

Runnymede Borough CouncilCORPORATE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE21 January 2021 at 7.30 p.m. via MS Teams

Members of the Committee present: Councillors N Prescott (Chairman), J Gracey (Vice-Chairman), A Alderson, I Chaudhri, D Cotty, L Gillham, M Heath, J Hulley, R King, M Maddox, D Whyte and M Willingale.

Members of the Committee absent: None.

Councillors T Burton, D Clarke, M Cressey, T Gracey, C Howorth, S Lewis, J Olorenshaw, J Sohi and J Wilson also attended.

401 MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 17 December 2020 were confirmed as a correct record. As the meeting was being held remotely using MS Teams, the Chairman would sign these minutes when this was physically possible.

402 STATEMENT OF ACCOUNTS 2019/20

This report was withdrawn from the agenda as the Council had been advised by its auditors that they had not as yet completed their audit of the Council's accounts for the reasons set out in section 4 of the report.

403 2021/22 TREASURY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY, ANNUAL INVESTMENT STRATEGY, PRUDENTIAL AND TREASURY MANAGEMENT INDICATORS AND MINIMUM REVENUE PROVISION STATEMENT

The Committee considered a report on the 2021/22 Treasury Management Strategy, Annual Investment Strategy, Prudential and Treasury Management Indicators and Minimum Revenue Provision Statement.

The Council had total investments of £73,121,000 at 30 November 2020. The Council invested its funds prudently and had regard to the security and liquidity of its investments before seeking the highest rate of return, or yield. This approach was inherent in the Council's Treasury Management Strategy which encompassed the Annual Investment Strategy at Appendix 'B' to the agenda for the meeting. Investment returns were likely to remain low during 2021/22 with little increase predicted in the following few years.

The Council's main source of borrowing was the Public Works Loan Board (PWLB). In November 2020, the Government had made it evident that if the Council borrowed for a purpose that was primarily commercial in nature and fell under the category of asset for yield, the PWLB could not be used for borrowing by Councils. However, the regeneration scheme in Egham was not affected by the PWLB lending criteria and the Council would continue to benefit from reduced rates on borrowing to fund that scheme.

A code of practice had been issued relating to money market investments called the UK Money Markets Code which CIPFA had recommended that all Councils should adopt and the Committee agreed to recommend that it be adopted by the Council to strengthen further the Council's treasury governance arrangements. The Committee agreed to recommend the Prudential and Treasury Management Indicators for 2021/22 as set out in Appendix 'C' to the agenda for the meeting. This included a total authorised limit for external borrowing by the Council in 2021/22 of £759,704,000.

One of the recommendations to Council on the budget was to seek permission from the Government to capitalise up to £4 million of transformation and Covid-19 costs to avoid urgent cuts to the budget in early 2021. Officers confirmed that the proposed capitalisation of up to £4 million would be financed from existing cashflows from the money set aside from various sources including the Minimum Revenue Provision.

The Council was required to pay off an element of the accumulated General Fund capital spend each year (the Capital Financing Requirement – CFR) through Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) which was a charge to revenue in order to have sufficient monies set aside to meet the future repayment of principal on any borrowing undertaken. The Council was required to approve an MRP statement in advance of each year. The Committee was advised that there was no need to amend the Council's current statement and agreed to recommend the Council's MRP statement for 2021/22 as set out in recommendation v) below.

**RECOMMEND TO FULL COUNCIL ON 9 FEBRUARY 2021 that -**

- i) the proposed Treasury Management Strategy as set out in the report encompassing the Annual Investment Strategy as reported, be approved;**
- ii) the Council adopts the UK Money Markets Code;**
- iii) the Prudential and Treasury Management Indicators for 2021/22, as reported, be approved;**
- iv) the authorised limit for external borrowing by the Council in 2021/22, be set at £759,704,000 (this being the statutory limit determined under Section 3(1) of the Local Government Act 2003); and**
- v) there be no change to the previously adopted Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) policy as set out below: -**

***The Council will use the asset life method as its main method for calculating MRP.***

***In normal circumstances, MRP will be set aside from the date of acquisition. However, in relation to capital expenditure on property purchases and/or development, we will start setting aside an MRP provision from the date that the asset becomes operational and/or revenue income is generated. Where schemes require interim financing by loan, pending receipt of an alternative source of finance (for example capital receipts) no MRP charge will be applied.***

