

Runnymede Borough Council  
LEISURE AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE

Thursday, 22 January 2004 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), Mrs P.I. Broadhead, A.J. Davis, Mrs C. E. Gant, Miss M.N. Heath, Mrs. S.E. Jacobs, A.M. Moore, R.J. Ray, and B.J. Relph.

## **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, Department of Administration and Leisure, Civic Offices, Station Road, Addlestone. (Tel. 01932 425627) email address: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.
- 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**

	<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. REVENUE ESTIMATES 2004/2005	3
6. RECYCLING SERVICE PLAN 2003/2004	3
7. AIR QUALITY IN RUNNYMEDE	4
8. COMMUNITY SUPPORT OFFICERS	5
9. BEST VALUE - COMMUNITY SAFETY - SCOPING AND CHALLENGE REPORT	7
10. ABBEY FIT SPORTS CENTRE - APPROVAL OF SCHEME DESIGN	11
11. AVIATOR PARK RECREATIONAL FACILITIES, STATION ROAD, ADDLESTONE - PARKING RESTRICTIONS	14
12. BASINGSTOKE CANAL	15
13. EGHAM SPORTS CENTRE LEISURE (DSO) TRADING POSITION 2003/04	16
14. ABBEY FIT JOINT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE - MINUTES	17
15. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC	17

### **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 20 November 2003.

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. REVENUE ESTIMATES 2004/2005 (DF)

1. Purpose of Report

1.1 **The purpose of this report is to receive and consider the draft Revenue Estimates for 2004/2005.**

2. Report

2.1 The report of the Director of Finance containing the draft Revenue Estimates and fees and charges for the services under the remit of this Committee is attached at Appendix 'A'. This Appendix has been printed separately and is enclosed with this Agenda. The papers comprise:

- i) Estimates for Leisure Services (pages 1 to 47)
- ii) Estimates for Environmental Services (pages 48 to 90)

**OFFICERS' RECOMMENDATION that -**

- i) the proposed fees and charges for 2004/2005 as set out in Appendix 'A', be approved to be effective from 1 April 2004 or as appropriate; and**
- ii) the draft Revenue Estimates for 2004/2005 be approved as submitted and the Corporate Management Committee be requested to make provision accordingly.**

**(TO RESOLVE)**

Background Papers

None stated.

6. RECYCLING SERVICE PLAN 2003/2004 (DTS)

(Ref: Minutes of Leisure and Environment Committee, November 2003, page 1058, para. 512 and page 1059, para. 514)

1. Purpose of Report

1.1 **The purpose of this report is to seek Members' approval for the proposed Recycling Service Plan for the year 2003/2004.**

2. Background Information

2.1 The Environmental Protection Division of the Technical Services Department already has four service plans in operation covering Food and Health & Safety services and Pollution and Public Health services. The requirement for two of these service plans (Food and Health & Safety) was driven by specific legislation. However, all four service plans are required to enable the Council to achieve a top quartile score for the Best Value Performance Indicator (BVPI 166) for Environmental Protection.

2.2 There is no specific requirement to provide a service plan for recycling to satisfy BVPI 166. However, there is a need to update the Council's Recycling Plan as it dates back to 1990. Updating the plan was deferred while the Council implemented kerbside recycling, and Government initiatives on Joint Municipal Waste Strategies were awaited. The progress on an 'Integrated Waste Management Strategy for Surrey' was reported to the previous meeting of this Committee in November 2003. A Recycling Service Plan is required which will both feed into this strategy and satisfy the legal requirement to update the Recycling Plan.

3. Report

3.1 The proposed Recycling Service Plan for 2003/2004 is attached at Appendix 'B' and Members are asked to approve the proposals contained therein. This service plan will be expanded and updated for 2004/2005 once the Surrey wide strategy has been finalised in March or April 2004.

**OFFICERS' RECOMMENDATION that –**

**the Recycling Service Plan for 2003/2004, as attached at Appendix 'B', be approved.**

**(TO RESOLVE)**

Background Papers

None stated.

7. AIR QUALITY IN RUNNYMEDE (DTS)

1. Purpose of Report

1.1 **The purpose of this report is to inform Members of the latest assessment of air quality submitted to the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra).**

2. Background Information

2.1 Runnymede Borough Council was required by the Government to undertake an 'Updating and Screening Assessment' of air quality in the Borough in 2003. This entailed a 'Stage 4, Review and Assessment of Air Quality' for the Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) that affects a narrow area of land along the M25.

