Agenda for a Meeting of: Cabinet

Date and Time of Meeting: Wednesday, 16 November 2016 at 7.00 pm

Place of Meeting Council Chamber, Civic Centre, Esher

Principal Committee and Member Services Officer: Mrs. T. Hulse
Direct Line: 01372 474175 E-mail: thulse@elmbridge.gov.uk

Members of Cabinet:

S.J. Selleck  
A. Davis  
B. Fairbank  
R. Green  
Mrs. R.J.M. Lyon  
Mrs. M. Marshall  
Mrs. K. Randolph  
C.R. Sadler  
Mrs. J.R. Turner

Fire Precautions:

(To be read from the Chair if members of the public are present)

In the event of the fire alarm sounding, leave the room immediately. Proceed downstairs by way of the main stairs or follow any of the emergency exit signs. Leave the building and follow the signs to the fire assembly point in the Civic Centre Car Park Recycling Area.
"If you would like more information in your own language, large print, on tape, or in Braille please contact us at the address or telephone number shown in this document."

Bengali;  
আপনি যদি নিজের ভাষায়, বড় হুরফে, টেপ বা ব্রেইলে আরও তথ্য জানতে চান তাহলে দর্শন করে আমাদের সাথে যোগাযোগ করুন। এই কাগজে আমাদের ঠিকানা ও টেলিফোন নম্বর দেওয়া আছে।

Chinese; (Cantonese or Mandarin)  
如果你需要更多详情，希望有中文版、大字体印刷件、磁带录音或盲文版，请按本文件中提供的地址和电话号码与我们联系。

Italian;  
Se desiderate ulteriori informazioni nella vostra lingua, a caratteri grandi, su cassetta, o in Braille, siete pregati di contattarci all’indirizzo o al numero di telefono indicati sul presente documento.

Urdu;  
زبر معلومات اپنے زبان سے، جنگ جو تفور فن، ایک اورکی صورت سے بہت چاہیے پہلی بار کریں۔

Spanish;  
Si desea recibir más información en su lengua, en un tamaño de fuente mayor, en casete o en Braille, póngase en contacto con nosotros en la dirección o mediante el número de teléfono que aparecen en este documento.

**Please Note:** The Council permits the filming and/or recording of the public element of its meetings. Electronic equipment and devices should be operated as unobtrusively as possible and without disruption to the business of the meeting. The Council retains copyright in all recordings. Filmed images should not be used or reproduced in a way that misrepresents or distorts the nature of the proceedings or seeks to lower the public reputation of the Council or an individual.

This meeting may also be filmed by the Council, broadcast live and subsequently retained as an archive on the Council’s website ([www.elmbridge.gov.uk](http://www.elmbridge.gov.uk)). The images and sound recording may be used for the purposes of public record or for training purposes. Entry to the meeting room and use of the public seating area will be treated as consent to being filmed.

Members of the public are also asked to ensure their mobile phones are switched off during the course of the meeting, as they can interfere with the induction loop system and interrupt the proceedings.

Free O2 wifi is available in all civic committee meeting rooms, including the council chamber, for all to access.

Thank you for your co-operation.
Access to Historical Information Relating to Reports

Please note that the items within this Agenda will usually have an historical context and therefore may have been considered previously by the Council, Cabinet or its Committees. Whilst reports appearing on this Agenda will include a background summary, Members may wish to appraise themselves of the more detailed historical context and to do this may wish to view previous reports / minutes on the matter which are available via the Council’s website: www.elmbridge.gov.uk or intranet, either by searching on the relevant topic or by committee reports. Copies of particular reports can be provided on request from the Democratic Services contact shown on the front of the Agenda.

Part I Items

1. Declarations of Interest

All Members present are required to declare, at this point in the meeting or as soon as possible thereafter

(i) any disclosable pecuniary interests and / or
(ii) other interests arising under the Code of Conduct

in respect of any item(s) of business being considered at this meeting.

Leader – Councillor S.J. Selleck

2. 2016/17 – 2nd Quarter Council Performance Report

3. Council’s Schedule of Meetings 2017/2018

4. Recommendations of the Overview and Scrutiny Task Group: Heathrow Expansion

5. Recommendations of the Constitutional Review Member Working Group Meeting held on 21 April 2016 referred back to the Committee by Cabinet for further consideration

Leader – Councillor S.J. Selleck / Resources – Councillor C.R. Sadler

6. Revenue Budget Proposals for 2017/18


Environment - Councillor B. Fairbank

8. Future Surrey Waste Partnership (SWP)
Highways and Transport – Councillor A. Davis
9. Elmbridge Public Car Parks Review 107 - 120

Housing – Councillor R. Green
10. Affordable Housing Opportunity with Thames Valley Housing 121 - 128

Leisure and Culture – Councillor Mrs. J.R. Turner
11. Deep water safety in Elmbridge 129 - 136

12. SCC Highways Verges Cutting Contract 137 - 144

Please note: Included within this report (Appendix A - page 141), and printed on grey paper, is exempt information, which is not for disclosure to the press and public by virtue of Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended).

If this is to be debated, the Cabinet will be asked to consider it in camera, having first resolved to exclude any members of the press or public present.

Planning Services – Councillor Mrs. K. Randolph
13. Local Plan - Strategic Options Consultation 145 - 210

Resources – Councillor C.R. Sadler
14. 2016/17 Revenue and Capital Budget Update - Quarter 2 211 - 222

15. Exclusion of Public

To consider the following motion:

That the public be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of the following items in view of the likelihood of the disclosure of exempt information of the descriptions specified:-

Part II Items Following Exclusion of Press and Public

Community and Corporate Development – Councillor Mrs. M. Marshall

Resources – Councillor C.R. Sadler

In the first quarter 20 (88%) Council Plan objectives were on target and 4 (44%) Flagship activities were on target. Full details are provided in the attached appendix.

**RECOMMENDED: THAT**

(A) PROGRESS AGAINST THE PERFORMANCE DASHBOARD BE NOTED;

(B) PROGRESS AGAINST COUNCIL PLAN OBJECTIVES BE NOTED;

(C) PROGRESS AGAINST ‘FLAGSHIP’ ACTIVITIES BE NOTED; AND

(D) THE COMMENTS PROVIDED FOR THE TARGETS SHOWING AN AMBER OR RED TRAFFIC LIGHT ARISING FROM (A), (B) AND (C) BE CONSIDERED.

**Financial implications:**
None for the purposes of this report.

**Environmental/Sustainability Implications:**
As set out within the report.

**Legal implications:**
None for the purposes of this report.

**Equality Implications:**
None for the purposes of this report.

**Risk Implications:**
As set out within the report.

**Community Safety Implications:**
None for the purposes of this report.

**Principal Consultees:**
Council Management Board and Heads of Service.
Background papers:
None

Enclosures/Appendices:
Appendix A – 2016/17 2nd Quarter Performance Report

Contact details:
Rebecca Gayton, Policy Assistant
rgayton@elmbridge.gov.uk, 01372 474 377
**Performance Report**  
Q2 2016/17  

**Overview of Performance**

**Basket of Performance Indicators**  
33 (73%) performance indicators objectives are currently on or above target.

![Performance Indicators Chart]

**Pis on red:**

**L-OD6(a)**  Working days lost due to sickness absence - short-term (cumulative)

**L-HS1**  Number of affordable homes delivered (gross) – cumulative

**L-HS2**  Number of households in temporary accommodation

**L-HS2(a)**  Number of households in bed & breakfast

**L-LCS21**  Number of external customer complaints recorded in joint EBC/TLG log

**L-TP4**  Percentage of planning appeal decisions made in favour of the Council

**L-CS29**  Number of passenger journeys undertaken on Dial a Ride, Hire a Bus and the Community Cab scheme to optimise vehicle utilisation

---

A green face means that work is on target to achieve the objective as specified or has been achieved. Most of the milestones under the objective and sub-objectives have been achieved within the timeframes.

An amber face is a warning that the achievement of the target in the way specified in the plan may not be possible. It requires an explanation; however, no decision is required at present. Some milestones under the objective and sub-objectives are behind the timeframes however, it is expected that they will be achieved in the current financial year.

A red face means the target is no longer achievable in the way specified and therefore requires a decision about remedial action. A number of milestones under the objective and sub-objectives are behind the timeframes and it is likely that they will not be able to be completed in the current financial year.
Council Objectives
20 (80%) Council Plan objectives are currently on target or completed.

Objectives on red:
N/A

Flagship Activities
4 (44%) Flagship Activities are currently on target or completed.
Performance Indicators

L-OD1  Number of complaints received
This PI does not have a dial.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 2015/16</th>
<th>Actual 2016/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YE</td>
<td></td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** this figure does not include complaints about green spaces maintenance, for those please see L-LCS21.

L-OD3  Percentage of telephone calls answered within 20 seconds

**Context:** The average call answering time for the Council is 7% below target.

**Action:** Awareness of call answering times against the target will continue to be communicated to Heads of Services in the form of monthly reports.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 2015/16</th>
<th>Actual 2016/17</th>
<th>Target 2016/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YE</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

L-OD6  Working days lost due to sickness absence (cumulative)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cumulative actual 2015/16</th>
<th>Cumulative actual 2016/17</th>
<th>Cumulative target 2016/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From Q1 2016/17 sickness absence is measured using the FTE figure, rather than the total number of employees.

**Context:** From Q1 2016/17 sickness absence is measured using the FTE figure, rather than the total number of employees.

The days lost to short-term sickness is 0.7 above target.

**Action:** Heads of services are receiving monthly sickness reports to aid them in addressing staff sickness within their teams.
L-Customer8
Percentage of customers who contacted the Council once to deal with their enquiry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 2015/16</th>
<th>Actual 2016/17</th>
<th>Target 2016/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YE</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Good to be high

L-Customer9
Percentage of customers who were satisfied with the time taken to answer their call

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 2015/16</th>
<th>Actual 2016/17</th>
<th>Target 2016/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Good to be high

L-OD2 Percentage of complaints resolved at each stage of the complaints process

In quarter two:
- 29 complaints were dealt with at Stage 1
- 4 complaints were dealt with at Stage 2
- 5 complaints were dealt with at Stage 3

In the 2015-16 year the Local Government Ombudsman received 18 complaints from the public about Elmbridge services, 4 of which were upheld.
This indicator monitors voluntary turnover against a target of 10% +/-3% (i.e. between 7% and 13%).

**Flagship Activities**

**Put in place new CCTV monitoring arrangements by March 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cumulative Actual</th>
<th>Cumulative Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>6.59%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>14.39%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/16 Q1</td>
<td>3.16%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/16 Q2</td>
<td>7.51%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/16 Q3</td>
<td>10.71%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/16 Q4</td>
<td>14.58%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/17 Q1</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/17 Q2</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/17 Q3</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/17 Q4</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A report will be presented to O&S on 20 October 2016 this will outline procurement recommendations. A recommendation will be made from O&S to November Cabinet and following that, Council.

**Support at least 50 businesses with funding for new start-ups and business investment growth by March 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cumulative Actual</th>
<th>Cumulative Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 Elmbridge Civic Improvement Fund applications approved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 start-up applications approved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion of the Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership Local Growth Hub business advice service resulting in the highest number of enquiries across the LEP from Elmbridge businesses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoy Elmbridge Day was held on 2 July 2016, which included coordination amongst out town centres, increased footfall and awareness of our independent retailers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Held Elmbridge Retailer of the Year awards to promote and celebrate our local retailers and town centres.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Agree a Devolution Deal that secures more Council control over services that residents value by March 2017

Lead Officer: Robert Moran

The timetable for negotiating a Devolution deal across the 3SC area has been extended following the changes in Government following the EU Referendum. There has been a slight loss of momentum as the new Government clarifies its commitment to devolution deals. However, the preparation of a 3SC devolution deal continues with regular Leader’s meetings and separate Chief Executive meetings. The current timetable still shows a likely draft deal for sign off by partners in March 2017.

Council Objectives – Exception Reporting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CM1 Put in place new CCTV monitoring arrangements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supporting the Council’s Top Priorities: P1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Officer: Natalie Anderson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Milestones:**
- (30/04/16) Decision taken on what the Council is looking to procure in relation to CCTV
- (31/05/16) Tender advertised
- (31/12/16) Contract awarded
- (31/03/17) New monitoring arrangements in place

**Status**

**Context:** A report will be presented to O&S on 20 October 2016 this will outline procurement recommendations.

**Last quarter**

**Action:** A recommendation will be made from O&S to November Cabinet and following that, Council.

**Supporting Pls**

N/A
Portfolio Dashboard
Q2 2016/17
Environment

Performance Indicators

**L-ES2**
Percentage of household waste sent for reuse, recycling and composting

![Q2 2016/17 result](chart)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>6,165</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>7,632</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>6,593</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>7,314</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>7,274</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>5,943</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YE</td>
<td>25,975</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**L-ES2(a)**
Percentage of household waste sent for recycling

![Q2 2016/17 result](chart)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>2,864</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3,204</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>3,531</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>3,278</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>3,725</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>3,304</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YE</td>
<td>13,424</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**L-ES2(b)**
Percentage of household waste sent for composting

![Q2 2016/17 result](chart)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>3,275</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>4,349</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>3,060</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>4,170</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>3,550</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>2,638</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YE</td>
<td>12,523</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**L-ES6 Number of food premises which have increased their hygiene rating to 2 or above (cumulative)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 2015/16</th>
<th>Actual 2016/17</th>
<th>Target 2016/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**L-ES9 Percentage of land assessed as having deposits of litter and detritus that fall below an acceptable level - average**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 2015/16</th>
<th>Actual 2016/17</th>
<th>Target 2016/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey 1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey 3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Flagship Activity**

**Award a new and more efficient waste collection contract with 3 partner authorities by March 2017**

Lead Officer: Anthony Jeziorski

The Cabinet is considering a report on the outcome of the procurement project at its meeting of 12 October 2016.

**Council Objectives – Exception Reporting**

There are no Council Objectives on amber or red.
Performance Indicators

There are no performance indicators reported under this portfolio.

Flagship Activities

There are no flagship activities in this portfolio.

Council Objectives – Exception Reporting

There are no Council objectives under this portfolio.

Parking Performance – Pay & Display Ticket Sales

Commuter Car Parks - Rolling Quartely Sale (based on previous 4 quarters) by Tariff Ban
(Walton Park 2 & 3-hour stays not significant)
Commuter Car Parks
Average Daily Sales by Month – April 2015 to September 2016 (18 months)

Changes in monthly behaviour due to operational or seasonal reasons are better represented by 'average daily sales per operational working day' - the figures used below. Total sales figures per month would otherwise be influenced by the differing number of operational days in each.

All Commuter Car Parks - Average Day Ticket Sales per Operational Day
(with trend lines)

Mon-Fri before 4pm
539
Mon-Fri after 4pm
81
Saturday
370
326
196
322

Commuter Car Parks - Average Day Ticket 'Mon-Fri before 4pm' Sales per Operational Day, by Car Park

Station Avenue
Mayfield Road
Heath North
Heath South
Walton Park
Performance Indicators

L-HS1 Number of affordable homes delivered (gross) – cumulative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Cumulative Actual 2015/16</th>
<th>Cumulative Actual 2016/17</th>
<th>Cumulative Target 2016/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Good to be high

Context: There was one affordable home delivered in quarter two. As discussed with the Performance & Finance Standing Panel, construction delays have occurred on two of the developments which were expected to deliver the majority of the 40 homes initially forecast this. Hence, the full-year target will not be met and over 30 of the affordable homes originally scheduled for the current year will be delivered next year.

Action: Work is ongoing to bring forward the delivery of additional affordable housing, but due to the timescales involved in delivery, it will not be possible to install value-for-money substitutes to make up the shortfall this year. Some consideration may need to be given to amending this target.

L-HS2 Number of households in temporary accommodation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Actual 2015/16</th>
<th>Actual 2016/17</th>
<th>Target 2016/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YE</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Good to be low

Context: Like many other local authorities, the Council is seeing a rise in the number of homeless households occupying temporary accommodation, particularly when the supply of rented affordable housing for letting is limited and the opportunities to move households out of temporary accommodation is restricted.

Action: Officers will continue to focus on homelessness prevention as a means of reducing the need for temporary accommodation, along with longer-term efforts focussed on increasing the supply of affordable housing. In the short-term, we anticipate a slight rise in social housing relets in the coming months, which may help reduce numbers. However, market conditions coupled with planned welfare reforms and falls in the supply of new
rented, affordable homes could well result in increased homelessness in the coming years. Some consideration may need to be given to amending the targets later in the year.

### L-HS2(a)
**Number of households in bed & breakfast**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 2015/16</th>
<th>Actual 2016/17</th>
<th>Target 2016/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YE</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Context:** Bed and breakfast accommodation will continue to be used as a last resort. The number of households accommodated at the end of the September was less than at the end of June, but placements are still being made because of a combination of continuing demand and limited move-on opportunities.

**Action:** We will continue to focus on homeless prevention (to manage demand) and making best use of other temporary accommodation, exploring opportunities for increasing the supply of more suitable temporary accommodation and increasing the rate of move-on from temporary accommodation to more settled housing. Some consideration may need to be given to amending the targets later in the year.

### L-HS3(a)
**Days taken to process HB/CTB new claims**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 2015/16</th>
<th>Actual 2016/17</th>
<th>Target 2016/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YE</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### L-HS3(b)
**Days taken to process HB/CTB change events**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 2015/16</th>
<th>Actual 2016/17</th>
<th>Target 2016/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YE</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Flagship Activities

Secure at least 40 additional affordable homes and bring at least 40 empty properties back into use by March 2017

Lead Officer: Julie Cook

Due to delays in construction of two of the developments due to deliver the majority of new affordable homes in 2016/17, it will not be possible to achieve the target of 40 additional affordable homes this year.

The likely number of additional affordable homes to be delivered this year is around five, although the other 35 homes being delivered next year, rather than this. An empty homes review has resulted in the number of recorded long-term empty homes falling by 112 from 608 at start of July to 496 at start of October.

Further work will be undertaken to understand why these properties are empty and to help reduce the number further. This flagship has been rated as amber, reflecting the two different outcomes.

Council Objectives – Exception Reporting

H1 Deliver more affordable housing and make best use of existing stock to meet need

Supporting the Council’s Top Priorities: P1

Lead Officer: Julie Cook

Sample milestones:
(30/06/16) 1 affordable home delivered (ytd)
(30/09/16) 2 affordable homes delivered (ytd)

Status

Context: One additional affordable home has been provided in the year to date, via the Elmbridge Homeownership Assistance Scheme, rather than the two anticipated. The number and timing of any further purchases through this scheme is unpredictable.

As outlined elsewhere, the target of 40 additional affordable homes (through various sources) will not be met due to delays in their construction, for reasons beyond the Council’s control. This objective has been rated amber, as one milestone has been achieved and one has not.
**Supporting PIs**
L-HS1

**Action:** Work is ongoing to bring forward the delivery of additional affordable housing, but due to the timescales involved in delivery, it will not be possible to install value-for-money substitutes to make up the shortfall this year. Some consideration may need to be given to amending the affordable homes target.
Performance Indicators

L-LCS16
Number of people engaging with Museum Learning Service activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 2015/16</th>
<th>Actual 2016/17</th>
<th>Target 2016/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>1,066</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>1,955</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>1,840</td>
<td></td>
<td>965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>666</td>
<td></td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YE</td>
<td>5,527</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,065</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

L-LCS19
Number of people taking part in Healthy Walks per quarter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 2015/16</th>
<th>Actual 2016/17</th>
<th>Target 2016/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>1,195</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>1,507</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>1,384</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>1,587</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YE</td>
<td>5,673</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

L-LCS20
Number of people taking part in Countryside Education activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 2015/16</th>
<th>Actual 2016/17</th>
<th>Target 2016/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>2,387</td>
<td>1,794</td>
<td>2,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>1,335</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>351</td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>623</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YE</td>
<td>3,764</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Context: From mid–August TLG grounds maintenance contract showing improved quality and service delivery following the meeting of the EBC & MVDC Chief Executives with the CEO of TLG.

Action: Green Spaces Team implementation of micro-monitoring of the contract with daily updates and joint site inspections with TLG.

Flagship Activities

**Deliver Leisure Live to encourage people to be more active by September 2016**

Lead Officer: Ian Burrows

Leisure Live took place on Saturday 9 July 2016 at Hersham Green and it is estimated that over 3,000 people attended. The day was vibrant, engaging and successful with over 40 local clubs, groups and businesses showcasing their leisure and wellbeing related activities and services to local residents throughout the day.

Community partners gave positive feedback about the event, its key purpose to provide residents with the inspiration and confidence to get active in their local community. We will contact community partners to see how effective the event has been in terms of attracting new participants / members and how we can improve the event in 2017.

**Work in partnership with The Landscape Group to effectively implement the new contract to maintain and improve the Council’s green spaces by March 2017**

Lead Officer: Ian Burrows

From mid-August TLG grounds maintenance contract showed improved quality and service delivery following the meeting of the EBC & MVDC Chief Executives with the CEO of TLG.

The Green Spaces Team have implemented micro-monitoring of the contract which includes with daily updates and joint site inspections with TLG.
**Council Objectives – Exception Reporting**

**L2 Support Walton Athletic Club, Walton Casual and Walton and Hersham FC in the preparations to move to the new Sports Hub through club development plans and ongoing support**

Supporting the Council’s Top Priorities: P1

**Lead Officer:** Ian Burrows

| Milestones:                      | (31/05/16) Club development plans signed off  
|                                | (30/06/16) Shadow board established  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(31/03/17) Operating model and governance arrangements confirmed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Status**

- **Context:** Work continues with all of the clubs, with WAC and WCFC Club development plans now signed off and being delivered. Monthly meetings have been established with WAC to support in the build up to Sept 2017 opening to ensure prepared for an increase in interest/membership.

  WAC and WCFC have attended meetings and are supportive of the operating model moving forward. Further meetings to be arranged with WHFC in due course. Shadow board meetings will be progressed at this time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last quarter</th>
<th><strong>Action:</strong> Meeting to be held with WHFC when appropriate.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting PIs</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Performance Indicators

L-TP4
Percentage of planning appeal decisions made in favour of the Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 2015/16</th>
<th>Actual 2016/17</th>
<th>Target 2016/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YE</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Context:** 30 decisions issued in Q2: 13 allowed; 17 dismissed. Of the appeals allowed 3 (10%) were at the same site (conjoined appeals) – if dismissed these would have resulted in 67% appeal decisions in favour of council (i.e. target met).

**Action:** Target not met due to one site with 3 appeals – therefore no action required due to this unusual situation being a rare occurrence.

L-TP5
Percentage of planning applications processed in 13 weeks: Major applications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 2015/16</th>
<th>Actual 2016/17</th>
<th>Target 2016/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YE</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

L-TP6
Percentage of planning applications processed in 8 weeks: Minor applications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 2015/16</th>
<th>Actual 2016/17</th>
<th>Target 2016/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YE</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Context: There was a backlog in registering applications during this quarter which had a knock-on effect on determination periods for applications. However, whilst we did not meet the local target for this quarter, we did meet the national target of 65%.

Action: There is no longer a backlog in registering applications so we anticipate performance on determination times improving. We are also continuing to seek Extensions of Time Agreements (ETAs) on all applications that will exceed the determination period.

| L-TP7 Percentage of planning applications processed: Other applications |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Actual 2015/16 | Actual 2016/17 | Target 2016/17 |
| Q1 | 93 | 93 | 92 |
| Q2 | 91 | 91 | 92 |
| Q3 | 97 | 92 |
| Q4 | 93 | 92 |
| YE | 94 | 92 |

Context: Only 1% below target and still significantly higher than the national target of 80%.

Action: Continue to monitor performance and encouraging officers to seek ETAs as much as possible.

Flagship Activities

Complete the evidence review of Planning policies aimed at providing for housing growth whilst safeguarding the environment by July 2016

Lead Officer: Ray Lee

Evidence base review completed and 43 out of 48 members attended briefings in July and August. LDS approved by Cabinet in September. Strategic Options consultation is being prepared with oversight from the Local Plan Working Group. Consultation paper scheduled to be considered by Cabinet in November with consultation starting on 3rd January 2017.

Council Objectives – Exception Reporting

P1 Deliver appropriate planning decisions for sustainable development that provides Elmbridge residents with a good quality of life

Supporting the Council’s Top Priorities: P1 & P3

Lead Officer: Ray Lee

Milestones: (31/12/16) Review the pre-application service to support delivery of sustainable development
(31/12/16) Update the validation checklist to ensure smooth processing

Status

Context: The review of the pre-application service is ongoing and has been focusing on performance monitoring and providing a list of pre-app enquiries to Members on a monthly basis.

The review of the validation checklist is unlikely to be completed by the due date as the officer progressing the project has been engaged with higher priority work (Waterside Drive sports hub application).

Last quarter

Action: Continue to monitor the progress of these projects.
## Community Infrastructure Levy Update

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total CIL collected to date (paid invoices)</th>
<th>12,057,424</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total CIL allocated</td>
<td>£5,943,901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total ring fenced for admin</td>
<td>£602,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total ring fenced for SANGs</td>
<td>£252,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unallocated total CIL</strong></td>
<td>£5,252,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unallocated local CIL</td>
<td>£1,661,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unallocated strategic CIL</td>
<td>£3,590,928</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Spending Board</th>
<th>Allocated Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walton</td>
<td>£168,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weybridge</td>
<td>£212,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hersham</td>
<td>£78,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molesey</td>
<td>£127,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thames Ditton</td>
<td>£23,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esher</td>
<td>£140,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cobham</td>
<td>£369,001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Performance Indicators

L-IT4(a) Percentage uptime of web services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Actual 2015/16</th>
<th>Actual 2016/17</th>
<th>Target 2016/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>99.95</td>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YE</td>
<td>99.98</td>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

L-IT4(d) Percentage uptime of Council network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Actual 2015/16</th>
<th>Actual 2016/17</th>
<th>Target 2016/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YE</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

L-IT4(g) Percentage uptime of online payments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Actual 2015/16</th>
<th>Actual 2016/17</th>
<th>Target 2016/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YE</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
L-IT5(d)
Percentage of Service Desk tickets closed within SLA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 2015/16</th>
<th>Actual 2016/17</th>
<th>Target 2016/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YE</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Good to be high

Context: Service Desk performance has improved over the year but still 5% away from the target.

Action: This will be reviewed as part of the changes in the move to a single service desk.

L-LT1
Percentage of Council Tax collected – including previous years’ arrears

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cumulative Actual 2015/16</th>
<th>Cumulative Actual 2016/17</th>
<th>Cumulative Target 2016/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>97.8</td>
<td>97.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Good to be high

L-LT1(a)
Percentage of Council Tax collected - current year only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cumulative Actual 2015/16</th>
<th>Cumulative Actual 2016/17</th>
<th>Cumulative Target 2016/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>98.8</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This PI does not have a trend chart.

L-LT2
Percentage of Non-Domestic Rates collected – including previous years’ arrears

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cumulative Actual 2015/16</th>
<th>Cumulative Actual 2016/17</th>
<th>Cumulative Target 2016/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>97.9</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Good to be high
L-LT2(a)
Percentage of Non-Domestic Rates collected - current year only

Good to be high

This PI does not have a trend chart.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cumulative Actual 2015/16</th>
<th>Cumulative Actual 2016/17</th>
<th>Cumulative Target 2016/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>98.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage difference of energy usage against same quarter in previous year

% difference for Q2 15/16 and Q2 16/17

PI Status: Good to be low

Generally warmer weather has reduced energy usage. One Centres for the Community were unable to get meter readings in time and so energy has been estimated based on previous 2 years.

Gas and Electric for Civic Centre was broadly equivalent to previous year despite increased occupancy showing value of upgrade works over the previous years.

This year’s DEC certificate for the Civic Centre shows a slight improvement in energy rating / CO2 emissions.

Energy Usage Trend
Flagship Activities

| Complete the contamination works and start construction of the Waterside Drive Sports Hub by October 2016 |
| Lead Officer: Alex Williams |
| Works commenced on site in March 2016 we continue to remediate the land via a complex groundwork package and subject to inclement weather conditions or any unforeseen objects being found in the landfill site it is envisaged that we will have completed the remediation work by January 2017. |

Council Objectives – Exception Reporting

| R2 Develop an effective and innovative proposal for the use of Weybridge Hall and flats for consideration by Members |
| Supporting the Council’s Top Priorities: P2 & P3 |
| Lead Officer: Alex Williams |
| **Milestones:** |
| (31/07/2016) Report to Cabinet on proposal |
| (31/10/2016) Begin implementing recommendation |
| **Status** |
| **Context:** Feasibility study with regard to options available to us have been carried out through the SCAPE framework and their contractor Kier. |
| **Last quarter** |
| **Action:** The costs and options open to the Council will be reported to November Cabinet giving the Council the opportunity of considering the various options open to it in order to deliver much needed regeneration at that end of the High Street. |
| **Supporting PIs** |
| N/A |
Performance Indicators

L-CS28  
Number of Community Support Services Volunteers Recruited - cumulative  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cumulative Actual 2015/16</th>
<th>Cumulative Actual 2016/17</th>
<th>Cumulative Target 2016/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Context:**  We are 2 below target, but this is largely due to a change in staff who are leading on our volunteer recruitment.

**Action:**  Our Preventative Services Manager has taken over leading on volunteer recruitment. We have reviewed processes and procedures and are now more actively promoting volunteering.

L-CS29  
Number of passenger journeys undertaken on Dial a Ride, Hire a Bus and the Community Cab scheme to optimise vehicle utilisation  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 2015/16</th>
<th>Actual 2016/17</th>
<th>Target 2016/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>4,814</td>
<td>3,909</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>5,299</td>
<td>3,956</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>4,812</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>4,349</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YE</td>
<td>19,274</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Context:**  We recognise that we are still below target.

**Action:**  We have only recently recruited a full compliment of staff and we are now actively promoting services such as Hire a Bus, Dial a Ride and the Community Cab Scheme that were curtailed due to staff shortages.
### L-CS30 Number of lunches served at Centres for the Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 2015/16</th>
<th>Actual 2016/17</th>
<th>Target 2016/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>13,065</td>
<td>12,421</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>12,601</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>13,962</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>13,371</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YE</td>
<td>54,398</td>
<td></td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Good to be high*

### L-CS4 Number of CSS volunteer sessions including Meals on Wheels and Centres

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q2 14-15</th>
<th>Q3 14-15</th>
<th>Q4 14-15</th>
<th>Q1 15-16</th>
<th>Q2 15-16</th>
<th>Q3 15-16</th>
<th>Q4 15-16</th>
<th>Q1 16-17</th>
<th>Q2 16-17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>4650</td>
<td>4767</td>
<td>4420</td>
<td>4185</td>
<td>4363</td>
<td>4390</td>
<td>4421</td>
<td>3962</td>
<td>4193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### L-CS6 Number of Meals on Wheels delivered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q2 15</th>
<th>Q3 15</th>
<th>Q4 15</th>
<th>Q1 16</th>
<th>Q2 16</th>
<th>Q3 16</th>
<th>Q4 16</th>
<th>Q1 17</th>
<th>Q2 17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YE</td>
<td>12,883</td>
<td>12,622</td>
<td>12,230</td>
<td>13,065</td>
<td>12,053</td>
<td>12,135</td>
<td>11,570</td>
<td>12,184</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
L-CS14b Relief Carers Scheme annual number of specialist group places/support groups

The increase reflects the introduction of an eleventh specialist group and a busy carers café programme.

L-CS21 Community Alarm Service total number of installations

We are averaging 40.3 installations per month and currently 1,693 customers. Our position this year shows a 61 units increase from the same period last year.

Flagship Activities

There are no flagship activities in this portfolio.

Council Objectives – Exception Reporting

There are no Council objectives on amber or red.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

To consider the Schedule of Meetings for the Municipal Year 2017/2018.

RECOMMENDED: THAT

(A) THE COUNCIL’S SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS FOR THE MUNICIPAL YEAR 2017/18, AS SET OUT AT APPENDIX A, BE APPROVED; AND

(B) IT BE NOTED THAT THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY WORKSHOP WILL BE HELD ON 25 MAY 2017.

REPORT:

Background

1. As Members will be aware, the Council’s Constitution requires the Council to approve a Schedule of Meetings for the forthcoming Municipal Year.

2. As is customary, the attached draft Schedule has been prepared, taking the following aspects into account:

   (i) accommodation of the budget setting and closing accounts processes;

   (ii) accommodation of the needs of the Planning process;

   (iii) the scheduling of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee following the Cabinet meetings and within the Cabinet Call In Notice periods;

   (iv) adjusting the pattern of meetings so as to incorporate an August recess, as far as possible;

   (v) where possible, taking account of the Multi Faith Calendar; and

   (vi) the School Term and Holiday dates 2017/18, as published by Surrey County Council.
3. It should be recognised that the Schedule of Meetings sets out, as is customary, the formal schedule of meetings of the Council, however, this is not an exhaustive list. Members will appreciate that the list does not take account of Working Groups / Overview and Scrutiny Committee Task Groups / Chairman’s Briefing Meetings etc. It should also be noted that it may be necessary to convene Licensing Sub-Committees as required, in line with statutory processes.

4. Early establishment of the Schedule of Meetings enables other bookings to then be considered, some of which would be by way of external bookings and increase the income stream accordingly.

**August Recess**

5. In accordance with Members’ requests, when preparing the Schedule of Meetings, the pattern of meetings has been adjusted so as to incorporate an August recess. Mindful that a regular 3 week cycle of Area Planning Sub-Committee meetings is required to ensure that a majority of the applications considered at those meetings are determined within the statutory 8 week time limit, it has been necessary to schedule Area Planning Sub-Committees on 14 August 2017.

**Overview and Scrutiny Committee**

6. **February 2018**

In order to accommodate the budget setting process, whilst observing the scheduling of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee following the Cabinet meetings and within the Cabinet Call In Notice period, it is proposed that the February 2018 Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting be held on 15 February, during the half term holiday.

**Area Planning Sub-Committee Meetings**

7. **December 2017**

Members will be aware that, following a previous request by one of the Area Planning Sub-Committee Chairmen, the three Area Planning Sub-Committees scheduled in late December over recent years were moved given the proximity of the meetings to the Christmas period. Whilst preparing the Schedule of 2017/18, the Area Planning Sub-Committees would again routinely fall within the week of Christmas and therefore, in line with previous arrangements, these meetings have been accommodated in the preceding week, on Monday 11 December 2017.

**Audit and Standards Committee – Closing of Accounts**

8. On 17 February 2015, Regulations were laid before Parliament confirming proposals to bring forward the date by which accounts must be published in England to 31 July, effective from the 2017/18 financial year.
In this regard, it is necessary for the Audit and Standards Committee to consider the Council's draft Statement of Accounts for the year ended 31 March 2018 in May 2018 and therefore it is proposed that a meeting of the Committee be held on 30 May 2018 which falls within the June half term holiday.

**Annual Overview and Scrutiny Workshop**

9. To support the development of an overview and scrutiny work programme for each Municipal Year, an annual workshop is organised to provide Members with the opportunity to generate and prioritise topics for inclusion in the work programme.

As the Overview and Scrutiny Workshop has become an annual event, it was suggested that a date be identified at the same time as the Schedule of Meetings was prepared which would enable Members to diarise the event at the earliest opportunity. In this regard, the Overview and Scrutiny Workshop has been arranged for **Thursday 25 May 2017**.

**Financial implications:** None for the purposes of this report. Early establishment of the Schedule of Meetings enables other bookings to then be considered, some of which would be by way of external bookings and increase the income stream for the Council accordingly.

**Environmental/Sustainability Implications:** None for the purposes of this report.

**Legal implications:** None for the purposes of this report.

**Equality Implications:** The Schedule of Meetings is compiled having regard to key dates within the Multi Faith Calendar.