**404 CAPITAL STRATEGY AND CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2021/22 TO 2025/26**

The Committee considered a report on a proposed Capital Strategy and General Fund Capital Programme 2021/22 to 2025/26. The main thrust of the Strategy centred on funding the Council's regeneration projects and the provision of assets to deliver services. A large proportion of the capital receipts that the Council could rely on in the next two financial years arose from the Egham and Addlestone regeneration schemes. The current policy of the Council was only to borrow for regeneration schemes where the resultant assets generated sufficient income to cover the interest charge and loan repayment. As the Council's useable general capital receipts were declining, the Committee agreed to recommend to Council that the Corporate Management Committee consider future revisions to the Council's Capital and Treasury Management Strategies to maintain these receipts at a prudent level.

The underlying Capital Strategy remained the same as last year with the exception of a key change this year resulting from the adverse effects of coronavirus which was the proposal to capitalise up to £4 million of net revenue expenditure. In order to class revenue expenditure as capital, the Council would need to receive a specific dispensation from the Government. The benefits of this capitalisation would be to protect services and to avoid revenue balances being depleted to a dangerously low level. This capitalisation would be financed from existing cashflows from the money set aside from various sources including the Minimum Revenue Provision. The Committee agreed to recommend this capitalisation proposal to the Council. The revenue spending items to be capitalised would be approved by the Corporate Management Committee at a single meeting or through its regular meetings.

**RECOMMEND TO FULL COUNCIL ON 9 FEBRUARY 2021 that –**

- i) the Capital Strategy and the Capital Programme, as reported, be approved;**
- ii) the Council seeks dispensation from the Government to charge up to £4 million of revenue spending to its capital budget with any capitalisation of revenue spending to be approved by the Corporate Management Committee at a single meeting or through its regular meetings to both protect services and avoid revenue balances being depleted to a dangerously low level; and**
- iii) the Corporate Management Committee considers future revisions to the Council's Capital and Treasury Management Strategies to maintain useable capital receipts at a prudent level.**

405 COUNCIL TAX BASE AND COLLECTION FUND DEFICIT

The Committee considered a report on the 2021/22 Council Tax base and the projected Collection Fund Deficit for the year ending 31 March 2021. The Council was required to undertake a formal calculation of the 2021/22 Council Tax base in accordance with the requirements of the Local Government Finance Act 1992. The precepting authorities had to be provided with details by 31 January 2021 to allow them to set their precept.

The Council had to make a judgement on the level of Council Tax support and the collection rate. In normal years the number of households claiming Council Tax support had remained fairly constant and over 98% of Council tax had been collected within the financial year. The Committee expressed its appreciation of the very high Council Tax collection rates that had been achieved by officers. However, as a result of the ongoing impact of Covid-19 on the collection rate, the estimated collection rate for 2021/22 had reduced from 98% to 96%. At the same time it had been assumed that there would be no net increase in dwellings due to new build or demolition of properties in the borough.

The increase in Council tax support claimants and the estimated reduced collection rate had reduced the tax base by 2%. Any surplus or deficit on the Collection Fund account had to be paid over or collected by the preceptors in proportion to their precepts set for the year. The Committee noted a table showing the Collection Fund estimated deficit for the year ending 31 March 2021. As there were over three months to go to the end of the financial year and the whole country was currently in lockdown, the table showed a range of estimates for the collection rate. The best estimate from the Council's finance officers was a deficit of £1,527,947. The Committee noted the apportionment of this deficit to Surrey County Council and Surrey Police. £132,774 of this deficit would be apportioned to Runnymede Borough Council. In December 2020, the Government had changed the legislation to require the deficit to be spread. Therefore, the deficit for Runnymede Borough Council would be £44,258 spread over three years from 2021/22 to 2023/24. The Band D equivalent tax base had reduced from 34,099 to 33,404 and the expected Council Tax

income to the Council in 2021/22 was now £49,149 and not £170,496 which had been anticipated originally.