3. Report

3.1 Following a competitive tendering exercise arranged with Epsom and Ewell Borough Council the Environmental Research Group (ERG), King's College, London was awarded the contract to undertake the assessment work. Stage 1 and 2 review studies undertaken by Officers found that a more detailed assessment of air quality was necessary, and ERG completed a further study in 2000 resulting in the declaration of the AQMA along the M25.

3.2 Both of the review studies have been submitted to the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra). Defra has accepted the findings of the Updating and Screening Assessment, but comments are awaited on the Stage 4 report.

3.3 The Updating and Screening Assessment report has been placed on the Council's Website. The Stage 4 report will also be made available once it has been approved by Defra.

- 3.4 The Updating and Screening Assessment of Air Quality in Runnymede has highlighted the need for further assessment work on Nitrogen Dioxide.

**(FOR INFORMATION)**

Background Papers

None stated.

8. COMMUNITY SUPPORT OFFICERS (DTS)

1. Purpose of Report

1.1 The purpose of this report is to:

- i) provide Members with the background to the introduction of Community Support Officers (CSOs).
- ii) advise Members of the possibility of future provision of CSOs.
- iii) seek approval for the necessary funding in order to continue employment of CSOs in Runnymede.

2. Background Information

- 2.1 Community Support Officers (CSOs), are Police Authority employed support staff, authority for which was introduced under Section 38 of the Police Reform Act 2002. They perform a high visibility, patrolling role providing reassurance to the communities they serve.
- 2.2 Police Forces were required to bid for funding for CSOs and Surrey successfully bid for 52 Officers, of which five were allocated to Runnymede.
- 2.3 There has been a subsequent round of bidding and Surrey was again successful, securing eleven Officers, of which one will be allocated to each Borough and District specifically to work with young people. These eleven posts are fully funded by the Home Office, the Police Authority and Surrey County Council.
- 2.4 The five posts in Runnymede were fully funded in the first year by the Home Office and Surrey Police. The Home Office has agreed to provide significant funding in 2004/05 and 2005/06 but with no commitment beyond this date. Forces are expected to find partnership funding to make up the difference and local authorities or commercial bodies are suggested as possible partners.
- 2.5 The five CSOs in Runnymede are currently allocated to Chertsey, Woodham & New Haw, Englefield Green, Egham and Pooley Green & Hythe.
- 2.6 CSOs can be used in a variety of roles at the discretion of the local Force and may be designated to have limited enforcement powers. However, this designation has not been made in Surrey. A summary of possible powers is attached at Appendix 'C'.

3. Report

The Future of CSOs

- 3.1 As set out at paragraph 2.4, funding for CSOs is not secure and to ensure their continued deployment Surrey Police has requested that the Borough makes a financial contribution in the sum of £12,500 for 2004/05 and £25,000 in 2005/06.
- 3.2 CSOs appear to have been welcomed generally and being trained and employed by Surrey Police and wearing a police approved uniform they are effectively an addition to the very limited policing resources in the Borough. Without the full powers and demands made on Police Officers they are able to spend almost all their time working in the community.

4. Implications for the Council

- 4.1 A number of initiatives have been introduced by the Government to increase the 'Policing Family' on the street. A common feature has been an initial fund but then the Police and Local Authorities are left to find ongoing revenue funding, with no increase in Formula Grant settlement.
- 4.2 Some areas with greater problems of crime and disorder have embraced these initiatives and appointed Neighbourhood Wardens or Street Wardens. These have achieved good results in some areas of the country but at not inconsiderable cost.
- 4.3 This Council already makes a considerable contribution to policing and the reduction in the fear of crime through the Safer Runnymede and other Community Safety initiatives but this will be effectively a direct contribution to policing the streets.

