

MEETING OF THE COUNCIL

18 July 2019 at 7.30 pm

The Worshipful the Mayor (Councillor P Sohi) in the chair.

Members of the Council present Councillors M Adams, A Alderson, D Anderson-Bassey, M Brierley, J Broadhead, I Chaudhri, D Clarke, D Cotty, M Cressey, S Dennett, R Edis, J Furey, E Gill, L Gillham, J Gracey, T Gracey, M Harnden, M Heath, C Howorth, J Hulley, N King, R King, M Kusneraitis, S Lewis, S Mackay, M Maddox, I Mullens, A Neathey, J Olorenshaw N Prescott, P Snow, J Sohi, P Sohi and S Walsh.

Members of the Council absent: Councillors Burton, B Clarke, Nuti, D Whyte, S Whyte, Willingale and Wilson.

Prior to the commencement of the formal proceedings, the Mayor asked Council to stand for two minutes silence in memory of a pupil at Salesian School who had died in an incident at Chertsey Station earlier in the week, and Emily Oliver, daughter of the Leader of SCC, who had sadly passed away from cancer.

129 FIRE PRECAUTIONS

The Mayor read out the Fire Precautions.

130 MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Mayor reported some of the highlights of the first few months of his Mayoral Year and drew Members attention to future Mayoral Charity events.

131 MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the Annual meeting of Council held on 15 May 2019 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

132 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillors Burton, B Clarke, Nuti, D Whyte, S Whyte, Willingale and Wilson.

133 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Furey declared a non-pecuniary interest in the Motion on street lighting as he had been involved in the consideration of the matter in his role as a County Councillor, but remained , participated and voted thereon.

134 QUESTION FROM MEMBER OF PUBLIC UNDER STANDING ORDER 12

The following Question was asked by Mr Mclellan on behalf of the Englefield Green Action Group.

Given that our potential new PM will press Heathrow to stand by the recommendations of the all party Select Committee on the third runway proposals; will RBC ensure through the Development Consent Order (DCO) process that there

should be no more noise in the borough and that there will be targets to reduce noise and air pollution from existing levels? Will RBC also ensure that Heathrow fund all infrastructure costs so that there will be no increased burden on the rates or on local taxpayers.

What are RBC's action plans to safeguard residents on the critical issues of noise and air pollution and on potential cost implications for the borough and local residents, and on the introduction of performance based navigation (PBN) which has serious health, and environmental impacts for the whole borough?

In response, the Leader of the Council commented that whilst Runnymede Borough Council did not hold the authority to commit to the request that there would not be more noise in the borough, that there would be targets to reduce noise and air pollution from existing levels and that Heathrow would fund all infrastructure costs so that there would be no increased burden on the rates or on local taxpayers, the Council did commit to working to prevent increased noise and air pollution as well as fighting for funded infrastructure where needed.

These issues would be addressed under the Development Consent Order (DCO) which was required as part of the planning process for any expansion at Heathrow. Officers and Members were working at every level to ensure that Runnymede's voice would be heard and the Council would continue to seek to protect its residents.

The Leader referred the speaker to the 'expectations list' which was published by the Council in December 2018. There were 9 principles in the expectations list and the Leader asked Mr Mclellan to bear these in mind in the process of dealing with the Heathrow expansion.

The Leader further commented that the Council had a close and strong dialogue with Heathrow and they were fully aware of Runnymede's stance and expected direction on how the Council saw the expansion of Heathrow progressing. The issue was not solely about the runway, it was also about the increased infrastructure around the expanded airport. Whilst the noise pollution from aircraft was a key concern, planes were becoming quieter and more efficient in their operational processes. It was hoped that technological improvements would make them quieter still. The Leader's main concern for the air pollution was not necessarily from the emissions of the aircraft; but from the increased vehicle movements to and from the airport which was why the proposed rail link was so important as well as the use of electric and zero carbon vehicles. One matter already discussed with Heathrow was the use of their railway line to bring in the materials needed to build the runway which would keep a substantial number of heavy vehicles off the road.