The Committee approved the changes to the Council Tax base and to the estimated deficit on the Collection Fund.

**RESOLVED that -**

- i) the Council tax base (showing the Band D equivalent dwellings for tax setting purposes for the Borough for the financial year 2021/22) be approved as 33,404; and**
- ii) the estimated deficit on the Collection Fund for 2020/21 be declared at £1,527,947 and split among the precepting authorities as reported and it be noted that Runnymede Borough Council's proportion after the spreading adjustment is £44,258.**

406 BUDGET AND COUNCIL TAX 2021/22

The Committee considered a report on the Council's Budget and Council Tax for 2021/22. The budget was less strategic than in previous years and was more of a tactical budget to recover from the effects of the coronavirus pandemic. Although taxation was an important part of the Council's budget, most of the money that the Council received was from fees and charges, from services which provided income and from rent from commercial assets, and the levels of income that the Council received in those areas of the budget had reduced as a result of Covid-19.

The outlook for the current financial year had changed considerably since the Council had set its budget in February 2020. The original budget showed a surplus of £500,000 to provide services. Covid-19 had changed this to a projected deficit of £5.6 million by March 2021. As a result, General Fund reserves had been seriously depleted, mainly because of the loss of income which was likely to persist into 2021 and 2022. The Committee noted assumptions made by officers on income shortfalls prior to the third national lockdown. Increased costs and reduced income of at least £11 million over a three year period necessitated measures to bridge the budget gap and protect services.

The Committee agreed to recommend that the Band D Council Tax rate for Runnymede be increased by £5 a year which was the maximum allowed to stay within the Government's referendum limits. However, as the Council was a low tax rate Council, this increase would not cover inflation.

The Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) at Appendix 'F' to the agenda detailed risks faced by the Council over the next two financial years. Covid -19 would have an ongoing impact on the Council's income. The Government's "fair funding review" and business rates retention scheme had been delayed probably until 2023 but it was likely that only those Councils which provided adult social care services would benefit. Capital receipts were reducing with limited scope to replenish them. Council tax and business rates collection were not as certain as in previous years. The Government might not continue its Covid-19 relief schemes indefinitely which might result in increased cost pressures for the Council. The rateable value of office premises was being considered currently by the Government's Valuation Office which might lead to significant reductions in rateable value and potential loss of income to the Council.

In order to bridge the budget gap, the Committee agreed to recommend that the Council seek permission from the Government to capitalise up to £4 million of Covid and transformation costs. This would be funded from cash set aside in previous years to repay debt in 2063 totalling £14 million and would be accounting treatment of capital financing and would not increase the Council's borrowing requirement or the cash balances of the

Council. Using the strength in the Council's balance sheet would be the lowest risk option to resolve the short term problems caused by Covid and would allow time to redefine capital and revenue spending priorities.

Officers were not recommending that more than £4 million was capitalised as the Council's proposals would be scrutinised carefully by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government and by the Treasury and this was a measure that should be used sparingly arising out of the exceptional circumstances created by Covid-19. Permission to capitalise up to £4 million could not be guaranteed and it was also possible that conditions could be placed upon the capitalisation.

If the Council was able to capitalise up to £4 million of Covid and transformation costs it would still need to find £1 million of efficiency savings in 2021/22 and reduce its base budget by a further £1 million in 2022/23 and the Committee agreed to recommend that proposals to achieve those requirements be produced for the consideration of Members. If the effect of Covid-19 on the budget had been underestimated it might be necessary to make further savings. The Council's earmarked reserves would need to be retained for the purposes originally set by the Council, not to support general revenue spending. These earmarked reserves had been set up to mitigate specific risks. The onset of the pandemic had not removed those risks and instead the likelihood of those risks crystallising was more acute.

It was noted that the budget for 2021/22 made provision for a staff pay award of 2%. At this stage it was envisaged that this 2% pay award would be implemented. Other Surrey districts were awarding their staff no more than a pay increase of 1.3% for this year. However, in view of the need to make savings in 2022/23, it might be necessary to reduce the staff pay award to 1% in that year.