5. Resource Implications

- 5.1 Currently, CSOs are employed by and paid for by the Police Authority and Runnymede Borough Council does not contribute any funding towards them.
- 5.2 In 2003/04 the Home Office is funding the posts in full. In 2004/05 the Home Office will provide 75% of funding for the posts and Surrey Police Authority has agreed to give 13%, leaving a shortfall of 12% or £12,500. In 2005/06 the Home Office will be providing 50% funding for the posts and Surrey Police Authority has agreed to 26%, leaving a shortfall of 24% or £25,000.
- 5.3 There are no commitments for 2006/07 but it is quite possible that with no Home Office funding the Borough Council could be asked for 50% of the funding, amounting to something over £50,000.
- 5.4 At the current time it is proposed that the Council contributes to the 2004/05 shortfall, but in light of the Council's medium term financial strategy, based on savings of £1 million a year together with stepped increases in Council Tax, Members may wish to consider whether the Council should be contributing to future shortfalls.

6. Summary

- 6.1 Should Members wish to support future partnership funding there are considerable resource implications. In such circumstances the deployment and associated operational management of the CSOs should reasonably be shared rather than left to the Police, as is the current position.

**OFFICERS' RECOMMENDATION that –**

- i) provision in the sum of £12,500 be made in the draft Revenue Estimates for the year 2004/05;**

**(TO RESOLVE)**

- ii) a commitment be made to include a sum of £25,000 in the budget for 2005/06, subject to agreement with Surrey Police as to the future deployment of Community Support Officers; and**

**(TO RECOMMEND)**

- iii) Officers be instructed to agree suitable working arrangements with Surrey Police and to report annually to Committee so that the Council may monitor its ongoing support commitment.**

**(TO RESOLVE)**

Background Papers

None stated.

9. BEST VALUE - COMMUNITY SAFETY - SCOPING AND CHALLENGE REPORT (DTS)

1. **Purpose of Report**

1.1 **The purpose of this report is to seek approval for the scope of a Best Value review in respect of Community Safety.**

2. **Background Information**

2.1 This Best Value review is being undertaken across service departments and reviews those functions undertaken by Safer Runnymede.

3. **Report**

3.1 Set out below is a summary of the Scoping and Challenge Exercise undertaken for Community Safety. The full Scoping and Challenge Report is attached at Appendix 'D'.

3.2 **Section 1 - Core Information**

<b>Area Subject of Service Review: Community Safety</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• CCTV Monitoring Service</li><li>• Careline Monitoring Service</li><li>• Out of Hours Calls Service</li><li>• Intruder/Fire Alarm Receiving</li><li>• Speed Camera Project</li><li>• Community Constable Scheme</li><li>• Environmental Improvement Scheme</li><li>• Community Safety</li><li>• Civic Offices Duties</li><li>• Major Incidents</li></ul>

3.3 Details of each service provided are set out at Appendix 'D'.

3.4 All the services when introduced were discretionary although the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 has since placed a statutory duty on the Council to "do all it reasonably can to prevent crime and disorder in its area".

3.5 **Current Provision of the Services**

3.6 All the services covered by this Review have developed from the Safer Runnymede Project introduced by this Council in 1996 or, from requirements of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998. This Act imposed a statutory duty on the Council to become a partner in a 'Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership' for the Borough together with Surrey Police and Surrey County Council.

3.7 This is an area of great change with new legislation and increasingly the provision of direct funding and reporting requirements, through the Government Office for the South East, from and to the Home Office.