**Risk Implications:** None for the purposes of this report.

**Community Safety Implications:** None for the purposes of this report.

**Principal Consultees:**
Council Management Board

**Background papers:** None for the purposes of this report.

**Enclosures/Appendices:**

**Contact details:**
Mrs. T. Hulse, Principal Committee and Member Services Officer
01372 484175, thulse@elmbridge.gov.uk
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### May 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mon</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>22 APS</th>
<th>29</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tues</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10 APPT</td>
<td>17 AN CO*</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurs</td>
<td>4 Election (SCC)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### June 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mon</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>12 APS</th>
<th>19 LIC</th>
<th>26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tues</td>
<td>6 PLNG</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>7 CBNT</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21 ICMDM</td>
<td>28 A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15 O&amp;S</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### July 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mon</th>
<th>3 APS</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>24 APS</th>
<th>31</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tues</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11 PLNG</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>5 CBNT</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19 ICMDM / CO</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13 O&amp;S</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### August 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mon</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>14 APS</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tues</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### September 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mon</th>
<th>4 APS</th>
<th>11 LIC</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>25 APS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tues</td>
<td>5 PLNG</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13 CBNT</td>
<td>20 ICMDM / A&amp;S</td>
<td>27 CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21 O&amp;S</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### October 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mon</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>16 APS</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tues</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10 PLNG</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>4 CBNT</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18 ICMDM</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12 O&amp;S</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### November 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mon</th>
<th>6 APS</th>
<th>13 LIC</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>27 APS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tues</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21 PLNG</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>1 ICMDM</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15 CBNT</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23 O&amp;S</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### December 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mon</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>11 APS</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tues</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>6 CO</td>
<td>13 ICMDM</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2018</td>
<td>February 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mon</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mon</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 APS</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 LIC</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 APS</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tues</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 PLNG</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>27 PLNG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wed</strong></td>
<td><strong>Wed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 CBNT</td>
<td>7 CBNT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 ICMDM / A&amp;S</td>
<td>21 ICMDM / CO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thurs</strong></td>
<td><strong>Thurs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 O&amp;S</td>
<td>15 O&amp;S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fri</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fri</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sat</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sat</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sun</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sun</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>March 2018</th>
<th>April 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mon</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mon</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 APS</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 LIC</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tues</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tues</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 PLNG</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wed</strong></td>
<td><strong>Wed</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 ICMDM</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 CBNT</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 A&amp;S</td>
<td>18 ICMDM / CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thurs</strong></td>
<td><strong>Thurs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 O&amp;S</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fri</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fri</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sat</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sat</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sun</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sun</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>May 2018</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mon</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 APS</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tues</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wed</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 APPT</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 CO</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thurs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Election</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fri</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sat</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sun</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AN CO* – Annual Council 7.45 pm
APPT – Appointments Sub-Committee 7.00 pm
APS – Area Planning Sub-Committees 7.45 pm
A&S – Audit and Standards Committee 7.00 pm
CBNT – Cabinet 7.00 pm
CO – Council 7.45 pm
ICMDM – Individual Cabinet Member Decision Making 10.00 am
LIC – Licensing Committee 7.45 pm
O&S – Overview and Scrutiny Committee 7.45 pm
PLNG – Planning Committee 7.45 pm

Meetings are usually held in the Civic Centre, Esher. Public are welcome to attend all meetings, although may be excluded on occasions.

* Meetings of the Audit & Standards Committee; Licensing Committee; Overview & Scrutiny Committee and Planning Committee will be held at the rise of the Annual Council Meeting in order to appoint their respective Chairman and Vice-Chairman.

Agendas and minutes are available on the Council's Website: [www.elmbridge.gov.uk](http://www.elmbridge.gov.uk)
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

To consider the minute extract from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee regarding the recommendations of the Overview and Scrutiny Task Group: Heathrow Expansion.

RECOMMENDED: THAT THE RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE, ATTACHED AT APPENDIX A, REGARDING THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY TASK GROUP: HEATHROW EXPANSION, BE CONSIDERED.

PLEASE NOTE: whilst the report considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee has not been re-circulated with this agenda, it can be viewed via your iPad by accessing the Overview and Scrutiny Committee agenda for the 20 October 2016.

REPORT:

1. At its meeting on 20 October 2016, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee considered recommendations from the Overview and Scrutiny Task Group: Heathrow Expansion. The Cabinet is therefore asked to consider the recommendations from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

2. The relevant minute extract from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee is attached at Appendix A.

Financial implications:
As outlined in the agenda for the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Environmental/Sustainability Implications:
As outlined in the agenda for the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Legal implications:
As outlined in the agenda for the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Equality Implications:
As outlined in the agenda for the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.
**Risk Implications:**
As outlined in the agenda for the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

**Community Safety Implications:**
As outlined in the agenda for the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

**Principal Consultees:**
As outlined in the agenda for the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

**Background papers:**
None.

**Enclosures/Appendices:**
Appendix A – Minute extract from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee

**Contact details:**
Nicholas Martin, Policy Officer (Partnerships)
01372 474399, nmartin@elmbridge.gov.uk

Natalie Anderson, Head of Organisational Development
01372 474111, nanderson@elmbridge.gov.uk
RECOMMENDATIONS TO CABINET ON 16 NOVEMBER 2016

27/16 RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY TASK GROUP: HEATHROW EXPANSION

(Link to Council Priorities: A Safe, caring and healthy Elmbridge)

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee had set up a Heathrow Expansion Task and Finish Group to consider the impact of expansion of Heathrow Airport (LHR) on Elmbridge with the aim of developing a Council position statement. The Committee considered a comprehensive report of the Task and Finish Group findings and recommendations. Councillor Mrs. C, Elmer, the Chairman of the Task and Finish Group, provided the Committee with a brief overview of the work undertaken.

The Committee noted that in July 2015 the Airports Commission had published a report that set out recommendations to Government for the expansion of aviation capacity within the United Kingdom (UK). The Commission had argued that expanded airport capacity was crucial for the UK’s long-term prosperity. The Commission had concluded that a proposal for a new northwest runway located at Heathrow Airport combined with a significant package of measures to address environmental and community impact, presented the strongest case and offered the greatest strategic and economic benefits by 2050. It was anticipated that the Government would imminently make an announcement in respect of the proposed airport expansion.

Since January 2016 the Task and Finish Group had met on eight occasions to gather evidence in respect of the proposed airport expansion and the potential impact to Elmbridge. Most recently, two intense sessions had been held during September whereby presentations from external organisations and Officers of the Council had been received.

The Task and Finish Group had gathered evidence from several organisations, action groups and individuals which included: Heathrow Airport Limited (HAL); Local Authorities Aircraft Noise Council (LAANC); Gatwick Ltd; Residents Action Group Elmbridge (RAGE); private sector feedback from large and strategically important companies; Air Products based at Hersham Technology Park; and from the Council’s Housing Strategy & Enabling Officer and the Economic Development Officer.

The Committee noted that an independent survey had been undertaken by Populus within Elmbridge and that the Council had also undertaken an additional public survey during September 2016.

The Task Group had considered the main arguments in relation to the proposed airport expansion in respect of the following impacts: Economic; Surface Transport Infrastructure; Air Quality; Noise; Housing; Gatwick; Residents’ views; and whether Elmbridge Borough Council should consider making a position statement.
During the discussion, one Member commented that they thought that it may be pertinent for this Council, along with other Councils and people affected, to encourage the Government to establish an independent regulator who had the responsibility for air quality and noise and have the necessary power to enforce this. The Chairman explained that the Task Group had looked at this matter and had considered that it would be beneficial to have an over-arching independent regulatory body in this regard and that this could be included within the recommendations made.

In respect of the mitigation packages that had been offered by Heathrow Airport to Councils who had made position statements, one Member enquired whether there was any specific information or guidance in respect of these packages and whether these incentives would be withdrawn given that media reports had indicated that the Government would be imminently making an announcement in respect of this. The Chairman explained that she understood that earlier in the year there had been a discussion between Heathrow Airport and the Council and that certain offers had been made in respect of apprenticeships, bus services and infrastructure ideas however, nothing had been confirmed at that time. During a presentation by Heathrow Airport to the Task Group, the offer for further discussions with the new Leader of the Council had been made. In respect of the timeliness, when the report was being deliberated it was not known when the Government were likely to make a decision.

Whilst acknowledging that the Government had indicated that they would be making a decision on this matter in the coming days or weeks, one Member asked that should the Council decide to make a position statement after this decision had been announced, would this be meaningless. The Chairman explained that the Council had not been formally consulted on this, even though other local authorities had, and she believed that the view of the Task Group was that it was important to the residents of Elmbridge that the Council to make a formal statement in this regard.

One Member advised that given that residents in Molesey were already within the existing flight path, if a third runway was to be agreed at Heathrow Airport, it was likely that it would affect the residents further and the Council was likely to receive more complaints because of this.

In respect of the costs for an additional runway at Heathrow or Gatwick Airports, clarification was sought as to whether it would cost the Government in the region of £5.7 billion for Heathrow with no cost at Gatwick. The Policy Officer confirmed that this was correct.

The Committee acknowledged the hard work that had been undertaken by the Policy Officer and the extensive information obtained and provided to the Task Group for consideration.

On consideration of the recommendations of the Heathrow Expansion Task and Finish Group, the Committee
RECOMMENDED: THAT:

(A) THE FINDINGS OF THE HEATHROW EXPANSION TASK AND FINISH GROUP BE NOTED;

(B) CABINET NOTE THE REPORT AND THE OUTCOME OF THE REVIEW AND THAT COUNCIL SHOULD DEBATE THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE HEATHROW EXPANSION TASK AND FINISH GROUP REPORT AND CONSIDER WHETHER IT WANTS TO MAKE A PUBLIC STATEMENT ON THE EXPANSION OF HEATHROW BASED ON THE EVIDENCE GATHERED; AND

(C) IRRESPECTIVE OF THE DECISION BY GOVERNMENT AS TO WHETHER OR NOT TO EXPAND HEATHROW AIRPORT OR THE POSITION TAKEN BY ELMBRIDGE, THE COUNCIL WORK IN PARTNERSHIP WITH HEATHROW AND THE COMMUNITY FORUMS TO ADDRESS THE ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF THE AIRPORT ON THE BOROUGH AND ENCOURAGE THE GOVERNMENT TO ESTABLISH AN INDEPENDENT REGULATOR RESPONSIBLE FOR AIR QUALITY AND NOISE.
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To consider the minute extract from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee regarding the two recommendations from the Constitutional Review Member Working Group meeting held on 21 April 2016.


PLEASE NOTE: whilst the report considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee has not been re-circulated with this agenda, it can be viewed via your iPad by accessing the Overview and Scrutiny Committee agenda for the 20 October 2016.

REPORT:

1. At its meeting on 20 October 2016, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee reconsidered two of the recommendations from the Constitutional Review Member Working Group meeting held on 21 April 2016. The Cabinet is asked to consider the recommendations from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

2. The relevant minute extract from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee is attached at Appendix A.

Financial implications:
As outlined in the agenda for the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Environmental/Sustainability Implications:
As outlined in the agenda for the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Legal implications:
As outlined in the agenda for the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.
Equality Implications:
As outlined in the agenda for the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Risk Implications:
As outlined in the agenda for the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Community Safety Implications:
As outlined in the agenda for the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Principal Consultees:
As outlined in the agenda for the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Background papers:
None

Enclosures/Appendices:
Appendix A – Minute extract from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Contact details:
Beverley Greenstein, Head of Democratic Services
01372 474174, bgreenstein@elmbridge.gov.uk
Minute Extract from the Overview & Scrutiny Committee meeting held on 20 October 2016

RECOMMENDATIONS TO CABINET ON 16 NOVEMBER 2016

28/16 RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE CONSTITUTIONAL REVIEW MEMBER WORKING GROUP MEETING HELD ON 21 APRIL 2016 REFERRED BACK TO THE COMMITTEE BY CABINET FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION

(Link to Council Priorities: All)

Following the outcome of the Electoral Review for Elmbridge and the resultant reduction in the size of the Council, the Constitutional Review Member Working Group (CRMWG) was asked to review the Council’s formal decision making arrangements and consider making recommendations that the Council could implement with effect from the new Municipal Year 2016/17. The Constitutional Review Member Working Group considered a variety of aspects relating to the Council’s decision making arrangements and accordingly a number of recommendations were subsequently considered at the Annual Council meeting held on 18 May 2016.

Whilst the majority of recommendations from the CRMWG were endorsed by the Council for implementation, the recommendations in respect of: an increase in the number of unresolved planning objections, from five to ten objections, that would trigger a planning application to be considered by an Area Planning Sub-Committee; the number of Settlement Areas; and the number of Area Spending Boards were referred to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee for further consideration by Members.

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee had considered these matters at the meeting held in July 2016 and made recommendations to Cabinet in September 2016. At the Cabinet meeting in September, the Overview and Scrutiny recommendation in respect of the increase to the number of unresolved planning objections was not supported and in this regard a revised recommendation was made by Cabinet and subsequently considered at the September Council meeting. In respect of the recommendations for the number of Settlement Areas and the number of Area Spending Boards, Cabinet referred these recommendations back to the Overview and Scrutiny for further consideration.

The Portfolio Holder for Housing who was present at the meeting advised that following discussions with the Planning Policy Manager he proposed that Hersham should be a separate settlement area to Esher. He further commented that there should be no change to the local area spending board recommendation whereby Esher would remain with Hersham in this regard.

The Planning Policy Manager explained that if the settlement areas were not coterminous with the ward boundaries the Council’s statistical data would not synchronise easily with the Government’s. He further commented that the proposal for Hersham as a separate settlement area and for the spending boards to remain the same was a practical way forward.
One Member commented that it was important that these recommendations were resolved as soon as possible given that all Councillors had been notified of a recent Hersham spending board meeting as it remained constituted on the old ward boundary basis. He further commented that it was unacceptable for non Hersham Ward Councillors to be able to discuss where money raised in Hersham should be spent, in his opinion the spending boards ought to solely consist of Councillors from areas that the money was going to be spent. In respect of the proposal for Hersham to become a separate settlement area, in his opinion as long as this was workable, he did not have an issue with it.

One Member raised concern that following the Boundary Review a part of Molesey was now within the Thames Ditton Ward and that a Molesey Councillor would not be in a position to represent former Molesey area residents at the Dittons spending board meetings. The Chairman advised that this had been raised previously and it was envisaged that there was the opportunity for Councillors to liaise with each other in respect of items being considered at the spending board meetings. The Member further enquired whether it was possible for this to be monitored and brought back for discussion if concerns were raised.

One Member commented that as a Councillor they were entitled to have access and read all Committee papers, attend the meeting itself and also, with the permission of the Chairman speak at the meeting. In this regard, a Molesey Councillor could attend a Dittons spending board meeting.

In light of the discussion, one Member proposed an amendment to the existing settlement areas recommendations so that there would be eight settlement areas namely; Claygate; Cobham & Oxshott; Dittons; Molesey; Esher; Hersham; Walton on Thames; and Weybridge which the Committee supported.

With regard to the Local Area Spending Boards it was agreed that no changes be made to the areas previously proposed namely Cobham & Oxshott; Dittons; Molesey; Esher & Hersham; Walton on Thames; and Weybridge.

**RECOMMENDED: THAT**

(A) THERE BE 8 SETTLEMENT AREAS NAMELY, CLAYGATE; COBHAM & OXSHOTT; DITTONS; ESHER; HERSHAM; MOLESEY; WALTON ON THAMES; AND WEYBRIDGE; AND

(B) THERE BE 6 LOCAL AREA SPENDING BOARDS NAMELY COBHAM & OXSHOTT, DITTONS, MOLESEY, ESHER & HERSHAM, WALTON ON THAMES AND WEYBRIDGE.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

This report includes initial Budget proposals for consideration and inclusion in the 2017/18 Budget as part of the Annual Budget setting process.

RECOMMENDED: THAT

(A) CONSIDER AND APPROVE THE BUDGET REDUCTIONS TOTALLING £765,000 FOR INCLUSION IN THE DRAFT BUDGET AND SERVICE PLANS FOR 2017/18;

(B) CONSIDER THE SPENDING PRESSURES IDENTIFIED IN PARAGRAPH 7. TO BE INCLUDED IN THE 2017/18 DRAFT BUDGET;

(C) THE SURPLUS ON THE COLLECTION FUND FOR 2016/17 BE DECLARED AND SPLIT AMONGST THE PRECEPTING AUTHORITIES IN 2017/18 AS REPORTED IN SECTION 11; AND

(D) NOTE THE PROGRESS MADE ON DEVELOPING THE BUDGET POSITION FOR 2017/18.

REPORT:

1. **Key Issues**

1.1 The key issue facing the Council continues to be its ongoing financial sustainability. In December 2015 and in February 2016 the Council received confirmation that 2016/17 would be the last year it would receive Revenue Support Grant (RSG) and that in 2017/18 and 2018/19 it would receive nil RSG. In addition, it was also confirmed that in in 2019/20 there will be a negative adjustment of £1.5m meaning the Council would be expected to pay that sum to the Treasury, effectively making it a “negative RSG”. The table below summaries the funding changes.
The following table sets out the Revenue Support Grant (RSG) as indicated in the finance settlement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RSG (including Support Grant)</td>
<td>1,776</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Grant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative RSG</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-1,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,776</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1,480</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The funding reductions described are one of the main drivers in the projected budget gap reported in February and July this year and would not be sustainable if not addressed.

2. **National Funding Position**

The overall financial situation continues to present the Council with significant challenges and is expected to do so for a number of years. The on-going budget has increasing costs relating to inflation, demand, and service pressures as well as the continued loss of Government grants.

The Council therefore has to continue to plan for several years of financial restraint. The future years’ financial projections in the MTFS include ongoing forecast reductions in Government funding which are expected to continue until at least the end of the decade, with the likelihood that RSG as a funding source disappearing completely.

Other factors that will impact the MTFS include external factors such as the interest base rate which is a major influence on the returns that Council can achieve on investment income and also the cost of borrowing. The base rate after being held at 0.5% since March 2009 decreased to 0.25% post Brexit. It is not currently predicted to increase in the short-term, although there is significant uncertainty over both the timing and extent of any change.

Since the funding settlement was announced there has been the EU Referendum resulting in the Brexit decision followed by key changes. In National Government we now have a new Prime Minister, Chancellor and a Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government. It is not clear at this stage as to what extent these changes will impact on Local Government and the deficit reduction programme.

**Council Tax Levels**

One source of funding for the provision of local services is Council Tax, however despite being a local democratically set tax there continues to be centrally imposed parameters for England. A referendum threshold ‘cap’ continues to apply for 2017/18. However, as part of the finance settlement District Councils were given the freedom to increase Council Tax levels by £5 per annum for the period up to 2019/20.
Given the context of reducing central government funding the Council needs to remain focused on achieving a self-sustaining position by:

- Using economic development and regeneration to encourage growth in the business rates tax base.
- Maximising income streams from Council’s existing assets.
- Generating regular rental stream by investing in Property Assets within the Borough.
- Whilst undertaking engagement with stakeholders and users and taking into account affordability impact on local residents and businesses seeking to maximise income from fees and charges.
- Developing income from alternative or sustainable models of delivery.
- Gradual increases in Council Tax and working within the boundaries set by Government.

3. **UK Economy and Inflation**

The Bank of England cut interest rates to a record low of 0.25% after the country voted to leave the EU.

British inflation after falling to a five-year low of minus 0.1% has steadily increased but remains below the Bank of England’s 2% target. The increase in inflation had been driven mostly by higher commodity prices and the weakening of sterling making imports more expensive.

The two headline inflation measures Retail Price Index (RPI) and Consumer Price Index (CPI) have increased steadily since Brexit. The CPI is the measure which estimates the average price of consumer goods and services purchased by households and the RPI includes the same measures as the CPI, but also includes mortgage interest payments, council tax and some other housing costs not included in CPI.

Minutes of the Bank of England’s September policy meeting, showed Monetary Policy Committee members voted unanimously to maintain the bank rate at 0.25% and continue its Quantitative Easing (QE) programme.

Financial markets are predicting a rate cut by the Bank of England in the last quarter of 2016 to 0.10% with rates then increasing in Quarter 1 of 2018.

The inflation rates do give rise to risks for contract payments, where contractual increases are linked to either CPI, RPI or other specific indices which reflect inflationary type increases.

The CPI has remained below the government’s target rate of 2% since January 2014. The CPI and RPI from January 2014 to September 2016 is set out below for information:
4. Business Rates

The Government has announced that it intends to move to a position where all business rates collected will be retained by the local government sector. This does not mean that each local authority will keep all of the business rates it collects and it has been confirmed that the system of top-ups and tariffs will continue to enable the government to redistribute business rates collected between local authorities nationally.

The current position for Elmbridge is that it collects £54 million of business rates each year but retains approximately £2 million. This figure is then substantially reduced to £0.8m in 2019/20 due to the negative RSG being imposed by DCLG. The consultation on the 100% business rates retention has been concluded and outcome from the responses to the consultation are awaited. It is expected that the new scheme will come into effect in 2019/20 – 2020/21. Based on early indications, Elmbridge’s position is not likely to improve under the new scheme. Officers will report to Members as the Government’s review progresses.

4.1 Business Rates – Pooling & Revaluation

4.2 A system of dealing with income from Business Rates (the business rate retention scheme) was introduced by the Government from April 2013. Under this scheme local authorities are allowed to retain a proportion of the business rates that they collect. However, this system is complex with tariffs, top-ups, safety nets and levies.
4.3 Within this scheme, authorities can formally seek designation as a “pool”. This allows them to “pool” their resources and ensures that they are treated as if they were a single entity for the purposes of calculating tariffs, top-ups, levies and safety net payments. In summary, the main aim of the pool is to maximise the retention of locally generated business rates and to ensure that it further supports the economic regeneration of the area.

4.4 Members will remember that following careful consideration Elmbridge signed up to being part of a Surrey pool along with three other Districts for the year 2015/16 but not for 2016/17. Any additional business rates gained through the pooling arrangement will be for one year only and only be realised in an 18 to 24 months' timeframe. It was also reported to Members that the make-up of the “pool member” was likely to change in the following years, assuming pooling is still available to local authorities.

4.5 In the absence of a clear statement from the Government regarding the continuation of pooling for the year 2017/18, Surrey authorities have been modelling and considering the business rates pooling composition for 2017/18.

4.6 The main aim of the pool is to maximise the retention of locally generated business rates and to ensure that it further supports the economic regeneration of the wider County of Surrey. The modelling work that has been undertaken by the pool demonstrates that financially the County of Surrey would retain a greater share of business rates revenue through pooling then it would otherwise do, as long as it experiences economic growth. This will act as a further incentive for all the pooling authorities to proactively work together to drive economic growth within Surrey and Croydon.

4.7 The new pool for 2017/18 will consist of:

- Surrey County Council
- London Borough of Croydon
- Elmbridge Borough Council
- Guildford Borough Council
- Mole Valley District Council
- Spelthorne Borough Council
- Surrey Heath Borough Council

4.8 Discussions among all of the authorities involved (including those who would find themselves outside of a pool) reached agreement over both the formation of the new pool and the dissolution of the existing pool to enable the new pool’s designation in the wider interest of the whole area.
4.9 There are a number of benefits that accrue from forming a new pool; firstly the pool will reduce the risks to individual authorities from volatility in business rates income and allow pool members to retain more of their income to be used locally; secondly, the pool provides an increased incentive for pool members to support and stimulate economic development within their local area; and finally the pool encourages and strengthens collaborative working with the two LEPs of which Surrey is part to deliver greater business growth in future. Surrey County Council will act as the Lead Authority for the pool.

4.10 The next business rates revaluation will take effect from 1 April 2017. This is intended to be a revenue neutral exercise where local authorities will neither gain nor lose out by changes to the rating valuation of businesses in their areas.

5. New Homes Bonus Grant (NHB)

The Government launched a review and consultation on the future of NHB early this year. The outcome of this consultation was due to be published in the Summer but this has now been delayed. Elmbridge will receive £2.9m of NHB in 2016/17 as the year-6 allocation and this is a very important source of funding for the Council. It is highly likely that the allocation of NHB will be reduced in the future as a large part of it is being top-sliced for the Better Care Fund. Officers will report to Members once the Government's final proposals are known and the impact has been assessed.

6. The Multi-Year Grant Settlement

The offer made by the Government, as part of the Spending Review, is to any Council that wished to take up a four-year funding settlement up to 2019/20. The purpose of this offer is to help local authorities prepare for the move to a more self-sufficient resource base by 2020. The multi-year settlements were intended to provide more funding certainty and stability for the sector that would enable more proactive planning for service delivery.

In September, Members agreed to accept the multi-year settlement and asked Officers to reinforce to the Government the Council’s concerns to the principle of negative RSG being applied in 2019/20. The Efficiency Plan which was a requirement for accepting the settlement together with a covering letter expressing the Council’s concerns were sent by 14 October. Copy of the Efficiency Plan is attached at Appendix A.

7. New Spending Pressures

There have been a number of spending pressures identified in recent months.

The following table provides the updated forecast of the new spending pressures compared to the MTFS which included a provisional figure of £250,000.
## Spending Pressures Forecast 2017/18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homelessness (including B&amp;B)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Rates 2017 Revaluation – Impact on increased BR payable for Council-owned properties</td>
<td>100+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Officer Post</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Reduction by SCC on recycling credits [10% reduction in income from recycling credits and 25% from green waste]</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Income</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Parking Income</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC reduction in Grants for Community Services</td>
<td>75+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Car Parking Concessions</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>630+</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Pensions

In November, we will know the outcome of the triennial actuarial valuation for the Surrey Pension Fund and their assessment as to how the employer contributions should rise over the next three years. The MTFS assumes £240,000 per annum for the next three years.

### Rollout of Universal Credit (UC)

The Government continues to progress the rollout of UC. The rollout is expected to be fully completed by 2018/19 which will result in the loss of funding the Council receives for its efficiency in recovering overpayments. It is difficult to quantify it and officers will report back in February.

### Funding from Surrey County Council

We currently receive circa £800,000 funding from SCC towards services to older people. Early this year, SCC informed that this funding will be reduced by £200,000 over a two-year period. Given the financial position of the County it will be prudent to assume the remainder of the funding will be gradually reduced over the medium term. This will exacerbate our budget deficit over this period and consideration needs to be given as to how we make services to older people more sustainable. Officers will report any developments on this funding situation in February.

In addition, there are early indications that there will be price hikes due to currency fluctuations following the Brexit decision. This is relevant for ICT related expenditure and construction and building related work.
Officers are also monitoring the position relating to the Council’s income streams. The Cabinet will be updated later in the year should a variation to the 2017/18 budget position be required.

8. **Progress on 2017/18 Budget**

8.1 **Preparation of Revenue Budgets**

Cabinet received a report in July 2016 outlining the management’s approach to identifying the required savings and budget reductions of £1.7 million to meet the 2017/18 budget requirement.

The overarching priority continues to be to maintain existing services. This requires Managers to give careful consideration to operational practices and running costs and to deliver efficiency savings whilst minimising any adverse impact on services to our residents.

The Council is determined to spend Council taxpayers’ money prudently and in a manner that is both fair and protects the services that matter to local people.

9. **Review of Fees & Charges**

A review of all charges should be undertaken regularly to ensure they are consistent with the Council’s priorities and take account of service objectives, market sensitivity, customer preferences and income generation needs.

The setting of appropriate fees & charges should be an integral part of service planning and improvement. Income from fees & charges is based on estimated demand and fees charged for various services and any proposals will be considered during the year.

Fees & charges for services within Community Support Services was considered by Cabinet in October.

Fees & charges for Leisure Services will be reported to Cabinet in January.
10. **2017/18 Budget Target Update**

The Budget Strategy Report in July this year outlined the Budget position for 2017/18 and the Budget Reduction Target of £1.7m set across the Council. The current budget position compared to the February and July MTFS is as follows:

**Budget Savings Proposals – 2017/18**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>£'000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joint Waste Contract Saving</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel/Payroll Outsourcing</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retendering CCTV Monitoring Contract</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared ICT Service with Epsom and Ewell</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charging for street naming and numbering</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in CARE and HP fees [mainly paid from government grant]</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings from partnership work with SCC on Internal Audit provision</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of ICT Network Services to Spelthorne BC</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roundabout Sponsorship</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Expenditure Savings with no impact on Service Provision</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>765</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2017/18 Budget Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Feb/July 2016 £'000</th>
<th>Nov 2016 £'000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Expenditure Budget</strong></td>
<td>17,911</td>
<td>17,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflation on contracts and Pay (provisional)</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension Contributions (provisional)</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spending Pressures</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Changes – Apprenticeship Levy/HB admin grant</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Forecast net cost of services</strong></td>
<td>19,036</td>
<td>19,416</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Funding Available**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Feb/July 2016 £'000</th>
<th>Nov 2016 £'000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business Rates retained</td>
<td>(2,173)</td>
<td>(2,173)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formula Grant Transition Grant</td>
<td>(190)</td>
<td>(190)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection Fund Surplus</td>
<td>(200)</td>
<td>(210)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Rates Surplus</td>
<td>(250)</td>
<td>(250)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Tax Income (based on a 2% increase)</td>
<td>(13,313)</td>
<td>(13,313)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Reserves</td>
<td>(915)</td>
<td>(915)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(17,041)</td>
<td>(17,051)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget Gap/Shortfall in Funding</strong></td>
<td>1,995</td>
<td>2,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved increase in Fees &amp; Charges</td>
<td>(250)</td>
<td>(250)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved Budget Savings Proposals – November Cabinet</td>
<td></td>
<td>(765)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional income from increase in Council Tax base</td>
<td></td>
<td>tbc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget Gap with 2% CT increase</strong></td>
<td>1,745</td>
<td>1,350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over the next few months’ officers will firm up these figures and continue to identify further budget reductions whilst work continues on developing the 2017/18 budget and service plans. Cabinet and Council will receive the final proposals in February 2017.

11. **Formal Disclosure of Collection Fund Surplus**

11.1 The estimated surplus on the Collection Fund for 2016/17 is £1,722,373. This surplus arises from:

- Surplus brought forward higher than estimated for 2015/16 £ 263,000
- Income in excess of non-collection allowance £1,459,373

11.2 **Treatment of Surpluses**

Surpluses (or deficits) on the Collection Fund are required to be paid over to (or paid by) all of the major precepting authorities in proportion to their precepts in the area for the year of account. Any declared surpluses must be applied to reduce the overall level of Council Tax in the forthcoming year.
11.3 The split of the overall surplus is therefore as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elmbridge Borough Council</td>
<td>210,968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey Police</td>
<td>223,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey County Council</td>
<td>1,287,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1,722,373</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Borough’s £210,968 share of the surplus will be applied to reduce the overall level of the 2017/18 council tax. It should be noted that the MTFS already included an estimated £200,000 for the Borough’s share of the surplus.

11.4 Explanation of Collection Fund Surplus

The 2016/17 Budget was based on a net collectable debit of £106.2m. Given an estimated non-collection allowance of 1.7% to reflect anticipated losses, a surplus of around £1.8m would be expected.

12. Capital Programme

12.1 Each year the Council approves a three-year Capital Programme and full Council in February 2016 approved a three-year rolling Programme. Further additions to the Capital Programme will require the approval of Full Council. New schemes will need to specifically consider alternative funding options, taking into account the cost of capital reserves and the impact on the revenue budget.

12.2 The Capital Programme consists mainly of capital expenditure on our assets, information technology, leisure, replacement vehicles and housing. The funding required from the Condition Survey of Council’s car parks recently undertaken will need to be included in the Capital Programme.

12.3 The revenue implications of funding the Capital Programme can have implications for the Council’s MTFS. It is important that accurate projections of capital financing costs are made because they can have a significant impact on the revenue budget.

12.4 Officers are being asked to undertake a thorough review of current and future years spend projections and proposals for 2017/18 – 2019/20 will be reported in February 2017.

Financial implications:

Whilst the multi-year settlement gives a fair amount of certainty to plan ahead for the next couple of years, the uncertainty over SCC grant funding and the negative RSG proposed in 2019/20 will result in a very challenging financial position for the Council.

Providing services within budget and the achievement of approved savings are key responsibilities of budget managers.
Environmental/Sustainability Implications:
None for the purpose of this report.

Legal implications:
None for the purpose of this report.

Equality Implications:
As in previous years, impact assessments will be completed for budget proposals and departmental service plans.

Risk Implications:
Risk implications are stated throughout the report. The strategic risk register continues to reflect the increasing uncertainty of future government funding. It is a statutory requirement to set a balanced budget for 2017/18 by March 2017.

Community Safety Implications:
There are no direct community safety implications as part of this report.

Principal Consultees:
Corporate Management Board
Portfolio Holder for Resources

Background papers:
None for the purpose of this report.

Enclosures/Appendices:
Appendix A: EBC Efficiency Plan.

Contact details:
Strategic Director & Deputy Chief Executive, 01372 474100
sselvanathan@elmbridge.gov.uk
Head of Finance, 01372 474123 acooper@elmbridge.gov.uk
Elmbridge Borough Council Efficiency Plan 2016 - 2020

This Plan is drawn from principles agreed in the Council’s Medium Term Financial Strategy approved in February 2016. This takes account of the current savings initiatives designed to deliver a balanced budget over this period. Accepting the Government’s four-year settlement offer will underpin the efficiency plan by providing greater financial certainty over the period of the plan including decisions about use of reserves and levels of Council Tax increases.

The Council has seen significant year-on-year funding reductions since 2010, with Formula Grant falling from £6.4 million in 2010/11 to RSG of 0.6 million (90% reduction), and projected to be completely eliminated by 2017/18. In addition, the Council is expected to pay a “negative RSG” of £1.5 million (65% of our retained Business Rates share) in 2019/20.

As a result of this the Council faces a significant challenge in addressing its forecasted budget deficit over the next four years in an environment where there is considerable uncertainty and increasing levels of risk. The Council will have to adopt a balanced approach to addressing the projected £5 million budget shortfall over the four-year period.

The Council, through excellent financial management and clear political decision making and prioritisation and no council tax increase for seven out of nine years, has managed to cope well with the impact of the deficit reduction.

Elmbridge Borough Council has a strong track record of delivering savings. The Council has a strong track record of sound financial management, a view endorsed by the Audit Commission and affirmed by the current External Auditors, Grant Thornton. The Council has relatively low staffing levels and has outsourced services such as Waste Collection, Street Cleaning and Grounds Maintenance. In addition, there are a number of joint posts with other authorities in Surrey enabling us to deliver efficiencies.

Savings of £10 million has already been achieved over a 7-year period. However, there is recognition that freezing council tax is not sustainable in the longer term even more so with the funding reductions announced in December 2015.

Financial constraints facing local authorities are very challenging and, in order to contain expenditure within available resources, it is expected that some difficult decisions will have to be made. However, within the tight overall constraints, there are real opportunities for the Council to direct its resources towards local priorities and to transform services.

The MTFS also includes the use of a reasonable level of reserves over the medium term. However, it is recognised that any organisation, whether private or public sector, can only achieve a finite level of efficiency savings, or use up its finite cash reserves, before it has to consider reductions of service standards or service volumes.

Resident perceptions of the services provided by the Council are measured through the Elmbridge Residents’ Panel surveys and previously through BVPI/Place Survey. Eighty-eight per cent (88%) of residents said they were satisfied with the way Elmbridge runs its services. Seventy-five per cent (75%) of residents agreed that the Council provides value for money for the services for which it is responsible.
Our high level strategy for becoming self-financing organisation is in four key areas:

- **Transformation** – continue with the digitalisation of customer contact and challenge systems and processes, with a focus on digital by design approach.
- **Major Contracts** – reviewing our major contracts and ways to procure jointly to achieve savings and improvements.
- **Income** – increased income from Business Rates and Council Tax as well as new sources of income from commercial property investment and good management of existing fees and charges income.
- **Regeneration and Economic development** – ambitious plan for regeneration and investing in local businesses will result in direct financial benefits through growth in Business Rates, Council Tax and New Homes Bonus.

The MTFS approved by Council in February included some estimates for savings and additional income. They are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017/18</th>
<th>2018/19</th>
<th>2019/20</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget Deficit</strong></td>
<td>1,745</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>2,370</td>
<td>4,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Savings yet to be identified and realised</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings from contracts</td>
<td>(500)</td>
<td>(300)</td>
<td>(200)</td>
<td>(1,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other income (Planning, Property etc.)</td>
<td>(200)</td>
<td>(200)</td>
<td>(200)</td>
<td>(600)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin and Efficiency savings –staffing</td>
<td>(200)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>(400)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings/Income to be identified</td>
<td>(845)</td>
<td>(240)</td>
<td>(1,870)</td>
<td>(2,955)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Purpose of Efficiency Plan**

- Provide a high level framework for addressing the projected budget shortfall in the medium term.
- Demonstrate that sufficient resources will be available to meet the Council’s priorities.
- Plan ahead to the longer term to protect and help plan sustainable services within an extremely challenging external economic and funding environment.
- Strengthen Elmbridge’s financial resilience and manage volatility and risk, including maintaining an adequate level of reserves.
- Secure, maintain and develop Elmbridge’s capital assets consistent with the Asset Management Plan.
- Anticipate financial pressures and identify potential ways to balance the budget shortfall which includes the efficiency measures.

The Council recognises that its ability to continue to deliver the full range of front line services will depend on its ability to generate new funding streams, manage costs and improve the way that the residents access services whilst supporting the vulnerable.