In previous years Members had received a Section 25 report which outlined the risks that the Council faced in preparing its budget. As the report on the budget and the MTFs for this year were concerned to a very large extent with risk management, no separate section 25 report had been produced for this year. The Council's section 151 officer confirmed his view that the Council's budget for 2021/22 was sustainable and robust.

**RECOMMEND TO FULL COUNCIL ON 9 FEBRUARY 2021 that -**

- i) the Council capitalises up to £4 million of transformation and Covid-19 related costs in 2020/21 and 2021/22, subject to Secretary of State approval;**
- ii) the £4 million is funded from cash set aside in previous years to repay debt in 2063 totalling £14 million which is accounting treatment of capital financing and will not increase the Council's borrowing requirement or the cash balances of the Council;**
- iii) the Medium Term Financial Strategy as reported be approved;**
- iv) the Band D Council Tax rate be increased by £5 a year in line with the Government's referendum limits;**
- v) proposals be produced for the Council to consider which produce £1 million of efficiency savings to be implemented in 2021/22; and**
- vi) plans be produced to reduce the base budget in 2022/23 by a further £1 million.**

407 RUNNYMEDE CYCLING AND WALKING INFRASTRUCTURE PLANS – STAGE ONE

The Committee considered whether to approve funding for project feasibility work for the proposed Runnymede Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans (LCWIP)s which were blue-prints of walking and cycling routes within an area that had been assessed as meeting Department of Transport (DFT) standards. They were due to be rolled out for all areas within Surrey. Runnymede Borough Council (RBC) had been invited to participate in the first tranche of studies along with the Elmbridge and Spelthorne local authorities.

Stage 1 (also known as Phase 1) would have an approximate total cost of £60,000. SCC would contribute £40,000 and Runnymede had been requested to contribute £20,000. The work would commence in 2020/21 with an approximate start date of January or February 2021. The revenue funding would be required in 2021/22. This would produce schemes that had been consulted with stakeholders and high level costings but the specific details required to successfully secure funding for delivery for the plan would be established in stage 2 (also known as Phase 2) of the LCWIPs.

SCC had indicated that the estimated total cost of stage 2 was approximately £300,000 which would be split between SCC and RBC. Given a potential start date of approximately October or November 2021 for Stage 2, RBC's indicative spend in 2021/22 for phase 2 would be approximately up to £160,000. During stage 2 design standards and aspirations set out in the Government's Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy launched in the summer of 2020 would be factored in to the business case to enable the Plan to be ready for RBC and SCC to make a bid for mainly DFT funding to deliver on the schemes identified across the borough. It was likely that if a bid for funding were submitted SCC would request from RBC a 50% contribution to the 25% partner funding that it was anticipated might be required. Other possible funding streams might also be available. The timing of delivery of identified schemes would be dependent on the availability of Government funding and RBC and SCC's ability to provide match funding.

In 2019/20 the Council had set up an earmarked reserve of £100,000 for initial infrastructure feasibility works called the Infrastructure Feasibility Fund. Any funding from this reserve would be matched by SCC in the gearing ratio of 1:0.86 (with RBC contributing £1 and SCC providing £0.86). The initial £20,000 for stage 1 of this project could be drawn from this earmarked reserve. In December 2020, RBC had invoiced SCC for approximately £80,000 to cover historical costs incurred in developing the A320 project, from the HIF grant. The money, together with the £100,000 earmarked reserve was sufficient to cover the cost of the estimated stage 2 payment of £160,000. If the stage 2 payment of £160,000 was drawn from this reserve -once additional contributions had been received – this would fully deplete the reserve placing the Council in the same position as it was when the reserve had been set up. Any allocation of these funds by RBC would be dependent on other partners also making their funding contributions toward the project.

The Committee expressed its strong support for the LCWIPs as they would promote the enhancement of the environment and sustainable forms of travel and would also provide a key element of a future Climate Change Strategy for the Borough. Further to an inquiry from a Member, the Committee noted that there had been positive recent progress regarding the delivery of the River Thames scheme and it was noted that the LCWIPs would link into that scheme.

The Committee approved the revenue funding of £20,000 from the Council's Infrastructure Feasibility Fund for stage 1 of the LCWIPs and agreed that this would be released only when SCC's contribution of £40,000 was confirmed. The Committee also approved match funding of stage 2 of the plan development in principle, but agreed that on completion of stage 1, a report would be brought to Members providing an update on the stage 1 work and seeking approval for the Council to release funds for stage 2 feasibility work.