3.8 The financial scale of activity for the service is set out below:

<b>SCALE OF ACTIVITY</b>				
<b>BUDGET FOR THE YEAR ENDING 31st MARCH 2004</b>				
<b><u>EXPENDITURE</u></b>	<b><u>2001/02</u></b>	<b><u>2002/03</u></b>	<b><u>2002/03</u></b>	<b><u>2003/04</u></b>
	<b><u>Actual</u></b>	<b><u>Estimate</u></b>	<b><u>Probable</u></b>	<b><u>Estimate</u></b>
	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>
<u>Employees</u>				
Salaries	412,800	404,400	404,400	435,400
Training & Recruitment	3,549	5,000	5,000	5,000
<u>Premises Related Expenses</u>				
Maintenance	1,876	2,000	2,000	3,000
Energy	2,529	2,000	2,000	1,000
Rents & Rates	2,061	2,100	2,100	2,100
<u>Transport Related Expenditure</u>				
Travelling and Subsistence	5,073	5,400	5,400	5,200
Mobile Vehicle Costs	4,600	4,900	4,900	4,300
<u>Supplies and Services</u>				
Equipment Maintenance	35,441	41,200	41,200	47,000
Operational Budget	21,358	32,400	32,400	30,400
Communications	36,272	51,500	51,500	54,400
Computing	20,933	23,500	23,500	23,800
Consultants Fees, etc.	712	5,000	5,000	5,000
Crime & Disorder	39,630	37,000	40,500	40,500
Partnership Development Fund	10,706	0	12,700	20,600
Communities Against Drugs	55,934	0	78,900	67,400
Safer Communities Initiative	0	0	0	24,100
<u>Support Services</u>				
Office Accommodation	43,600	40,400	46,500	47,400
Personnel Services	7,100	7,900	7,900	8,400
Legal and Admin Services	0	2,000	2,000	2,100
Financial Services	8,077	7,300	7,300	9,400
Technical Services	17,500	16,600	16,600	16,800
Document Management Services	0	0	3,800	3,800
<u>Capital Charges</u>				
Capital Charges	233,800	266,500	207,600	216,100
<u>Special Works</u>				
Provision for Additional Environ. Initiatives	9,190	20,000	20,000	20,000
Speed Reduction Initiative	0	40,000	30,000	35,700
<b>Gross Expenditure</b>	<b>972,741</b>	<b>1,017,100</b>	<b>1,053,200</b>	<b>1,128,900</b>

<b>SCALE OF ACTIVITY: Continued</b>				
<b>BUDGET FOR THE YEAR ENDING 31ST MARCH 2004</b>				
	<u>2001/02</u> <u>Actual</u> £	<u>2002/03</u> <u>Estimate</u> £	<u>2002/03</u> <u>Probable</u> £	<u>2003/04</u> <u>Estimate</u> £
<b><u>INCOME</u></b>				
Costs Recovered:				
- For Services	56,893	111,200	96,700	108,400
Contributions & Donations:				
- Junior Citizen	3,032	0	0	0
- Surrey Police	37,000	37,000	30,000	30,000
- Crime & Disorder contributions	20,691	27,000	27,000	27,000
- Partnership Development Fund	10,706	0	12,700	20,600
- Communities Against Drugs	55,934	0	78,900	67,400
- Safer Communities Initiative	0	0	0	24,100
Recharges to Services:				
- Community Alarm Scheme	34,201	38,500	38,500	40,500
- Civic Offices Caretaking & Security	32,900	36,300	36,300	39,500
- Other Council Services	49,500	54,500	49,400	49,400
<b>Gross Income</b>	<b>300,857</b>	<b>304,500</b>	<b>369,500</b>	<b>406,900</b>
<b>Net Expenditure</b>	<b>671,884</b>	<b>712,600</b>	<b>683,700</b>	<b>722,000</b>

4. **Section 2 - Process**

4.1 **The Challenge Exercise**

4.2 The Service Review commenced with a workshop in December 2003 in order to challenge the arrangements for the current services. The Chairman of this Committee attended and invitations were sent to all Departments of the Council. Eight Council Officers attended together with the Safer Runnymede Supervisor and the Community Safety Officer.

4.3 In addition, comment has been sought from other agencies including Surrey Police, Ashford and St. Peters Hospital Trust and Surrey County Council.

5. **Section 3 - Scoping and Challenge**

5.1 Members are asked to consider carefully the various implications and satisfy themselves that there has been sufficient rigour in completing this phase of the Best Value process. It is recommended that the following matters be investigated during the next stage of the Review:-

CCTV Monitoring

- 1) Review the current locations of cameras to ensure they meet current need.
- 2) How the other services provided impact on the monitoring of CCTV.
- 3) The potential for increasing income using current and new technologies.
- 4) The acquisition of an effective mobile or relocatable CCTV camera.

#### Careline Monitoring

- 1) The potential to expand the service without increasing staffing costs.
- 2) Outsourcing the service and could staffing costs be saved.

#### Out of Hours Calls

- 1) The potential to expand the service without increasing staffing costs.
- 2) Outsourcing the service and could staffing costs be saved.
- 3) Direct provision of services such as housing repairs.

#### Intruder/Fire Alarm Receiving

- 1) The potential for savings and for income.

#### Speed Camera Project

- 1) Review the services provided to establish what if anything should be continued in discussions with Surrey County Council Highways and Surrey Police.

#### Community Constables

- 1) Reconsider this initiative in the light of the introduction of 'Police Community Support Officers', which are the subject of a separate report elsewhere on this Agenda.