**Managing Financial Risk and Uncertainty**

As the Council's funding becomes increasingly reliant on local sources and exposed to greater fluctuations, it is increasingly important to have appropriate strategies for managing any impact. The Council has identified the main areas of risk as:

- Reducing business rates yield.
- Falling income from services due to changes in demand and other external barriers.
- Rising costs of maintaining aging assets.
- Rising demand and expectation of core services.
- New and extended legal duties.
- Future of New Homes Bonus funding.
Business Rates funding share.

To manage the impact of a reducing business rates yield, the Council has:

- Strengthened staff resources towards debt collection and enforcement.
- Worked with the District Valuer and partners to try and develop reliable forecasts of business rates valuation changes.
- Reviewed the benefits and risks of “pooling” with neighbouring authorities for 2017/18.
- Invested in our local businesses

Key actions in Efficiency plan

- Agree to the four-year grant offer from government to reduce uncertainty in this element of general fund income for the next four years.
- Review level and use of reserves and balances in the light of the greater certainty on grant funding for the next three years.
- Optimising return on cash surplus in times of low interest rates, balancing security, liquidity and return.
- Continue to use existing assets more effectively, releasing space which can generate rental income.
- Continue to invest selectively in Property Acquisitions within the Borough which not only strengthens financial resilience but also contributes to the economic wellbeing of the Borough.
- Undertake a review of capital spending plans to ensure a sustainable business case with affordable capital programmes.
- Review Partnerships and funding to Voluntary sector, strengthen service level agreements and encourage volunteering to support local community services.
- Maximise invest to save opportunities to generate income, improve processes and make savings.
- Use digital technology to speed processes and make it more efficient for the end user.
- Secure new funding opportunities or alternate delivery vehicles to deliver services.
- Optimise efficiency savings by jointly procuring for services.
- Enhance the provision of customer services by effective use of technology to align with our resident needs and accessibility requirements.

By implementing a combination of the above Elmbridge Borough Council will look to have a balanced budget for the period of the medium term financial strategy (MTFS). Reserves will be cautiously used given the uncertainty over the outcome of the 100% Business Rates retention.

The External Auditors in their Audit findings report in September, stated “The Council will have to ensure adequate level of reserves are held in the medium term financial planning period to address any negative fluctuations in funding”.

External Auditors also went on to say “we are satisfied that in all significant aspects the Authority has put in place proper arrangements to secure value for money through economic, efficient and effective use of its resources for the year ended 31 March 2016”.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

To consider the report of the Independent Remuneration Panel on the Council’s scheme for Members’ Allowances, in accordance with Government regulations and guidance for Local Authority Members’ Allowances Schemes.

RECOMMENDED: THAT

(A) CABINET CONSIDERS THE PANEL’S RECOMMENDATION TO SET THE BASIC ALLOWANCE AT £4,942 PLUS INDEXATION IN LINE WITH OFFICERS’ PAY AWARD;

(B) CABINET CONSIDER THE APPROPRIATE LEVEL OF THE SPECIAL RESPONSIBILITY ALLOWANCE AS SET OUT IN PARAGRAPH 4;

(C) INDEXATION IS APPLIED TO THE ALLOWANCES ON THE BASIS OF THE OFFICERS PAY AWARD;

(D) THE TRAVEL ALLOWANCES SHOULD BE SET AT THE SAME LEVELS AS HMRC LEVEL USED FOR DEFINING A NON-TAXABLE BENEFIT;

(E) CABINET CONSIDERS CONTINUING THE ONE SPECIAL RESPONSIBILITY ALLOWANCE ONLY RULE.

REPORT:

1. Introduction

1.1 The Local Government Act 2000 requires each local authority to establish and maintain an Independent Remuneration Panel for the purpose of considering a scheme for the payment of Members’ Allowances.

1.2 The Government issued Statutory Guidance which provides for each local authority to decide its scheme and the amounts to be paid under that scheme. The Local Authorities’ (Members’ Allowances) (Miscellaneous Provisions) Regulations 2001 require councils to establish and maintain a Remuneration Panel. This Panel has the function of providing the local authority with advice on its scheme, the amounts to be paid and the pensionability of allowances where relevant. Local authorities must have regard to this advice.
1.3 The Government’s intention is that the approach should be one where questions raised as to the amounts payable to Members are matters for local determination. In this way, the Government intends that local authorities can take full account of their particular circumstances, including the precise form of their constitution, and be directly accountable to their electorate. This accountability is sharpened through each Council being advised on its own allowances scheme by a local panel whose members are required to be independent.

1.4 A Members’ Allowances scheme aligned with the Council’s new Constitution, to operate with effect from May 2001, was duly approved by the Council in April 2001.

2. Appointment of the Panel

2.1 In 2014 the Independent Remuneration Panel has the following as its membership:-

   Chairman: Mark Palmer (South East Employers)

   Dennis Frost (who has lived in Elmbridge for over 25 years and is a retired Local Government Officer)

   Choudhury Ahmed (Doctor by profession, who has lived in Elmbridge for over 20 years)

   Gordon Manickam (local resident and Assistant Director, Regulatory Policy Committee).

3. Independent Remuneration Panel Reports and Current Allowances Scheme

3.1 The Council has previously considered fifteen reports from the Independent Remuneration Panel. The last report was submitted to the Council in November 2014.

3.2 The Panel has undertaken a full review of the Members’ allowances scheme for 2016/17 having regard to the Boundary Commission review which reduced the number of Members from 60 to 48.

3.3 The Panel last undertook a full review of all Members’ allowances payable in September 2012.

4. Recommendation of the Independent Remuneration Panel 2016:

4.1 Cabinet considers the panel’s recommendation to increase the basic allowance to £4,942 plus indexation linked to staff pay increases;

4.2 Cabinet consider the appropriate level of the responsibility allowances as set out in the report of the Independent Remuneration Panel (Appendix A).
4.3 The rational for the value of the allowances are set out in the report of the IRP and specifically the interrelationship of the allowances (eg a percentage of the Leader’s allowance, however, there are some specific recommendations which may be of note:

i That the SRA for the Chairman of Licensing should be reduced from £3,590 to £2,471 [20% of Leader’s allowance] with the Vice Chairman reduced to £618 reflecting the reduction in the number of scheduled meetings.

ii The SRA of the Principle Opposition Group Leader should be £2,471 [20% of the Leaders allowance] reflecting the significant responsibilities of the role.

iii That the Leader of Groups with less than 10% of total Members should be withdrawn (5 members) with Leaders of Groups with more than 10% receiving an SRA of £1,236 [50% of the Principle Opposition Group Leader].

iv That basic Dependent Carers Allowance should be reimbursed at £8.25 per hour (on the production of receipts) but that specialist care should be reimbursed at actual costs (on the production of receipts and evidence that this type of care is required).

4.4 The travel allowances should continue to be set at the same levels as HMRC level used for now taxable benefit (currently 45p per mile).

4.5 Cabinet continues to support the one Special Responsibility Allowance rule.

5. Publicity

5.1 The 2001 Regulations place certain duties on local authorities in connection with publicising the recommendations made by their Independent Remuneration Panel, their scheme of allowances and the actual allowances paid to Members in any given year.

5.2 The Regulations require that as soon as reasonably practicable after receiving a report from their panel which sets out the Panel’s recommendations, local authorities must ensure that copies of the report are available for inspection at their principal office at all reasonable hours. Local authorities must also, as soon as reasonably practicable after receiving a report from their Panel, publish a notice in at least one newspaper circulating in their area giving details of the availability of the report and the Panel’s recommendations. Local authorities are also required to repeat this process as soon as reasonably practicable after determining a scheme of allowances.

5.3 The Guidance states that all of these publicity requirements are statutory minimum requirements, and that local authorities should publicise more widely the report from their Panel, their scheme of allowances and the sums paid to each Member. This should include publishing the information on their website and in the Council’s own newspaper/magazine.
**Financial implications:**
The Council in setting its Members Allowances Scheme must have regard to the recommendations of the Independent Remuneration Panel. The effect of the recommendations on the Council’s budget are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£'000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase in Basic Allowance (from £4,395 to £4,942)</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Responsibility Allowances – Leader &amp; Cabinet Portfolio Holders (the 2016/17 budget allows for 9 portfolio holders)</td>
<td>(5.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Responsibility Allowances – Other</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members’ Pensions – Legislative Change Removing Entitlement</td>
<td>(6.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Insurance Contribution Increase as a result of the changes in allowances</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Additional Cost</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total effect of the above for budgeting purposes is £18,800 (excludes any reductions for the one SRA rule) and can be contained within the 2017/18 strategy for pay and price increases.

**Environmental/Sustainability Implications:**
None for the purpose of this report.

**Legal implications:**
A requirement to appoint an Independent Remuneration Panel and consider its recommendations under the Local Authorities (Members’ Allowances) (Miscellaneous Provisions) Regulations 2001 and related Guidance.

**Equality Implications:**
None for the purpose of this report.

**Risk Implications:**
By linking the Members’ Allowances to the pay award for staff on local pay, which the council approves, there is some reputational risk with Members in effect approving an increase in their allowances.

**Community Safety Implications:**
None for the purpose of this report.
**Principal Consultees:**
Council Management Board.

**Background papers:**

**Enclosures/Appendices:**
- Appendix B: Independent Remuneration Panel Members’ Allowances – Questionnaire

**Contact details:**
- Head of Finance – 01372 474123
  acooper@elmbridge.gov.uk
- Principal Committee & Member Services Officer – 01372 474175
  thulse@elmbridge.gov.uk
A Review of Members’ Allowances for Elmbridge Borough Council

Report of the Independent Remuneration Panel

19th & 20th September 2016

2 CROWN WALK, JEWRY STREET,
WINCHESTER
HANTS,
SO23 8BB
1. Introduction

The Independent Remuneration Panel was convened to undertake a full review of Members’ Allowances. The review was undertaken and the Panel convened in accordance with The Local Authorities (Members Allowances) (England) Regulations (SI 1021) (2003 Regulations).

The Panel met on 19th and 20th September 2016 and membership of the panel was:-

Choudhury Ahmed, Doctor and local resident
Dennis Frost, Local Government Officer (Retired) and local resident
Gordon Manickam, Assistant Director, Regulatory Policy Committee and local resident
Mark Palmer, Development Director, South East Employers (Panel Chairman)

A questionnaire was sent out to all Members prior to the review and we interviewed 7 Members and 3 Officers. Fourteen of the 48 Members of the Council completed the questionnaire, a copy is attached as Appendix 1. A comprehensive analysis of the questionnaire is attached as Appendix 3.

The Panel would like to thank the Members who completed the questionnaire as well as the Members and the Officers we interviewed during the process. We have taken account of the views expressed to us by those Members and would like to thank them for their assistance in this review.

Additionally the Panel was assisted and supported throughout by Tracey Hulse (Principal Committee and Member Services Officer). We would also like to thank all the officers involved for their help and support.

Other information at our disposal included previous Reports of the Independent Remuneration Panel, the current Scheme of Members’ Allowances and key member role profiles.

We also had the benefit of the Members’ Allowance Survey for District and Borough Councils in the South East published by South East Employers in September 2016. The Survey has been used to support benchmarking and for this purpose we have used the Surrey district and borough Councils as the benchmark group

Comprehensive details of the allowances in these Councils are attached as Appendix 2.

2. Terms of Reference

Our terms of reference were to undertake a full review of Members’ Allowances for Elmbridge Borough Council and to make recommendations as to the level of the Basic Allowance and of Special Responsibility Allowances for the year 2016/2017 and beyond
for a maximum 4 year period. The review also included the Dependents’ Carers’ Allowance and the scheme for travelling and subsistence.

3. **The Deliberations of the Panel**

The Panel was informed that since the last meeting of the Panel on the 24th September 2014 the Boundary Commission for England had undertaken a review that had led to a recommendation to reduce the number of Members from 60 to 48. This change took effect from May 2016. There have been no further changes made to the governance structure or the size and terms of reference of the Cabinet and other Committees.

A key role of the Panel is to recommend a scheme of allowances which recognises both Members’ responsibilities and workloads. However, the Panel was mindful of the Council’s continued financial constraints when making its recommendations.

To develop a structured approach in determining allowances the Panel has used transparent formula and methodology for calculating the Basic Allowance and the Special Responsibility Allowances.

4. **Basic Allowance**

The Basic Allowance for Elmbridge Borough Council has not changed since at least 2005 except for some intermittent indexation increases based on staff salary increases. In September 2007 the IRP recommended a Basic Allowance of £4,120, the present level of Basic Allowance is £4,395. The Panel when reviewing previous reports and recommendations could find no structured and coherent formula for calculating the Basic Allowance and was of the view that a structured formula for calculating the Basic Allowance will provide a foundation to allow a future Panel to better determine the allowance and also provide a transparent formula for how the Basic Allowance was arrived at.

In determining a formula, the Panel chose median hourly earnings for the South East of England area as a place of residence. This information is published by the Office for National Statistics each December as part of its National Statistics of Hours and Earnings (NOMIS) and in December 2015 this was **£14.62 per hour**.

The results of the Members’ Allowances questionnaire and subsequent interviews conducted as part of the review, identified that 12 to 13 hours per week for the Front Line Councillor role for Elmbridge Borough Council was appropriate. The average national weekly hours based on the LGA Councillor Census was between 10 to 15 hours. The Panel therefore chose **13 hours** to support the calculation of the Basic Allowance.

The Panel also looked at the level of the Public Service Discount (PSD). The PSD is the element of a Members activity that should be given on a purely voluntary basis. The questionnaire responses had varying differences ranging from 0% to 80%, the average
across the South East region is 35-50%. The Panel was of the view that a level of 50% should represent the level of recommended “Public Service Discount”.

Based on these figures the level of Basic Allowance for Members of the Council can be calculated as 13 hours x 52 weeks x £14.62 per hour - 50% Public Service Discount which gives a annual Basic Allowance of £4,942.

The Panel Report of September 2014 made reference to the level of Basic Allowance and the fact that 60% of Members responding to the Questionnaire stated that the Basic Allowance was too low. In September 2014, Elmbridge BC ranked fifth in the level of Basic Allowance across the Surrey district/borough councils; currently Elmbridge BC is within a lower range (7th position) of the Basic Allowances paid within the benchmark group of Councils. Even after this recommended change to the Basic Allowance, Elmbridge BC will be at the mid point (5th position) of Basic Allowances across the benchmark Councils.

**Benchmark Councils- Basic Allowance (September 2016)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council</th>
<th>Basic Allowances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Woking BC</td>
<td>£7,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guildford BC</td>
<td>£6,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelthorne BC</td>
<td>£5,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reigate &amp; Banstead BC</td>
<td>£5,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey Heath BC</td>
<td>£4,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waverley BC</td>
<td>£4,619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elmbridge BC</strong></td>
<td><strong>£4,395</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Recommendation £4,942)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mole Valley DC</td>
<td>£4,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tandridge DC</td>
<td>£4,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epsom &amp; Ewell BC</td>
<td>£3,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runnymede BC</td>
<td>£3,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>£4,893</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDATION: The Basic Allowance for Members of Elmbridge Borough Council for the year 2017/2018 should be £4,942 subject to any indexation.

5. Special Responsibility Allowances

The Panel have largely used the same methodology for our recommendations as those currently in place.

We do, however, for ease of reference, set out on page 9 the current allowances and the level of allowances the IRP recommends for 2017/18. All the SRAs with the exception of the Leader of the Council and Vice Chairmen are calculated as a percentage of the Leaders Allowance.

In determining which roles merit an SRA (Special Responsibility Allowance) the Panel was cognisant of the 2006 Statutory Guidance (May 2006, paragraphs 70 and 73) that states:

“SRAs may be paid to those members of the council who have significant additional responsibilities over and above the generally accepted duties of a councillor. These special responsibilities must be related to the discharge of the authority’s functions.”

When considering all the current roles at Elmbridge Borough Council that receive an SRA the Panel was of the view that all except one role continue to involve a "significant additional responsibility" that will lead them to continue to attract an SRA.

Leader of the Council

In arriving at an indicative SRA for the Leader, the Panel has used a methodology that is specifically mentioned in the 2006 Statutory Guidance, namely the factor approach. This multiplies the Basic Allowance by an accepted factor to arrive at the recommended Leader’s SRA. Benchmarking shows that the average SRA for a South East council Leader is just below three times the Basic Allowance. The Panel are therefore proposing a factor of 2.5 times the Basic Allowance for the Leader of the Council – 2.5 x £4,942 = £12,355.

The following SRAs referred to are where the Panel are making recommendations that lead to a significant change to the amount payable to the existing allowance and for new roles that will attract an allowance. The Panel also makes a recommendation to withdraw one allowance.

Chairman and Vice Chairman of Licensing

At the September 2014 Independent Remuneration Panel the Panel recommended a reduction in the SRA for the Chairman and Vice Chairman of Licensing. The Chairman’s allowance was recommended to be reduced from £4,075 to £3,590 and it was also recommended that the Vice Chairman’s Allowance was reduced from £930 to £800. The key reason for the reduction was that the number and frequency of meetings of the
Licensing Committee had fallen. During the last two years the number of Committee meetings has continued to fall and just 4 meetings are now scheduled on an annual basis. The Panel was of the view that the SRAs for the Chairman and Vice Chairman of Licensing should be further reduced.

**RECOMMENDATION:** The Panel recommends that the SRA for Chairman of Licensing should be reduced from £3,590 to £2,471 this equates to 20% of the recommended Leaders Allowance. The SRA for Vice Chairman of Licensing should be reduced to £618, being 25% of the Chairman of Licensing allowance.

**Leader of the Principal Opposition Group**
The role of principal opposition group leader is an important role to support local democracy and local democratic accountability. The opposition group leader also has to manage and develop the political group so that it can undertake the roles and responsibilities of a main opposition group.

Elmbridge Borough Council currently remunerates the Minority Leaders of Groups with at least 10% of Members an SRA of £500.

The Panel was of the view that the Leader of the Principal Opposition Group should receive a dedicated allowance based on a percentage of the Leader’s allowance to be consistent with the calculation of all other SRAs below Leader. The Panel was of the view that the Principal Opposition Group Leader did have significant responsibilities.

**RECOMMENDATION:** The SRA for Principal Opposition Group Leader should be £2,471, being 20% of the proposed Leader’s allowance.

**Leader of a Minority Group with at Least 10% of Total Members**
Currently Elmbridge BC remunerates Leaders of minority Groups with less than 10% of Members with an SRA of £125. The Panel was of the view that this allowance should be withdrawn and that only group leaders overseeing groups with at least 10% of total members (5 Members and above) should receive an SRA. This SRA should also be calculated as a percentage of the Leaders Allowance.

**RECOMMENDATION:** The SRA for Leaders of Groups with less than 10% of total Members should be withdrawn and the Leaders of Groups with 10% plus of total Members should receive an SRA of £1,236, 10% of the proposed Leaders Allowance.

**Chairman of Audit and Standards**
The panel was of the view that the Audit and Standards Committee continues to be an active committee with a high level of internal impact. The Panel recommends that the allowance continue to be at 30% of the proposed Leaders Allowance.

**RECOMMENDATION:** The SRA for Chairman of Audit and Standards should be 30% of the proposed Leaders Allowance, £3,707.
Currently Elmbridge BC has 25 roles that receive an SRA across 48 Members (52% of Members). Because of the ‘One SRA Only Rule’ seven of these SRA roles are not remunerated.

Good practice referred to in the Members Allowances Regulations is that no more than 50% of roles should receive an SRA, within Elmbridge Borough Council, 52% Members could conceivably receive an SRA. This position has more than likely arisen as a consequence of the number of Members having been reduced from 60 to 48 without any corresponding reduction in the number of roles that attract an SRA; this is a result of no changes to the governance and committee structure having been made.

RECOMMENDATION: The SRAs for 2017/18 to be in accordance with those listed on page 9 of the report

6. Dependants’ Carers’ Allowance

Currently Elmbridge Borough Council offers a Dependants’ Carers’ Allowance (DCA) at a rate linked to the Living Wage although take up has always been low. The Local Government Act 2000 explicitly clarifies the right of local authorities to pay a DCA, which members can claim to assist them with the costs of care for their dependants while undertaking approved Council duties.

The Panel was of the view that the Dependants’ Carers’ Allowance was important and should continue to be recommended. The Panel was also of the view that there were different types of care required ranging from basic - care e.g. babysitting to very specialist care for adults and children. The actual cost of this care differed significantly therefore the Panel recommend that there should be two distinct classifications of supported care, basic and specialist care.

RECOMMENDATION: In respect of basic care the Panel recommends that the Dependants’ Carers’ Allowance should be reimbursed to a maximum of £8.25 per hour upon production of receipts. This rate will be linked to the National Living Wage determined by the Living Wage Foundation and reviewed on an annual basis.

In respect of more specialist care this should be reimbursed at the actual cost upon production of receipts. In the case of reimbursement for specialist care, medical evidence that this type of care is required must also be provided.
7. **Travel and Subsistence**

The Council currently pays mileage allowances based on the HMRC rates.

**RECOMMENDATION:** The Council continue to adopt the HMRC rates for calculating reimbursement of Members mileage.

Any subsistence payments should be in accordance with those paid to Officers of the Council.

8. **Index Linking**

The index linking of the Basic Allowance is currently linked to staff pay increases.

The Panel is of the view that any future index linking of the Basic Allowance and the Special Responsibility Allowances should continue to be at the rate of increase in staff salaries.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Any index linkage agreed by the Council should be in line with staff salary increases for a maximum of four years from 2017/2018 to 2021/2022.

9. **The One SRA Only Rule**

The 2003 Members’ Allowances Regulations do not limit the number of SRAs an individual Member can receive. Nevertheless, it is common and established good practice in most councils to have a ‘One SRA only’ rule set out in their allowances schemes. The Panel was pleased to see that the Elmbridge Borough Council Members’ Allowances Scheme now includes the ‘One SRA Only Rule’

10. **Implementation of Recommendations**

As permitted by the 2003 Members’ Allowances Regulations (paragraph 10.6) it is recommended that the new Members’ Allowances as set out in this report be implemented by April 2017

Mark Palmer  
Chairman of the Independent Remuneration Panel  
October 2016
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>CURRENT ALLOWANCES £</th>
<th>2017/2018 RECOMMENDATIONS £</th>
<th>RATIONALE &amp; METHODOLOGY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic Allowance</td>
<td>4,395 (48)</td>
<td>4,942 (48)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader Of The Council</td>
<td>12,240</td>
<td>12,355</td>
<td>2.5 x Basic Allowance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabinet Members</td>
<td>6,120 (9)</td>
<td>6,178 (9)</td>
<td>50% of Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman of Overview and Scrutiny</td>
<td>6,120</td>
<td>6,178</td>
<td>50% of Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chairman of Overview and Scrutiny</td>
<td>3,060</td>
<td>3,089</td>
<td>50% of Chairman’s Allowance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman Of Planning Committee</td>
<td>5,100</td>
<td>5,560</td>
<td>45% of Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chairman Of Planning Committee</td>
<td>1,163</td>
<td>1,390</td>
<td>25% of Chairman’s Allowance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairmen Of Area Planning Sub Committees</td>
<td>4,075 (3)</td>
<td>4,324 (3)</td>
<td>35% of Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chairman Of Area Planning Sub Committees</td>
<td>930 (3)</td>
<td>1,081 (3)</td>
<td>25% of Chairman’s Allowance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman of Licensing Committee</td>
<td>3,590</td>
<td>2,471</td>
<td>20% of Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chairman of Licensing Committee</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>25% of Chairman’s Allowance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman of Audit and Standards Committee</td>
<td>3,662</td>
<td>3,707</td>
<td>30% of Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Opposition Group Leader</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2,471</td>
<td>20% of Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders of Opposition Group with 10% Plus of Total Members</td>
<td>500 (2)</td>
<td>1,236 (1)</td>
<td>10% of Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders of Opposition Group with less than 10% of Total Members</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Allowance withdrawn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost*</td>
<td>317,915</td>
<td>348,108</td>
<td>+30,193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
* Based on all 48 Members receiving the Basic Allowance and all SRAs paid.

The Panel recommendations will lead to an increase in the annual cost of all allowances of £30,193. However, when the number of Council Members was reduced from 60 to 48 this led to savings in respect of the Basic Allowance of £52,740. The Panel recommendations will therefore still result in savings of £22,547.

Summary of Recommendations:-

a) The appropriate levels of Basic Allowance and Special Responsibility Allowances for 2017 / 2018 are as set out on page 9 of the report.

b) The Dependants’ Carers’ Allowance should be re-prioritised as basic and specialist care.

c) The SRA for Leader of an Opposition Group with less than 10% of Members should be withdrawn.

d) An SRA for Principal or Main Opposition Group Leader should be introduced.

e) Index linking for the Allowances should be at the same rate as that applied to staff salaries for the year 2017 / 2018 for a maximum of four years.
MEMBERS AND OFFICERS OF ELMBRIDGE BOROUGH COUNCIL INTERVIEWED BY THE INDEPENDENT REMUNERATION PANEL 19 & 20TH SEPTEMBER 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Tim Oliver</td>
<td>Leader of Conservative Group and Chairman of Overview and Scrutiny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Simon Foale</td>
<td>Vice Chairman of audit and Standards Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Roy Green</td>
<td>Cabinet Portfolio for Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Shweta Kapadia</td>
<td>Chairman of East Area Planning Sub Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Barry Cheyne</td>
<td>Chairman of South Area Planning Sub Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Mary Sheldon</td>
<td>Chairman of the North Area Planning Sub Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Stuart Selleck</td>
<td>Leader of the Council and Group Leader of the Residents Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Moran</td>
<td>Chief Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Selvanathan</td>
<td>Strategic Director and Deputy Chief Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverley Greenstein</td>
<td>Head of Democratic Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Independent Remuneration Panel

Members’ Allowances Questionnaire 2016

It will greatly assist the Independent Remuneration Panel undertaking the review of Members’ Allowances to have your views.

1. In a typical week how many hours do you spend on Council business?

   ___________ hours

   Please indicate how this time is spent:

   (a) Attending meetings (including travelling) ___________ hours

   (b) Community representation ___________ hours

   (c) Case work (dealing with particular issues in your ward) ___________ hours

   (d) Research ___________ hours

2. If you hold a role(s) within the Council i.e. Portfolio Holder, Chairman etc., how many hours do you spend in a typical week on Council business relevant to the role(s). [Please provide details separately for each role if more than one additional role is held.]

   Role 1: ___________ hours

   Role 2: ___________ hours

   Role 3: ___________ hours

   Role 4: ___________ hours

   Please indicate how this time is spent:

   (a) Attending meetings (including travelling) Role 1: ___________ hours

   (b) Community representation Role 2: ___________ hours

   (c) Case work (dealing with particular issues in your ward) Role 3: ___________ hours

   (d) Research Role 4: ___________ hours
3. Do you incur any significant costs which you believe are not covered by your present allowance?

YES / NO

If YES, please provide details:


4. Government guidance states that “it is important that some element of the work of Councillors continues to be voluntary”. As part of their deliberations, Independent Remuneration Panels will assess what Public Service Discount should apply to the basic allowance - that is the percentage of their time Councillors expect to give without any financial remuneration.

Accordingly, what do you feel is an acceptable amount of time to be given, unremunerated, if any, expressed as a percentage?

% 

Basic Allowance

5. The present level of Basic Allowance payable to all Councillors is £4,395. Do you think this is appropriate?

YES / NO

If NO, should it be higher or lower?

HIGHER / LOWER

Please give a reason for your answer:

If you are able, please indicate an appropriate level:

£
Special Responsibility Allowances

6. Special Responsibility Allowances (SRAs) are currently paid as follows:

[To assist the Panel to produce a more consistent group of allowances, please can you score each role / position in respect of importance and impact:

1 to 13, with 1 being the most important, and 13 being the least important.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Identity</th>
<th>Allowance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leader of the Council</td>
<td>£12,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Cabinet Members</td>
<td>£6,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman of Overview &amp; Scrutiny Committee</td>
<td>£6,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-Chairman of Overview &amp; Scrutiny Committee</td>
<td>£3,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman of Planning Committee</td>
<td>£5,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-Chairman of Planning Committee</td>
<td>£1,163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman of Area Planning Sub-Committees</td>
<td>£4,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-Chairmen of Area Planning Sub-Committees</td>
<td>£930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman of Licensing Committee</td>
<td>£3,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-Chairman of Licensing Committee</td>
<td>£800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman of Audit &amp; Standards Committee</td>
<td>£3,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders of Opposition Groups with membership greater than 10% of total Members</td>
<td>£500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders of Opposition Groups with membership less than 10% of total Members</td>
<td>£125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Would you like to see any changes made to these allowances?

YES / NO

If YES, please provide details:


Would you like to see any new SRAs introduced?

YES / NO

If YES, please provide details:


Carers Allowance

7. The Dependent Carer’s Allowance is currently set at £7.65 per hour. Do you think this rate should be increased?

YES / NO

If YES, please indicate rate and reason:

Travel and Subsistence

8. The current scheme of travel allowances (see attached) are linked to those recommended by HMRC level.

Do you have any comments on the current scheme for Councillors?

YES / NO

If YES, please provide details:

If you have any other comments on Members’ Allowances, please detail below:
### SCHEDULE 3 - RATES FOR TRAVEL AND SUBSISTENCE ALLOWANCE

The following travel and subsistence rates apply where an approved duty is performed and the amounts of the allowances are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRAVEL</th>
<th>RATE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Transport – Rail</td>
<td>2nd class or any available cheap rate</td>
<td>Note (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Warrants available from Payroll Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transport – Bus</td>
<td>Ordinary fare or any available cheap rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Transport – Ship</td>
<td>1st class</td>
<td>Note (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Transport – Plane</td>
<td>Ordinary fare or any available cheap rate</td>
<td>Note (b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle Allowance</td>
<td>20 pence</td>
<td>Rate per mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Cycle</td>
<td>24 pence</td>
<td>Rate per mile Note (c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own Motor Vehicle</td>
<td>45 pence</td>
<td>Rate per Mile for the first 10,000 miles Note (c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25 pence</td>
<td>Rate per mile after the initial 10,000 miles Note (c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi-cab</td>
<td>Actual fare and any reasonable gratuity</td>
<td>Emergency / no public transport Note (d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hired Motor Vehicle</td>
<td>Not exceeding own vehicle rate unless body approve rate to an amount not exceeding actual cost of hiring</td>
<td>Excludes taxi cab</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBSISTENCE</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt;4 hours before 11am</td>
<td>Breakfast allowance £7.14</td>
<td>Notes (e), (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;4 hours including 12 noon to 2pm</td>
<td>Lunch allowance £9.86</td>
<td>Notes (e), (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;4 hours including 3pm to 6pm</td>
<td>Tea allowance £3.90</td>
<td>Note (e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;4 hours ending after 7pm</td>
<td>Evening meal allowance £12.21</td>
<td>Notes (e), (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overnight absence</td>
<td>Out of Pocket expenses £5.52 per night</td>
<td>Note (g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Out of Pocket expenses £22.06 per week</td>
<td>Note (g)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTES:

(a) The rate may be increased by supplementary allowances not exceeding expenditure actually incurred on:

(i) reservation of seats and deposit or porterage of luggage; and

(ii) sleeping accommodation engaged by the Member for an overnight journey, subject, however, to reduction by one-third of any subsistence allowance payable for that night.

(b) Not to exceed rate applicable to travel by appropriate alternative means of transport together with an allowance equivalent to the amount of any saving in subsistence allowance.

(c) The rate may be increased by not more than the amount of any expenditure incurred on tolls, ferries or parking fees, including overnight garaging. This equates to rates agreed by HMRC.

(d) Where not a case of urgency or public transport exists, the amount of the fare for travel by appropriate public transport.

(e) All subsistence rates shall be reduced by an appropriate amount in respect of any meal provided free of charge. This equates to rates agreed by the National Joint Council for Local Government Services.

(f) Where main meals are taken on trains during a period for which there is an entitlement to a day subsistence allowance, the reasonable cost of the meals (including VAT) may be reimbursed in full as an alternative, subject to the time limits shown above.

(g) Cost of overnight accommodation will be paid directly by the Council.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The Surrey Waste Partnership has enabled the 12 Surrey waste authorities to perform increasingly well by working together. Analysis has indicated that whilst the current level of co-operation has been beneficial, greater collaboration and co-ownership of waste collection and disposal functions would result in significant financial savings and further improvements to the services offered to residents.

Cabinet will recall that the four Partner Authorities under the Joint Waste Collection Contract have already aligned their services and have agreed an Inter Authority Agreement to create a shared Contract Management Office as well as a Joint Committee to manage and govern the Joint Contract. Surrey County Council is already an agreed party to the Inter Authority Agreement arising from its role as Waste Disposal Authority, but this is at present limited in capacity to one of liaison and consultation. The proposal in this report would see Surrey County Council delegate to the Joint Committee certain functions that relate to waste management in the wider partnership context.

The four Councils in the Joint Waste Collection Contract would retain jurisdictional exclusivity in Joint Contract matters relating to the services, but the Inter Authority Agreement and the Joint Committee Constitution would be amended to permit Surrey County Council participation in the functions expressly delegated by it to the Joint Committee. The Partner Authorities believe there is merit in integrating these functions within the IAA, reinforcing a partnership ethos between the two tiers of waste management and opening up opportunities for more effective and economic joint working.

RECOMMENDATIONS: TO COUNCIL 7 DECEMBER 2016 THAT:

(A) THE COUNCIL AGREES TO INCORPORATE THE AMENDMENTS TO THE INTER AUTHORITY AGREEMENT (RELATING TO JOINT WASTE COLLECTION CONTRACT AND THE JOINT WASTE COLLECTION SERVICES COMMITTEE) AS DETAILED AT APPENDIX A TO THE REPORT, IN ORDER TO INCLUDE THE NON-STATUTORY PARTNERSHIP (WASTE DISPOSAL AUTHORITY) FUNCTIONS SET OUT IN PARAGRAPH 12 OF THE REPORT, ON THE BASIS THAT THIS WILL NOT AFFECT HOW DECISIONS RELATED TO THE JOINT CONTRACT ARE MADE NOR HAVE ANY NEGATIVE FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS FOR THE COUNCIL; AND
THE COUNCIL SUPPORTS THE FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF THE SINGLE TIER MODEL FOR WASTE SERVICES IN SURREY AND THAT A FURTHER REPORT IS MADE TO CABINET ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN APPROPRIATE MODEL.

REPORT:

Background

1. The Surrey Waste Partnership (SWP) has enabled the Surrey waste authorities to perform increasingly well by working together. The co-operation between the Waste Disposal Authority, Surrey County Council and the Waste Collection Authorities has contained the costs of waste management in the county as well as enabled improved recycling rates and service improvements for residents. Most recently, this has included the creation of a Surrey Waste Partnership communications team who have delivered a number of award winning campaigns and a pooled budget that has enabled Councils to trial new and innovative resident engagement initiatives.

2. Analysis undertaken by the Surrey Waste Partnership and by the environmental consultancy Eunomia has indicated that whilst the current level of co-operation has been beneficial, greater collaboration and co-ownership of the entire waste service would result in significant financial savings and further improvements to the services offered to residents. This analysis suggests that up to £12.4 M per year could be saved from the collective waste budgets in Surrey through:
   - Operational efficiencies
   - Increasing recycling
   - Gaining greater value from materials
   - Increasing commercial waste collections
   - Back office efficiencies

3. In addition, a single entity could further reduce the overall costs of waste management by aligning the operational and management functions of all the authorities within a co-ownership model and ensure that waste management in Surrey is designed as one complete system. This would mean that kerbside collection rounds, transfer stations and Community Recycling Centres (CRCs) would be aligned and the service to our residents would be joined up and consistent.

Building on the Joint Waste Collection Contract

4. The four Joint Waste Collection Contract Councils have worked closely and successfully together to procure a Joint Contract to deliver significant financial savings and service improvements on the collection aspects of waste management. However, neither the Joint Contract nor the recent Inter Authority Agreement (IAA) that will govern the future working arrangements includes any of the waste disposal arrangements currently managed by Surrey County Council. This results in the continued duplication of some waste functions as well as the risk that policies and services designed by the Waste Disposal Authority are not complementary with those operated by the Waste Collection Authorities, and vice versa.
5. The governance of the single entity would be ensured through a Joint Committee to include Surrey County Council and any of the Waste Collection Authorities that chose to join the entity, for example, when included in the Joint Contract. Each member of the Committee would have an equal vote on matters residing within the Joint Committee’s jurisdiction. Such an arrangement, would for the first time allow districts and boroughs to be involved in decision making relating to the waste disposal arrangements in their areas.