**RESOLVED that -**

- i) £20,000 revenue funding be approved as match funding to enable commencement of phase 1 of the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan feasibility work for Runnymede Borough Council to commence in the financial year 2020/21 with a withdrawal of funding required in 2021/22;**
- ii) The £20,000 revenue funding referred to at i) above be met from the Council's Infrastructure Feasibility Fund and be released only when Surrey County Council's contribution of £40,000 is confirmed;**
- iii) match funding of stage 2 of the plan development be agreed in principle, but on completion of phase 1 a report be brought to Members to provide an update on the phase 1 work and to seek approval for the Council to release funds for stage 2 feasibility work; and**
- iv) it be noted that the stage 2 payment would fully deplete the earmarked Infrastructure Feasibility Fund Reserve placing the Council in the same position as it was when the Fund was set up and that there would therefore be a requirement to replenish the reserve with a further growth bid before any further schemes could be entertained.**

408 CARER'S POLICY

The Committee considered a proposed Carer's Policy. As life expectancy had increased, more employees were undertaking caring responsibilities for elderly relatives. Other employees looked after a disabled relative or a child. Runnymede had to consider how it responded to the increased number of employees who were carers and therefore a Carer's Policy had been drafted. The draft Policy had been considered by the Human Resources (HR) Member Working Party and UNISON and some of the amendments proposed by UNISON had been included in the Policy.

Councillor R King proposed a number of amendments to the Policy. The Policy currently stated that an employee who was a registered carer for someone who was not a family member such as a friend or neighbour would also be covered by this Policy (at section 3, paragraph 2). Councillor R King's view was that the word "registered" should be deleted as an employee might be undertaking that role who was not "registered".

The Policy also currently stated that "the organisation offers various types of flexible working" (at section 6, paragraph 2). Councillor R King considered that the words "to all employees" should be added as he considered that flexible working should be made available to all employees.

Councillor R King also proposed that the Corporate Head of Human Resources and Organisational Development undertake a costing review and report back to the Corporate Management Committee within six months on the proposed addition of two further paragraphs to the Policy as set out below:-

- (1) Where an employee's hours, and therefore salary, are reduced on a temporary basis, Runnymede will maintain the previous Superannuation contribution based on their previous salary or hours contribution, providing that the employee continues to make their previous contribution prior to their hours reduction as well. Any further extension to such temporary hours, and so continued original pension contribution by Runnymede, will be at the discretion of their line manager.
- (2) Where an employee has had their dependant's attendance allowance application initially turned down or delayed and is in the process of reapplying or awaiting a

decision of appeal for this allowance, their line manager will have the discretion to award care vouchers to the said employee for the period until a final decision is made. The period or value of such care vouchers will be reviewed on a case by case basis based on Runnymede's care policy and needs of service.

Officers advised that they would need to consider further some aspects of these proposed amendments and report back to the Committee. Some Members of the Committee indicated also that they would wish to have more time to consider the proposed amendments. Accordingly the Committee

**RESOLVED that –**

**the item be deferred so that officers can consider and report further on the amendments to the Policy proposed by Councillor R King.**

Councillor R King requested a named vote on the above decision and the voting was as follows: -

For (11) Councillors Prescott, J Gracey, Alderson, Chaudhri, Cotty, Gillham, Heath, Hulley, R King, Maddox and D Whyte  
Against (1) Councillor Willingale

409 PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATION OF MAYORAL SELECTION

The Committee considered candidates for the office of Mayor for the Municipal Year 2021/22 in accordance with Standing Order 7 of the Council's Constitution.

The Government in April 2020 had enacted regulations which allowed the continuation in office of any Mayor who had been appointed to office in May 2019. Council P Sohi, who had been appointed as Mayor in May 2019 and was scheduled to leave office in May 2020 had agreed to remain in office to assist the Council and avoid the need to hold an Annual Meeting to appoint a new Mayor at a time when the country was in lockdown. In October 2020, when the use of remote meeting technology had been developed, Councillor Sohi had resigned from office of Mayor. Councillor E Gill had been appointed by Full Council as Mayor until May 2021 and Councillor M Harnden had been appointed to the office of Deputy Mayor for the same period.