#### Environmental Improvements

- 1) How this should be developed in the light of direct funding for some projects from Home Office funds.

#### Community Safety

- 1) Definition of the role of the Community Safety Team and working relationships with other Departments/Sections.
- 2) The potential of putting a value on all the services provided.

#### Civic Offices Duties

- 1) Are Safer Runnymede Operators the most appropriate staff to be performing these duties?

### 6. **Section 4 - Future Phases**

- 6.1 The Compare part of the process will involve taking relevant comparative service, quality and financial data.
- 6.2 At the Consultation Stage it is proposed to undertake a survey of service users. Use will be made of the public survey completed earlier in the year to determine public perceptions.
- 6.3 A report will be submitted on the results of this work by March 2004.

#### **THE COMMITTEE IS ASKED to -**

- i) **review the services listed in paragraph 3.2 to determine whether they continue to reflect the Council's aspirations for the provision of these services;**
- ii) **endorse the proposal to examine the matters listed in paragraph 5.1 together with any issues the Committee may wish to add;**

iii) **endorse the use of a user survey and the public community safety survey as the prime sources for the collection of data for the consultation element of the Review; and**

iv) **endorse the scope of this Review and the Challenge Phase.**

**(TO RESOLVE)**

Background Papers

None stated.

10. ABBEY FIT SPORTS CENTRE - APPROVAL OF SCHEME DESIGN (DAL)  
(Ref: Minutes of Leisure and Environment Committee, June 2003, page 185, para. 121 and Council July 2003, page 299, para. 208)

1. **Purpose of Report**

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

- i) **seek approval of a capital estimate for a detailed scheme to develop Abbey Fit Sports Centre;**
- ii) **seek authority for the Director of Administration and Leisure to negotiate and conclude the final terms of the new dual use agreement and lease with the agreement of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman.**

2. **Background information**

2.1 Abbey Fit Sports Centre is a dual use Community/School Sports Centre located within the campus of Jubilee High School, School Lane, Addlestone. Following recognition that over a number of years the facilities had become very tired, and a sustained downturn in the Sports Centre's revenue position, it was agreed, after several reports to Committee, and debate at full Council in July 2003, that a £1.2 million capital investment be made in the facilities.

2.2 The existing facilities consist of:

- 4 Court badminton sports hall
- Traditional wooden floored school gymnasium
- 2 squash courts
- 12 station health and fitness gym
- Outdoor swimming pool
- Outdoor floodlit multi-use games courts
- Grass football pitches
- Associated changing accommodation and bar/social area

2.3 The capital investment will provide a new health and fitness gym, aerobics studio, separate community changing accommodation, extra car parking and improved reception facilities.

2.4 The existing dual use facilities will be managed under a new and revised dual use agreement with the School Foundation. The new health and fitness gym will be managed under a lease from the School Foundation that will allow community access during school term day time, which is not available for the existing dual-use facilities.

2.5 At the meeting of full Council in July 2003, and following a recommendation from this Committee in June 2003, it was agreed that:

"A further report be submitted for approval for the requisite capital estimate for the works, after the terms of documentation have been settled and the further advice has been received on detail and costings; and

A project group of the relevant Officers and any necessary consultants, together with a member of this Committee, be formed to carry the project forward, and the Foundation and the School each be invited to nominate a representative to attend and participate."

3. Report

3.1 A Steering Group consisting of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of this Committee, Officers from Leisure Services, the Finance Department and Technical Services along with representatives from the School and the School Foundation and a customer representative have met on several occasions to discuss the brief for the architect and project manager. A copy of the design brief is attached at Appendix 'E'.

3.2 After a competition exercise Baker Consulting were appointed as project managers and architects. They helped the Steering Group to refine the design brief and based on that produced two alternative schemes, A and B. Plans for both schemes will be on display at the meeting. Scheme A meets the project brief and can be achieved within the scheme budget. Scheme B is similar to scheme A with the additional demolition of the existing bar/social area envisaging these also to be new build facilities. However, this is £70,000 over the proposed estimate and is not being recommended to the Committee.

3.3 It was hoped that other facilities attractive to potential new customers such as a sauna and steam room could be incorporated within the design. These proved to be too expensive and difficult to locate within the tight confines of the site and are not recommended at this time.