The Leader reminded Members that the Council was not the planning authority on the DCO, that was a matter for Westminster but the Council would do everything it could to build relationships and dialogue to influence and build rapport with the key stakeholders in order to ensure our objectives were met.

In response Mr Mclellan commented that the DCO stage was the key stage where representations could be made and questioned whether the Expectations List was strong enough. Frequency of and noise from flights was increasing and would increase further over the north of the borough. Mr Mclellan welcomed the Member Working Group and asked that it meet as a matter of urgency to discuss matters relating to Heathrow. Cllr Prescott confirmed that he would send his full written response to Mr Mclellan and all Members after the meeting.

135 QUESTION FROM MEMBER OF THE COUNCIL UNDER STANDING ORDER 13

The following Question to the Leader of the Council was put by Councillor Neathey:

'Most of our residents have little idea which tier of local government performs which function and, those that do, are often left disappointed with Surrey County Council. RBC increasingly has to fund services that historically would have been considered the responsibility of Surrey County Council. Given all of this, does the Leader of the Council agree with me that the time has come for the Secretary of State to 'invite' a proposal of reorganising local government in what is currently Surrey into unitary authorities in order to service all of our residents' needs more effectively?'

In reply the Leader of the Council outlined some of the implications of any move to Unitary status including abolition of 11 districts/boroughs and reduction in number of Councillors, adverse effect on the Council's strong financial position, restriction on place shaping decisions, loss of benefits of the Committee system and reduction of the involvement of all Councillors in the decision making process of the Council, and loss of direct and close connection between councillors and their residents. The work of the Runnymede Joint Committee allowed for close cooperation between the County and Borough Councils. It brought together economies of scale at county level but also the adjustment of services required at borough level. Using these local partnerships meant all Surrey residents benefit from best practice but also were able to have the local ward councillor to represent them at the ward level. This allowed additional local representatives to have input into County wide policy taking account of local borough needs.

In response Cllr Neathey drew attention to the savings which could accrue from a move to Unitary status through reductions in Chief Officer and senior officer level posts which could then be directed to front line service provision. In view of the cuts made by SCC, Cllr Neathey asked should the opportunity not be taken to make such savings.

In response the Leader of the Council commented that the cost of moving to Unitary status would outweigh any potential savings and that the number of resulting Unitary Authorities would not provide sufficient economies of scale. The Leader commented that the current county/borough model had worked well for many years and with the recent establishment of the Runnymede Joint Committee, the realignment of those services, which were confusing to residents, was being addressed

A Member commented that it was in the political interests of the Conservative Party to retain the current two tier system.

The Leader commented that there was no need for change as the current system enabled all Councillors to participate in the decision making process and ensured greater accountability between Councillors and their residents.

136 COMMITTEE SEATS REVIEW

Council reviewed the allocation of seats on the Council's Committees following the resignation of Councillor Kusneraitis from the Conservative Group and establishment of Runnymede Residents' and Community group (RRC), and recommendation of the Constitution Member Working Group to retain the number of seats on Planning Committee at 15.

Council noted that the table at Appendix 'A' reflected the apportionment agreed at Annual Council in May this year, except that it now reflected the changes resulting from the resignation of Councillor Kusneraitis from the Conservative group and the establishment of the RRC group.

RESOLVED that

- a) **the views of the Constitution MWG that the number of seats on Planning Committee remain as 15 be noted and that the size of that Committee be 15 Members;**
- b) **the allocation of seats on the Committees shown in Appendix 'A' be as set out therein;**
- c) **the allocation of Committee seats to Members of Political Groups as previously requested by those groups in May 2019 be reaffirmed, subject to the change to reflect d), e) and f) below;**
- d) **Councillor Kusneraitis be appointed to Planning Committee and Standards and Audit Committee to take the seats allocated to the RRC group, and Councillor Dennett be appointed to Community Services Committee to the seat allocated to the Conservative group which Councillor Kusneraitis has temporarily occupied;**
- e) **Councillor Maddox be removed from the Planning Committee; and**
- f) **Councillor Dennett be removed from the Standards and Audit Committee.**