Councillors Gill and Harnden had been nominated as Mayor and Deputy Mayor in May 2020 but due to the Covid pandemic had been unable to take up those offices. Members had indicated prior to the Full Council meeting in October 2020 that they would support the nomination of Councillors Gill and Harnden for the offices of Mayor and Deputy Mayor for the Municipal Year 2021/22 in acknowledgement of the fact that due to the impact of coronavirus they were unable to be appointed to those roles in May 2020.

The Committee noted that, under the procedure set out in Standing Order 7, while it considered candidates for the office of Mayor before the end of February in each calendar year, candidates for the office of Deputy Mayor were considered at the March meeting of Council. Accordingly, the Committee nominated Councillor E Gill for the office of Mayor for the Municipal Year 2021/22.

**RECOMMEND TO FULL COUNCIL ON 4 MARCH 2021 that –**

**that Councillor E Gill be nominated for the office of Mayor for the Municipal Year 2021/22 in acknowledgement of the fact that due to the impact of Covid-19 she was unable to take up this office in May 2020.**



410 LETTING OF UNITS AT EGHAM BUSINESS PARK

By resolution of the Committee, the press and public were excluded from the meeting during the consideration of this matter under Section 100A (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 on the grounds that the discussion would be likely to involve the disclosure of exempt information of the description specified in paragraphs 1 and 3 of Schedule 12A to Part 1 of the Act.

The Committee considered outline heads of terms for the granting of a 12 month licence and a 5 year reversionary lease for one of the units in the Egham Business Park to the Food Bank which had been established in response to the coronavirus pandemic and was located in one of the units in Egham Business Park. At its meeting on 30 July 2020, the Committee had noted that as it was proposed to let the unit which the Food Bank currently occupied to a business, it might be necessary for the Food Bank to move to an alternative location. As terms had now been agreed for the letting of the unit in which the Food Bank was currently located to a business, there was now a need to find alternative accommodation for the Food Bank.

The Committee considered and approved outline terms for the granting of a 12 month licence for another unit in Egham Business Park to the Food Bank and also for a 5 year reversionary lease for that unit, subject to the conditions set out in resolution ii) below. Delegated authority was given to the Chief Executive, Assistant Chief Executive and the Corporate Head of Assets and Regeneration to finalise these terms. The Committee also agreed that as the Food Bank provided an essential service to the borough, highlighted by the key role it had played in supporting residents throughout the Covid pandemic, if officers considered that a break clause should be exercised in respect of either the licence or the lease, the matter would be considered by the Corporate Management Committee rather than the decision being taken by officers under delegated powers. The Committee noted the resource implications and the legal implications of these decisions.

The Committee also noted the updated tenancy schedule for Egham Business Park which showed that the scheme would be fully let by the end of February 2021.

**RESOLVED that –**

- i) the outline heads of terms for the granting of a 12 month licence for the unit in the Egham Business Park development to the Food Bank as reported, be approved;**
- ii) the outline heads of terms for the granting of a 5 year reversionary lease for the unit in the Egham Business Park to the Food Bank be approved, to be conveyed if and when financial/funding arrangements are put in place by the organisation to the satisfaction of the Council;**
- iii) delegated authority be given to the Chief Executive, Assistant Chief Executive and the Corporate Head of Assets and Regeneration to finalise these terms; and**
- iv) if officers consider that a break clause should be exercised in respect of either the licence or the lease referred to in resolutions i), ii) and iii) above, the matter will be considered by the Corporate Management Committee rather than the decision being taken by officers under delegated powers.**

411 REFERENCE FROM COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE – AVIATOR PARK SKATE PARK

By resolution of the Committee, the press and public were excluded from the meeting during the consideration of this matter under Section 100A (4) of the Local Government Act

1972 on the grounds that the discussion would be likely to involve the disclosure of exempt information of the description specified in paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A to Part 1 of the Act.