Revised Dual Use Agreement and New Lease

3.4 The revised dual use agreement has been drafted and submitted to the School Foundation for consideration. The new lease agreement will be prepared and submitted to the School Foundation following the Committee's decision as to which scheme should be pursued.

Estimated Cost Plan

3.5 The estimated cost plan for scheme A is as follows:

	£
Construction	890,000
Consultancy Fees	30,000
Planning/building Regs	6,000
Fitness Equipment	200,000
Fittings	24,000
Computer upgrade	10,000
Contingency	<u>40,000</u>
Total	1,200,000

Scheme B is as above except for an additional £70,000 added onto the construction element taking the total up to £1,270,000.

Provisional Timetable

3.6 The initial estimated project timetable is attached at Appendix 'F' and shows a proposed start on site of 16 August 2004. The School have indicated that they would wish the construction phase of this project to start earlier than this in order to avoid their main teaching times. This makes the timetable very tight and means that specification writing and planning permission will have to take place at the same time. By writing the specification and tender documents at the same time as seeking planning consent it is possible to save two weeks on this programme. Planning consent is estimated to take 12 weeks and discussions between the project manager and the planning department have commenced to see if it is possible to reduce this to the minimum of eight weeks. However, with a scheme of this size and complexity this will be ambitious. The project manager has been instructed to see what, if any, further savings in time may be made.

4. Council Policy

4.1 The Leader's Position Statement 2004/05 states;

*"The development of the Abbey Fit Centre, in partnership with the Jubilee High School, will be progressed in order to provide a first class affordable sports facility in the south of the Borough."*

5. Financial Implications

- 5.1 In the normal course of events, businesses are not able to recover the Value Added Tax (VAT) they incur that relates to income they receive that is exempt from VAT. However, VAT legislation gives local authorities the capacity to reclaim VAT that they incur in respect of "exempt supplies" up to a certain limit.
- 5.2 This ability to reclaim VAT on exempt supplies only applies where the VAT payable on purchases for such activities is "insignificant", deemed to be less than 5% of total VAT paid for all purchases made by the authority. If this 5% limit is exceeded, no VAT paid that relates to "exempt supplies" is reclaimable. The formula for this calculation is known as the "partial exemption calculation" and includes both the direct and indirect costs of each activity.
- 5.3 Runnymede is below its 5% partial exemption limit and is therefore able to recover all the VAT incurred on "exempt supplies". If the limit is exceeded then the Council would not be able to reclaim VAT incurred on all purchases that relate to "exempt supplies" (not just the amount over the 5% limit) in that accounting year. Based on the current partial exemption limit, this would mean that Runnymede would be able to reclaim approximately £70,000 of VAT incurred each year, provided the schedule of payments met the Council's current criteria.
- 5.4 Members will be aware that Runnymede has a medium term financial strategy based on savings of £1m per annum being achieved by 2004/05, together with stepped increases in Council Tax. All contracts should therefore be arranged to make best use of the Council's cash flows to assist in this strategy.
- 5.5 Including a predefined schedule of payments in the contract will ensure that the Council makes payments at the most appropriate times. However, it may mean that the prices received during the tendering exercise will be slightly inflated as tenderers endeavour to recover potential lost cash flows. It may also be the case that several of the smaller contractors may refuse to bid under such circumstances.
- 5.6 There is currently provision of £1.2m in the Capital Programme for this scheme and all relevant capital charges have been incorporated into the revenue budgets shown elsewhere on this Agenda. Any increase in costs incurred will require an additional Capital Estimate.

6. Legal Implications

- 6.1 The letting of an approved contract for the construction of the scheme is dependent upon the completion of the dual use agreement and the lease.

7. Planning and Technical Considerations

- 7.1 The scheme will require Planning and Building Control consent.

**OFFICERS' RECOMMENDATION that -**

- i) Members approve the details of Scheme A for Abbey Fit Sports Centre;**
- ii) a scheme capital estimate of £1.2 million be made;**
- iii) appropriate financial mechanisms be incorporated into the tender documents to assist with the Council's cash flow; and**
- iv) the Director of Administration and Leisure be authorised to negotiate and conclude the final terms of the lease and revised dual use agreement with the agreement of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Committee.**

**(TO RESOLVE)**

Background Papers

None stated.