6. Given the Joint Contract Councils have now aligned their services and to agree to create a shared waste function as well as a Joint Committee to govern the Joint Contract, it is logical for these Councils to be among the first to create the single entity together with Surrey County Council. The intention, however, is to encourage and enable other Councils to join the entity as soon as possible. Their membership could either be through the Joint Collection Contract or under their own collection arrangements. The former is likely to bring greater collective benefits but the latter would still reduce duplication and, therefore, bring financial and service benefits to all parties.

**Phased Approach**

7. It is proposed that a phased approach is taken to create a single entity (the Partnership Group) to better manage waste in Surrey. The first phase represents the four Councils moving to the Joint Waste Collection Contract, which is now in progress, and the second phase integrates the Waste Disposal Authority functions from Surrey County Council into the Partnership Group.

8. The Waste Disposal Authority has two key statutory functions, which it carries out through a 25 year Public Finance Initiative contract with Suez:
   - To arrange for the disposal of controlled waste collected by Surrey’s Waste Collection Authorities
   - To provide places for, and disposal of, waste deposited by householders in the county i.e. the Community Recycling Centres.

9. In addition to these statutory functions, the way that waste management operates in Surrey means that Surrey County Council has a number of non-statutory functions that enable the two tiers of waste management to operate (the Waste Disposal Authority Partnership functions):
   - Kerbside improvement initiatives to increase recycling and reduce waste arisings;
   - Payments to Waste Collection Authorities;
   - Data management and monitoring;
   - Policy development and alignment;
   - Performance management;
   - Engagement with government, the waste sector, industry and others on the waste agenda.
10. The Country Council also administer host authority for the Surrey Waste Partnership which includes:
   - Surrey wide communications and engagement;
   - Strategy development and monitoring;
   - Management of key Surrey Waste Partnership projects;
   - Surrey Waste Partnership governance.

11. In order to integrate the full range of the statutory Waste Disposal Authority functions into the Partnership Group, further work is required to develop a fair and transparent cost sharing mechanism.

12. Whilst this work takes place, it is proposed that the Waste Disposal Authority Partnership functions set out in Paragraph 9, transfer to the Partnership Group, alongside the management of food, green waste and other recyclables collected at the kerbside. Members will note, the Waste Disposal Authority would continue to separately manage residual waste collected at kerbside and processed at the waste transfer stations as well as run the CRCs until the work on the cost sharing mechanism is completed, and further consideration is given to the transfer of these additional statutory functions.

**What would this mean in Practice?**

13. The transfer of the Waste Disposal Authority Partnership functions from the County Council would extend the scope and remit of the Joint Waste Collection Services Committee, but would not lead to material changes to the IAA. The required changes to the current IAA are detailed at Appendix A.

14. In terms of governance, the decision making process for matters relating to the Joint Collection Contract would be unchanged; the nominated representatives from each of the four Joint Contract Councils would collectively make these decisions. For decisions relating to the wider waste agenda, the nominated representative from the County Council would join the district and borough representatives in collectively making these decisions. Both scenarios will be based on a one authority: one vote system, as already set out in the IAA.

15. The Partnership functions that would be transferred to the Partnership do not carry with them any financial liability. They would, however, demonstrate the early benefits of single tier working by reducing the current duplication of effort inherent in the current system. The changes would further improve the service and cost effectiveness of waste operations offered to residents, as well as placing the Council at the heart of work to set the strategic direction for waste management in Surrey in the medium to long term.

16. It is proposed that this change takes place in early 2017/18 in order realise these benefits as soon as possible and start to create a ‘one team’ ethos from the commencement of the Joint Contract.

17. It is also proposed that the County Council and the Joint Contract Councils engage with other district and boroughs about the opportunity to transfer the
management of the SWP office into the Partnership Group to further reduce duplication of effort, although the Surrey Waste Partnership would continue to act on behalf of all of Surrey’s authorities.

**Full Integration**

18. The transfer of the Waste Disposal Authority statutory functions into the Partnership Group is much more complicated and has greater financial, operational, legal and decision making implications. Before these functions are considered for transfer, further work is necessary to fully develop the business plan and revise the IAA in order to reflect the changes to the partnership arrangements. This work will confirm: the scope of functions to be transferred; the cost sharing mechanisms between the authorities; the governance arrangements; and the legal status of the Partnership Group.

19. The business plan will also outline how additional Waste Collection Authorities can join the Partnership Group, either as part of the Joint Contract or with their own collection arrangements. It is proposed that this work will take place during 2017 for further consideration late next year. This work will be led by the Surrey Waste Partnership Manager and be funded by the Surrey Waste Partnership.

**Financial implications:** None for the purpose of this report.

**Environmental/Sustainability Implications:** None for the purpose of this report

**Legal implications:**

Surrey County Council is already an agreed party to the Inter Authority Agreement arising from its role as Waste Disposal Authority, but this is at present limited in capacity to one of liaison and consultation. The proposal in this report would see Surrey County Council delegate to the Joint Committee certain of its “non-core” functions, tasks which fall outside the strict definition of statutory waste disposal but which nonetheless relate closely to waste management in the partnership context. The four Councils in the Joint Waste Collection Contact would retain jurisdictional exclusivity in Joint Contract matters relating to the services, but the IAA (and the Joint Committee Constitution) would be amended to permit Surrey County Council participation in the functions expressly delegated by it to the Joint Committee. The Partner Authorities believe there is merit in integrating these functions within the IAA, reinforcing a partnership ethos between the two tiers of waste management and opening up opportunities for more effective and economic joint working. The IAA will continue to regulate how liabilities, rights, duties, undertakings and responsibilities arising out of the Joint Contract will be shared and managed between the authorities.

**Equality Implications:** None

**Risk Implications:** None

**Community Safety Implications:** None

**Principal Consultees:** Head of Legal Services

**Background Papers:** None
Enclosures/Appendices:
Appendix A – Recommended Additions – Inter Authority Agreement, (IAA)

Contact details: Head of Environmental Services

SWP Future
SWP – Surrey Waste Partnership
SCC – Surrey County Council
The Four – The Joint Waste Collection Councils (Elmbridge, Mole Valley, Surrey Heath and Woking)
IAA - Inter Authority Agreement

Transferring SCC non-core functions: required amendments to the IAA

Principles and Objectives (Clause 6)
1.1. SCC’s current inclusion in the IAA is simply for the purposes of liaison and consultation. This would change as a result of adding SCC’s non-core functions, meaning that:

1.1.1. The reasons for which SCC is party to the IAA would need to be amended in the introductory section (known as the recitals) to reflect the new purpose.

1.1.2. Clause 6 would need to be amended to set out why SCC is party to the agreement, and what obligations and liabilities it is assuming as a result.

1.1.3. Clause 6 would also need amending to formalise the relationship between The Four and SCC, beyond simply requiring them to act together in good faith and also make clear that the joint working arrangements between SCC and The Four are not pursuant to the Joint Contract (as SCC is not a party to the Joint Contract).

Discharge of functions (Clause 3 & Schedule 6)
1.2. The functions that The Four will be delegating to the Joint Committee are set out in Schedule 6 of the IAA. Amendments will therefore be required to:

1.2.1. Schedule 6 – adding SCC’s non-core functions as listed above.

1.2.2. Clause 3 – stating that SCC will delegate its functions to the Joint Committee as set out in Schedule 6.

Termination (Clause 4)
1.3. The IAA is drafted in such a way that it terminates upon the termination of the Joint Contract. By including SCC’s non-core functions, the Joint Committee would have a role beyond the management of the Joint Contract. So Clause 4 needs to be amended so that termination of the Joint Contract does not
automatically terminate the IAA and the Joint Committee. It should be changed to say that the IAA and Joint Committee continues until such time as it is dissolved.

**Admission of new authorities (Clause 5)**

1.4. Clause 5 provides for a new authority to be admitted to the IAA in consequence of that new authority wishing to become a party to the Joint Contract. It proposes that new authorities could join the Joint Committee and participate in the Contract Management Office (CMO) but not necessarily the contract. For example, the new authorities may wish the CMO to manage their existing contracts. Clause 5 would therefore need to be amended to reflect this appropriately.

**Consequences of termination (Clause 17)**

1.5. As part of transferring its non-core functions, SCC would also transfer staff to deliver these functions. The provisions in Clause 17 would need to be amended to provide for the return or allocation of staff, or in the event of any redundancies, liability for redundancy costs, arising other than under the Joint Contract.

**Dispute resolution (Clause 18)**

1.6. Clause 18 would need a procedure inserted into it for the resolution of non-Joint Contract related disputes, particularly if the Contract Partnering Board is not a suitable forum.

**Decision making and Joint Contract management (Clause 23)**

1.7. The governance model would need to be further refined to deal with governance and decision making on matters not directly related to the Joint Contract.

**Quorum and voting arrangements (Clause 24 and Schedule 1)**

1.8. The quorum and voting arrangements of the Joint Committee would need to be expanded beyond the scope of the Joint Contract:

   1.8.1. There would need to be provision for SCC to vote on matters not directly related to the Joint Contract, and these matters would need to be defined.

   1.8.2. The quorum would need to be increased to five if SCC does not want meetings to go ahead in its absence.

**Contract management office (Clause 25)**

1.9. This clause (and clause 29.3) states that the CMO will be funded in equal shares between The Four. This would need to be amended following agreement on the share that SCC will be contributing following the migration of its non-core functions. The migrated functions would also need to be referred to in this clause.
1.10. This clause currently provides for staff to be made available to the CMO Director on a secondment or equivalent type basis, it does not provide explicitly for any TUPE transfer. Surrey Heath as the Administering Authority would need to agree the transfer of funding (including pensions) and the scope of the appropriate indemnities with SCC if a TUPE transfer of staff is involved.

**Contributions to the annual budget and principles of CMO service costs apportionment (Clause 29), Income (Clause 30), Funding of capital expenditure (Clause 31) and Payment (Clause 32)**

1.11. These sections would need to be amended to make sure that SCC wasn’t required to contribute to the cost of the Joint Contract, but only to the relevant costs of the CMO.

1.12. If, as part of migrating SCC’s non-core functions, SCC were to transfer funding to The Four in place of existing funding mechanisms (such as recycling credits) or to fund payments made on behalf of SCC to the WCAs, the appropriate provisions would need to be inserted in these sections to deal with this. The funding mechanism may also need to be set out in a separate schedule.

**The constitution and operation of the Contract Partnering Board (Schedule 1)**

1.13. The Contract Partnering Board is currently set up to manage the Joint Contract. By adding SCC’s non-core functions, its scope would be widened meaning that:

1.13.1. It would need to be renamed to better reflect the revised scope;

1.13.2. The quorum and voting arrangements would need to be expanded in the same way as for the Joint Committee (see 1.8).

**Service level agreement (Schedule 2)**

1.14. This would need to be revised and expanded to reflect the services that the expanded CMO might provide to each of The Four and SCC as a result of the migration of SCC’s non-core functions. It would need to incorporate all of the amendments described above.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Meetings have taken place with local Members to discuss the effective operation of car parks serving their Ward. A number of initiatives were suggested ranging from more flexible payment arrangements, and the consideration of a pay-on-exit scheme in busy town centre locations. Local concessions, including an initial free period, were suggested to encourage increased use of an underused car park to support local businesses on Saturdays, and some concerns were expressed over car parks which were regularly full.

RECOMMENDATION: CABINET IS ASKED TO:

(A) AGREE THAT A MONTHLY SEASON TICKET OPTION BE INTRODUCED FOR ALL CAR PARKS;

(B) RECOMMEND THAT CAPITAL PROVISION OF £105,000 BE MADE IN 2017/18 TO EXTEND CONTACTLESS PAYMENT FACILITIES IN TO REMAINING TOWN CENTRE CAR PARKS, AND OTHER HIGH PERFORMING LOCAL CAR PARKS;

(C) AGREE THE FREE PARKING CONCESSIONS AS SET OUT IN PARAGRAPH 4.3, TO BEGIN IN APRIL 2017, AND SUBJECT TO A REVIEW AFTER NINE MONTHS AGAINST A SET OF SUCCESS MEASURES TO BE DEVELOPED IN CONSULTATION WITH THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER;

(D) RECOMMEND THAT THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT BE GIVEN DELEGATED AUTHORITY TO APPROVE LIMITED MINOR ADJUSTMENTS TO PARKING CHARGES FOR THE BETTER UTILITY OF A CAR PARK AS SET OUT IN PARAGRAPH 4.4;

(E) AGREE THAT A FURTHER REPORT BE BROUGHT TO CABINET ON THE OPERATIONAL AND FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF A PAY-ON EXIT SCHEME IN A PRINCIPAL TOWN CENTRE CAR PARK(S), AND THAT CONSIDERATION BE GIVEN TO A CAPITAL PROVISION OF £50,000 IN 2017/18 FOR THE INSTALLATION OF THE SCHEME;
(F) AGREE THAT A TEMPORARY CAR PARK MANAGEMENT PLAN BE DEVISED FOR WALTON TOWN CENTRE TO MITIGATE THE IMPACT ON SHOPPERS AND LOCAL BUSINESSES DURING THE PERIOD OF REPAIRS AND DISRUPTION TO THE DREWITTS COURT CAR PARK;

(G) AGREE FREE PARKING IN ALL TOWN AND VILLAGE CAR PARKS ON THE FOUR SATURDAYS IN DECEMBER THAT PRECEDE CHRISTMAS 2016.

REPORT:

Introduction:

1. The Portfolio Holder met with local Members in September to review the effective operation of car parks that serve their local community and to consult on the appropriateness of parking charges, in particular, on Saturdays.

2. These meetings were arranged on the basis of the general area served by a car park(s). Consequently, in addition to the Ward Members, Members from adjacent Wards were also invited where the car park(s) also served their Ward.

3. In support of these meeting Members were provided with the background information for the car park(s) concerned including: the operational revenue costs and income, the current level of parking charges and those otherwise due to be introduced from January 2017, and where available the typical daily occupancy of the car park(s).

Key Findings:

4. A summary of the key points and issues arising from each meeting is attached at Appendix A. Cabinet will note a number of common issues arose which are dealt with in more detail below:

4.1 Monthly Season Tickets: Season tickets are popular as they offer a significant discount (ranging from 35%-60%) when compared to the price of purchasing a daily ticket, and also because of their convenience since there is no requirement to obtain and display a new ticket each day. Currently, they can only be purchased for a three or twelve month period. Members felt a monthly season ticket would be more affordable compared to an advanced payment of three or twelve months.

Web-based parking permit management systems are now able to provide this facility and other convenient functions for example, to enable the number of months required to be selected from one to twelve. It is therefore recommended that a monthly season ticket option be introduced for all car parks in 2017/18.
4.2 New Contactless Payment Facilities: New pay and display machines incorporating 'contactless' payment facilities are already scheduled for busier town and commuter car parks in 2016/17. These facilities remove the necessity for payment using multiple coins, although payment using coins would remain an option. Members considered this facility provided a significant service improvement, in particular in customer convenience, which would also help ameliorate future charge increases. For this reason, it is recommended that contactless payment facilities are introduced in to the remaining busy town centre car parks and the busier local car parks which may include, Steels Lane, Oxshott, Halfway, Walton and York Road and Oatlands, Weybridge.

4.3 Limited Free Parking Periods: In a few local car parks the levels of use on a Saturday were notably much lower than levels during the week. Members in the three such areas suggested the introduction of an initial free period ranging from one to four hours as a concession to increase the use of the car park on Saturdays to support local shops and business. These are shown in the table below.

The vast majority of existing visits to these car parks are for up two hours, which is typically the time required for visiting a local shop. An analysis of tickets sales and estimated forgone income based on a two and three hours initial free period has been undertaken which is shown in the below. For example, a two-hour initial free period in Ashley Road car park on Saturdays would result in a reduction in annual income of £1,500 which would rise by £200 to £1,700 if a three hours initial period were in effect.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Car Park</th>
<th>Suggested Concession</th>
<th>Forgone Saturday Income p.a.</th>
<th>Total Saturday Tickets sales p.a. (current)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Initial 2-hrs</td>
<td>Initial 3-hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Road - Thames Ditton (&lt; 30%)</td>
<td>Saturday: 4-hrs free</td>
<td>£1,500</td>
<td>£1,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walton Road – Molesey (&lt; 50%)</td>
<td>Saturday: 3-hrs free</td>
<td>£10,000</td>
<td>£10,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Berry Lane – Hersham (&lt; 50%)</td>
<td>Saturday: 1-hr free</td>
<td>£2,700</td>
<td>£2,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>£14,200</td>
<td>£15,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cabinet is asked to agree the requests for local parking concessions for 2017 to help support and improve the vibrancy of locality on Saturdays. The concessions should be reviewed after nine months to ensure they deliver a sustainable increase in car park use (demonstrated by performance against a set of success measures to be developed in...
4.4 Minor Adjustment to Parking Charges: Modern parking software and systems, such as incorporated in the new pay and display machines, allow variable hourly rates to be applied during the day. This allows for rates to be decreased, to encourage greater usage, if demand is very low, or increased ensuring availability of spaces, if the occupancy in a car park is very high. It is proposed that Delegated Authority be given to the Portfolio Holder to agree minor adjustments in parking charges to this effect for the better management and utilisation of a car park.

The threshold for making such rate changes would be set very high such that before a variation in a car park rate may occur, the car park shall, for that particular hour, average either over 90% occupancy or less than 10% occupancy over a three-month period. If such a condition is reached, the change would be a ten pence increase or decrease in the usual rate for relevant hour(s).

For example, using the current car park rates for a village car park, a one hour stay during the affected period of the day would increase from 60 pence to 70 pence where the car park met the 90% occupancy threshold, and reduce to 50 pence where the car park met the 10% occupancy threshold.

The occupancy rates will include all users: season ticket holders, permit holders, daily and period purchased tickets. Any changes will be reflected in the daily ticket and seasonal ticket charges associated with that car park.

Under the proposal car parks would be reviewed at least once in the municipal year and if a car park requires an increase or decrease it would be reviewed again after a subsequent three month period or operation. Members will note any change to parking rates would first need to be advertised by way of a Notice of Variation to the Council’s Parking Order.

4.5 Pay-on-Exit: Barrier controlled parking management systems utilizing number plate recognition technology, are now feasible in medium sized car parks, in particular, when serving busy high street and commercial areas. These systems enable a ‘pay-on-exit’ operation whereby shoppers etc. pay for their stay on returning to the vehicle. This removes the need to predetermine the length of stay to be paid for when arriving, which can often curtail the visit. Members considered a pay-on-exit system would be very welcome by both shoppers and local businesses in busy high streets.

An initial feasibility study has been undertaken which has identified an estimated capital cost of approx. £50,000 for the installation of a pay-on-exit scheme in a principal town centre car park, such as the larger car parks at the Hollyhedge Road, Cobham, Civic Centre, Esher, or Churchfields Road, Weybridge. It is therefore recommended that a further report be brought to Cabinet setting out the operational and financial implications of a pay-on-exit scheme in one or more of these car parks.
Drewitts Court Car Park

5. The use and popularity of the Drewitts Court car park has markedly fallen following the closure of the adjacent supermarket in 2015. The use of the car park for short stays of two hours or less has reduced by some 25% in the first six months of 2016/17 compared to the same period in 2015/16.

6. Significant concerns were expressed by local Members on the associated impact on local businesses and the continuing vibrancy of the town centre, and for this reason a similar initiative to those set out in Paragraph 4.3 was considered appropriate. However, at that time the implications arising from the condition survey of the car park were not known.

7. Cabinet will be aware that a number of major repairs are required at the car park which would be expected to have a significant impact on the operation of the car park for a prolonged period of time. Because of the severe disruption such works would cause, Cabinet will need to consider temporary parking arrangements for the car park and for the town centre in general. It is therefore recommended that the concerns expressed by local Members are included within the development of a car park management plan that would be required to minimise the disruption.

Christmas Parking Concessions (2016)

8. The Portfolio Holder has previously been granted Delegated Authority to suspend parking charges to encourage and support business trading during the Christmas period for up to a maximum of three concessionary days. This concession represented approx. £15,000 forgone income. Last year the Council agreed that charges would also be waived on an additional Saturday in support of the Small Business Saturday representing a further £2,700 forgone income.

9. For Christmas 2016 a number of local Members expressed a wish to apply the concession to the four consecutive Saturdays in December leading up to Christmas, which would also support the Small Business Saturday on 3rd December. This is estimated to represent approx. £20,000 forgone income. An alternative would be to provide free parking in the week before Christmas, that is Monday 19 to Saturday 24 December inclusive, along with the Small Business Saturday which would represent forgone income at £30,000, and £5,000 respectively.

Financial implications:

The Council has a responsibility to maintain its car parks and following a condition survey on all of the Council’s car parks, it is evident that substantial sums have to be expended in repairing and maintaining the Council owned car parks over the next five to ten years. An initial review shows that for the 28 pay and display car parks the Council operates, the expenditure is likely to be up to £9 M for essential maintenance
and resurfacing.

Members will recall that in February 2016 the Council approved setting aside up to £150,000 per annum from the off-street car park income to pay for the upkeep of our car parks. It is acknowledged that the expenditure required to maintain our car parks will be much more than the allocated sum.

Officers are currently reviewing and prioritising the works required in these car parks and plan to report to Cabinet in February 2017 together with the funding implications.

The proposals in this report have the following revenue and capital implications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>£000s</th>
<th>Type of Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extension of Contactless Payment Machines</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Capital *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Parking Concessions lost income</td>
<td>14-16</td>
<td>Revenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay–On-Exit System</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Capital *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christmas Parking Concession</td>
<td>20-35</td>
<td>Revenue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Subject to a detailed Capital bid for 2017/18

The proposal for minor adjustments to a parking rate charge in a car park with very low or high occupancy levels would be expected to have a limited implications on the 2017/18 budget. However, since these changes are subject to survey it will not be possible to estimate the financial impact at this time.

A capital sum provision of £155,000 will need to be approved in 2017/18.

Lost revenue of between £14,000 to £16,000 per annum for free parking periods and between £20,000 to £35,000 for the Christmas 2016 period, will also need to be budgeted for.

**Environmental/Sustainability Implications:** None.

**Legal implications:** None

**Equality Implications:** None

**Risk Implications:** None

**Community Safety Implications:** None

**Principal Consultees:** None

**Background Papers:** None

**Enclosures/Appendices:**
Appendix A – Summary of Key Points and Issues Raised

**Contact details:**
Head of Environmental Services
Claygate:
Car Parks: - Torrington Lodge - Hare Lane

The South West Train station car park charges or absence of charges on Saturday has a marginal impact on parking in the Parade and local amenities. The South West Train station car park is not regularly enforced and a further approach should be made for the Council to operate it.

On-street parking levels are at deleterious levels - increase on-street enforcement of existing controls would be welcomed.

Free or reduced charges for Saturday parking would be welcomed by the community, but the impact, costs and lost income should not be overlooked and considered carefully.

The village’s car parks now operate at a modest surplus. However, planned increases due in January 2017 should be reviewed. The introduction of contactless payment facilities would help offset the inconvenience of increased parking charges.

Torrington Lodge car park was working successfully and no change was considered necessary. The increased use of Hare Lane on Saturdays to mitigate on-street parking problems in relation to the recreation facilities should be encouraged. This could involve a discount for Saturdays. Other initiatives such as a dropped curb at the recreation ground’s entrance could also help reduce the impact of on-street parking.

Cobham:
Car Parks: - Cedar Road - Hollyhedge Road

Demand for parking in the town is expected to increase as Waitrose has reduced its max stay to 1½ hrs and following the closure of the Holly Parade private car park. A revised layout for Hollyhedge Road car park could increase parking capacity. The Cedar Road car park is likely to get busier as local developments are finished.

Opportunities for better utilisation of on-street parking should be explored by SCC. Support for much increased on-street enforcement patrols.

No desire to see free Saturday parking introduced in Cobham and there is not perceived to be a problem with the parking charges, and the car park could simply fill-up. Local businesses support a pay on exit type scheme possibly utilising automatic number plate recognition systems. Any changes to parking charges and management system would need to consider the impact on the Farmers Market.

A wish for some consistency and parity in the charging regime across the borough with regard to comparative areas.
Dittons:
Car Parks: - Ashley Road - South Bank

To support local business prior to Christmas, consideration should be given to introducing a free period in the Ashley Road car park for Saturdays from early December 2016, rather than January 2017 when new charges are otherwise due. Although traditionally free parking on Saturday(s) leading to Christmas has been an annual initiative by the Council.

The Ashley Road car park was considered to be operating well, however, ongoing development in and around the village was expected to increase the demand for season tickets (all-day) parking in car park, and the consideration should be given to ‘capping’ the number of season tickets, and or not renewing existing season tickets to ensure short stay parking for shoppers was kept available.

Parking levels in the Ashley Road car park on Saturdays were typically much lower than weekdays (just 25% full), and a request for a four-hour limited free parking period on Saturdays (only) in order to attract more customers to support local businesses. The free period should be subject to a no-return that day, and any stays longer than 4 hours would be chargeable as at the applicable fee, for the fifth hour and so on. Enforcement should be minimal unless abuse became apparent. Penalty payments for overstays would help offset additional enforcement costs from checking free tickets. In the medium term, drivers could be required to enter their vehicle’s registration on new pay and display machines when getting a ticket – free or otherwise.

The Council’s year on year level of charges (as previously agreed) would apply. However, monthly season tickets would be more affordable compared to an advanced payment of three or twelve months as at present, and would be welcomed.

The South Bank car park is not well used, and offers capacity for more parking if and when new on-street controls are introduced and new developments are complete. The availability of season tickets in the car park should be promoted to local residents and businesses, in addition to local signs advertising changing charges and season tickets costs. However, season tickets should be managed to ensure adequate short-stay parking is maintained. As with the initiative for Ashely Road car park, a free period on Saturdays would be welcome, except for a three-hour free period, rather than four-hour.

Esher:
Car Parks:-  Civic Centre – Berguette – Heather Place – Highwaymans Cottage

A wish for consistency and parity in the charging regime across the borough, and no desire to see free Saturday parking introduced in Esher. There is not perceived to be a problem with the parking charges in Esher, which are due to rise in January. The need to minimise / mitigate the financial impact of any changes to parking charges (if proposed).

Notwithstanding the above, Esher should not be disadvantaged by any changes to the parking charges in other towns, although given the mix of outlets in Esher that is unlikely but a further discussion might be warranted.
Race and events days at Sandown are a specific issue, and parking (and traffic) requires careful consideration as part of any proposed change to the status quo.

Esher is subject to high demand for on and off street parking and nuisance parking in the outer environs is a problem for example West End. Esher would benefit from more parking spaces / car parks.

---

**Hersham:**
Car parks: New Berry Lane – Mayfield Road

The New Berry Lane car park was thought popular, despite the adjacent free Hersham Centre car park, because of its easy access, convenience and use associated with the school, recycling facilities, and surgery. The small surplus (£20,700 p.a.) helps contribute to on-going maintenance and to upcoming capital works that will be required to ensure car park infrastructure is maintained.

Parking levels in the New Berry Lane car park on Saturdays were typically 50% lower than weekdays, and there was some (not unanimous) support for a limited ‘free’ parking period on Saturdays (only) for example, the first hour free, in order to attract more customers to support local businesses. The free period would be subject to a ticket and a no-return that day and any stays longer than the free period would be chargeable as at the applicable fee for example, the second hour and so on. Enforcement would be minimal unless abuse became apparent. Penalty payments for overstays would help offset additional enforcement costs from checking free tickets.

The proposed introduction of contactless payment facilities would help offset the inconvenience of parking charges, in particular, at the commuter car park at Mayfield Road. Similarly, monthly season tickets would be more affordable compared to an advanced payment of three or twelve months which are available at the present time.

It appeared that some commuters were now arriving later in the morning and parking in local streets outside of the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) restrictions, and as a result a drop is evident in ticket sales in Mayfield Road car park. The Elmbridge Local Committee were supportive for the CPZ to be review to address this as residents parking was impinged. The extent to which non-residents used the Mayfield Road car park was raised, with a view to considering ‘differential’ prices for season tickets. However, at present only 3 out of 66 season tickets issued for the car park are to addresses outside of Elmbridge.

---

**Molesey:**
Car Parks: Walton Road

The Walton Road car park’s relatively low level of use (around 50% full) is probably due to the parking charges and / or high level on uncontrolled on-street parking. Request for limited free parking period on Saturdays (only) in order to: encourage migration of parked cars from side streets in to the car park, and to attract more customers to support local businesses. It was suggested that a three-hour free
The period is trialled and the free period is kept under review to better deliver the above local objectives. To be effectively enforced, it's accepted that drivers could be required to enter their vehicle’s registration when getting a ticket – free or otherwise. It was accepted any such trial would result in a reduction in income and expenditure (capital) on new modern machines – these would include contactless payment facilities. Penalty payments for overstays (over the free period), would help offset additional enforcement costs from checking free tickets. The free period would be subject to a no-return that day, and the fourth hour would be chargeable as at the applicable one-hour fee, and so on.

The Council’s year on year level of charges (as previously agreed would apply). Consideration should be given to introducing the free period from April 2017, rather than January 2017. Monthly season tickets would be more affordable compared to an advanced payment of three or twelve months.

---

Oxshott:  
Car Parks: - Steels Lane

An increase in on-street enforcement of existing controls would be welcomed in the village.

The Steels Lane car parks now operate close to its capacity - Monday to Saturday. The car park doesn’t attract noticeable commuter parking as it’s too far to walk to the Station. The car park operates at a surplus although provision for future maintenance costs are not included.

The agreed increases in charges are acceptable, and would help manage demand. The introduction on contactless payment facilities would help offset the inconvenience of increased parking charges. There is no desire to see free Saturday parking introduced – Saturday being relatively busy. However, there is a wish for consistency and parity in the charging regime across the borough, although local demands and parking pressures may warrant some variation.

---

Walton:  
Car Parks: - Ashely Park – Halfway - Manor Road - Drewitts Court - Station Avenue,  

Morning Meeting:

Acknowledged that as in the past, local adaptions in the management of a car park were beneficial in addressing local circumstances, and these adaptions need to be regularly reviewed as circumstances continue to change.

Whilst there was not perceived to be a problem with the charges and controls at the Ashely Park car park, the sub-standard surface remains an issue pending a revised and increased capital estimate for its re-surfacing.

There is a very high demand for (all-day) season ticket parking at the Halfway car park as a result of local businesses growth and an increase in commuter parking. As
a result short stay capacity is impeded. There is support to further reduce the number of season tickets sold and to limit the number available to any one business. Also, the previously agreed increases in season ticket and parking charges due from January 2017 are expected to help reduce the demand for all-day parking. Similarly, the proposed change to the nearby on-street max stay from one to two hours should help reduce demand for short stay parking in the car park. Therefore, the number of short stay only bays in the car park should be kept under review.

The Manor Road car park is reasonably well used, and offers further scope for reduced priced residents’ season tickets for use at the start and end of the day – only one in use at the present time. In this context, a query was raised regarding the income raised in the Drewitts Court car park from 9 am to 10 am and from 4 pm to 6 pm.

It was appreciated that future maintenance costs of the Drewitts Court car park were expected to rise very significantly following the recent condition surveys and the repairing obligations.

A key objective for the Drewitts Court car park is to provide convenient shoppers parking in support of the local businesses and the vibrancy of the town centre. However, short-stay sales have dropped considerably in 2016 by some 25% compared to 2015 and a parking initiative was thought necessary to help ‘kick start’ more short stay visits. A preferred option in the circumstances could include a trial free four-hour max period for the first floor area only with a ‘no-return’ that day. However, enforcement would be minimal unless abuse became apparent. Any such arrangement would need to be kept under review to ensure it continued to boost short stay sales, and was supported by businesses in the immediate vicinity.

The planned introduction on contactless payment facilities in key would help offset the inconvenience of parking charges, as would the monthly season tickets which would also be more affordable compared to an advance payment of three or twelve months.

**Evening Meeting:**

Despite still being unmanaged the small Thamesmead car park still largely operated satisfactorily, in providing limited daytime parking for shoppers, although some local businesses and residents appeared to be parking vehicles long term. It was felt that the availability of alternative short and long stay parking in nearby streets would accommodate cars if charges / controls were introduced in to the car park, and consequently, there was some doubt that the deficit would improve, once operational and equipment costs were included.

The marked drop in short stays tickets sales at the Drewitts Court car park was thought attributable to the closure of the nearby supermarket, and a general change in shopping habits due to the continued growth of internet based shopping. Whilst there was a recognition for initiatives to encourage increased visits to the town, there was no support for a free parking period on Saturday (or other days), as the benefits were uncertain and due to the forgone revenue.
It was appreciated that future maintenance costs of the Drewitts Court car park were expected to rise very significantly following the recent condition surveys and the repairing obligations, and the Council needed to consider the financial implications very carefully.

The introduction of contactless payment facilities would help offset the inconvenience of increased parking charges, and would be welcomed by local business as a pay on exist system.

**Weybridge:**
Car Park:- Churchfields – Baker Street - Monument Green – Heath North & South – York Road - Oatlands

Recognise that the car parks operate at a significant surplus, excluding the impact of the current condition survey works and its future capital expenditure, and the use of any overall surplus is regulated by local government finance laws.

General support for further consideration of additional ‘blue badge’ parking bays to meet or exceed the guidance levels.

The York Road car park is operating close to capacity partly as a result of long term parking levels, and limited on-street capacity. Although it’s generally full at peak times, there wasn’t a need to increase charges over those already scheduled for future years.

No desire to see free Saturday parking introduced in Weybridge, as it was thought the current arrangements work well and it wasn’t clear what would the benefit would be, if any. Moreover, the forgone income and impact on demand are unnecessary consequences. A request for some consistency and parity in the charging regime across the borough with regard to comparative areas.

Local businesses would support a pay-on-exit type scheme possibly utilising automatic number plate recognition systems. And the introduction of contactless payment facilities would help offset the inconvenience of increased parking charges, as would more affordable payment options for season tickets such as a monthly option.

Consideration should be given to the practicalities of differential pricing for season tickets, as a tool to better manage traffic associated with commuters to the station car parks by non-residents.

Welcome involvement in the review of on-street parking in the local area due by SCC (part of the Walton & Hersham Division review expected later this year) since effective and co-ordinated on-street controls very relevant to operation of car parks.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

This report sets out a proposal to provide a grant of £2.508m from the Affordable Housing Enabling Fund to help enable Thames Valley Housing (TVH), a local housing association, to acquire, develop and provide the residential element in the redevelopment of the Riverdene Business Park in Hersham, as a 100% affordable housing scheme.

RECOMMENDATION: THAT

(A) COUNCIL APPROVES PROVISION OF A GRANT OF UP TO £2,508,000 FROM THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING ENABLING FUND TO SUPPORT THAMES VALLEY HOUSING TO ACQUIRE AND DEVELOP THE HOUSING ELEMENT OF THE PROPOSED REDEVELOPMENT OF THE RIVERDENE BUSINESS PARK IN HERSHAM, ON CONDITION THAT IT BE PROVIDED AS A 100% AFFORDABLE HOUSING SCHEME

(B) COUNCIL AGREES THAT THIS SUM BE ADDED TO THE EXISTING CAPITAL PROGRAMME, FUNDED FROM SECTION 106 RECEIPTS PROVIDED FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING

(C) THE GRANT BE CONDITIONAL ON A FUNDING AGREEMENT BEING REACHED BETWEEN TVH AND THE COUNCIL SETTING OUT THE DELIVERY REQUIREMENTS AND PROTECTING THE COUNCIL’S INVESTMENT, AND A NOMINATIONS AGREEMENT GOVERNING THE SELECTION AND NOMINATION OF PROSPECTIVE TENANTS BY THE COUNCIL TO TVH

(D) COUNCIL DELEGATES AUTHORITY TO THE STRATEGIC DIRECTOR & DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE, IN CONSULTATION WITH THE PORTFOLIO HOLDERS FOR HOUSING AND RESOURCES TO CONCLUDE NOMINATIONS AND FUNDING AGREEMENTS WITH TVH, SUBJECT TO A SATISFACTORY EXTERNAL REVIEW CONFIRMING THE NEED FOR THE PROPOSED LEVEL OF COUNCIL FUNDING IN ORDER TO DELIVER THE SCHEME

Committee: CABINET
Date of meeting: 16 November 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject:</th>
<th>Affordable Housing Opportunity with Thames Valley Housing</th>
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<td>Key decision:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
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1. The Enabling Fund

1.1 The Council’s Enabling Fund is a fund set aside for the purposes of delivering affordable housing to meet local need. The fund mainly comprises contributions received from private developers of housing secured through planning obligations through the Council’s planning policies. The balance is made up through a portion of the Council’s New Homes Bonus (NHB) allocation along with various capital receipts. The current uncommitted balance of the fund stands at approximately £5.9m.