The Committee considered a reference from the Community Services Committee. Aviator Park was a small open space adjacent to a new housing development in Addlestone. It contained a well used skatepark, ball court and youth shelter. Complaints had been received from residents about noise and anti-social behaviour in Aviator Park and although action had been taken those complaints had continued. A statutory noise nuisance case was due to be heard at the Magistrates' Court in the near future.

At its meeting on 7 January 2021, the Community Services Committee had considered various options for further action. That Committee had agreed that the entrance to Aviator Park be fenced off and that the opening hours should be restricted as an interim arrangement, while other options for the relocation of the skate park were considered if required and necessary due to a court order. A further report would be brought back to that Committee with other potential locations and cost for the skatepark.

The cost of the fencing required could be met from existing open space budgets. The Community Services Committee had recommended that a supplementary revenue estimate be approved to cover the opening and closing of Aviator Park daily for an interim period. That Committee had made that recommendation on the basis that it might be necessary to engage the services of a contractor to open and close Aviator Park. In order to reduce the cost to the Council, the Committee noted that since the Community Services Committee had met on 7 January 2021, officers had established that it would be possible to undertake this task without using a contractor. The Committee approved accordingly a supplementary revenue estimate for up to a reduced sum as reported to provide for overtime if required for the daily opening and closing of Aviator Park for the next six months while options for the relocation of the skatepark were considered.

**RESOLVED that -**

**a supplementary revenue estimate of up to the sum reported be approved for the next six months to cover the daily opening and closing of Aviator Park while options for the relocation of the skatepark are considered.**

412 REFERENCE FROM COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE – INTEGRATED CARE PARTNERSHIP FUNDING AND CHANGES TO STAFF ESTABLISHMENT

By resolution of the Committee, the press and public were excluded from the meeting during the consideration of this matter under Section 100A (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 on the grounds that the discussion would be likely to involve the disclosure of exempt information of the description specified in paragraphs 1 and 3 of Schedule 12A to Part 1 of the Act.

The Committee considered a reference from the Community Services Committee which at its meeting on 7 January 2021 had recommended changes to the Council's staffing establishment in the Community Services Business Centre to facilitate plans to improve the health and social care offer to residents in North West Surrey.

The Council's Corporate Head of Community Services had successfully secured funding from the North West Surrey Integrated Partnership for the collaborative delivery of services related to health and social care by the four borough Councils of North West Surrey (Runnymede, Elmbridge, Spelthorne and Woking). In order to deliver the services it would be necessary to replace a part time Social Prescribing Officer post with a full time Personalised Care Planning Officer post and also to create a new full time post of Homesafe Plus Coordinator.

Budgets for each of the projects would ensure that the delivery of the services and recruitment of staff would not be at the cost of the Council. Whilst these funding bids did not create any surplus for the Council, a contribution of £3,000 per annum in recognition of the support provided by Safer Runnymede to the Homesafe Plus service would be received. The Corporate Management Committee supported these staffing changes noting that they would enable the Council to establish itself as a key partner and provider of services within an integrated health care system. The collaborative delivery of services would allow residents to receive the non-medical support that they required and would provide support to residents that would enable them to live at home.

**RESOLVED that –**

**the changes to the staff establishment in Community Services consisting of a full time Personalised Care Planning Officer post to replace the part time Social Prescribing Officer post and a new full time Homesafe Plus Coordinator post be approved.**

413 COMMUNITY ALARM MONITORING SOFTWARE – PROPOSED PROCUREMENT

By resolution of the Committee, the press and public were excluded from the meeting during the consideration of this matter under Section 100A (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 on the grounds that the discussion would be likely to involve the disclosure of exempt information of the description specified in paragraphs 1 and 3 of Schedule 12A to Part 1 of the Act.

The Committee considered a report on the current contract position in relation to the Community Alarm software used by Community Services and Safer Runnymede and the need to transition the software from an analogue platform to a digital platform ahead of a wider digitisation programme within the Community Alarm service. The Committee also noted the consideration given to procurement options, the proposed procurement process and the reasons for continuing with the Council's current Telcoms and software providers.

