for 9 July 2002. The two retiring Members on this Group are Councillors D.W. Parr and Ms C.M. Simmons.

(TO RESOLVE)

Background Papers

None

16. ABBEYLANDS SPORTS CENTRE JOINT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – MINUTES (BSLSO)

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 26 February 2002 are attached at Appendix 'O'.

(FOR INFORMATION)

Background Papers

None

17. CHERTSEY MEADS MANAGEMENT LIAISON GROUP – MINUTES (BSLSO)

The Minutes of the meeting of the Group held on 5 March 2002 are attached at Appendix 'P'.

(FOR INFORMATION)

Background Papers

None

18. RUNNYMEDE ARTS DEVELOPMENT STEERING GROUP – MINUTES (BSLSO)

The Minutes of the meeting of the Group held on 16 April 2002 are attached at Appendix 'Q'.

(FOR INFORMATION)

Background Papers

None

19. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

If the Committee is minded to consider any of the foregoing reports 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 the 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).