1.2 Increasing the supply of affordable housing to meet local needs is one of the administration’s top priorities and Registered Providers (RPs) have been encouraged to come forward with proposals to draw on the Enabling Fund to deliver additional rented, affordable homes.

1.3 There is a twin-track process in place concerning the approval of payments from the Enabling Fund, depending on whether the sum sought is below £75,000 or not.

1.4 For sums above £75,000 (as is the case with this proposal) it is ordinarily the practice that Cabinet determines recommendations for funding of affordable housing projects from the Affordable Housing Enabling Fund directly from the Portfolio Holder for Housing, in consultation with the Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and in conjunction with the officers where the projects meets the priorities endorsed by the Affordable Housing Member Panel.

2. The Site

2.1 In September 2015, planning consent (ref: 2014/5061) was granted to Lidl to redevelop the Riverdene Business Park on Molesey Road in Hersham to provide a food store on the ground floor with 38 flats above. Due to financial viability considerations, only five (13%) of these dwellings were required, through planning obligations, to be provided as affordable housing (all in the form of shared-ownership), rather than the 15 (40%) which the Council’s planning policy aspires to.

2.2 In December 2015, an application by Lidl to vary these plans was approved (ref: 2015/3474), enlarging the food store and changing the residential mix, although the overall number of homes and affordable homes remained unchanged from the earlier consent. The size and mix of the revised scheme is 10 x 1-bedroom homes; 22 x 2-bedroom homes and 6 x 3-bedroom homes.

2.3 It is understood that Lidl own the freehold of the site, but that Howarth Homes have an option in place to acquire it from Lidl, whereby Howarth Homes would construct both the entire development and lease the retail element back to Lidl. Furthermore, it is our understanding that Howarth
Homes’ interest lies in making a return through building the scheme and that rather than then selling the homes itself, Howarth has been looking to enter into a package deal with a third party, whereby Howarth constructs the scheme, but the third party takes on ownership and management.

2.4 Demolition is well underway and Officers have been advised that the construction timetable is driven by Lidl’s requirements in relation to the store’s opening date. There is a time pressure in place on Howarth to commence with the construction phase and to enter into a contract with a prospective purchaser for the residential element.

3. The Proposal

3.1 TVH is one of the Council’s preferred partner Registered Providers (RPs) and owns around 200 affordable homes in Elmbridge, with its most recent local development being Waterloo House on Mayfield Road in Hersham in 2015.

3.2 TVH have been approached about acquiring the residential element of the scheme and have been in discussions with Council officers as to whether the Council would be willing to provide financial support to TVH to take up the opportunity of acquiring a privately-owned site. In return, TVH would deliver and provide all 38 affordable homes as affordable housing, an increase of 33 over the five required through the planning consent.

3.3 The intention would be for TVH’s charitable arm, Thames Valley Charitable Housing to acquire the freehold of the residential element of the scheme from Howarth Homes.

3.4 TVH are proposing that all 38 homes would be provided as affordable rent, recognising that the Council’s foremost need is for rented, affordable housing as confirmed by sources such as our Housing Register and the latest Strategic Housing Market Assessment. A single-tenure scheme would also be easier to manage.

3.5 The residential element of the consented scheme has a gross development value and a land value reflecting the fact that it comprises 33 market dwellings and 5 shared-ownership homes and both Howarth and the current landowner would have an expectation of the values they could command, based on the consented scheme. An affordable housing scheme will deliver lower values, so in order for TVH to arrive at a value for the package which would both be competitive and acceptable; there is a need for a level of “top-up” subsidy to bridge the gap between the values produced by an affordable housing scheme relative to those generated by the consented scheme.

3.6 There has been extensive liaison between Officers and TVH on the financial aspects of the scheme. The level of support required from the Council depends on a range of factors, including the rent levels that TVH will charge, the value of other capital that TVH can afford (via borrowing,
grants from the Homes and Communities Agency and cross-subsidy generated from TVH’s commercial enterprises) and the price it can agree with Howarth.

3.7 The final proposal is that the Council will provide a grant to TVH of £2.508m from the Enabling Fund in return for TVH developing the entire scheme as a 100% affordable rented scheme. This subsidy would help fund the conversion of the five shared-ownership homes to affordable rent and the switching of the 33 market homes to affordable rent. This equates to a per unit subsidy of £66,000, if spread across all 38 homes (or £76,000 per unit if confined to the additional 33) or somewhere between the two, if an allowance is made for the additional subsidy required to convert the tenure of the five flats earmarked for shared-ownership to affordable rent. These levels of per unit subsidy are broadly comparable to what the Council provided on similar projects supported by the Enabling Fund in recent years (such as the redevelopment of the former Royal British Legion club in Heathfield Road, Hersham).

3.8 The Council will not receive a financial return on its investment (hence it is a grant) as there is insufficient income to do this whilst allowing TVH to meet its payback requirements and those of its lenders, but the Council will receive 100% nomination rights on all the first lettings and at least 75% of subsequent relets, and these rights will be secured through a nomination agreement. This would mean that the properties would be let to households on our Housing Register. There is a pressing need for more 2-bedroom accommodation amongst applicants on our Housing Register and with 22 of the dwellings being of this size, the scheme should make a significant contribution to meeting this particular need.

3.9 Whilst the proposed development will not include temporary accommodation for homeless households, the provision of a significant number of homes for rent should help reduce demand for temporary accommodation and, indirectly, reduce the number of homeless households placed in bed & breakfast and / or nightly paid accommodation outside of the Borough.

3.10 Officers believe that the proposal provides a valuable opportunity to deliver much-needed affordable housing at a reasonable cost to the Council. The grant, by complementing TVH’s own funding streams, will secure nomination rights to a far greater number of affordable homes than could be achieved were the Council to invest the same amount of money in purchasing properties on the open market.

3.11 Notwithstanding the above, Council officers have commissioned a desk-top review, to be undertaken by the Dixon Searle Partnership (DSP) to provide an independent assessment that the level of grant sought from the Council is necessary to deliver the 100% affordable rented scheme. DSP more usually acts for the Council in terms of reviewing viability appraisals submitted by developers seeking to justify a reduction in the level of affordable housing delivered on planning applications, but has carried out
this type of assessment for other local authorities. The revenue cost of this assessment will be approximately £2,200, which will be met through the Enabling Fund.

3.12 One of the key factors within this check will be to consider that the costs TVH are incurring (and which the Council would be partly meeting) are reasonable. The results are awaited and will determine whether the Council will enter into a funding agreement or not (and on what terms).

3.13 In anticipation of the Council approving the allocation of funding sought, TVH have made a provisional offer to Howarth Homes and this has been accepted in principle and the heads of terms for a contract of sale is being drafted. TVH have made it clear that without the Council’s funding it would not be able to proceed with the agreement and that the opportunity to deliver the additional affordable homes would be lost.

4. Formalising the arrangements

4.1 It is critical that the scheme deliverables be formalised in a funding agreement between the Council and TVH. Such an agreement would be necessary to protect the Council’s investment. This agreement would need to be finalised before any funding was released. The timing of the Council’s payments will be stipulated within the funding agreement and discussions are ongoing as to how this is structured. Whilst TVH would prefer for the Council to provide its funding upfront (recognising that our contribution is required to help with the purchase of the land element of the scheme), an arrangement which incorporating staged payments (with some funding held back until the development is completed) should give the Council some protection in the event that construction was delayed.

4.2 One of the conditions that TVH has agreed to is that in the event that one or more dwellings switches from affordable housing to market housing (because the tenant either takes up the Right to Acquire or what the Voluntary Right to Buy) that the Council would be reimbursed its contribution, as the dwelling would no longer be affordable housing. This will be enshrined in the agreement.

4.3 The proposed use of a grant, rather than the Council being directly involved in the acquisition (for example, through a back-to-back sale and disposal) also removes financial risks to the Council in terms of potential liability around VAT and Stamp Duty Land Tax.

4.4 As the site has got detailed planning permission, one of the key risks / uncertainties around delivery has been removed. TVH has indicated that it has no intention to seek any sort of material change to the consented scheme, except for seeking a deed of variation to switch the tenure of the five affordable homes from shared-ownership to affordable rent.

4.4 TVH has indicated that it is not minded to enter into a planning obligation with the Council, as the local planning authority, to secure all 38 homes as affordable housing, but to confine this to the five already secured in that
manner. This is because such planning obligations would restrict its ability to use these properties as security for future loans. Therefore the Council would seek to use other means to ensure that the homes are provided and retained as affordable housing, potentially through the use of restrictions on the title which would require successors-in-title (in most cases) to enter into a covenant with the Council to retain the homes as affordable housing.

4.5 The nominations agreement, governing the selection of tenants for the scheme, would also be entered into at the same time as the funding agreement.

5. **Due diligence and risk management**

5.1 Whilst not being a party to the sale, the Council wants to make sure that the site is developable and deliverable, that our contribution is required and that our fiduciary duties are satisfied. Therefore prior to entering into any binding agreements, Council officers will want to satisfy themselves that the freehold that TVH intend to buy is sold with good title and that the draft contract of sale that TVH intend to enter into is a sound one. Furthermore, as outlined previously, the Council will want external validation (either through a formal valuation or a desk-top review) that the Council grant is required to make the scheme viable as a 100% affordable housing scheme.

5.2 As well as confirming what the Council will receive in return for its grant, the funding agreement will both identify risks to the delivery of the project and include remedies to mitigate these risks, so that the Council can recover its funds, should TVH breach its contractual obligations. Although officers believe that there is little prospect of the risks materialising, it will be important that safeguards be put in place. Risks identified to date include:

- Delays - either failure to start on site or to complete the development within agreed timescales (the indicative timescale for completion is Summer 2018)
- TVH becoming insolvent
- Complications arising from the mixed-use nature of the development (and ensuring a clear separation, legally and financially, between the retail and residential elements)
- The Council being of the opinion that TVH no longer has the necessary resources and funding to complete the scheme and provide it a 100% affordable housing scheme
- TVH at some point transferring the homes to a third party (and the need to put safeguards in about the long-term provision of these homes as affordable housing in such circumstances)

5.3 These, and other risks, will be addressed both through the funding agreement and via other legal / contractual means.

6. **Timescales**

6.1 TVH are keen to enter into contract with Howarth Homes and are mindful
that any significant delays could lead to the deal breaking down, an alternative purchaser being sought and the opportunity to deliver much-needed affordable homes being lost. Subject to the approval of Cabinet being ratified by Council on 7 December, it is hoped that the funding and nomination agreements could be formalised shortly thereafter, such that the contract between Howarth Homes and TVH could be completed in a similar timeframe.

6.2 At the present time, TVH anticipate that the homes will be ready for occupation in Summer 2018.

7. Financial issues

7.1 It is necessary, in accounting terms, for the Council's Capital Programme to be increased so that sufficient funding can be drawn down from the Enabling Fund to cover the grant of up to £2.508m. This can be funded from the developer contributions collected specifically for affordable housing. It is proposed that the Capital Programme be increased by the requisite amount at this time, from financial contributions collected via planning obligations specifically for affordable housing.

7.2 A payment of £2.508m will still leave in excess of £3.3m available in the Enabling Fund for other projects with the prospect of further monies being received through further planning obligations.

7.3 The delivery of a 100% affordable housing scheme would also provide some indirect financial benefits that would partially offset the Council's capital outlay. The uplift in the number of rented affordable homes provided should help relieve pressure on homelessness and related budgets, by helping directly or indirectly to reduce use of temporary accommodation in general, and bed & breakfast in particular. The increase in housing supply delivered on the site should also feed into the Council's allocation of funding through the New Homes Bonus Scheme in future years, including a premium to reflect the new supply comprising affordable housing.

8. Conclusions and next steps

8.1 The Affordable Housing Member Panel was consulted on an earlier iteration of this proposal at a meeting on 19 September and provided its in-principle support, subject to further consideration by officers and a report being prepared for Members as appropriate.

8.2 Officers believe this proposal presents an opportunity to make a significant contribution towards affordable housing delivery and meeting the Core Strategy's target of delivering 1,150 affordable homes between 2011 and 2026. The proposal also fits with the stated aim of the action plan devised following the LGA Peer Review, namely to accelerate the delivery of affordable housing.
Financial implications:
The approved capital programme be increased by £2,508,000 for the grant to TVH. This increase in the capital programme be funded from the receipts held in the Council’s Enabling Fund which currently has a balance of £5.9m. The revenue cost of the desktop review undertaken by DSP of approximately £2,200 will also be met through the Enabling Fund.

Environmental/Sustainability Implications:
None for the purposes of this report.

Legal implications:
The proposals in this report would give effect to the Council’s powers to assist in the provision of affordable housing. The Enabling Fund comprises money lawfully obtained or applied for this purpose. If the funding is agreed, then the Council’s reasonable conditions will be incorporated into an appropriate funding agreement entered into between the parties.

Equality Implications:
Increasing the supply of affordable housing should help the Council contribute to its objectives around equality and diversity.

Risk Implications:
There are financial risks to the Council, in so much as the grant will be used to support the acquisition of the residential element of the development during the construction phase (and therefore constitutes forward-funding), rather than being paid out when the homes are built and ready for occupation. The funding agreement between the Council and TVH will identify risks and seek to mitigate them, for example, by including mechanisms for repayment of all or part of the Council’s contribution should TVH default on its agreed obligations.

Community Safety Implications:
None for the purposes of this report.

Principal Consultees:
Head of Legal Services; Head of Finance; Chairman of Overview & Scrutiny Committee

Background papers:
None.

Enclosures/Appendices:
None.

Contact details:
Julie Cook – Head of Housing Services – 01372 474060 – jcook@elmbridge.gov.uk
Colin Waters – Strategy & Enabling Manager – 01372 474631 – cwaters@elmbridge.gov.uk
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Elmbridge as a Borough has a complex range of water courses, with a variety of landowners who each have their own responsibilities for river safety. Officers continue to manage the deep water risk assessments for Elmbridge owned land, and have received expert training and advice from ROSPA in carrying out these risk assessments.

In the absence of a single body responsible for water safety in Elmbridge, and in recognition for the important role that the rivers and other water courses have in the Boroughs culture and amenity it is proposed that a new Local Drowning Prevention Plan is produced working with partners through the Elmbridge Community Safety Partnership as set out in the report.

RECOMMENDED: THAT

(A) MEMBERS NOTE THE CURRENT POSITION WITH DEEP WATER SAFETY IN ELMBRIDGE AND THE STEPS THAT HAVE BEEN TAKEN TO SAFEGUARD THE COMMUNITY IS NOTED;

(B) A LOCAL DROWNING PREVENTION PLAN BE PRODUCED AND BROUGHT BACK TO CABINET IN DUE COURSE; AND

(C) OFFICERS IMPLEMENT THE ACTIONS FROM THE DROWNING PREVENTION PLAN AND INITIATES A BOROUGH WIDE PUBLICITY CAMPAIGN IN SPRING 2017 TO HIGHLIGHT THE DANGERS OF OPEN WATER SWIMMING.

REPORT:

1. Background

2. Following the tragic death of a young schoolboy in the River Thames this summer, at the meeting of the Cabinet on 12 October 2016, members considered a petition in respect of a request to allow the free use of all EBC swimming pools to under 16 year olds, and improve no swimming signage along the EBC stretch of the river.
3. As there was no single overall authority in charge of safety along the River Thames, the best that could be done in this situation was to review the circumstances and assess whether there was anything that the Council could do to prevent such tragedies in future, and the Leader advised that he had requested that Officers bring forward a report to a future meeting on any actions that the Council and its partners could take to improve river safety.

4. Elmbridge is a very green Borough, but at the same time also has a large volume of water passing through the area, including the River Thames to the north, rivers Wey, Mole and Rythe, several ponds on the Elmbridge Countryside (Black pond, Littleworth pond) and some former gravel pits which are now deep water ponds (Littleheath pond).

5. There are also several water holdings across the Borough which are situated on private land, including reservoirs, fishing lakes and golf courses. The Borough does not have a direct role in the management of these land holdings and these all are managed by the landowner.

6. The longest stretch of water in Elmbridge is arguably the River Thames which runs through the Borough from Long Ditton, through to Weybridge. Elmbridge owns very little land immediately adjacent to the river along the length of the River Thames with a variety of landowners including private landlords, the Environment Agency and Network Rail having responsibility for assessing and managing the risk.

7. **Agencies working on the River**

8. The River Thames is complex both in the nature of its land holdings, but also the agencies working along the river. A short summary of each agency and their responsibilities is included below:

9. **Environment Agency**
   - The Environment Agency is the statutory navigation authority for the non-tidal Thames
   - All Agency owned land holdings & assets, locks, some river banks, towpaths etc, are subject to full Public Safety Risk Assessments. These are reviewed annually or following an incident.
   - The Environment Agency Waterways dept issues relevant stream advice for river users, eg during enhanced flow.
   - The Environment Agency works in partnership with the Canal & River Trust's Boat Safety Office. We share safety messages and campaign initiates from BSO. All Thames registered boats are required to have a valid boat safety certificate if applicable to the type of boat.
   - Fire and Rescue Service have statutory responsibility for river rescue.

10. **RNLI**

    Today, the RNLI provides a search and rescue service to any point within the tidal reaches of the River Thames between Canvey Island and Teddington.
There are four stations on The Thames: Tower, Chiswick, Gravesend and Teddington. RNLI lifeboat stations on The Thames are unique, as they are all permanently manned, this is because RNLI Lifeboat crews on the Thames are required to be afloat within 90 seconds of being notified of an incident.

11. **Surrey Fire and Rescue**

In Surrey there is 583.5km of river and numerous lakes and reservoirs. To provide water rescue and transport capability for these risks and for incidents involving flooding.

Surrey Fire and Rescue Service have a Water Rescue Team based at Walton Community Fire Station.

The water rescue equipment consists of the Water Rescue Vehicle (call sign H188), a Pioneer Rescue Boat (call sign H187), and a Water Rescue Pod (call sign H183).

12. There are also many private residences, and other businesses all with access to the rivers and open water.

13. **Elmbridge Risk Controls**

14. Elmbridge owns land with immediate access to the River Thames at Desborough Island, Ditton Reach, Cowey Sale, Thames Ditton Slip, Albany Reach, Cigarette Island and Hurst Meadows, and has carried out deep water risk assessments at these sites to assess and manage the risk.

15. Elmbridge has a legal responsibility for effective water safety management strategies to protect the community on all its public spaces. In order to manage this responsibility, officers trained by the Royal Society for the Prevention of Accidents (ROSPA) carry out deep water risk assessments on all of its land holdings which have immediate access to deep water. Each risk assessment considers the physical features of the water, the risk of inadvertently entering the water, and the controls to mitigate risk.

16. In total Elmbridge has carried out and maintains 49 Deep Water Risk assessments, which are reviewed at least every 2 years (or in the case of an incident, or change to the physical nature of the site), and are monitored through the Council’s Covalent performance management software.

17. Mitigation measures on Elmbridge sites have included cutting back vegetation to avoid inadvertent slips into deep water and the provision of warning signage at certain locations, e.g. Littleheath and Thames Ditton slip.

18. ROSPA guidance makes it clear that the installation of water safety equipment must be seen as part of the overall assessment of the hazards presented and preventative measures. The guidance cautions against the provision of lifebelts other than at specific locations where they can be dropped vertically such as in a lock (locks are the EA’s responsibility). They
are extremely difficult to throw any distance horizontally such as from a river bank due to their weight and shape (and are vulnerable to vandalism and theft).

19. Where water safety equipment is present, some may feel that if they get into difficulty in the water, they can be saved by the available water safety equipment. This can create a false sense of security, leading to individuals believing it is safe to enter the water and taking undue risks in the water.

20. This has been reviewed recently with the removal of life buoys at Cowey Sale which were installed prior to the handover of the public open space immediately next to the fast flowing River Thames.

21. **ROSPA review**

22. Following the tragic incident at Littleheath pond in 2011 The Royal Society of Accidents (RoSPA) were commissioned to carry out a post incident review of the water safety arrangements, risk assessments and operating procedures pertaining to Littleheath Pond a flooded disused quarry which is directly access by members of the public and the owners of residential properties to the North of the pond.

23. In concluding, ROSPA made 4 recommendations which have been implemented on site, and are regularly checked as part of the Countryside team’s regular patrols:

I. reinforce the dangers of deep or fast flowing water and implementation of a No Swimming Policy where appropriate and following a suitable risk assessment.

II. EBC write to the residents of the adjacent properties to Littleheath pond reminding them of the risks from the deep water and the potential for very cold water from „Thermal Inversion“- If residents continue to use their leisure craft on this stretch of water it is strongly recommended the suitable life saving equipment is worn at all times and that young persons are supervised’.

III. produce new pictorial information signs at the entrances to the Pond these should pictorially describe the deep water in the pond and the difficulties in egress due to the sudden drop off into deep water – very cold water should be indicated.

IV. and a prohibition of swimming at any time (supported by a By Law.).

V. As previously indicated RoSPA continues to support the policy of no Personal Rescue Equipment at this site.

24. **Education and Awareness**

25. The RNLI has delivered water safety awareness at the Elmbridge Junior Citizen since 2009. Each year over 1200 year 6s from Elmbridge Schools attend Junior Citizen. This equates to approximately 9600 children from Elmbridge who have received water safety advice from the RNLI.
26. **Swimming Lessons**

27. Elmbridge took part in the 2 year Government funded Free Swimming offer (2009/10) for those aged 16 and under with external funding of £67,518 provided for the first year of the scheme. In the first year of the scheme 16,339 young people took advantage of the free swimming. National research carried out by the DCMS found that although 18 million free swims were taken across the UK during the first year of the scheme, around 73% of those aged 16 and under would have gone swimming anyway, even if they had to pay for it. Unfortunately, it is highly unlikely that free swimming would be reintroduced at the Council’s swimming facilities this would deter young people from swimming in open water such as the River Thames.

28. The Council’s leisure contractor Places for People (PFP) currently offers free swimming for under 8s (when accompanied by an adult) and has been since the end of the Government’s free swimming offer in 2010. PFP have found this approach to be self sustaining (not requiring funding) with an increase in overall attendance of both parent and child (parent paying) offsetting the non charging of under 8’s. PFP have seen a continued group wide growth in swimming participation against a national decline.

29. Residents and non-residents can obtain a 20% discount on the normal casual swim price at the Xcel Leisure Complex and Hurst Pool if they present a Council more card. This is a discount leisure card scheme which costs £10 for adults and £5 for children annually and is free for concessions thus providing a reduced rate swimming for those on low income. More work is planned with a relaunched More card in promoting the benefits of the scheme to families with lower income.

30. Swimming is the only sport detailed in the National Curriculum that should be delivered by the end of Key Stage 2 (age 11 years). Unfortunately if schools do not meet this requirement of the Curriculum it does not negatively affect their Ofsted score resulting in 45% (ASA research) of 11 year olds leaving primary school not being able to swim.

31. **Future actions**

32. Drowning is among the leading causes of accidental death in the UK; about 400 people drown every year and many of these tragedies involve children and young people, cutting short lives and devastating families. In addition, a further 200 people take their own life through drowning. The National Water Safety Forum has therefore produced the first UK Drowning Prevention Strategy (2016-26) with the aim of reducing accidental drowning fatalities in the UK by 50% by 2026.

33. The national strategy includes the following themes:

- Develop partnership working to ensure consistent guidance for the safe enjoyment and management of activities in, on and around water
- Reduce the drowning risk amongst the highest risk populations, groups and communities.
• Ensure every community with water risks has a community-level water safety risk assessment and water safety plan
• Increase awareness of everyday risks in, on and around water
• Recommendation that all recreational activity organisations should have a clear strategic risk assessment and plans that address key risks
• Develop a better understand water-related self-harm
• Improve evidence and data to better understand the causes of drowning
• Support partners and networks
• Provide leadership and advocacy
• Mobilise resources and sustained investment in drowning prevention
• Measure success

34. Elmbridge is a riverine Borough, with many river based clubs and activities. and it also has an extensive network of river and canal towpaths. This does however make it is a high risk location for drowning and sadly such tragedies have been seen in recent years. Elmbridge Borough Council is therefore eager to work with its partners and link in to the national strategy and its ambition to at least half the number of deaths by 2026.

35. Through the production of a local Drowning Prevention Plan, working closely with key partners and agencies the local plan will seek to encourage people to use the rivers and canal for recreation but ensure they do so in a safer and more informed way. Particular emphasis will be given to educating people about the high risk activities of impromptu wild water swimming and jumping from bridges.

36. A similar prevention plan has been produced in Oxford, and Officers will seek to implement the learning from this piece of work.

37. It is proposed that an Elmbridge Drowning Prevention Plan will be prepared with other partner agencies through the Elmbridge Community Safety Partnership, who will then retain responsibility for its implementation, and monitoring. The plan will consider previous incidents on Elmbridge waterways, and any joined-up actions that could be implemented to reduce the risk of these occurring in the future. This will be completed before the spring of 2017, and will be accompanied by a joint communications plan to raise awareness among key risk groups before the summer of 2017.

38. Other actions

39. In addition to the local drowning prevention plan, and joint communication activity as set out above, Elmbridge Officers will continue to assess and manage the risk on Council land through the following ongoing actions:

• Carry out regular deep water risk assessment training for staff
• Regular monitoring and review of deep water risk assessments
• To review the content of junior citizen sets to include Elmbridge appropriate water safety advice focused on rivers.
Financial implications:
 Contained within existing budgets

Environmental/Sustainability Implications:
 As contained within the report

Legal implications:
 None

Equality Implications:
 None

Risk Implications:
 There is a risk to members of the public and the authority if deep water risk is not appropriately managed on the Borough's open spaces.

Community Safety Implications:
 As contained within the report.

Principal Consultees:
 Policy Officer (Partnerships)
 Organisational Development Officer
 Green Spaces Manager
 Health and Safety Advisor

Background papers:
 None

Enclosures/Appendices:
 None

Contact details:
 Ian Burrows
 Head of Leisure and Cultural Services
 iburrows@elmbridge.gov.uk
 01372 474572
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Executive Summary:
Responsibility for highway verges and weed treatment rests with the local highway authority, Surrey County Council (SCC). The current agency agreement between SCC and EBC for grass cutting on highways verges and weed treatment comes to an end on 31 March 2017.

SCC have issued a revised 3-year funding offer to EBC, at a reduced maintenance specification and 39% less funding.

Officers have utilised the Surrey Framework to procure an alternative provider to maintain the Highway verges from 1 April 2017.

RECOMMENDED: THAT:

(A) USING THE DIRECT AWARD ROUTE TO MARKET, ELMBRIDGE AWARD THE CONTRACT TO A PRE-QUALIFIED SUPPLIER (BURLEYS) AS SET OUT IN THE REPORT FROM 1 APRIL 2017 FOR A THREE YEAR CONTRACT TERM;

(B) AN INITIAL FAMILIARISATION CUT BE CARRIED OUT IN FEBRUARY TO BE FUNDED FROM EXISTING BUDGETS; AND

(C) MEMBERS NOTE THE ADDITIONAL MEASURES THAT HAVE BEEN CONSIDERED TO ENSURE THE SMOOTH MOBILISATION OF THIS CONTRACT.

REPORT:

1. Background

   Members originally approved the transfer of selected Streetscene services to Elmbridge Council at a meeting of the Cabinet in November 2008, with responsibility for the highway verge cutting, weed control and verge repairs passing to the Council from 1 April 2009.

   The existing agency agreement between Elmbridge and Surrey, including the grant to be payable for the Streetscene services expires on 31 March 2017. Officers from SCC have undertaken a tendering exercise to establish
a new base level of funding from 1 April 2017 onwards, should any Surrey Boroughs decide to hand back the services, or to use the contract prices provided through the framework. The framework has been tendered on the basis of 7 urban cuts, 2 rural cuts and 2 weed spray treatments per year. Surrey’s responsibilities are primarily highway safety in so far as cutting to maintain sight-lines more so than amenity of street scene. As a result, these standards are some way below the existing standard of cut delivered for verges in Elmbridge.

4. Surrey’s Local Highway Services Group Manager has contacted Elmbridge with the financial offer for the next 3 years based on the outcomes of the Framework tender. This will be secured through an updated agency agreement to protect the levels of funding for this period. The offer sum is a 39% reduction on the current level of funding, however Surrey have made clear that they are prepared to offer an additional 20% for staffing costs on top of that amount.

5. At the Cabinet meeting on 6 July 2016, it was resolved that Option 2 – Maintain existing frequency, be supported as the preferred option moving forward. This option provides for up to 10 urban and 2 rural cuts per years at an additional cost to the Council of £3,597 a year for the remainder of the contract.

6. **Current position**

7. Due to the uncertainty around the funding and the future of the verges a one year temporary agreement was reached with the current Green Spaces Contractor, The Landscape Group (TLG) through until 31 March 2017.

8. To continue to provide best value for the Council, officers had agreed with TLG to continue to maintain the grass verges on a frequency based contract for the remaining year of the agency, continuing to maintain the verges at 10 urban (on a 4-week cycle) and 2 rural cuts a year. This work has been carried out through a subcontractor, as TLG have been unable to invest in new equipment without a longer-term commitment.

9. There has been unprecedented level of complaints received regarding the poor and non-performance of the grass cutting of the highway verges during the summer months, totalling 487 complaints during the main growing season from April to October 2016.

10. There have been a series of operational challenges in maintaining the grass cutting standards across the Borough. In response, an additional 3-day weekend project of concentrated urban verge mowing was arranged by the contractor during August at no cost to the authority. Since this time, standards on the highway verges have been maintained, coupled with a natural reduced rate of growth as the seasons changed.

11. There is one remaining urban cuts for the year to be completed by TLG, this is scheduled for March 2017 before the current agreement comes to an
12. **Options moving forward**

13. Given that the current temporary arrangement with TLG comes to an end in March 2017, and mindful of the current level of dissatisfaction, Officers have revisited the options for delivering the service through to the end of the current funding arrangement with Surrey County Council in March 2020.

14. TLG have confirmed that it would be their intention to continue with the existing sub-contractor for next year, maintaining the verges at 10 urban (on a 4-week cycle) and 2 rural cuts a year. There are no long term assurances that the same sub contractor would be available through to March 2020 which would be an additional risk were members minded to continue with TLG.

15. As part of the Surrey tendering exercise, a Framework tender (SCC Dynamic Purchasing System (DPS) /Framework) has been made available, where any of the Surrey Boroughs can call off services, including Highway verges, through a benchmarking exercise.

16. The DPS/ Framework Agreement provides greater flexibility to vary the number and frequency of cuts, between 10 to 12 urban and 2 to 3 rural cuts. This is based on 3 week\15 working day cycle for the urban area, during the main growing season and, provides the opportunity of 1 – 2 urban cuts during a mild winter/early spring as required.

17. The tighter 15 working day frequency with a lower cut (height) will provide a higher quality finish than the current 4 week cutting frequency.

18. The DPS/ Framework Agreement also provides a greater financial remedy for non-or poor performance. As the financial remedy covers the full value of the works and would allow the Council to fully deduct the cost of the works and bring in an alternative contractor to complete the required works and charge the failed contractor any difference in costs to EBC.

19. A benchmarking exercise was held with the 2 available contractors on the Elmbridge element of the Framework. Within the competition Officers were able to clarify the availability of more detailed GIS maps, with accurate areas of grass and to clarify important elements including the number of days to complete each cut, and references.

20. These results were then analysed, and compared against the available budgets. The results of the comparison can be found at Appendix A.

21. Within the £133, 685 funding approved by Cabinet in July, the framework prices have confirmed delivery of up to 10 urban cuts and 2 rural cuts. There is also a small surplus of funding left over that will be held as a further contingency should an additional urban or rural cut be required.
22. As a result, this report recommends that Cabinet approve the route to market to direct award to G. Burley & Sons Limited (using the SCC Countryside DPS/Framework (Verge Maintenance) Lot 2, a three-year contract, starting 1 April 2017.

23. Subject to Cabinet agreeing the above, TLG will be issued with a month’s notice to terminate the current contract for the Highway Verges by 01 April 2017.

24. **Mobilisation**

25. SCC Highway Verges follow an extensive complex network of roads throughout Elmbridge. The risks facing a contractor with no previous knowledge or experience of Elmbridge’s highway grass verges are enormous. A new contractor needs to establish detailed knowledge of the size and extent of the verge network.

26. In the light of the issues faced with the verges in the past 2 summers, additional controls have been put in place to mitigate the risk of poor performance and ensure that the new contractor is up to speed by April 2017 when the rate of grass growth is at its peak.

27. Burleys have previous knowledge and experience of cutting Elmbridge highway verges to the Councils required standard and will be provided with GIS plans providing clear site locations and extent of the SCC verges.

28. A revised specification has been secured with the new framework contract, with contractors being asked to price to maintain grass height between 20-25mm, compared to the previous Surrey guidance of 50-75mm. This will ensure that the grass is kept to a much tighter finish, but will also be easier to maintain the quality.

29. Burleys have also confirmed that they will be able to complete each scheduled cut within 15 working days (subject to weather and machine breakdowns) compared to the 20 working days in the past 2 summers. This combined with the shorter length of grass, and the above controls should ensure a much neater finish and a significant reduction in complaints.

30. As part of the benchmarking exercise, officers sought confirmation of the type of machinery to be used on the contract, which has been confirmed as appropriate for the task by the Green Spaces Manager.

31. As part of the benchmarking exercise, Officers have obtained an excellent local reference for Burleys from London Borough of Sutton as quoted below:

   “We have been working with Burleys since around 1996, and on verge cutting for much of that time including our latest Verge maintenance contract which has run from about 2007 (with extensions). They have always performed well even at times when others have struggled, and
32. Financial remedies have been included for any slippages or breaches of the contract. This includes not paying the contractor until each cut is completed to the satisfaction of the Contract Administrator.

33. Subject to Cabinet agreement, it is proposed that Burleys will be requested to carry out one urban cut during February 2017 (subject to weather conditions) to re-familiarise their staff as to the extent and site locations of the highway verges. This will be within existing budgets and will be in addition to the final cut of the season from the existing contractor.

Financial implications:
In advance of the 2016/17 budget setting, officers were made aware of Surrey County Council’s intention to reduce their funding for grass cutting on highways verges and weed treatment from 1 April 2016.

Surrey County Council did not reduce their funding for 2016/17 but have given notice to reduce funding for 2017/18. The table below summarises Cabinets agreed Option 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Option 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highway Grass Cutting</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor Costs</td>
<td>133,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Costs</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weed Treatment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor Costs</td>
<td>22,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On costs</td>
<td>1,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditure</strong></td>
<td><strong>176,305</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC Funding</td>
<td>131,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus 20%</td>
<td>26,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>157,918</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(surplus)/Deficit</strong></td>
<td><strong>18,387</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17 Budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways Grass Cutting</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verges</td>
<td>(3,210)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2016/17 Budget</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,790</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2017/18 Approved Budget Growth</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,597</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Environmental/Sustainability Implications:
As contained within the report

Legal implications:
As contained within the report

Equality Implications:
As contained within the report

**Risk Implications:**
As contained within the report

**Community Safety Implications:**
As contained within the report

**Principal Consultees:**
CMB
Services Group Accountant
Head of Legal Services
Procurement Adviser

**Background papers:**
None.

**Enclosures/Appendices:**
**Appendix A** – Benchmarked Prices with two pre-qualified providers

**Contact details:**
Ian Burrows
Head of Leisure and Cultural Services
iburrows@elmbridge.gov.uk
01372 474572

Ian Gayton
Green Spaces Manager
igayton@elmbridge.gov.uk
01372 47471
By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

In 2014 the Council agreed to undertake a review of the evidence base supporting the Local Plan. This was in response to the changing policy framework at a national level and several legal challenges in relation to local plans. The review was completed earlier this year and following the consideration of this new evidence it was agreed that the Council would need to prepare a Local Plan to replace the Core Strategy. The timetable for the delivery of this new plan was the set out in the Local Development Scheme (LDS) 2016 to 2019 which was adopted at the Cabinet meeting 14 September 2016. Following the adoption of the LDS a consultation paper has been prepared setting out the strategic options the Council has considered in seeking to deliver sustainable development within the Borough over the next 20 years. This paper provides an overview of the consultation document, attached in Appendix A, and asks Cabinet to approve this draft for consultation.

RECOMMENDATION: THAT THE CABINET

- RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL THAT THE ATTACHED STRATEGIC OPTION CONSULTATION BE AGREED FOR PUBLICATION

REPORT:

1 Background

1.1 The Government is committed to significantly increasing house building across the Country and has stated that local planning authorities must meet housing needs for their area in full. This directive is set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which was introduced by the Government in 2012, a year after the Council adopted its Core Strategy. Further to the NPPF the Government published Planning Practice Guidance which provides more detail as to how local authorities should seek to establish what the need for development is in their areas and how they should plan to meet those needs.