Officers had been in discussions with its current Telecoms provider and software provider to move forward with the required upgrade of its Community Alarm call service platform. The contract with the Council's current software provider expired at the end of March 2021. The current provider could be appointed for five years from April 2021 by means of a direct award process permitted through the PfH Telecare, Telehealth and Associated Services Framework which would enable full procurement compliance. This new contract would require an increase in expenditure which could be met from existing budgetary provision and reallocation of existing budgets.

The Committee also agreed that it would be appropriate to enter into a three year contract with the Council's existing TelComs provider. This new contract would require an increase in expenditure which could be met from a contract with Spelthorne Borough Council as reported. Further migration to a fully digital TelComs environment would be required by 2025 and this TelComs change would be presented to Members during October to December 2023.

**RESOLVED that -**

- i) the Council enters into a formal procurement process for a new Community Alarm software supplier;**
- ii) the PfH Framework be used to directly award a five year contract to the provider specified in the report;**
- iii) the anticipated value of the contract be noted which can be met from existing budgetary provision and reallocation of existing budgets; and**

- iv) the Council enters into a three year contract with the provider referred to in the report for the provision of Telcoms upgrades and the increased Telcoms costs be met by revenue from a contract with Spelthorne Borough Council as reported.**

414 ENFORCEMENT OF PROCEEDS OF CRIME ACT ORDERS – PADD FARM

By resolution of the Committee, the press and public were excluded from the meeting during the consideration of this matter under Section 100A (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 on the grounds that the discussion would be likely to involve the disclosure of exempt information of the description specified in paragraphs 1, 3 and 7 of Schedule 12A to Part 1 of the Act.

The Committee considered a report setting out an additional funding commitment to underwrite the Enforcement Receiver's costs in enforcing outstanding orders under the Proceeds of Crime Act 2002 in relation to Padd Farm. The Enforcement Receiver, who had been appointed by the Court, had now incurred costs that outweighed the previous budget allocation by the Council to underwrite her appointment. The Committee noted the reasons for the increase in costs and the current work being undertaken by the Enforcement Receiver who had also given notice that additional legal costs incurred by her in recent months might need to be sought from the Council.

The Committee noted that although it was necessary to increase the total budget set aside in order to underwrite the Enforcement Receiver's fees, the potential resource implications to the Council were limited as explained in paragraphs 1.3, 4.4 and 4.5 of the report. The Committee also agreed to authorise the Corporate Head of Law and Governance, in consultation with the Chief Executive and Assistant Chief Executive, to release funds from the revised budget pursuant to any further requests received from the Enforcement Receiver if it was required to do so, in order to assist with her complying with her duties to the Court.

**RESOLVED that -**

- i) a supplementary revenue estimate in the sum reported be approved from the General Fund to increase the total budget set aside to underwrite the Enforcement Receiver's fees incurred further to her appointment by the Court in this matter;**
- ii) the revised budget be increased to the sum reported and be carried over into the next financial year should her appointment continue; and**
- iii) the Corporate Head of Law and Governance, in consultation with the Chief Executive and Assistant Chief Executive, be authorised to release funds from the revised budget pursuant to any further requests received from the Enforcement Receiver if it is required to do so, in order to assist with her complying with her duties to the Court.**

415 ACHIEVE LIFESTYLE GRANT FACILITY – FURTHER RELEASE OF FUNDS

By resolution of the Committee, the press and public were excluded from the meeting during the consideration of this matter under Section 100A (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 on the grounds that the discussion would be likely to involve the disclosure of exempt information of the description specified in paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A to Part 1 of the Act.

The Committee noted an update on the financial position of Achieve Lifestyle as agreed at its last meeting on 17 December 2020.

It was noted that the Partnership Board which consisted of Members and officers had discussed with Achieve Lifestyle what their financial position would be coming out of the Covid-19 pandemic and after the pandemic. It was not necessary at this stage to release any further tranche from the grant facility for Achieve Lifestyle which had been set up at the Extraordinary Meeting of Full Council on 28 September 2020. The Committee would receive further information on Achieve Lifestyle's financial position at its next meeting.

It was also agreed that an update would be provided to Corporate Management Committee Members on progress in attempting to establish the social value provided by Achieve Lifestyle, as agreed at the Extraordinary Meeting of Full Council on 28 September 2020.

(The meeting ended at 9.59 p.m.)

Chairman