11. AVIATOR PARK RECREATIONAL FACILITIES, STATION ROAD, ADDLESTONE - PARKING RESTRICTIONS (DTS/DAL)

(Ref: Minutes of Planning Committee, October 2000, page 869, para. 384, Leisure and Environment Committee, June 2002, page 234, para. 128 and Planning Committee, September 2003, page 422, para. 259)

1. Purpose of Report

1.1 **The purpose of this report is to inform Members of the need to introduce parking restrictions in the car park associated with the new recreational facilities on land adjacent to Aviator Park, Addlestone.**

1.2 **A report on the necessary amendment to the Off-Street Parking Places Order is due to be considered by the Economic Development Committee on 15 January 2004, which is responsible for the provision and management of parking and fixing of parking charges.**

2. Background Information

2.1 When the old Marconi site in Addlestone was redeveloped, the former playing field and the access and adjoining land were transferred to the Council under a Section 106 Agreement, together with a commuted payment for, inter alia, recreational purposes. The recreational facilities being provided include a street skating area, a small multi-use games area, a teen shelter and a junior football pitch. The original car park and access road from Station Road, have been reconstructed as part of the recreational facilities.

3. Report

3.1 Officers are concerned that, due to its proximity to Addlestone Station and Station Road, commuters residents and business employees from the Station Road area might park in the new car park and prevent legitimate users of the recreational facilities from parking there.

3.2 In order to deter parking by non-users of the recreational area it is being proposed to the Economic Development Committee that the Council's Off-Street Parking Places Order be amended to include this car park to enable it to be subject to the normal parking restrictions, in particular that:

- a) parking of cars and light goods vehicles is restricted at all times, day and night, to a maximum period of 3 hours with no return within 2 hours.
- b) all cars and light goods vehicles must park only in the clearly marked bays.
- c) only cars displaying in the windscreen a valid disabled parking permit may park in the disabled bays.
- d) motor cycles and scooters must park only in the designated bay.

3.3 It is proposed that the driver of any vehicle contravening any of the above restrictions will be liable to be issued with a Fixed Penalty Notice being subject to an excess charge of £60 (£30 if paid within 7 days).

3.4 The Council's existing Car Parking Officers would enforce the restrictions.

4. Resource implications

4.1 As the restrictions would be enforced by existing Car Parking Officers and the Fixed Penalty Notices processed via the existing car parking system, it is anticipated that there would be no significant additional costs, although there would need to be adjustments made to the Car Parking Officers routine inspections.

5. Legal implications

5.1 If the Economic Development Committee agrees to this proposal the parking restrictions will need to be published to enable the public to be consulted on the proposals. Any responses received will be reported back to a future meeting of the relevant Committee.

**(FOR INFORMATION)**

Background Papers

None.

12. BASINGSTOKE CANAL (DF)

1. Purpose of Report

1.1 **The purpose of this report is to propose a revised level of funding for the Basingstoke Canal in light of the Council's medium term financial Strategy.**

2. Background Information

2.1 Basingstoke Canal follows a course down the eastern boundary of the Borough for 1.42 miles from the bridge at Sheerwater to the Wey Navigation.

2.2 The Canal was purchased by Surrey and Hampshire County Councils in the mid 1970s, and following a 16 year restoration period, the management of the Canal was transferred to the newly created Basingstoke Canal Authority (BCA).

2.3 Funding for the BCA comes from the two County Councils plus the six riparian District Councils, with each County Council entering into an agreement with its own Districts over the extent of the funding.

2.4 Runnymede Borough Council has a medium term financial strategy based on savings of £1m a year being achieved by 2004/05 together with stepped increases in Council Tax.

3. Report

3.1 The running costs of the Surrey section of the Canal were originally borne between Surrey County Council at 50% and the four Surrey riparian Districts at 50%, based on a combination of the length of the canal, rateable value and population.

3.2 In 1990 Surrey County and District Officers met to agree a revised formula following a series of disputes. A revised formula was eventually agreed based on canal mileage and population alone and it was this approach that was endorsed by Members of the former Leisure Services Committee.

3.3 Since 1996/97 Runnymede Council has restricted its annual contribution to the running costs of the Canal to inflationary increases only, and has withdrawn completely from funding all items of a Capital nature.