1.2 As a result of these changes in policy and legislation there have been a number of legal challenges and inspector’s decisions as to the ‘soundness’ of other local authorities’ local plans. These decisions gave a strong indication that the Council needed to reconsider the evidence supporting the
Core Strategy. Two examples were the legal challenge against Solihull’s adopted Core Strategy and the inspectors’ findings of the Harrogate Local Plan. Both these situations indicated that plans based on pre NPPF housing targets supported by data from Regional Spatial Strategies that had been revoked by the Government, would be considered out of date.

1.3 Within this policy climate the Council decided in 2014 to review the evidence base supporting the Core Strategy and using this evidence agreed to prepare a new Local Plan for submission to the Secretary of State in 2018. The three main elements of this review were the preparation of a new Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) to assess housing needs, a review of constraints on development (including a review of the Green Belt) and the preparation of a new Land Availability Assessment to consider the supply of development land. In addition officers commissioned additional studies on Retail Needs, a Traveller Accommodation Assessment as well as undertaking studies in-house on land supply, Local Green Space, employment land, retail frontages and settlement hierarchies.

1.4 The result of the evidence review are all available on the Council’s planning policy webpages and informed the Council’s decision to adopt a new Local Development Scheme which detailed the Council’s commitment to prepare a new local plan. The preparation of this plan starts with a consultation on the strategic options with regard to the Council’s approach to delivering new development over the next 20 years.

2 The Strategic Options Consultation

2.1 As part of the preparation of a new plan all local planning authorities are required to consult with both their residents and other key stakeholders such as local businesses, land owners, developers and infrastructure providers on the potential development options that could be considered by the authority. The proposed consultation is the first part of that process and sets out the potential options that the Council has considered in trying to meet our development needs over the next 20 years. Alongside these strategic development options the consultation paper also sets out a number of other key issues facing the Borough such as developer contributions for affordable housing, development densities and how the Council should consider the provision of Gypsy and Traveller pitches.

2.2 The responses to this consultation will then inform the preparation of a preferred approach which will be consulted on in the summer of 2017 before a final plan is prepared. A final opportunity is then given to all stakeholders to make representations on the soundness of this plan before it is submitted to the Secretary of State, alongside all the representations, for a public examination in 2018.

Developing the strategic options

2.3 In developing a local plan the Council is required to undertake an objective assessment of development needs within the area. Against these needs the Council must also then assess the availability of land to meet that need
including the constraints to development. If there is insufficient land in the urban area to meet needs in line with the parameters of the current Local Plan, the Council must then examine alternative options to meet this residual need.

2.4 The results of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) showed that the Borough’s Objectively Assessed Housing Need was 474 units per annum with the total expected need of 9,480 units by 2035. With regard to affordable units again need of 332 per annum is significantly higher than our current target and reflects the back log of need in the Borough that would need to be addressed as well as meeting any new needs coming forward. In addition to the overall assessment of need the SHMA gave an indication of the mix of units that would be required to meet future needs. It is clear that needs are predominately in 1, 2 and 3 bedroomed units with only 1% of total need being for houses of four or more bedrooms. However, at present the predominant form of housing delivered has been four or more bedrooms, for example 105 such houses were built in 2015/16 compared to 19 three bedroomed units built during the same period. Accommodation needs for specific groups, such as older people and the traveller community, are also being assessed and will form part of the overall assessment of housing needs in the Borough.

2.5 Away from housing needs, projections for employment uses, such as offices, warehouses etc. the evidence base review indicates demand for a further 30,000sqm of office floorspace and 20,000sqm of distribution/warehouse floorspace. In addition to this, and in order to maintain market share the area needs around an additional 19,000sqm of comparison retail (shops selling white goods, clothes etc.) and 1,900sqm of convenience retail (such as supermarkets and other day to day grocery stores).

Capacity of urban area to deliver new development

2.6 In order to understand whether the Council is able to meet this level of development needs through the Core Strategy officers have prepared a Land Availability Assessment (LAA). This assessment seeks to identify all the available and developable land in the urban area that could be used to meet identified needs. As part of this assessment a call for sites was undertaken and landowners, developers and their agents contacted to identify any potential development sites. All sites were than considered and a thorough assessment was undertaken on each site as to whether they were:

- suitable for the development proposed;¹
- available for development; and
- development on the site was achievable.

¹ Planning Practice Guidance identifies a suitable site as one which offers a suitable location for development and would contribute to the creation of sustainable communities. An available site is one where there is no ownership or other legal issues that would prevent the ability of the site from being developed or which cannot be overcome. Achievability refers to whether the site is economically viable when considering the market and the cost of development.
2.7 The results of the assessment indicated that the Council has sufficient available and developable land in the urban area to deliver in the region of 3,725 additional homes by 2035. This figure includes 1,300 units from unimplemented planning permissions, 1,700 units from opportunity sites\(^2\) and 725 units from windfall (sites of between 1 and 4 net units). Alongside opportunities for delivering new homes, there is some scope to deliver in the region of 10,000sqm of offices and 10,000sqm of warehousing through redevelopment and intensification of existing Strategic Employment Land. No specific sites have come forward as part of the preparation of the LAA for retail expansion in the town and village centres or for Gypsy and Traveller pitches.

2.8 Whilst the land available for development is sufficient to deliver the level of development set out in the Council’s Core Strategy it is clear that it would be insufficient to deliver the needs set out above. In particular there remains a significant shortfall of housing land to meet the objectively assessed need, with additional land needing to be identified to provide for the residual of 5,755 dwellings (9,480 minus 3,725).

**Constraints on development**

2.9 The NPPF sets out in paragraph 47 that Local Planning Authorities should ensure they meet in full the objective assessment of housing need as far as is consistent with the policies set out in the NPPF. These policies include paragraph 14 which states that that Local Plans should meet needs unless “specific policies in the Framework indicate development should be restricted”. These policies include Green Belt, Sites of Special Scientific Interest, Local Green Space, designated heritage assets and locations at risk of flooding.

2.10 However, whilst Green Belt remains a key part of the Government’s policy in the NPPF it also states that Green Belt boundaries should be reviewed as part of the plan making process and to consider whether there are any exceptional circumstances supporting their amendment. In addition the NPPF states that when defining these boundaries LPAs should not include land which it is unnecessary to keep open and consider the consequences for sustainable development of channelling development towards urban areas inside the Green Belt. Therefore as part of preparing the plan and developing options the Council has reviewed Green belt and other constraints.

2.11 The broad results of this study showed that of the 5608 ha of land designated as Green Belt:

- 2750 ha of Green Belt is performing strongly against at least one purpose
- 2580 ha of Green Belt is performing moderately against at least one purpose of the Green Belt

\(^2\) An opportunity site is one considered to be available for development and deliverable should a reasonable scheme come forward. It does not convey any form of permission on that site and is purely an assessment of potential.
• 278 ha of Green Belt is performing weakly against all the purposes of the Green Belt

2.12 In addition to the Green Belt Review officers also undertook an assessment of the absolute constraints that were present. Absolute constraints are those that would prevent development from taking place and where it would not be possible to mitigate the impacts. This includes for example, land designated as Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI); Ancient Woodland; and land within the Functional Flood Plain (Flood Zone 3b). Of the weakly performing Green Belt parcels 56ha were covered by an absolute constraint. This means that there was 222ha of Green Belt that is considered to be weakly performing but that are not, or only partially, covered by absolute constraints.

3 The Options

3.1 Based on the evidence collected and the policies set out in the NPPF three broad options were identified.

1. To meet housing need by delivering very high density development in the urban area
2. To meet needs as far as possible by amending Green Belt boundaries and remove those areas that are performing weakly in relation to the purposes of Green Belt and seek opportunities for development in these areas
3. To meet needs in full by exploring opportunities for development in the Green Belt regardless of the strength to which it meets these purposes

3.2 Details of each of these options, including the benefits and disadvantages of each are set out in the attached consultation document. These were identified as part of the Sustainability Appraisal for each option and from this “Option 2” was identified as the preferred option that officers recommend that the Council should take forward. It was considered that “Option 2” provided the most appropriate balance in terms of meeting needs whilst protecting the character and environment of the Borough’s settlements. Whilst the other two options were considered to have the benefit of meeting housing needs in full it was considered that the potential impact on the area from these two options were not sustainable and the adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the NPPF.

3.3 In addition to undertaking a sustainability appraisal of these options the Council must also consider whether there are exceptional circumstances that allow it to amend Green Belt boundaries as part of the plan making process. These are not defined in national policy and would need to be locally specific. The Government has said that unmet need on its own is not considered exceptional. Officers have considered what these circumstances could be and how these are exceptional in relation to Elmbridge. The circumstances identified by officers are:
- One of the worst levels of affordability in the country coupled with an under supply of affordable homes;
- Need to deliver a better mix of new housing away from current delivery focussed on houses of four or more bedrooms; and
- The land that is being kept open for the purposes of Green Belt is no longer meeting those purposes.

3.4 Officers consider that these circumstances could be recommended to an inspector as being exceptional and are sufficient to support the amendment of Green Belt where it is weakly performing against the purposes of Green Belt.

Key Strategic Areas

3.5 Based on the principles set out in “Option 2” in the consultation document three areas of Green Belt have been identified where the designation could be removed and which would offer some potential for development. Each of these area was judged in the Green Belt Boundary Review to have been performing weakly against the purposes of Green Belt and were not, or only partially, affected by absolute constraints. The three key strategic areas are:

- Land north of Blundell Lane including Knowle Hill Park and Fairmile Park, Cobham (Local Area 14);
- Land south of the A3 including Chippings Farm and The Fairmile, Cobham (Local Area 20); and
- Land north of the A309 and east & west of Woodstock Lane North, Long Ditton (Local Area 58).

3.6 Maps for each of these areas are set out in the consultation document and indicate key features and absolute constraints. No development sites have been identified in these areas that this stage and it is expected that as part of the consultation sites will be submitted for further consideration.

Why we haven’t included a do nothing option.

3.7 The Government has been clear that it remains committed to a plan led system and has taken steps to ensure Councils progress plans quickly to examination and adoption. Firstly the Government has identified its expectations as to when different authorities should have plans in place. Those Councils that have not adopted a plan since the introduction of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act in 2004 are required to have a plan submitted for examination by early 2017. There are now indications that the Government will set out the expectation that plans adopted prior to the publication of the NPPF in 2012 will be expected to have reviewed existing plans and where necessary submitted these for examination by March 2018.

3.8 To enforce these deadlines the Government have given greater powers to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government to intervene in the plan making process in the Housing and Planning Act 2016. This Act gives the Secretary of State the power to:
• prepare a local development scheme for an authority and direct them to bring that scheme into effect;
• direct an inspector during the examination of a development plan;
• prepare or revise plans on behalf of an authority and give directions with regard to publication and adoption of development plans; and
• require the authority to reimburse the Secretary of State for any intervention.

3.9 The Government have also been consulting on proposed amendments to the distribution of the New Homes Bonus with reductions in these funds should applications come forward by appeal or where a local authority does not have an up to date local plan in place. Whilst no firm policy direction has been provided yet it gives an indication of what the Government's policy could be.

3.10 Given that the authority already faces a significant application for a development in the Green Belt the risks are stark. Those authorities who are not planning positively through the preparation of up to date local plans are at risk of having key decisions on development in their boroughs being made by the Planning Inspectorate and Secretary of State rather than by locally elected Councillors.

4 Other key issues for consultation.

4.1 Section 4 of the consultation document examines the key issues that will define how development comes forward over the next 20 years and we are seeking views on how we might address these issues in future. The section examines a range of issue from affordable housing provision and development densities through to employment land and managing flood risk. In some instances we are not seeking to amend policies where they are in conformity with the NPPF, however, it is considered appropriate to ask whether improvements could be made to our current approach. Where a new approach is considered to be required changes are suggested. No options are being put forward in this section and any comments on these issues will be considered and used to develop policy approaches for the next stage of plan preparation.

5 Consultation

5.1 Should Cabinet agree the recommendation the consultation will begin on the 15 December 2016 for a period of 8 weeks. This is longer than the 6 week statutory timetable and reflects the fact that the consultation will include the Christmas period. As part of the consultation process letters will be sent to all statutory consultees and all contacts on our consultation database. A series of drop in sessions will be held to give residents and other interested parties the opportunity to learn more about the Strategic Options and discuss any concerns with officers. The consultation will be publicised through the Council’s website, notice boards, social media and through the local press.
**Financial implications:**
Resources for the review and preparation of the local plan were agreed in September and at present remain sufficient to support delivery. However, given the constantly changing policy framework with regard to the preparation of local plans officers will monitor this situation. There are potential implications of not preparing a plan in relation to New Homes Bonus (NHB) depending on the outcomes of recent Government consultations [https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/new-homes-bonus-sharpening-the-incentive-technical-consultation](https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/new-homes-bonus-sharpening-the-incentive-technical-consultation). This could lead to a reduction in the amount of NHB allocated to the Council should it not adopt a plan and development being permitted on appeal.

**Environmental implications:**
None for the purpose of this report.

**Legal implications:**
In preparing a new Local Plan the Council must have regard to a variety of legislation to ensure it is legally sound. At this stage the Council must ensure that the correct consultation process is followed with regard to minimum timescales and statutory consultees. Our approach to consultation is set out in our Statement on Consultation and Involvement (SCI) which sets out how the Council will fulfil its statutory obligations. Other legal obligations such as the Duty to Co-operate, Equalities legislation and Strategic Environmental Assessments have also been considered as part of the process of preparing the Strategic Options consultation.

**Equality Implications:**
The approach taken in meeting the needs of key groups such as older people, gypsies and travellers and younger people will be considered throughout the preparation of the local plan.

**Risk Management Implications:**
The risks of not preparing a new local plan are set out in the report.

**Community Safety Implications:**
None for the purpose of this report.

**Background papers:**
None

**Enclosures/Appendices:**
Appendix ‘A’: Strategic Options consultation paper

**Contact details:**
Mark Behrendt, Planning Policy Manager 01372 474829 mbehrendt@elmbridge.gov.uk
Glossary of Acronyms and Initials

AMR – Authority Monitoring Report
CIL – Community Infrastructure Levy
DPH – Dwellings per hectare
ELR – Employment Land Review
EqIA – Equality Impact Assessment
FRA – Flood Risk Assessment
GBBR – Green Belt Boundary Review
GTAA – Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment
HMA – Housing Market Area
HRA – Habitats Regulation Assessment
IDP – Infrastructure Delivery Plan
LAA – Land Availability Assessment
LNR – Local Nature Reserve
NPPF – National Planning Policy Framework
OAHN – Objectively Assessed Housing Need
PPG – Planning Practice Guidance
SA – Sustainability Appraisal
SANG – Suitable Accessible Natural Greenspace
SEA – Strategic Environmental Assessment
SEL – Strategic Employment Land
SFRA – Strategic Flood Risk Assessment
SHMA – Strategic Housing Market Assessment
SPD – Supplementary Planning Document
SSSI – Site of Special Scientific Interest
TBHSPA – Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area
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1 Introduction

What is this consultation about?

1.1 This consultation is to seek views on the options for meeting development needs as part of the preparation of a new Local Plan to replace the Core Strategy.

1.2 In particular, it sets out the Council’s preferred option for a new spatial strategy against which new development targets will be established. We are also seeking comments on the future direction on a range of issues which will help inform the development of a new Local Plan.

What is the Local Plan?

1.3 The Local Plan is the document which guides the direction of new development in the Borough. It sets targets for the delivery of different types of development, provides guidance on locations as to where this development will happen and establishes which areas should be protected. It also sets out policies by which future planning applications will be determined. The new Local Plan together with revised and existing documents will set the direction for future development in the Borough up to 2035.

How is the Local Plan different to the Core Strategy?

1.4 In 2011 the Government amended the legislation on plan making. This removed the requirement for us to have a suite of documents – a Core Strategy, Development Management Plan and a Site Allocations Plan. In contrast we were required to prepare a single Local Plan. However, those Local Authorities which had already adopted multiple plans, such as Elmbridge, were allowed to keep using those polices considered to be up to date and preparing multiple plans.

1.5 As we are reviewing the Core Strategy, and have not yet adopted a site allocations plan (which we called Settlement Investment and Development Plans), we will look to combine these into a single plan called the Local Plan. This plan will set out our overarching approach to the location of new development; the infrastructure required to support that development as well as polices affecting how that new development will come forward such as the type, scale and mix of development on a site. As highlighted above this consultation is on the overarching spatial strategy with a further consultation on detailed policies and site allocations taking place in the summer of 2017.

Why have we reviewed the Core Strategy?

1.6 In 2012 the Government published the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which changed the way that we must plan for new development. Following this they published Planning Practice Guidance which provided more detail as to how Local Planning Authorities should implement the NPPF. In particular, the Government has required local authorities to meet the housing needs of their areas. Whilst the Council has an adopted Plan setting out a housing target, a number of decisions regarding local plans indicated that our
Plan could be considered out of date as it was adopted prior to the NPPF being introduced. Alongside changes to housing policies, the Government has also set out that all Local Planning Authorities need to ensure it has considered all options for delivery – including reviewing Green Belt boundaries to ensure that only land which is required to be kept permanently open to meet the purposes of Green Belt is retained under that designation.

1.7 In 2014 the Council therefore committed to a review of the evidence supporting the Core Strategy in order to make a decision as to whether we could continue to use the Core Strategy or whether a new plan was needed. Two key outcomes of the evidence base review showed that the need for housing was significantly higher than our current target and that the approach and policies set out in the Core Strategy needed to be reviewed and various options considered as to how to address development needs in future.

How have we approached the review of the Core Strategy?

1.8 In undertaking the review of Core Strategy the Council has looked to examine needs and has then assessed whether the existing strategy could meet those needs without having to amend the Plan. Once it was established that needs could not be met through the current Core Strategy, alternative options were considered and it is these options that are set out in this consultation document.

1.9 Included within this consultation document are the high-level outcomes from the evidence base review. For those wishing to see the final details, the entire suite of evidence base documents can be found on our website. Appendix 1 also sets out an Evidence Base Glossary explaining briefly each of the evidence base documents available.

Will we be changing all existing planning policies?

1.10 We will be preparing a whole new plan, which will be called the “Local Plan”, for examination to replace the Core Strategy as well as allocate development sites. However, we will seek to retain many of the policies in the Core Strategy that are in conformity with the NPPF and which continue to meet our objectives for development locally. We will seek to update policies where necessary, changing any references that are out of date and updating justifications with new evidence.

1.11 We are also not proposing to amend the Development Management Plan that was adopted in 2015. As this document is about day-to-day decision-making it is not affected by policies on the location and scale of development that are set out in the Core Strategy.

1.12 Our approach to the policies in the Core Strategy and whether they will be retained, amended or replaced is set out in Appendix 2.

How can you get involved?

1.13 We want to hear your views. You are welcome to comment on every issue and option set out in this document or, if you are interested in just one or two, you can focus your comments on these. We are particularly interested to know if:

- You agree with the Council’s preferred option to meeting, as far as possible, the development needs of the Borough; and
• We have correctly identified all the issues and options that a new Local Plan should address.

1.14 Your comments will help us to choose the best strategy for the Borough and the mix of development to be delivered up to 2035.

This statutory consultation runs from Friday 16 December 2016 until Friday 10 February 2017.

1.15 We cannot accept anonymous comments and your views must be made in writing. We would like you to send your comments electronically if possible. You can complete the questionnaire on our website submitting your response directly into our consultation or download a copy, complete and email back to us at planningpolicy@elmbridge.gov.uk. If you are unable to access our documents electronically, please contact us via the details set out in paragraphs 1.24 and request a printed copy of the questionnaire that can be completed and returned to us. You will need to clearly mark any additional sheets confirming which part of the document you are responding to.

1.16 Any comments that you submit will be published on the Council’s website and in hard-copy form as appropriate. Signatures and personal contact details such as postal and email addresses will be redacted. Your name will however be published. If applicable, the name of the company / organisation etc. that you represent will also be published.

1.17 If you need any help with making your comments please contact the Planning Policy Team using the contact details in paragraph 1.24.

1.18 As part of the consultation, a number of road shows / drop-in events are being held across the Borough. These will consist of exhibitions where the headlines of this consultation document will be displayed. The evidence base documents supporting this consultation will also be available to view. Representatives from the Planning Policy Team will be on-hand to answer any questions you have. Please visit our website for further information.

1.19 Copies of the consultation document will also be available to view at the Council Offices in Esher and in libraries across the Borough during the consultation period. For locations and opening times, please check the appropriate websites:

• Civic Centre – www.elmbridge.gov.uk/our-offices
• Libraries – www.surreycc.gov.uk/people-and-community/libraries

What happens next?

1.20 Following the consultation, we will assess all the comments and prepare a statement responding to the issues raised and how we will seek to address them. We will then prepare a more detailed plan which will be published for consultation in July 2017. This will set out for consultation the Council’s preferred approach to:

• Our vision and objectives for delivering new development;
• The spatial strategy to deliver the vision and objectives;
• Key sites that will be allocated for development and what they will be allocated for;
- Which existing sites together with the uses on those sites that will be protected from inappropriate development; and
- The strategic policies which will support us in making decisions and determining planning applications to deliver the vision.

**How can I continue to be involved?**

1.21 This consultation marks the first in a series of documents that we will seek the views of our residents and other interested stakeholders on, as set out in figure 1 below. As we progress, each document will become more detailed in terms of our approach to addressing the development needs of the Borough and the identification of sites for future allocation and designation e.g. safeguard against future development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2015-2016</th>
<th>Evidence gathering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan-Mar 2017</td>
<td>Strategic Issues and Options (Regulation 18 Consultation)* Consult on options for meeting development needs and a new spatial strategy for the Borough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-Sep 2017</td>
<td>Preferred Strategic Approach and Policies – including site allocations and policy designations (Regulation 18 consultation)* Consult on draft policies and proposals and sites for inclusion in the Local Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2018</td>
<td>Draft Plan – Pre-submission Representation Period. (Regulation 19 Consultation)* Consult on the draft plan that we intend to submit for Examination in Public. Representations received will be submitted to the appointed Planning Inspector for consideration and are not acted upon by the Local Planning Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2018</td>
<td>Submit Plan to the Secretary of State for Examination (Regulation 22) The Plan, all supporting documents and all representations received are submitted to the Planning Inspectorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 2018</td>
<td>Independent Examination in Public and Inspector’s Report (Regulation 24 and 25) An independent examination is held to test the soundness of the draft Local Plan. All those who made representations are given the opportunity to make their case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 2018</td>
<td>Adoption of the new Local Plan (Regulation 26) Will be adopted at full Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1: Process for delivering a new Elmbridge Local Plan 2015 – 2035 *Opportunities for community participation in the Local Plan process.**
1.22 Ultimately, we will be seeking views on a draft Local Plan that we intend to submit to the Secretary of State for examination by a Planning Inspector. The Planning Inspector will examine the content of the plan and the evidence base and consider all comments submitted during the final consultation period to help determine whether the plan is appropriate for adoption by the Council.

1.23 Those submitting comments at the final consultation stage will be given the opportunity to appear at the examination of the draft Local Plan and have their views heard by a Planning Inspector in public.

**Keeping up-to-date**

Even if you do not respond to this consultation, the best way to be kept up to date with the progress of the new Local Plan is by registering on our Consultation Portal. Each time we consult on a Local Plan document we will automatically engage with those who have registered their details.

Register your details at: consult.elmbridge.gov.uk/consult.ti/system/register

If you respond to this consultation via e-mail or letter, the Council will automatically register your details on the portal and we will continue to engage with you. If you do not wish for us to continue to contact you regarding the Local Plan, please make this clear in your comments.

We will not disclose personal information to third parties for marketing purposes.

**Contacts**

1.24 The officers in the Council's Planning Policy Team are here to provide assistance throughout the preparation of the Local Plan. Should you have any queries relating to this consultation document or the Local Plan, please contact us by:

**Writing to:** Planning Policy Team, Planning Services, Elmbridge Borough Council, Civic Centre, High Street, Esher, Surrey, KT10 9SD

**Emailing:** PlanningPolicy@elmbridge.gov.uk

**Telephoning:** 01372 474474
2 The Key Issues for Elmbridge

2.1 Elmbridge covers an area of 9,634 ha in the north of Surrey and adjoins the London Boroughs of Kingston upon Thames and, across the river, Richmond. Despite being a relatively small Borough in size it is home to over 150,000 people who live in the towns and villages, each with its own distinctive character. Whilst Walton on Thames is the largest centre with the most significant shopping area there is no single dominant town providing a core of services for the entire Borough. Each town and village has its own centre with a range of shops and services which seek to support the needs of that community.

2.2 This patchwork of towns and villages is a distinct feature of the Borough with these settlements, by and large, being separated by open land which is designated as Green Belt. A key feature of the urban area in Elmbridge is the relatively low-density character within many of its settlements. This character is further enhanced by the significant open spaces that provide space for recreation and leisure as well as providing key breaks in the urban character.

Figure 2: Elmbridge Borough and neighbouring Boroughs and Districts

2.3 The high quality environment and good rail and road links to the capital means that the area is popular with those working in London. Over half the working population commutes into London. These transport links to the capital and proximity to both Gatwick and Heathrow also make the Borough popular for businesses. The Borough is home to a
number of major corporations located mainly at the Brooklands Business Park to the south of Weybridge. However, the area is not just attractive to major corporations. Elmbridge has one of the highest business start-up rates in the Region with our town centres and sites such as Hersham Technology Park and Molesey Industrial Estate providing space for smaller businesses to develop and grow.

Figure 3: Elmbridge Borough

2.4 The very qualities set out above which make Elmbridge a popular place to live and work, also mean that there is a significant demand for more land on which to build more houses, offices, warehouses and the associated infrastructure to support such new development. We are required by Government to not only assess these development pressures but also set out how we intend to meet them and to what extent.

2.5 However, it is essential that the approach we take for meeting development needs are sustainable. This means that the social, environmental and economic impacts of development need to be considered. Therefore outlined below are not only the development
pressures we are facing but also other factors which will need to be considered when deciding the most appropriate approach to meeting the Borough’s development needs to 2035. Whilst these pressures reflect the current economic, social and political landscape we will continue to monitor changes such as the decision to leave the European Union or the expansion of Heathrow that could impact on the approach we need to take with the new Local Plan.

2.6 These development needs are summarised visually in Figure 4.

![Figure 4: A summary of Elmbridge’s development needs up to 2035](image)

**Housing**

2.7 The principal development pressure across London and the South East is for housing. Elmbridge’s location, the availability of good services and high quality environment mean that this pressure is reflected locally. In fact the high house prices and pressure for new development is more reflective of London than the rest of Surrey. Therefore when assessing housing needs we examined needs across an area that included Kingston upon Thames, Epsom and Ewell and Mole Valley (both of which also border Kingston) and formed a logical Housing Market Area (HMA) within which to consider needs.
2.8 The needs across this HMA are set out in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) and show that 40,005 new homes are required across the HMA between 2015 and 2035 (2,000 new homes per annum). The highest need is recorded in Kingston (14,348 homes; 717 per annum) followed by Elmbridge (9,480; 474 per annum), Epsom & Ewell (8,352 homes; 418 per annum) and Mole Valley (7,814; 391 per annum).

2.9 In seeking to meet housing needs, we must also ensure that we are providing the right type, size and tenure of housing that our existing and future populations require. A key focus of this consultation paper is therefore how we seek to provide more affordable housing, smaller homes (one to three bedrooms), and specialist accommodation including the provision of pitches for Gypsies and Travellers and plots for Travelling Showpeople.

2.10 It is important to stress that the housing figure for Elmbridge in the SHMA is not necessarily a target to be transposed into the Local Plan. Rather, it shows how many new homes would be needed if there were no planning restrictions on development in the Borough. Often referred to as the Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAHN), it is the starting point for the debate about the number of new homes that the Local Plan will eventually indicate should be built in Elmbridge. Working alongside our communities and neighbouring authorities we will also need to determine whether we can help meet any further housing need arising from the wider HMA. This will be done through the preparation of the Local Plan and will take account of the Green Belt, areas at high risk of flooding and other policies which constrain new development in the Borough. It will also be necessary to take account of the Borough’s infrastructure and the limitations it places on new development.

**Offices, Warehousing and Industry**

2.11 These are commonly referred to as employment uses and whilst demand for such uses in Elmbridge are not as significant as housing, it is expected that demand will grow over the next 20 years. Elmbridge’s location within the “upper M3” area means that it is a highly valued location for new business and in particular for those in the professional sector.
services, information technology and distribution sectors. It is therefore expected that the focus for growth in employment uses will be for offices and warehousing but that demand for more industrial uses will decline. Whilst further evidence is being commissioned to take account of the new Local Plan timescales and consider changing economic circumstances, such as the decision to leave the European Union, the 2013 Commercial Property Market Study suggests that based on continuing growth within the economy there is likely to be sufficient demand to support an additional 30,000 to 40,000sqm of office floorspace and an additional 20,000 to 30,000sqm of floorspace supporting warehousing and distribution uses.

Retail

2.12 Despite significant and tough competition from online shopping; major centres such as Kingston; and the popularity of out of town centres, the Borough’s town and village centres continue to be both vibrant and viable. This current vibrancy is reflected in the amount of spend seen within our centres and in the low vacancy rates. The challenge facing us will be to maintain the vibrancy and viability of our centres going forward and ensuring that they reflect the changing demands for shops and services. In particular our town and village centres face pressure from conversion to housing, especially as part of changes to permitted development rights.

2.13 Evidence from our retail study shows that convenience retail uses (those shops providing day to day goods such as food and drink) are well provided for in the Borough and that even at the highest projections of population growth only an additional 1,900sqm would be required to meet the growth in demand for convenience goods. However, the demand for non-convenience goods (clothes, furniture, electrical products etc.) means that in order for our town and village centres to maintain their current market share of demand, between 14,000 and 19,000sqm would be required.

Tourism

2.14 Tourist attractions in the Borough consist of traditional parks and gardens, the motoring and aviation Museum at Brooklands, and Sandown Park Racecourse which hosts a number of races and events. In addition, Hampton Court Palace is accessed from Hampton Court Station in Molesey and a series of high profile cycle events following on from the London Olympics has created a growing demand for visitor services and accommodation. However, whilst the evidence on hotel needs prepared by Surrey County Council indicates that there is potential demand for additional hotel accommodation to meet demand from tourist and business visitors, the lower returns means they are often dropped from mixed-use schemes in favour of more profitable types of development.
Infrastructure

2.15 Any increase in development will require improvements in infrastructure to support growth. Until a clear direction is agreed with regard to new development it is not possible to identify the required infrastructure or its desired location. However, it is possible to give an example of the scale of improvements required using school places. For every 100 new homes we will need to deliver 25 additional primary school places and 18 secondary school places. If the housing needs outlined above were to be met in full a further 2,350 primary places and 1,700 secondary places would be required. This would roughly translate as 3 new primary schools and 2 new secondary schools.

2.16 A key issue for the Borough will also be the impact of new development on our road network and the increase in population and their travel movements. We will need to ensure that new development can be accommodated and any potential issues addressed. Given the levels of in and out-commuting we are already aware of ‘hot-spots’ in our road network particularly at peak-time and at junctions across the Borough. This will also be a key issue for any new Local Plan.

Key factors limiting development

Constraints

2.17 When considering how to meet the development needs of the Borough we will need to carefully consider those factors which limit what can realistically be achieved. This includes a number of natural, built and historic features which restrict development and also the provision of new infrastructure that will be required to support any increase in our population.

2.18 It will be important, that as part of any new Local Plan, the contribution that the natural, built and historic environments make to the character of our Borough are fully acknowledged.

2.19 Where appropriate, such features will be protected and enhanced. However, as required by national policy, we have undertaken a review of all constraints on development. This included a review of land currently designated as Green Belt to assess the degree to which this land was meeting the purposes of this designation as set out in national policy.

What is Green Belt?

The Green Belt is not an environmental or landscape designation but a policy for controlling urban growth. The fundamental aim of Green Belt is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. Therefore the most important attribute of Green Belts is their openness. National policy sets out the purposes of Green Belt as:

- to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
- to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
- to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.
2.20 The review of Green Belt found that the majority of land currently designated as Green Belt was meeting its purposes or were fully constrained by other factors, such as flooding. However, it also showed that there were areas which did not necessarily meet the purposes of the Green Belt. The review identified around 222ha of land to be weakly performing against the purposes of Green Belt and which is unconstrained or partially constrained by absolute constraints, such as flood plains and Sites of Special Scientific Interest.

Land Availability in the Urban Areas

2.21 Much of the urban land in Elmbridge has been developed with very few large undeveloped or previously developed sites available or appropriate for redevelopment. To assess the capacity of the urban area we have prepared a Land Availability Assessment which has identified the potential to deliver approximately 3,700 new homes in the urban areas by 2035.

2.22 The 3,700 new homes identified in the urban areas is a combination of sites with planning permission that have not yet been implemented (approx. 1,300 new homes); 1,600 new homes on opportunity sites; and approx. 800 dwellings on windfall sites. Opportunity sites are those which have been identified as having potential for development in the future but do not benefit from planning permission. Windfall sites are those of four homes or less that are on previously developed land, whilst we are unable to identify them, are likely to come forward for development in the future.

The Challenge for Elmbridge

2.23 The Government have been very clear that the purpose of planning is to achieve sustainable development and have defined this as “ensuring that better lives for ourselves does not mean a worse life for future generations.” This is then expanded and the three key roles of the planning system in achieving sustainable development are defined:

- Economic role
- Social role
- Environmental role

2.24 To achieve sustainable development there must be gains across each of the three roles and as such each cannot be considered in isolation. We will use the Local Plan to maximise the benefits whilst ensuring the disadvantages are limited or addressed to ensure the most sustainable way forward is taken. In order to understand this balancing act we have used the evidence base to set out the key challenges for Elmbridge in the diagram below (Figure 5).
Figure 5: The key challenges for Elmbridge

Questions

The key challenges facing the Borough will inform the vision and objectives the Council adopts in the way it will seek to manage development and growth in the future. It is important that we are addressing both the right challenges and the most important ones to everyone who lives, works and visits the Borough.

Therefore do you:

1. Agree that these are the key challenges facing Elmbridge?

2. Consider there are other challenges that we should be addressing?

3. Consider any particular challenge or challenges that are more important than the others?
Appraising sustainability

2.25 When preparing any plan we are required to appraise all reasonable options to ensure the most sustainable approach can be taken forward. The starting point for this appraisal is to undertake a scoping exercise as to the main sustainability issues facing Elmbridge.

2.26 Whilst this paper has principally been prepared to set out the issues facing the Council and, in the next section, asks your opinion on how we address these issues it does set out options for a future spatial strategy. Each of these options has been appraised against the sustainability objectives set out in the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Paper. The overarching sustainability of each option was considered taking into account where and what development would be likely to come forward. However, a more detailed appraisal of any sites coming forward for development will be undertaken at the next stage. This will enable a more detailed assessment as to the potential impacts of the options available to the Council and any mitigation which may be required.
3 Meeting the key challenges

3.1 Many of the challenges highlighted in figure 5 are not significantly different to those set out in the Core Strategy. However, one key difference is that our objectively assessed need for housing is significantly higher than our current target. Whilst the Government has stated that we must seek to meet all our development needs in full, it also recognises that some policies in the NPPF will restrict development which may prevent us from meeting all our development needs in full. We therefore have a significant balancing act to try and meet as much of our identified need as possible whilst also balancing the need to ensure sufficient infrastructure to support our communities is delivered and that our built and natural environments are sufficiently protected.

3.2 The overriding need for new development in the Borough is housing. The objectively assessed housing need (OAHN) for the Borough is 9,480 new homes over the next 19 years to 2035. It is estimated that we can provide 3,700 new homes on previously developed land in the urban areas over this time period. This leaves us with the challenge of exploring how much of the remaining need (5,780 new homes) we can meet. We will also need to consider whether we can meet any of the housing need arising from the wider HMA.

3.3 As part of the preparation of any new Local Plan we must therefore consider a range of options as to how we will seek to deliver new development and the degree to which this has a positive or negative impact on the social, environmental and economic issues facing the Borough. Key to the whole plan will be the spatial strategy which sets out the broad locations of where development should and should not take place and the amount of development we will seek to deliver. A proposed new spatial strategy is outlined below and we would like your comments on these options and the preferred option for the new spatial strategy.

3.4 However, we will also have to consider options as to how development will be delivered within this broad spatial strategy. To help us develop these options we have set out a series of questions on the key areas the plan will cover. We would like to know your thoughts on these issues and this will help us to develop our policies when we prepare the next stage of our Local Plan.

A new approach?

3.5 Key to any new Local Plan will be our approach to meeting development needs as far as possible. Our current approach, as set out in the Core Strategy, will not allow for any significant increases in housing delivery over and above what has already been planned for. The Core Strategy was prepared to deliver a specific housing target that reflects the capacity of developable land in the urban area. As required by the NPPF, and set out above, we have
examined both the need for development and assessed the constraints\(^1\) on development in the Borough. This indicated both a high level of need but also significant constraints.

3.6 However, the evidence also indicated that the Borough’s Green Belt did have areas which are not performing well against the purposes set out in the NPPF. There is a small amount of land which could be considered to only weakly meet the purposes of Green Belt. As such, and if there were exceptional circumstances, the Green Belt boundary could be amended to allow for some redevelopment of these weakly performing areas.

3.7 Set out below are three options for delivering new development that we have considered and assessed using our sustainability appraisal framework.

**Option 1**

Maintain existing Green Belt boundaries and deliver all development by concentrating development within the urban area by:

- Significantly increasing densities on all sites in the urban areas; and
- Identifying open spaces such as allotments and playing fields for redevelopment and relocating these uses within the existing Green Belt.
- Using the Duty to Co-operate to enquire as to whether other authorities have the potential to meet some of our need.

3.8 This option would seek to deliver all of our development need of 9,480 new homes within the urban area on identified sites. Currently our towns and villages reflect a generally suburban character ranging from Victorian terraces (around 60 to 80 dwellings per hectare) to detached homes on large plots (around 10 to 15 dwellings per hectare). Only in our town centres have we seen significantly higher densities such as the Heart at Walton which is over 150 dwellings per hectare.

---

\(^1\) We consider these to be: Undeveloped land in Flood Zone 3b; Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI); Internationally designated habitats; Suitable Accessible Natural Greenspace (SANG); Registered Park or Garden; Ancient Woodlands; and Registered Commons and Village Greens
3.9 This option would require all identified opportunities for development to be delivered at very high densities of over 300 dwellings per hectare, more akin to those found in the most urbanised parts of the Country such as central London. Given the relatively small size of our urban development sites such densities would require buildings of over 7 storeys not only in town centres but across the Borough. Whilst this option would seek to protect Green Belt land from redevelopment it would also have a considerable impact on the character of the Borough making it significantly more urbanised and adversely affecting the quality of the environment in which we live.

Benefits

- Seeks to meet needs in full
- Protects Green Belt by preserving current settlement boundaries
- Makes Green Belt work harder
- High density development would deliver smaller, potentially cheaper, market housing

Disadvantages

- Limited number of appropriate sites in the urban area creates a significant risk as to the deliverability of housing need
- Changing character due to increased urbanisation of residential areas as a result of high density development
- Loss of open space in the urban area
- Reduces accessibility of open space to most urban parts of the Borough
- Could affect development viability and the delivery of affordable housing due to the increasing costs associated with high density development
- Difficulties in delivering infrastructure alongside development
- Places pressure on those areas that have historically taken most development
- Will not deliver the desired mix of houses and flats
Option 2

As far as possible meet development needs whilst maintaining development at appropriate densities in the urban area by:

Increasing densities on sites in the urban area only where it is considered appropriate and does not impact significantly on character;

- Amending Green Belt boundaries where:
  - the designation is at its weakest;
  - the areas are in sustainable locations; and
  - the areas are not, or are only partially, affected by absolute constraints.

Within these areas opportunities for accommodating our development needs will be explored taking into account site constraints, land ownership, the need to support sustainable development, and compliance with other planning policies; and

- Using the Duty to Co-operate to enquire as to whether other authorities have the potential to meet some of our need.

3.10 Option 2 seeks to balance the needs for housing whilst recognising there are constraints on development within the Borough. However, this option also recognises that there are parcels of land currently designated as Green Belt that are no longer meeting the purposes of Green Belt. As such there is potential for these parcels to enable the Council to meet more of its housing needs whilst maintaining the character of its towns and villages.

Benefits:

- Protects the character of the urban area
- Protects 97% of the Green Belt ensuring boundaries can endure beyond the plan period
- Maintains existing settlement pattern
- Delivers an increase in housing provision over previous Core Strategy
- Larger sites enable infrastructure to be delivered alongside new development
- Increase in the delivery of affordable housing and smaller units compared to previous Core Strategy
- Potential opportunity to identify land for self / custom-housebuilding

Disadvantages:

- Will not meet housing needs in full
- Some loss of Green Belt
- Development may be in less sustainable locations on the edge of urban areas
- Increased pressure on highways
- Reliance on other Local Planning Authorities to meet residual needs
Option 3

Deliver development needs of the Borough in full and explore opportunities to meet needs of other Boroughs and Districts in the HMA by:

- Increasing densities only on sites in the urban area only where it is considered appropriate and does not impact on character; and
- Amending Green Belt boundaries regardless of the strength of Green Belt and allocating sites in these areas for development.

3.11 The final option considered was to meet needs in full by amending Green Belt boundaries regardless of the strength with which it was delivering against the purposes of Green Belt. Whilst such an approach would meet needs and deliver a significant amount of affordable housing it would fundamentally alter the character of our towns and villages through coalescence, urban sprawl and encroachment of new development into the countryside.

Benefits:

- Protects the character of the urban area
- Meets housing needs in full
- Seeks to meet the needs of the wider HMA
- Larger sites enable infrastructure to be delivered alongside new development
- Increase in the delivery of affordable housing compared to previous Core Strategy
- Potential opportunity to identify land for self / custom-housebuilding

Disadvantages:

- The loss of a significant amount of Green Belt
- Significantly increases the risk of settlement coalescence, encroachment into countryside and excessive sprawl
- Fundamental changes to the nature of the Borough and its settlement patterns
- Massive pressure on infrastructure in particular highways

Why is there not an option for “doing nothing”?

3.12 We could decide not to amend the Core Strategy and continue to apply its existing policies. This approach would uphold our current position to maintain the Green Belt boundary unchanged and keep densities of development in urban areas at current levels. However, this would effectively mean we are adopting a “planning by appeal” approach for any development not in line with the Core Strategy. This has not been considered as an option for a number of reasons:

- The Government has indicated that where a local authority is not preparing a plan in keeping with its current guidance it will:
  - Intervene and prepare a plan on behalf of that authority.
  - Instruct the Council to prepare a joint plan with another authority
  - Invite the County Council to prepare a plan on behalf of the Borough
The approach would lead to unplanned development that fails to take account of the cumulative impacts on our infrastructure, such as schools and roads whilst reducing our ability to ensure development contributes to the delivery of the required infrastructure.

Elmbridge Borough Council wants to be plan led and this approach would lead to decisions on development being made by a Planning Inspector thereby removing our ability to control development.

3.13 In addition, the Government has placed a legal duty on planning authorities, county councils in England and public bodies to engage constructively, actively and on an on-going basis to maximise the effectiveness of their Local Plan preparation in the context of strategic cross boundary matters. This includes for example, the provision of new homes with the hope that if one local authority has insufficient capacity within its area to meet identified needs, the residual can be met elsewhere. The duty to cooperate is not a duty to agree. But local planning authorities should make every effort to secure the necessary cooperation on strategic cross boundary matters before they submit their Local Plans for examination. Should we decide not to prepare a local plan other authorities could challenge the local authority for failing to co-operate effectively and place even greater pressure to release more land for development to meet their needs.
Our Preferred Option

3.14 When examining options we have considered the Government’s continuing position which places significant importance on Green Belt as a planning designation. The Secretary of State has upheld a number of decisions by Councils across the country preventing inappropriate development on Green Belt. However, the Government has also set out that Councils must also seek to meet housing need and as part of the plan making process consider whether land currently designated as Green Belt still meets those purposes. The Government have also been clear that Councils can only amend Green Belt boundaries as part of the preparation of a local plan and only if there are exceptional circumstances.

3.15 Option 2 and 3 both seek to amend the Green Belt boundary in Elmbridge. We have therefore had to consider whether there are exceptional circumstances that would enable the Council to take forward such options. These are not defined in national policy and would need to be locally specific. The Government has said that unmet need on its own is not considered exceptional. We have considered what these circumstances could be and how these are exceptional in relation to Elmbridge. The issues that we consider should be recommended to a Planning Inspector as capable of amounting to exceptional circumstances are:

- One of the worst levels of affordability in the country coupled with an under supply of affordable homes;
- Need to deliver a better mix of new housing away from current delivery focussed on houses of four or more bedrooms; and
- The land that is being kept open for the purposes of Green Belt is no longer meeting those purposes.

3.16 Based on the evidence collected and on the sustainability appraisal of the options set out above, we consider that Option 2 is to be preferred. This option balances the Government’s directive to increase the levels of development, and in particular, housing development in the Borough whilst recognising that there are constraints on the amount of developable land which will prevent us from meeting our development needs in full.

3.17 A key consideration in choosing this option is the high cost of housing. This is a significant problem facing both our current residents and those people working in the Borough who are unable to find the right housing at the right price to buy or rent. However, the problem is also one facing future generations who will not be able to afford to live in the area they have grown up in or in which they work. As such in making this decision we have given significant weight to the need to deliver not only more affordable housing but we have also considered the need to deliver a better mix of housing. At present, the housing market is delivering significantly more large detached houses than are needed for our growing population. Small sites coupled with the desirability of the area mean that small houses are not as attractive to developers.

3.18 By increasing the supply of land and bringing forward some larger sites we can seek to increase the supply of the types of homes we need rather than those we do not. We could only seek to release land from the Green Belt for development where it will address the exceptional circumstances outlined above. Such development could be required to not only
deliver a specified level of affordable housing but also provide the right mix of 1, 2 and 3 bedroomed homes.

3.19 Alongside the need to increase the supply of the right type of housing we do not want to dismiss those policies that have helped to maintain the pattern of our towns and villages and the distinct characters they have. Therefore, we have also placed significant weight on the protection of the overall integrity and function of Green Belt, a policy that continues to be strongly supported by Government, and in ensuring other “absolute constraints”\(^2\) such as the functional flood plain, Sities of Special Scientific Interest and Village Greens are not impacted on by new development. Therefore, we believe that it would only be appropriate in Elmbridge to consider development on those areas of Green Belt that are assessed as only weakly meeting the purposes as set out in national policy recognising that this will impact on our ability to meet our development needs in full. We also believe that by only focusing on the weakest performing areas of Green Belt, this will strengthen the remainder of land designated as Green Belt.

**Preferred Option – Option 2**

As far as possible meet development needs whilst maintaining development at appropriate densities in the urban area by:

- Increasing densities on sites in the urban area only where it is considered appropriate and does not impact significantly on character;

- Amend Green Belt boundaries where:
  - the designation is at its weakest;
  - the areas are in sustainable locations; and
  - the areas are not, or are only partially, affected by absolute constraints.

Within these areas opportunities for accommodating our development needs will be explored taking into account site constraints, land ownership, the need to support sustainable development, and compliance with other planning policies; and

- Use the Duty to Co-operate to enquire as to whether other authorities have the potential to meet some of our need.

\(^2\) We consider these to be: Undeveloped land in Flood Zone 3b; Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI); Internationally designated habitats; Suitable Accessible Natural Greenspace (SANG); Registered Park or Garden; Ancient Woodlands; and Registered Commons and Village Greens
Key Strategic Areas

3.20 Following the principle of the Preferred Spatial Strategy (Option 2) we consider there to be three key strategic areas within the Green Belt where the designation could be removed. Each of these areas has been judged to be weakly performing against the purposes of Green Belt and is either unaffected or only partially affected by ‘absolute constraints’ which limit development opportunities. An initial appraisal of these three areas shows that their potential removal from the Green Belt to meet development needs would provide an appropriate balance of the three roles of sustainable development: economic, social and environmental.

3.21 The three key strategic areas are:

- Land north of Blundel Lane including Knowle Hill Park and Fairmile Park, Cobham (Local Area 14);
- Land south of the A3 including Chippings Farm and The Fairmile, Cobham (Local Area 20); and
- Land north of the A309 and east & west of Woodstock Lane North, Long Ditton (Local Area 58).

3.22 The location of each of these three key strategic areas is set out below in Figures 6, 7 and 8. The absolute constraints to development within each key strategic area are highlighted on the maps. These constraints will limit the identification of future development opportunities. Also outlined are other local constraints such as Local Nature Reserves, cemeteries and heritage assets all of which will also determine the type and scale of any development within these areas. It has not been possible to identify all the potential constraints, such as topography, these will also determine the type, scale and location of development within these areas.

3.23 Within Local Area 58, there is a small section of land that is located in the neighbouring London Borough of Kingston-upon-Thames. It is important to note that our Green Belt Boundary Review does not directly influence the approaches to Green Belt in neighbouring authorities and no recommendations will be made beyond the boundaries of Elmbridge. Area 58 is therefore limited to the area of land within Elmbridge Borough.

3.24 Within each of the key strategic areas, we will be looking for sites that could be allocated to meet development need. It is important that any site delivers an appropriate level of affordable housing and smaller units given the significant levels needed as set out in

Questions:

Given the expected levels of demand for land from new development do you:

4. Agree that Option 2 is the most appropriate option? If not, why not, and what other option would you support and why?

5. Consider the suggested exceptional circumstances are sufficient to support the amendment of the Green Belt boundary?
the SHMA. We will undertake viability assessments to establish the potential of any sites in these areas. Sites not considered to be sufficiently contributing to the type of housing needs identified in the SHMA will not be considered to be supporting the exceptional circumstances required to amend Green Belt boundaries.

Questions

Given the expected levels of demand for land from new development do you:

6. Agree that, given the appropriate exceptional circumstances, these three key strategic areas are appropriate for removal from the Green Belt? If not, why not?

7. Know of any sites within any of the three key strategic areas that could be considered for future development?

8. Consider that other areas of land should be removed from the Green Belt including those that are moderately or strongly performing?

3.25 Provided within Appendix 3, is a map of all the Local Areas identified and assessed against the purpose of Green Belt.
Figure 6: Land north of Blundel Lane including Knowle Hill Park and Fairmile Park, Cobham (Local Area 14)
Figure 7: Land south of the A3 including Chippings Farm and The Fairmile, Cobham (Local Area 20)
Figure 8: Land north of the A309 and east and west of Woodstock Lane North, Long Ditton (Local Area 58)
4 Key Issues

4.1 This section examines the key issues that will define how development comes forward over the next 20 years and seeks your views on how we might plan to address these issues in future. In some instances we do not think there is a need to amend policies significantly to support new development and to be consistent with national policy. Where this is the case we have said so but your views on any potential changes would be welcomed. If we think a new approach is required due to a change in national policy or changes in the evidence supporting our plan we have made suggestions as to a new approach. Any suggestions made at this section will then be used to develop options from which a policy approach can be prepared.

Housing

4.2 Elmbridge is one of the least affordable parts of the country to live. Some of this is due to the high cost of housing but it is also due to the type of housing that is built. Over the last few years the provision of larger detached properties (4+ bedrooms) has dominated new supply. Whilst it is not necessarily the case that smaller homes (1 to 3 bedrooms) equal cheaper more affordable homes, they are required to ensure wider choice and balance of supply in the housing market. The supply of smaller homes is particularly important to those seeking their first step on the property ladder, young families moving up the property ladder, and older persons seeking to downsize.

4.3 We want to deliver a variety of high quality housing that widens the tenures, types and sizes of homes currently available within the Borough in order to meet the needs and demands of different households in our community. This includes smaller homes for those seeking their first step on the property ladder, young families, older people, and Travellers. New housing must take account of local need to give a genuine choice of housing and help create balanced, sustainable and inclusive communities.

4.4 A key part of any policy to establish a variety of new homes means that we should be seeking to provide the mix of housing in the proportions as set out in our SHMA. Outlined below are the key headlines from this study. In setting future policies, this information will need to be considered carefully alongside issues such as viability, character and design.

4.5 In order to address this issue we can ask developers to provide certain types of housing as part of a development, such as the mix of flats and houses, and the number of 1, 2, 3 and 4+ bedroomed homes that are provided on different sites. This will be guided by the SHMA, which in addition to identifying the overall amount of housing needed in the Borough, sets out the mix of housing required to meet needs. This information is shown in the table below.
## Table 1: Mix of housing needed in Elmbridge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of Unit</th>
<th>No. of Units Required</th>
<th>Percentage of Objectively Assessed Housing Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,654</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,982</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,749</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,480</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Kingston & North East Surrey SHMA (2016)

### Questions

Based on your knowledge of the housing market in Elmbridge:

9. Do you agree that we should seek to provide more of a balance in terms of the size of new homes being built? If not, why?

10. Given the over delivery of homes with 4 or more bedrooms should we try to limit their delivery in future?

### Densities

**4.6** The approach to new development outlined in the preferred option will increase the amount of developable land within the Borough. However, the number of new homes that can be delivered with this approach will depend on the densities at which development is delivered. Higher densities of housing would enable us to do more in meeting the housing needs identified for the Borough.

**4.7** As in many suburban areas there is a wide range of housing styles and types reflecting different eras, styles and demands. These range from higher density flatted and terrace developments through to low density detached houses on large plots. Our highest densities tend to be in the town centres with developments such as The Heart in Walton upon Thames providing around 150 dwellings per hectare (dph). Elsewhere areas of Victorian terraces provide densities of between 60 and 80dph whereas semi-detached houses tend to be built at a density of around 30dph. Only in those areas with detached houses on larger plots will densities be significantly lower than 30dph.

**4.8** At present we currently seek a minimum density in our suburban areas of 30dph and 40dph in our town centres. However, the Government has suggested that the most sustainable locations, such as those with good access to public transport and around train stations could be the location for higher density developments. We would like to know your views on the potential of delivering higher density developments in appropriate locations and where this does not impact negatively on local character.
Housing for Specialist Groups

Affordable Housing

4.9 The close proximity of the Borough to the capital and the easy commute and high salaries available within the city are reflected in the high house prices experienced in Elmbridge. The cost of housing when compared to the salaries paid locally means that the Borough is one of the least affordable parts of the Country. This means there is a significant need for more affordable homes within the Borough. The need for more affordable homes is set out in the SHMA as 6,640 between 2015 and 2035 (332 per annum). This information is summarised in the table below for both the Borough and wider HMA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Planning Authority</th>
<th>Social Rented</th>
<th>Affordable Rented</th>
<th>Intermediate</th>
<th>Total Affordable Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elmbridge</td>
<td>5,340</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>6,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epsom &amp; Ewell</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston upon Thames</td>
<td>13,420</td>
<td>1,520</td>
<td>1,580</td>
<td>16,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mole Valley</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>-420</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>2,660</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions

Given the need for both market and affordable housing:

11. Should we seek to increase minimum densities at sustainable locations in the urban areas, such as in town centres and at train stations, above 40 dwellings per hectare, where this would not impact on local character? If yes, what density do you think would be appropriate?

12. Within the three key strategic areas we will be exploring opportunities for accommodating our development needs taking into account site constraints, land ownership, compliance with other planning policies and the need to support sustainable development. If potential housing sites are identified within these areas, do you consider it appropriate to:

   deliver at higher densities i.e. above 40 dwellings per hectare, in order to maximise delivery?

   a. Support lower density developments that maintain the open character of an area and reflects the surrounding character
Table 2: The need for Affordable Homes in Elmbridge and across the wider HMA
Source: Kingston & North East Surrey SHMA (2016)

What is Affordable Housing?
Affordable housing is social rented, affordable rented and intermediate housing often provided by a local authority or housing association to those whose housing needs are not met by the market.

- **Social rented:** often owned by the local authority or housing association with rents being determined nationally. They are generally set low so that people on lower incomes are able to access a home and pay rent without struggling.

Affordable **rented:** subjected to rent controls, affordable rented properties require a rent of no more than 80% of the local market rent.

- **Intermediate housing:** is a home for sale and rent provided at a cost above social rent, but below market levels. This can include shared equity (shared ownership for example) and other low cost homes for sale and intermediate rent.

Homes like shared ownership and intermediate rent are generally for the people in who do not need the full support of social rented housing but cannot afford a market

4.10 Our current policies seek contributions towards affordable housing provision on all appropriate sites. This is either via a financial contribution or via the provision of affordable units on-site. We seek the highest level of affordable housing provision on greenfield sites and those in public ownership. However, there have been considerable changes to housing policies since the adoption of the Core Strategy. The introduction of starter homes as a new type of affordable housing and the adoption of a small sites exemptions policy on planning contributions are just two of the changes that we will need to address within any new Local Plan. Both of these issues are discussed in more detail below.

Starter Homes

4.11 The Government introduced “starter homes” as a new type of affordable housing as part of the Housing and Planning Act. These homes are offered for sale on the open market at a reduced value to first time buyers. To promote the delivery of such homes we have been given a legal duty to support their delivery. To help understand the need

What is a Starter Home?
Starter homes will be new dwellings (and not previously occupied) available to first time buyers between the ages of 23 and 40. They are to be sold at 20% less than the open market value (capped at no more than £250,000).
for Starter Homes, the Government has established a national register, which allows would-be first-time buyers to record their interest in the scheme. However, interest can only be registered at present for Walton, Weybridge and Surrey. The need recorded for these areas as of April 2016 was 70, 58 and 1,116 homes respectively.

**Small Sites Exemption Policy**

4.12 Government has recently introduced changes to the way in which local authorities can deliver more affordable homes. An exemption has been introduced whereby on developments of 10 units or less and which have a maximum gross floorspace of no more than 1,000sqm, local authorities are no longer able to collect financial contributions towards the provision of affordable housing. The reason for the change is that the Government considers that small sites are being disproportionally burdened by certain planning obligations.

4.13 As of June 2016, our policy on affordable housing (CS21 of the Core Strategy) had supported the delivery of 373 affordable homes through on-site delivery and supported off-site delivery from financial contributions totalling £6.89m. Since the adoption of the Core Strategy, 919 new homes have been delivered on sites of less than 10 units and where there has been an increase in housing. This equates to 50% of the total number of new homes built during that period (2011 – 2016). In terms of the type of site coming forward for development in the Borough, 91% of current applications providing an increase in new homes are on sites of 10 or fewer units.

4.14 Following the Government’s changes, our current affordable housing policy is now in conflict with national guidance. The consequence we now face is that without the ability to collect affordable housing contributions on small sites, our capacity to deliver the new homes needed by our communities is substantially reduced. Yet, Elmbridge remains the most expensive place to live in the south-east region and 4th most expensive in the country; we have a significant need for affordable housing within the Borough; and on the vast majority of sites of 10 or fewer units, the delivery of an affordable housing contributions has never previously been an issue.

4.15 We have therefore taken the decision to continue to consider Policy CS21 on a case by case basis as part of the decision making process for any relevant application. This approach considers whether local circumstances in regard to affordable housing and the nature of development sites in the Borough are sufficient to warrant the requirement of affordable housing contributions, or whether greater weight should be attached to Government guidance.
4.16 Elmbridge has a well-established community of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (hereafter referred to collectively as ‘Travellers’). As part of the preparation of our new Local Plan, we are required to assess the housing needs of Travellers within the Borough and provide appropriate accommodation.

4.17 The latest assessment of need is our draft 2016 Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA). The draft GTAA shows that we should provide between two and nine additional pitches for Gypsies and Travellers over the next 15 years up to 2031. There is no need for Travelling Showpeople plots. The additional pitches are required to meet the housing needs of concealed households, address issues of ‘doubling-up’ on existing sites as well as meeting the needs arising from future household formation. The assessment did not identify an immediate need for transit sites however; this issue will need to be kept under review.

4.18 Whilst there is no current requirement to include the needs of ‘non-travelling’ Travellers in the GTAA, we are still required to consider the accommodation needs of all people residing in or resorting to the Borough. The GTAA therefore identified the number of pitches and plots required in the Borough to meet the needs of ‘non-travelling’ Travellers. This information is summarised in the table below.

---

3 Who is considered a ‘Traveller’ by the Government for planning purposes and therefore included within the assessment of need as part of the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment is set out in Appendix 1.
4.19 The implication for Traveller households who do not travel and do not meet the planning definition of a Traveller is that their needs form part of the wider housing needs of the area as identified through the SHMA process. Whilst this need forms part of the wider housing need identified, the provision of pitches and plots will need to be balanced against our ability to provide other types of accommodation such as affordable homes and homes for older people.

**Table 3: The needs of 'non-Travelling' Households in Elmbridge by 5-year periods**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household</th>
<th>2016 - 2021</th>
<th>2021 - 2026</th>
<th>2026 - 2031</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gypsies &amp; Travellers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23 pitches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(non-travelling)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travelling Showpeople</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 plots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(non-travelling)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Elmbridge Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (2016)*

4.20 We need to provide suitable homes for the current and projected growth in the number of older people living in our community and those households with specialist accommodation requirements. Different types of homes are required to offer a real choice, be it smaller well-located market housing or more specialised homes offering improved safety and support suited to the various needs of people.

4.21 Focusing on needs within our community, our evidence shows that between 2015 and 2032, the number of people aged 65 and older living in Elmbridge is set to increase by 8% (an additional 13,600 people). Whilst many older households will wish to remain in their own home and will be able to do so either independently, or with a level of social-support, others may wish to downsize or have the support they require ‘on-site’. Smaller homes in suitable locations provide the opportunity to downsize, allowing households to retain a level of independence whilst remaining in their community or, by providing the chance to move to an alternative area with improved access to local facilities in a home that is more manageable. Others may require more specialised accommodation that caters for their needs. This is often provided in the form of Sheltered, Enhanced Sheltered or Extra Care Housing.
4.22 Our evidence shows that there is an additional need of 1,366 Sheltered, Enhanced Sheltered, and Extra Care Housing units required within the Borough up to 2035. This equates to 66 units per annum. The majority of the demand (975 units; 74%) is for Sheltered accommodation followed by Extra Care Housing (195 units; 15%) and Enhanced Sheltered (156 units; 12%).

Accessible housing

4.23 Within our communities there are also a number of people that require accessible accommodation for example, wheelchair accessible. Good design such as level access and flush thresholds to properties, a WC at entry level, door openings of a suitable width and care with the design and internal and circulation space can help to ensure that future accommodation is adaptable and wheelchair friendly. Factors to be considered include a building’s layout, materials and lighting which can also help people with dementia, reduced mobility or sight loss to continue to live as independently as possible. Focusing on wheelchair accessible homes, our evidence shows there is an unmet need of 232 households.

Families

4.24 Compared to the HMA authorities and Surrey as a whole, we have the largest proportion of households that have at least one dependent child (47% of all households). We need to carefully plan for our families’ needs ensuring we provide the right size and tenure of accommodation. A particular focus will be providing suitable accommodation in the affordable housing sector to address issues of overcrowding.

People who wish to build their own home

4.25 Self-build and custom housebuilding is also another relatively new concept introduced by the Government to increase homeownership and the supply of new homes. Those seeking to

What are the different types of housing that are specifically designed to meet the accommodation needs of older people?

Sheltered - accommodation for elderly or disabled people consisting of private independent units with some shared facilities and a warden.

Enhanced sheltered - a term used that reflects the additional care and support needs of older residents in sheltered housing but not high enough levels to require Extra Care Housing.

Extra Care Housing - is types of self-contained and independent housing developed for frail older people, with varying levels of care available on-site.

What does Self-Build and Custom Housebuilding mean?

Self-build and custom housebuilding are two terms which refer to people who are seeking to acquire serviced plots of land in an area in order to build a home for them to occupy. Self-build usually means that you are directly involved in organising the design and construction of your new home. Custom build usually means working with a specialist developer to help you deliver your home.
build their own property in Elmbridge are able to register their interest in a plot of land via an on-line register. Established in January 2016, 55 expressions of interest have been received as of 1st September 2016.

**Question**

15. Do you consider there to be any other specific housing needs that are an issue within Elmbridge and that we should seek to address as part of the new Local Plan?

**The Economy**

**Offices, warehousing and industry**

4.26 We want to ensure that Elmbridge continues not only to be a great place to live but also an area attractive to businesses and workers. To do this we need to balance the need for housing with the need to support and grow our economy.

4.27 Elmbridge is a key economic location that is close to London but also with excellent access to strategic national and international transport networks. The Borough has one of the best performing local economies in the Country and is ranked 20th in the UK competitiveness index. The area provides employment opportunities for residents not only in the Borough but across the north Surrey and South West London area. Businesses are located not only in our major business parks and industrial estates such as The Heights at Brooklands and Molesey Industrial Estate but also in a range of other smaller office developments and industrial estates that support smaller companies. These support a wide, and growing, range of business from major multinationals through to small start-up businesses with 1,020 additional businesses in the area since 2012 and 3,600 new jobs created since 2011.

**What is Strategic Employment Land (SEL)?**

These are sites designated in the Core Strategy because they are considered to be strategically important in terms of the economy either locally or sub regionally. There are currently 11 sites designated as SEL in the Core Strategy.

4.28 As highlighted earlier we expect there to be sufficient demand to fill an additional 30,000 to 40,000sqm of offices and 20,000 to 30,000sqm of warehousing. Our current policies seek to ensure that the most important sites with employment uses on them are retained to support economic growth and job creation within the Borough. The most important of these sites are designated as “Strategic Employment Land” and uses are restricted to offices, warehousing and industrial uses. This means that the redevelopment of these strategic sites to housing or retail for example will be strongly resisted. We feel that it remains important to protect those areas considered to be strategic and as such we are proposing to retain the current policy in the Core Strategy that prevents the loss of our most important areas of employment land to other uses. We will then need to consider which employment areas should be designated as being “strategic”, in the next consultation.
Brooklands

4.29 The redevelopment of Brooklands over the last two decades into a key location for business not only in Surrey but across the region has been a major success. The area is now home to a large array of businesses including multinational corporations such as Sony, Samsung and Cargill that are attracted by its excellent connections not only into London but also to both Heathrow and Gatwick.

4.30 The area, which is directly south of Weybridge, offers a mixture of employment uses with high quality offices at The Heights and Velocity through to large format warehousing and distribution centres on the Brooklands Industrial Estate. With over 36ha of land in B2/B8 uses and over 22ha of land supporting high quality offices it is one of the largest business parks in the upper M3 area.

4.31 However, the area is constrained. Like our other employment areas it is tightly bounded by residential development but the area is also constrained by the Green Belt running between The Heights and Brooklands Industrial Estate; a Scheduled Ancient Monument (the former Brooklands Race Track); and an area of Suitable Accessible Natural Greenspace (SANG). In addition to these constraints the area also suffers from severe congestion, in particular at rush hour. The A245 towards the A3 in particular is a congestion hotspot.

4.32 In line with our current policy in the Core Strategy, we will seek to explore opportunities for intensification within all our designated employment areas. However, there is the potential to explore the opportunity for amendments to the Green Belt boundary at Brooklands to deliver further opportunities for employment uses at this site. In particular any opportunities for expansion could support improvements to the road network to reduce congestion. Any exploration as to any further opportunities would also need to ensure that other constraints such as SANG and the heritage constraints are not affected by any further expansions.

4.33 As for all amendments to the Green Belt boundary this would require exceptional circumstances. These would need to be very strong as the Green Belt at Brooklands has been assessed as being strongly performing. Any exploration into amendments at
Brooklands would then need to consider what exceptional circumstances might be, such as the potential to address congestion and to continue to support such a vital economic asset.

Questions

18. Do you think that there are any exceptional circumstances that would support the amendment of the Green Belt boundary at Brooklands to support the further development of employment uses at this site?

19. Other than Green Belt what other barriers do you consider could prevent further development at Brooklands?

Sandown Park Racecourse

4.34 Whilst the Borough as a whole is not an obvious tourist destination there are a number of attractions in Elmbridge that draw in a wide range of visitors. The Core Strategy recognises this and as such includes a policy that encourages the development of existing tourist attractions and hotels to meet needs. Tourism remains an important part of the economy which we need to continue to support and a key part of this will be supporting our main tourist attractions.

4.35 One of the main attractions in the Borough is Sandown Racecourse which is not only a sporting venue but also a major conference and exhibition centre attracting 120,000 visitors every year to the 25 race fixtures, nearly 100,000 visitors to public exhibitions and over 25,000 people attending private events. The racecourse also supports over 100 permanent jobs and over 4000 temporary staff supporting race fixtures and events. However, the racecourse, stadium and supporting facilities are ageing and are likely to require improvement to meet the changing demands of race goers and conference organisers during the lifetime of the Local Plan. Though as the site is set wholly within the Green Belt careful consideration needs to be given to any improvements that balances the long term future of this key asset, its impact on infrastructure and the desire to preserve the character of the area. Therefore in order to ensure Sandown remains one of the regions key race and conference venues we will need to consider how best to support the future needs of this venue through the Local Plan.

Question

20. We will seek to maintain our broad support for tourism related development as set out in the Core Strategy. However, to recognise the importance of Sandown Park Racecourse as both a sporting and exhibition venue should we:

- Encourage the redevelopment of Sandown Racecourse to provide improved and extended conference and hotel facilities?
Retail provision in our town and village centres

4.36 The key issues to address with regard to our town and village centres is how to ensure that they remain vibrant in the face of not only our changing shopping habits but the way we all now spend our free time. However, there are limited development opportunities within which to deliver additional retail floorspace within our town centres. They are tightly bound by residential areas or physical barriers such as the Thames. It will be a challenge to meet the levels of development required to retain market share when faced with competition from centres such as Kingston and Guildford.

4.37 Our current policy, in line with the NPPF, seeks to focus all new retail development in our town centres and to protect existing primary and secondary retail frontages from inappropriate changes of use. The Core Strategy protects the main “primary” shopping frontages for retail uses and seeks to restrict the further erosion of these by stopping them from changing to other town centre uses such as restaurants, dentists, financial advisers, bars and takeaways. These uses are directed to secondary frontages. This approach seeks to retain our town centres as places to shop whilst also recognising their importance in meeting a much wider range of demands.

What primary and secondary retail frontages?
Primary frontages are those central areas in town centres where the majority of the shops are located and where uses such as takeaways, restaurants and offices are restricted. Secondary frontages will have a greater number of these uses alongside shops and tend to be towards the edge of town centres.

Question

21. Given changing consumer habits should we:

- Maintain our policy of focussing new retail development to town and village centres?
- Continue to protect primary shopping areas from other uses as set out in the current Core Strategy?
- Consider allowing other important uses in primary high street shopping frontages such as doctor’s surgeries, dentists and libraries?
The natural and built environment

Open space

4.38 We have 276 open spaces within our urban areas covering 1,850 ha and these are a key feature of our environment. These range from small pockets of amenity space through to large open spaces such as Hurst Park that covers 27 hectares of land in Molesey. National policy gives open spaces a significant level of protection. All open spaces are protected from inappropriate development unless they can be re-provided in an appropriate location to the same or better standard, they are surplus or it is for an alternative leisure and recreation use.

4.39 In addition, the NPPF sets out that we can establish what are known as Local Green Space for areas that are demonstrable special to the local community. These Local Green Spaces would then have the same level of protection as Green Belt. In our Development Management Plan we set out policies on both these areas and we are not proposing to change these policies. However, Local Green Spaces can only be established through the preparation of a Local Plan and we will look to designate such spaces where appropriate to give greater protection to those open spaces that meet the criteria set out by Government.

Question

22. Should the Council continue to give a high level of protection to all open spaces and designate those spaces that meet the criteria for Local Green Spaces?

Biodiversity and the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area

4.40 We are required by national policy to set out a strategic approach and plan positively for the creation, protection and enhancement of a network of Green Infrastructure and biodiversity. Our policies in the Core Strategy set out clearly our commitment to supporting biodiversity and maintaining an effective and multi-functional network of Green Infrastructure. We do not propose to change this commitment which is in line not only with national policy but our own aspirations.

4.41 However, alongside supporting key national and local designations such Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Local Nature Reserves (LNR) we must also ensure that new development does not impact on the internationally designated Thames Basin...
Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA) which stretches across the three counties of Surrey, Hampshire and Berkshire. Whilst only a small part of our Borough is covered by this habitat we are required to mitigate against the impact of all development within a 5km zone surrounding the SPA. To do this we require all new development within this zone to provide support to the creation of Suitable Accessible Natural Greenspace (SANG). These SANGs provide alternative areas for residents to visit that provide a similar experience to visiting the SPA without adversely impacting on what are sensitive habitats.

4.42 Without the commitment to supporting SANGs the Council would have to refuse all new residential applications within the buffer zone. As such we are not proposing to amend this policy and will continue to ensure any new development in this zone is adequately mitigated.

**Question**

23. Do you agree with our approach to biodiversity and mitigating the impact of new development on the Thames Basin Heaths habitat?