3.4 The requested revenue contributions for 2003/04 along with the actual contributions paid are as follows:

Authority	2003/04 Request	2003/04 Amount Paid
	£	£
Surrey County Council	136,800	136,800
Guildford Borough Council	32,100	32,100
Runnymede Borough Council	15,500	15,500
Surrey Heath Borough Council	19,300	11,000
Woking Borough Council	47,100	47,100
Hampshire County Council	136,800	136,800
Hart District Council	59,100	20,000
Rushmoor Borough Council	42,500	42,500

3.5 In recent years Surrey Heath has reduced its contributions to the Canal from the level of the formula agreed with the Surrey authorities. Hart District Council (which forms part of the Hampshire agreement) has also failed to meet its requested contributions over the last few years.

- 3.6 The anticipated running costs of the Canal in 2004/05 are anticipated to be £663,400. This is to be financed from income and donations with the balance of £502,400 being requested from the riparian authorities. If the level of funding by the riparian authorities matches last year's contributions, the Canal Authority will already be facing a shortfall of approximately £47,000 and any further reduction will mean a major rethink of their annual business plans.

4. Financial Implications

- 4.1 The Basingstoke Canal Authority has requested a financial contribution of £15,900 from Runnymede Council in 2004/05 and appropriate provision has been made in the annual estimates shown elsewhere on this agenda.
- 4.2 In light of the Council's medium term financial strategy to achieve savings towards the Council's £1m target, the Chairman and Vice-Chairman have suggested that this Council's level of funding to the Canal should be reduced by 50% to contribute towards the Council's savings target.

**THE COMMITTEE IS ASKED to -**

**indicate its desired level of funding for the Basingstoke Canal in the 2004/05 financial year.**

**(TO RESOLVE)**

Background Papers

Basingstoke Canal JMC Minutes.

13. EGHAM SPORTS CENTRE LEISURE (DSO) TRADING POSITION 2003/04 (DAL)  
(Ref: Minutes of Leisure and Environment Committee, June 2003, page 185, para.120)

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 **The purpose of this report is to inform Members of the current trading position of Egham Sports Centre and of plans to undertake a restructuring exercise in order to encourage an improvement in the performance of the Trading Account.**

2. Background Information

- 2.1 ESC Leisure has over the last few years produced a substantial trading surplus. However in the financial year 2002/03 this surplus decreased to £215,951 and after the contract payment to the Council's 'client side' of £232,400 reported a loss of £16,449. At the start of this financial year the trading surplus was estimated to be £228,200. After the contract payment to the client this would mean a loss of £10,000 for the Centre and this was reported to Members at the Leisure and Environment Committee in June 2003.

3. Report

- 3.1 Trading this year is below expectations. Press reports suggest that ESC is not the only facility, public or private, to find this at present. After a difficult start to the financial year trading was improving and by October looked to be heading back on track. However the levels of trading in October were not sustained although expenditure costs were contained. At the current levels of trading ESC is expected to make an operational surplus of £105,600. After the contractual payment to the client it is expected to report a loss of £131,200.
- 3.2 A new general manager was appointed on 1 October 2003, and has been working with the Officer steering group chaired by the Chief Executive on several initiatives to improve the trading position. These include a new marketing strategy; adjustments to the staff structure; new aerobics and fitness programmes and membership retention initiatives. Physical improvements to the building are also continuing with the recent opening of the refurbished male changing accommodation with the introduction of power showers.

- 3.3 It is the view of the Officer steering group that a restructuring is necessary to focus more closely on essential areas. As part of this more staff will have to be employed especially in the gym to improve levels of customer service if membership attraction and retention are to be successful. This is being discussed with the staff and UNISON representatives.
- 3.4 Membership numbers have declined from a high of 1660 in March 2001 to 1174 in December 2003. The loss of 100 members at the Sports Centre results in a financial loss of approximately £36,700 per annum in membership fees. Any reduction in membership levels also means a reduction in secondary spending.
- 3.5 The Committee may like to see a regular trading report for the Sports Centre and this can be submitted to subsequent meetings.

**(FOR INFORMATION)**

Background Papers

None stated.

14. ABBEY FIT JOINT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE - MINUTES (DAL)

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 21 October 2003 are attached at Appendix 'G'.

**(FOR INFORMATION)**

Background Papers

None.

15. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

If Members are minded to consider any of the foregoing reports in private, 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 paragraph 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).