**Heritage and Historic environment**

4.43 There are a number of different heritage assets in the Borough of international, national and local importance including Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Historic Parks and Gardens, Scheduled Monuments and Areas of Architectural Importance and Potential. They are important as individual entities but together they create our unique historic environment. They not only add architectural, historic, artistic and archaeological value but also provide social, economic and environmental aspects which are identified within recent government guidance. This also recognises that they are irreplaceable resources which are vulnerable both to gradual and dramatic change and that they should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance.

4.44 We have adopted a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of its historic environment through both the Development Management Plan and the Heritage Strategy. These resist the loss of heritage assets whilst recognising that there is potential to allow some redevelopment especially where this supports the long term protection of that asset and its key features. This pro-active approach recognises that Heritage is an asset rather than a constraint to development.

**Questions**

24. Do you agree that our strategic and pro-active approach to supporting our heritage assets is appropriate?

25. If not, what approach do you think we should take?
Design and character

4.45 Elmbridge is characterised by the different design and character of areas within the Borough. There is no particularly dominant town centre or settlement hierarchy. Some areas are uniquely historic with a few modern “one-offs”; others are typical examples of the phases and fashions of urban and suburban developments, while many retain their “village” character and community. Recognising and understanding these different components helps to identify character as well as capacity and is essential in guiding and delivering successful and sustainable development. The Council seeks to identify areas and encourage development within these built-up / brownfield areas where it is appropriate and sustainable whilst ensuring the character of the area is maintained.

Questions

26. Do you agree that the Council’s current approach to considering design and character is appropriate?

27. If not what approach do you think we should take?

Addressing the environmental impacts of development

4.46 New development will inevitably place greater pressure on the environment. An increase in the numbers of residents or businesses will mean greater pressure on resources and increases in emissions such as carbon dioxide and nitrogen dioxide. Increases in such pollutants also play a role in climate change which in turn increases the levels of flood risk faced by our residents. It is therefore important for us to ensure that we seek to reduce the impact of development on the environment and ensure that new development is adequately located and built to take account of changes in our climate.Outlined below are some of the issues we will seek to address within the new local plan.

Flooding

4.47 Many of our residents will have been affected by flooding in the last few years. Whether this is from the rivers that flow through the Borough, or from other sources, it has a massive impact on the lives of those affected. To minimise the impact of new development on flood risk national policy sets out that we must direct development to the lowest appropriate area of flood risk and that all development at risk of flooding must be designed to minimise risk, ensure it is safe and does not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere. This national approach is currently reflected not only in our Core Strategy but also our recently adopted Flood Risk Supplementary Planning Document and one which we are proposing to maintain.

4.48 However, since the adoption of the Core Strategy there have been changes in the way that advice and guidance on flood risk is provided. Until recently the Environment Agency provided detailed advice on all types of development at risk of flooding. However, due to a significant reduction in their funding the Environment Agency now do not provide detailed advice on small-scale development.
4.49 Our Strategic Flood Risk Assessment highlights that many of our residential areas are in areas at risk of flooding and that there is likely to be a cumulative impact from small-scale development in the Borough on increasing flood risk. When coupled with the lack of detailed advice on small-scale development, the current situation has created difficulties in ensuring the cumulative impacts of small-scale development on flood risk are addressed.

4.50 At present we manage this by requiring all development that is, or could be, affected by flooding to provide a detailed Flood Risk Assessment outlining the impact of a development on flood risk and what is being done to address these impacts. Whilst this has been effective we recognise that, due to the significant amount of existing residential development in areas at risk of flooding, a specific policy relating to small-scale development may be beneficial in determining applications and reducing the financial burdens on householder applications.

Sustainable transport and travel patterns

4.51 Elmbridge has one of the highest levels of car ownership with 1.5 cars per household and 46% of households owning more than two vehicles. Only 12% of households do not own a car, significantly lower than the South East average of 18.6%. This has contributed to high levels of pollutants in certain areas with seven areas being in Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) where pollution levels are above national minimum standards. For this reason the Core Strategy sets out policies that looked to:

- Direct development to the most sustainable locations close to public transport and existing services;
- Require major developments to prepare transport assessments and travel plans;
- Apply maximum parking standards, including the consideration of zero parking for town centre developments where appropriate; and
- Protect and improve footpaths, bridleways and cycle paths to encourage more sustainable modes of transport.
Infrastructure Delivery

4.52 We have worked hard with Surrey County Council and other infrastructure providers to improve infrastructure to meet needs. As set out in the Core Strategy we prioritised the collection of developer contributions and were one of the first authorities in the Country to start collecting the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). To date we have collected nearly £12m and allocated almost £6 million pounds to support infrastructure improvements. As set out in the Core Strategy we prioritised the delivery of new school places and working with the County have ensured that there are now sufficient primary places to meet planned needs to 2026. Whilst the majority of funding has come from the County Council we have supported the expansion of those schools most affected by new development by allocating £2.8m to Surrey County Council to support school expansions. This has assisted the delivery of an additional 1,260 places across 7 schools.

4.53 Alongside improvements to strategic infrastructure such as schools we have also used some of the money raised to support more local projects. These have helped, for example, to secure improved safety at crossings near schools, improved community facilities and provided improved access to open spaces. In total we have allocated over £1m to important local improvements to infrastructure.

4.54 However, we realise that further infrastructure improvements will be required to support any increase in development. Again schools will be a key focus for us but we will also need to ensure that improvements are made to the road network, public transport, health provision, community facilities and leisure facilities. In particular the impacts of additional development on both the local and strategic road networks will be considered through detailed modelling. This modelling will be used to identify congestion hotspots and outline potential solutions.

4.55 As with our current approach we will continue to seek developer contributions from developers to help deliver new infrastructure. As part of this we will review our current Community Infrastructure Levy charges and how these can be used alongside other developer contributions to secure the necessary infrastructure to support growth.
Any other issues?

4.56 This document sets out what we think are the key challenges facing Elmbridge with regard to managing new development over the next 20 years and how our approach to balancing the competing demands for land and concerns that inevitably arise from proposals to increase development. However, we recognise that there may be other issues or options we have not considered that you would like to raise. If there are we would like to hear these and consider them as part for this consultation.
Appendix 1 - Evidence Base Glossary

Included within this consultation document are the high-level outcomes from the evidence base review. For those wishing to see the final details, the entire suite of evidence base documents can be found on our website: http://www.elmbridge.gov.uk/planning/sdps/evidence-and-supporting-docs/

Set out below is a list which briefly explains each of the evidence base documents. Identified are those evidence base documents that have been prepared and those that will need to be prepared and / or updated to inform the further preparation of the new Elmbridge Local Plan. This list may be added to as and when appropriate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Development Options</td>
<td>September 2016</td>
<td>Outlines the alternative strategic options for the delivery of housing and development growth within the Borough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorities Monitoring Report</td>
<td>December 2016</td>
<td>An annual report designed to monitor the implementation of our current policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Land Review &amp; Functional Economic Area</td>
<td>Functional Economic Area completed. Employment Land Review update being prepared.</td>
<td>The aim of the study &amp; review is to enable the Council to make decisions relating to the potential allocation of employment sites for redevelopment; the designation of key areas of commercial property as strategic employment land; and the possible implementation of article 4 directions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Assessment</td>
<td>September 2015</td>
<td>Examines the economic, social and environmental roles of each of the eight settlements in order to understand their sustainability and potential to accommodate additional development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duty to Cooperate Scoping Statement</td>
<td>January 2015</td>
<td>Sets out how we will cooperate with other local planning authorities and organisations, to ensure that cross-boundary and strategic planning matters are addressed as part of the preparation and implementation of the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA)</td>
<td>November 2016</td>
<td>Explores the equality implications of Local Plan policies and identifies any mitigation measures that could be implemented to ensure any negative impacts are reduced to an acceptable level. The EqIA will be reviewed at each stage of the preparation / publication of the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Exceptional Circumstances

**Date:** September 2016

**Description:** Sets out the factors that the Council considers to be ‘exceptional circumstances’ to justify any proposed amendment to the Green Belt boundary.

## Green Belt Boundary Review (GBBR)

**Date:** March 2016

**Description:** Provides an assessment of how different areas of land perform against the purposes of the Green Belt as set out in national planning policy. The review identifies any land that no longer meets the aims and purposes of Green Belt.

## Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) (Draft)

**Date:** December 2016

**Description:** Identifies the need for pitches for Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople and Circus People across the Borough.

## Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) – Stage 1 Initial Screening Report

**Date:** November 2016

**Description:** The purpose of the Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) is to identify any aspect of the emerging Local Plan that would have the potential to cause a likely significant effect on protected sites, either in isolation or ‘in combination’ with other plans and projects. The Initial Screening Report is the starting point for this process and focuses on the three Strategic Options and whether these options alone or ‘in combination’ are likely to have a significant effect.

## Heritage Strategy

**Date:** December 2015

**Description:** The strategy provides a framework for how we understand, preserve, manage, integrate, interpret and promote our heritage in both the immediate and long term future.

---

4 For the purposes of planning Gypsies and Travellers means persons of a nomadic habit of life whatever their race or origin, including such persons who on grounds only of their own or their family’s or dependants’ educational or health needs or old age have ceased to travel temporarily, but excluding members of an organised group of Travelling Showpeople or circus people travelling together as such.

In determining whether someone is a Gypsy or Traveller for the purposes of planning, consideration is given to:

a) Whether they previously led a nomadic habit of life.

b) The reasons for ceasing their nomadic habit of life.

c) Whether there is an intention of living a nomadic habit of life in the future, and if so, how soon and in what circumstances.

5 For the purposes of planning, Travelling Showpeople and Circus people are members of a group organised for the purposes of holding fairs, circuses or shows (whether or not travelling together as such). This includes such persons who on the grounds of their own or their family’s or dependants’ more localised pattern of trading, educational or health needs or old age have ceased to travel temporarily, but excludes Gypsies and Travellers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP)</td>
<td>To be prepared</td>
<td>Sets out infrastructure requirements e.g. transport, schools needed to support proposed growth. In addition, an assessment of the potential funding sources for the infrastructure required to support growth is made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston &amp; North East Surrey Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA)</td>
<td>June 2016</td>
<td>Defines those areas with strong links and similarities to the housing market in Elmbridge and which form a coherent Housing Market Area (HMA). An assessment is then undertaken for the HMA to identify how many new homes will be required over a twenty year period, to meet the needs of existing and future populations. The SHMA sets out the need for market and affordable homes as well as the needs of specific groups such as older people, minority groups, and people with disabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Availability Assessment (LAA)</td>
<td>September 2016</td>
<td>Seeks to identify sufficient sites to demonstrate a five year supply of housing and pitches for Gypsies and Travellers in the context of the Core Strategy. It also sets out the Objectively Assessed Housing Needs (OAHN) for the Borough and whether or not this can be met within the context of the existing spatial strategy. The LAA identifies development opportunities to meet the needs of our economy including commercial/industrial/warehousing and retail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Green Space (LGS) Assessment</td>
<td>September 2016</td>
<td>Identifies those areas of open space that have particular importance and value to the community that are to be designated as Local Green Space and protected against future development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space and Recreation Assessment (OSRA)</td>
<td>October 2014</td>
<td>Provides a review of existing open space provision in terms of quantity, quality, accessibility and wider value to the community. Sets open space standards and identifies surpluses and deficiencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Assessment</td>
<td>April 2016</td>
<td>Provides evidence on the existing and future roles of the Borough’s Town, District and Local Centres and assesses future demand for retail floorspace having regard to the expected levels of growth in Elmbridge and neighbouring authorities as well as changes in consumer behaviour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of Absolute Constraints</td>
<td>September 2016</td>
<td>Identifies constraints to development e.g. Sites of Special Scientific Interest, Flooding etc., for areas of land within the Green Belt that would prevent development from taking place as the potential impacts cannot be mitigated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Flood Risk</td>
<td>May 2015</td>
<td>Provides information on flood risk from all sources (rivers, surface water, groundwater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment (SFRA)</td>
<td></td>
<td>sewers, and artificial sources) across the Borough to help ensure that development is directed away from areas of flood risk or where it does take place, that it is safe and the risk of flooding is minimised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitable Accessible Natural Greenspace (SANG) Assessment</td>
<td>To be prepared</td>
<td>If additional SANGs are required to mitigate higher levels of housing growth, this report will provide an assessment of land to determine whether it could be designated as a SANG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment (SA/SEA) Scoping Report</td>
<td>September 2016</td>
<td>An assessment process that aims to ensure that social, environmental and economic considerations are integrated into the plan making process. SA/SEA is applied at each stage of plan production and the process and key decisions are audited in a series of reports. The Scoping Report represents the first stage of the SA/SEA process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport Assessment</td>
<td>To be published</td>
<td>Provides the Council with an up to date understanding of the impact of future development scenarios on the local and strategic road network in Elmbridge and just beyond over the next 20 years. The assessment shows whether the existing road network has the capacity to support the proposed development options or whether mitigation measures will need to identified to off-set the impact of any proposed development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viability Assessment</td>
<td>To be prepared</td>
<td>Supports the setting of developer contributions e.g. affordable housing, Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area, to ensure that development is not financially overburdened and is achievable. It will also consider the ability of key strategic development areas to provide sufficient levels of affordable housing and smaller homes to meet the exceptional circumstances required to justify release from the Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2 - Core Strategy Policies

As set out in this consultation document, we will be preparing a whole new Local Plan to replace the Core Strategy. However, we will be seeking to retain many of the policies in the Core Strategy that are in conformity with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and which continue to meet our objectives for development locally.

Set out below is the list of policies contained within the Core Strategy and how we intend to approach each one as part of the preparation of a new Local Plan. As can be seen, such as the Spatial Strategy will be entirely replaced however, others only require amending and the general approach of the policy will be retained. It should be noted that the numbering of all policies will change and that the title will also be amended where appropriate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Why</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CS1</td>
<td>Replace</td>
<td>The existing spatial strategy is not sufficiently flexible to allow the Council to increase the delivery of new homes and other forms of development to meet its development needs. A new spatial strategy will be pivotal to the Local Plan showing how the Council intends to plan for sustainable development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS2</td>
<td>Replace</td>
<td>A new target for the number of homes to be provided within the Borough up to 2035 will be set out in the Local Plan. This will balance objectively assessed housing need alongside those designations and policies that limit development opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS3</td>
<td>Amend &amp; Retain</td>
<td>We are minded to continue with the concept of individual settlement area policies within the new Local Plan. Setting out a vision for each settlement areas, these policies will be locally distinctive identifying the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats to the areas. The accompanying maps will be updated to identify the broad location of any new development opportunities identified and any improvement schemes that are set to take place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Following the ward boundary review that was implemented at the local elections on 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Why</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS10</td>
<td>Cobham, Oxshott, Stoke D’Abernon &amp; Downside</td>
<td>May 2016, the boundaries of each settlement area will be redrawn as appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS11</td>
<td>Claygate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS12</td>
<td>The River Thames Corridor and its Tributaries</td>
<td>Amend &amp; Retain Amendments will be made to bring the policy up to date e.g. reflecting the adoption of the Development Management Plan and replacing references to Core Strategy Policies and the proposed Site Allocations Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS13</td>
<td>Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area</td>
<td>Amend &amp; Retain Amendments will be made to bring the policy up to date e.g. reflecting the most up to date standards and mitigation measures. Consideration may also need to be given to the identification of additional Suitable Accessible Natural Greenspace (SANG) to mitigate higher levels of housing growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS14</td>
<td>Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>Amend &amp; Retain Amendments will be made to bring the policy up to date e.g. reflecting the adoption of the Development Management Plan and replacing references to Core Strategy Policies and the proposed Site Allocations Plan. References to previous national policies and guidance will also be removed. The inclusion of Local Green Spaces as part of the Green Infrastructure network will also be required should these be allocated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS15</td>
<td>Biodiversity</td>
<td>Amend &amp; Retain Amendments will be made to bring the policy up to date e.g. reflecting the adoption of the Development Management Plan and replacing references to Core Strategy Policies and the proposed Site Allocations Plan. References to previous national policies and guidance will also be removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS16</td>
<td>Social and Community Infrastructure</td>
<td>Amend &amp; Retain Amendments will be made to bring the policy up to date e.g. reflecting the adoption of the Development Management Plan and replacing references to Core Strategy Policies and the proposed Site Allocations Plan. References to previous evidence base studies such as the Education Provision Assessment will be replaced with the most up to date evidence base. In addition, should certain forms of infrastructure be required to support the delivery of the spatial strategy e.g. new schools, these will be identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS17</td>
<td>Local Character, Density and Design</td>
<td>Amend &amp; Retain Amendments will be made to bring the policy up to date e.g. reflecting the adoption of the Development Management Plan and replacing references to Core Strategy Policies and the proposed Site Allocations Plan. Changes to the sub-section on Development Density may be required to reflect the drive to use land within the urban areas,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Why</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS18</td>
<td>Replace</td>
<td>The latest evidence base documents including the Retail Assessment, Settlement Assessments and Land Availability Assessment will be used to set out the level of new development being planned for including, the identification of any key sites. Should any changes to town centre boundaries and primary and secondary frontages be proposed, these will also need to be reflected. Amendments will be made to bring the policy up to date e.g. reflecting the adoption of the Development Management Plan and replacing references to Core Strategy Policies and the proposed Site Allocations Plan. Changes to national guidance and the permitted development order may also need to be reflected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS19</td>
<td>Amend &amp; Retain</td>
<td>Amendments will be made to bring the policy up to date e.g. reflecting the adoption of the Development Management Plan and replacing references to Core Strategy Policies and the proposed Site Allocations Plan. The most up to date evidence contained within the Strategic Housing Market Assessment in terms of the type, size and tenure of new homes required within the Borough will also need to be reflected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS20</td>
<td>Amend &amp; Retain</td>
<td>Amendments will be made to bring the policy up to date e.g. reflecting the adoption of the Development Management Plan and replacing references to Core Strategy Policies and the proposed Site Allocations Plan. The most up to date evidence contained within the Strategic Housing Market Assessment in terms of the type, size and tenure of new homes required within the Borough will also need to be reflected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS21</td>
<td>Replace</td>
<td>Our priority of providing more affordable homes remains however, since adopted there have been a number of changes to the planning framework that need to be reflected in a new policy. Our intended approach to requiring affordable housing on varying sizes and sites and at certain percentages will be set out. The thresholds and percentages will be set taking account of the level of need identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment; an up to date assessment of viability; the latest Government policies and guidance; and the consideration of local circumstances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Why</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS22</td>
<td>Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople</td>
<td>Replace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS23</td>
<td>Employment land provision</td>
<td>Replace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS24</td>
<td>Hotels and Tourism</td>
<td>Amend &amp; Retain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS25</td>
<td>Travel and Accessibility</td>
<td>Amend &amp; Retain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS26</td>
<td>Flooding</td>
<td>Replace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Why</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>however, the policy will need to be replaced to reflect our most up to date evidence as set out in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment 2015. This includes the widening of the policy to take account of all potential sources of flooding and the cumulative impacts of small scale / minor development. The policy may also need to be amended to take account of the change in advice now received from the Environment Agency on varying scales and the type of development. Amendments will also be made to bring the policy up to date e.g. reflecting the adoption of the Development Management Plan and replacing references to Core Strategy Policies, the proposed Site Allocations Plan, and previous Government policy and guidance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS27</td>
<td>Replace</td>
<td>Since adopted the Government has moved away from the Code for Sustainable Homes and a large amount of controls to reduce carbon emissions and make new development more energy efficient is covered by building regulations. The policy will therefore need to be replaced to reflect the most up to date national requirements for example, the range of Technical Standards for Housing. Consideration will also need to be given to the Housing Optional Standards which can be required, with evidence, through Local Plan policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS28</td>
<td>Replace</td>
<td>This policy will be replaced. In a new policy will be our approach to implementing and delivery the new spatial strategy and replaced / amended policies within our new Local Plan. The on-going implementation of our Local Plan and working with neighbouring authorities and other bodies as part of the duty to cooperate will be reflected as well as potential changes to our Charging Schedule and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) that may be required to deliver the infrastructure that is essential to support our planned growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS29</td>
<td>Replace</td>
<td>Our Local Plan will have a number of new targets and policies that we must monitor and report on as part of the annual Authorities’ Monitoring Report. This policy and section will be updated to reflect national and local indicators, and any contingencies in place should we not be delivering against them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: Elmbridge Green Belt Boundary Review - Local Areas
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

This is the second quarter monitoring report against the 2016/17 approved budget, which provides an update on the Revenue and Capital budget position as at 30 September 2016 and a mid-year view for the financial year.

RECOMMENDED: THAT CABINET

(A) NOTE THE REVENUE AND CAPITAL BUDGET POSITION FOR THE SECOND QUARTER OF 2016/17.

REPORT:

1. Revenue Budget

1.1 This is the second financial report on the 2016/17 budget. Appendix A contains the budget monitoring by portfolios to 30 September 2016, with Appendix B showing the variances against the key indicators requested by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Favourable variances are shown in parentheses.

1.2 At the end of September 2016, the operational revenue budget shows a favourable variance against net operational budget of £205,226 (£215,822 less £10,596) for the combined position to date. The following variations are worthy of note:

Corporate Development

The variance to the profiled budget at the end of September is due to £50,000 of additional costs incurred on Elections and Registration of Electors offset by salary savings in other areas within the portfolio.

Environment

At the end of the second quarter, the recycling income (net of gate fees) is £179,000 over budget. However, the gate fees we pay are due to be reviewed; it is expected that they will increase significantly and the estimated outturn will be close to budget. In addition, there has been an underspend of £54,000 on staff costs due to vacancies.
Highways & Transport

The off-street parking income for the first 6 months of the year is £65,000 below target in relation to pay and display income. The station and village car parks are showing income below budget but town centres are showing a favourable variance. Overall, net car parking income is £22,000 under budget.

Housing

There has been an increase in the net expenditure on nightly paid accommodation of £24,500 over the profiled budget. The number of households in nightly paid accommodation has increased from an average of 10 in the second quarter of 2015/16 to an average of 13 in the second quarter of 2016/17. Income received from the Care & Repair service is currently £24,000 above the profiled budget.

Leisure & Cultural

This portfolio is currently over spent by £79,000 mainly due to urgent repair works to Hurst Meadows footpath and Churchfields Recreation Ground basketball court, which cost £30,000. Cemetery income is also down against the profiled budget by £80,000. However, income received for SHOUT and grass cutting are both above their profiled budgets by £20,000 respectively.

Planning

There has been a drop in the level of planning income; the income is £115,000 below profiled budget and £197,000 lower than the income for the first 6 months of 2015/16. This is due to a reduction in the number of large developments and the fee income this generates.

Resources

The main variance to the profiled budget at the end of September are:

- £60,000 – Property maintenance during the period higher than the profiled.
- (£28,000) – Additional rental income (including amounts relating to 15/16 rent reviews).
- (£70,000) – Employee related savings.
- (£22,000) – Reduced business rates payable on Mole Business Park empty units.
- (£38,000) – Reduced fees for external audit work on financial accounts and internal audit costs.
- (£20,000) – Reduction in insurance premiums

Social

The underspend on the Social portfolio mainly relates to staff turnover savings and vacancies of £110,000. The reduced grant income outlined at the July Cabinet meeting has started to affect the income received from Surrey County Council and is down by £54,000.
Licensing

The variance of £5,900 is mainly due to staff vacancies.

Salaries

Overall, staffing costs are £135,000 favourable to budget. Staff turnover at the end of quarter two was just over 6%. It should be noted that salary savings identified in the above portfolios are for the first half of the year and these savings may not continue for the remainder of the year as a result of appointments to the vacant posts.

2. **Capital Monitoring**

2.1 Appendix C shows the variation of actual expenditure at the end of September against the annual estimated project costs, as agreed by the Council in February 2016. Where relevant, the budgets have been adjusted for underspends from the previous financial year.

2.2 The budgets have been profiled in line with the information included in the 2016/17 bid pro-formas provided by the lead officer for each scheme and, where relevant, profiles have been included for those budgets brought forward from previous years, either due to re-phasing as part of the 2016/17 budget process or underspends at the year end.

2.3 For monitoring purposes, a “major project” is defined as one with a current estimate of £25,000 or more.

2.4 At the end of the second quarter the following are worthy of note:

**Housing:**

**Housing Enabling Fund** - £1,314,000 variance to profile spend (it is difficult to profile the spending pattern of the Enabling Fund): The Enabling Fund has continued to grow as income has exceeded expenditure. There is a risk of future receipts diminishing due to changes in national planning policy. Officers are currently exploring opportunities to invest a significant portion of this budget; elsewhere on the agenda is a proposal to use the enabling fund in the second half of the year.

**Private Sector Housing Grants** – £38,500 underspend on 2016/17 Approvals: the pattern of expenditure on Private Sector Housing Grants is difficult to predict due to the demand led nature of these grants.

**Leisure & Culture:**

**Brooklands Community Park** - £44,100 underspend: works delayed due to subsidence issues. Surveys and tendering works are being completed with works likely to commence in Spring 2017.
Social:

Weybridge Centre Refurbishment - £31,000 underspend: The tender has been awarded and the works will require the centre to be closed for a six-week period, as a result work will commence in January 2017 to avoid disruption at Christmas.

Resources:

PV Roof Panel - £37,000 underspend: feasibility of this project has been undertaken and in the current utilities market it is no longer a viable option with no financial advantage to installation.

Works from Condition Survey 2012 - £408,200 underspend: works have been re-prioritised to make best use of available funds. In addition, the procurement process for the works usually takes a considerable time to get to the contract award stage.

IT Development Fund - £201,900 underspend: procurement of the shared datacentre with Epsom & Ewell Borough Council is due to commence imminently and will be completed in the second half of the year.

Financial implications:
At the end of the second quarter the net operational budget shows net expenditure 2% lower than the profiled budget.

Environmental/Sustainability Implications:
None for the purpose of this report.

Legal implications:
None for the purpose of this report.

Equality Implications:
None for the purpose of this report.

Risk Implications:
This is the second quarter monitoring for the year and any forward prediction using this data should be viewed with caution.

Community Safety Implications:
None for the purpose of this report.

Principal Consultees:
None for the purpose of this report.

Background papers:
None for the purpose of this report.
Enclosures/Appendices:
Appendix B: Financial Performance Monitoring Significant/Key Budgets to September 2016.
Appendix C: Capital Budget Monitoring to September 2016.

Contact details:
Head of Finance, 01372 474123 acooper@elmbridge.gov.uk
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## Financial Performance Monitoring by Portfolio to September 2016

### Portfolio Variance between Profiled Budget and Spent & Committed to Date

![Diagram showing portfolio variance between profiled budget and spent/committed to date.](image)

### Portfolio / Key Budgets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Portfolio / Key Budgets</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Profiled Budget April - September</th>
<th>Actual April - September</th>
<th>Variance to Original Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Development (1)</td>
<td>£418,180</td>
<td>£180,683</td>
<td>£173,089</td>
<td>(£7,594) (£4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Development (2)</td>
<td>£2,640,770</td>
<td>£1,403,259</td>
<td>£1,410,095</td>
<td>6,836 (£0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment (3)</td>
<td>£5,842,750</td>
<td>£2,320,275</td>
<td>£2,081,703</td>
<td>(£238,572) (£10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways and Transport (4)</td>
<td>(£1,682,360)</td>
<td>(£722,985)</td>
<td>(£694,374)</td>
<td>28,611 (£4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing (5)</td>
<td>£2,361,730</td>
<td>£1,144,159</td>
<td>£1,153,898</td>
<td>9,739 (£1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure and Culture (6)</td>
<td>£4,679,500</td>
<td>£2,254,788</td>
<td>£2,333,640</td>
<td>78,852 (£3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning (7)</td>
<td>£1,836,830</td>
<td>£846,008</td>
<td>£961,471</td>
<td>115,463 (£14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources (8)</td>
<td>£1,614,520</td>
<td>£161,730</td>
<td>£41,978</td>
<td>(£119,752) (£74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social (9)</td>
<td>£2,700,010</td>
<td>£1,299,711</td>
<td>£1,216,189</td>
<td>(£83,522) (£6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensing (10)</td>
<td>£172,800</td>
<td>£94,806</td>
<td>£88,923</td>
<td>(£5,883) (£6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operational Budgets</strong></td>
<td>£20,584,730</td>
<td>£8,982,434</td>
<td>£8,766,612</td>
<td>(£215,822) (£2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amount set aside for Land Charges</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£10,596</td>
<td>£10,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Operational Budgets</strong></td>
<td>£20,584,730</td>
<td>£8,982,434</td>
<td>£8,777,208</td>
<td>(£205,226) (£2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Financial Performance Monitoring
### Significant / Key Budgets to September 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Portfolio / Key Budgets</th>
<th>Original Budget</th>
<th>Profiled Budget April - Sept</th>
<th>Actual April - Sept</th>
<th>Variance to Original Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£'000</td>
<td>£'000</td>
<td>£'000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Environment
- Recycling Income (net of gate fees)
  - Original Budget: £1,447
  - Profiled Budget April - Sept: £880
  - Actual April - Sept: £1,059
  - Variance to Original Budget: £179 (20%)

### Highways and Transport
- Off -Street Car Parking Income
  - Stations: £909
  - Villages: £302
  - Town Centres: £995
  - Season Tickets: £502
  - Fines and Other income: £263
  - Total: £2,971

### Housing
- Net Direct Cost of Bed & Breakfast & Temporary Accommodation: £90

### Leisure and Cultural
- Maintenance of Recreational Land: £752
- Indoor Sports Contract: £70

### Social
- Centre Meals, Meals on Wheels and Transport Income: £380

### Regulatory Affairs
- Local Land Charges Income *
  - Original Budget: £326
  - Profiled Budget April - Sept: £163
  - Actual April - Sept: £134
  - Variance to Original Budget: £92 (28%)

### Planning
- Planning Income: £1,120

### Other Data
- Expected Rate of Return on Interest on Balances: 0.85%
- Interest Earned: £636,500

### Significant Balance Sheet Items
- Capital Receipts in year to end of September: £337
- Local Taxation Arrears to end of September: £1,682
- Invested Amounts at end of September: £78,900

* Any net deficit on this item will be funded from an Earmarked Reserve.
## Capital Programme 2016/17

### Capital Budget Monitoring to September 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Cost (Estimate)#</th>
<th>Actual as at 31.3.16</th>
<th>Current Estimate 2016/17*</th>
<th>Profiled Budget to September 2016</th>
<th>Actual to September 2016</th>
<th>Variance to 2016/17 Profiled Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£’000s</td>
<td>£’000s</td>
<td>£’000s</td>
<td>£’000s</td>
<td>£’000s</td>
<td>£’000s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td>1,109.4</td>
<td>837.9</td>
<td>271.5</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment &amp; Economy</td>
<td>578.5</td>
<td>472.7</td>
<td>105.7</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways &amp; Transport</td>
<td>251.9</td>
<td>128.0</td>
<td>123.9</td>
<td>123.9</td>
<td>104.2</td>
<td>(19.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>8,482.4</td>
<td>4,009.0</td>
<td>4,473.4</td>
<td>2,238.3</td>
<td>587.9</td>
<td>(1,650.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Development Fund</td>
<td>3,251.2</td>
<td>2,532.1</td>
<td>719.1</td>
<td>359.4</td>
<td>157.5</td>
<td>(201.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure &amp; Culture</td>
<td>4,099.8</td>
<td>725.1</td>
<td>3,374.7</td>
<td>451.4</td>
<td>335.7</td>
<td>(115.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>554.2</td>
<td>550.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Affairs</td>
<td>190.7</td>
<td>138.0</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>(20.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>31,012.6</td>
<td>2,326.5</td>
<td>23,204.0</td>
<td>4,443.7</td>
<td>3,679.2</td>
<td>(764.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>533.6</td>
<td>294.2</td>
<td>239.4</td>
<td>151.0</td>
<td>114.5</td>
<td>(36.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Capital Programme</strong></td>
<td><strong>50,064.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,013.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>32,568.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,901.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,112.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>(2,789.4)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Profiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£’000s</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April – June</td>
<td>3,980.7</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July – September</td>
<td>3,943.5</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October – December</td>
<td>6,418.8</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October - March</td>
<td>18,225.5</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>32,568.5</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Total Estimated Cost equals Actual Expenditure to 31.03.16 plus budgeted provision for 2016/17 and future years.

* Please note that the above includes rephasing from the 2015/16 Capital Programme where relevant.
## Capital Programme 2016/17

### Major Projects to September 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total Cost (Estimate)</th>
<th>Actual as at 31.3.16 £'000</th>
<th>Current Estimate 2016/17 £'000</th>
<th>Profiled Budget to September £'000</th>
<th>Actual to September 2016 £'000</th>
<th>Variance to 2016/17 Profiled Budget £'000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCTV Monitoring Hub</td>
<td>150.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>150.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECIF Grants</td>
<td>620.0</td>
<td>556.1</td>
<td>639.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tripartite (Community Buildings Grants) Scheme</td>
<td>314.4</td>
<td>261.1</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works at Old Church Path, Esher</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>(4.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment &amp; Economy</strong></td>
<td>578.5</td>
<td>472.7</td>
<td>105.7</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling Containers New Properties / Exchanges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highways &amp; Transport</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay &amp; Display Machines Commuter Car Parks</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>(0.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade Pay &amp; Display Machines</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>148.9</td>
<td>128.0</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>(19.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing</strong></td>
<td>5,623.1</td>
<td>2,873.5</td>
<td>2,749.6</td>
<td>1,374.8</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>(1,314.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing Grants for RSL</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>84.1</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>(36.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empty Property &amp; Loan Scheme</td>
<td>480.2</td>
<td>477.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>(2.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Housing Grants 2013/14 Approvals</td>
<td>931.1</td>
<td>384.3</td>
<td>546.8</td>
<td>273.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>(266.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Housing Grants 2014/15 Approvals</td>
<td>599.0</td>
<td>248.2</td>
<td>350.8</td>
<td>175.4</td>
<td>253.0</td>
<td>77.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Housing Grants 2015/16 Approvals</td>
<td>599.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>599.0</td>
<td>299.6</td>
<td>261.1</td>
<td>(38.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Grants and Loans</td>
<td>150.0</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>140.3</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>(70.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leisure &amp; Culture</strong></td>
<td>135.0</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>(44.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklands Community Park</td>
<td>196.0</td>
<td>102.6</td>
<td>93.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmbridge Museum Redevelopment</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eimgrove Tennis Courts Lighting &amp; Access System</td>
<td>120.0</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>(5.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved Green Space Security</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td>(0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation of Outdoor Gym Equipment</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Play Area Brooklands</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>(6.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paddling Pool Refurbishment</td>
<td>105.0</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground Refurbishment Programme 2014/15</td>
<td>180.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>180.0</td>
<td>180.0</td>
<td>179.8</td>
<td>(0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement Excavator &amp; Storage Container</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Hub, Waterside Drive</td>
<td>2,500.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2,500.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>508.7</td>
<td>399.8</td>
<td>108.9</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>(62.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning</strong></td>
<td>554.2</td>
<td>550.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regulatory Affairs</strong></td>
<td>180.7</td>
<td>134.3</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>(17.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Name Plate Replacement Programme</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>(3.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resources</strong></td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>(35.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset Management Software</td>
<td>558.0</td>
<td>400.4</td>
<td>157.6</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>(51.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Centre Alterations</td>
<td>130.0</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>(31.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of Allotments at Pleasant Place, Hersham</td>
<td>133.5</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>(0.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esher Church Wall</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>(37.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neilsions Bridge</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV Roof Panel</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>(13.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refurbishment of Civic Centre WCs</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refurbishment of Committee Rooms</td>
<td>17,896.0</td>
<td>1,441.6</td>
<td>10,972.3</td>
<td>3,630.1</td>
<td>3,444.3</td>
<td>(185.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Hub (Development)</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website &amp; Content Management System</td>
<td>220.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>205.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weybridge Hall Flat Conversion</td>
<td>1,214.6</td>
<td>269.7</td>
<td>944.9</td>
<td>472.4</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>(408.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Buildings - Works Arising from 2012 Condition Survey</td>
<td>230.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>230.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Parks - Works Arising from 2015 Condition Survey</td>
<td>10,000.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10,000.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of Potential Asset Investments</td>
<td>3,251.2</td>
<td>2,532.1</td>
<td>719.1</td>
<td>359.4</td>
<td>157.5</td>
<td>(201.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Development Fund</td>
<td>131.5</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>(6.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>(3.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase of Community Transport</td>
<td>242.6</td>
<td>182.6</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>(5.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weybridge Centre Refurbishment</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>(31.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weybridge Centre WC Refurbishment</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>149.0</td>
<td>111.6</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>(10.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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