| Committee | Con | RIRG | Lib | Labour | Ind | RRC | Green |
|--|-----|------|-----|--------|-----|-----|-------|
| Corporate Management (12) | 8 | 2 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Environment and Sustainability (10) | 6 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | 1 |
| Housing (10) | 6 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | |
| Community Services (10) | 6 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | |
| Planning (15) | 9 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Regulatory (5) | 3 | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Crime & Disorder/Overview & Scrutiny (9) | 5 | 2 | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Standards and Audit (10) | 6 | 2 | | | 1 | 1 | |
| (81) | 49 | 12 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 |

137 SCHEME OF DELEGATION – AMENDMENT

Council considered amendment of the Scheme of Delegation in Part 3 of the Council's Constitution to reflect changes arising from the recent restructure of the senior management tier of the Council and to facilitate the continued exercise of delegated powers by officers.

Council noted that there was no change to the powers delegated, only to the Officers delegated to exercise the powers. Council was agreeable to the suggested amendments and

RESOLVED that

The amended Scheme of Delegation, as reported, be approved .

138 TREASURY MANAGEMENT ANNUAL REPORT 2018/19

Council considered a recommendation from the Corporate Management Committee held on 28 May 2019 regarding the Treasury Management Annual Report 2018/19.

The Overview and Scrutiny Select Committee had also considered the Annual Report at its meeting on 4 July and had concurred with the recommendation of Corporate Management Committee.

RESOLVED that-

the Treasury Management Annual Report 2018/19 be received and noted.

139 FOOD SERVICE PLAN 2019/20

Council considered a recommendation from the Environment and Sustainability Committee held on 20 June 2019 regarding the Food Service Plan 2019/20 and

RESOLVED that –

- i) the proposed Food Service Plan for 2019/20 be approved save for updating of paragraphs 2.2.1-2.2.2, 2.5.1 and 3.7.2 to read Corporate Head of Environmental Services; and**
- ii) updating of paragraph 2.5.3 regarding the number of prosecutions and cautions**

140 PROVISION OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING USING RIGHT TO BUY RECEIPTS-
SUPPLEMENTARY CAPITAL ESTIMATE

Council considered a recommendation from the Corporate Management Committee held on 27 June 2019 regarding a supplementary capital estimate to enable the Council to provide affordable housing using right to buy receipts.

Council concurred with the recommendation of the Corporate Management Committee and

RESOLVED that-

a supplementary capital estimate of £500,000 a year for the next five years commencing 2019/20 be approved to enable the Council's Housing Business Centre to continue to work in partnership with Registered Providers in the acquisition of affordable housing in the Borough to which the Council would have nomination rights, with this expenditure to be financed from retained 1-4-1 Right to Buy receipts.

141 OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY ANNUAL REPORT 2018/2019

Council considered a recommendation from the Overview and Scrutiny Select Committee held on 4 July 2019 recommending that the Overview and Scrutiny Annual Report be received and noted.

Council supported the recommendation and

RESOLVED that-

the Annual Report of Overview and Scrutiny 2018/2019 be received and noted .

142 *ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENTS – MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR GILLHAM*

Councillor Gillham moved the following Motion, seconded by Councillor Alderson:

‘In light of the encouraging conversations and the current awareness within both this Council and the country at large, we submit that this Council must now commit to an environmental impact assessment be undertaken when a decision is made, funding agreed or actions taken. This assessment must ensure that we are able to be held to account when such impact is not treated with the importance it deserves and requires.’

In moving the Motion, Councillor Gillham requested that the Motion be remitted to Environment and Sustainability Committee and if appropriate, Corporate Management Committee for further consideration.

The Motion was subsequently amended to replace the word ‘a’ with ‘any’ in the third line of the Motion

Cllr Gillham supported by other Members of the Council considered that a duty was owed to current and future residents to achieve a net zero based carbon economy, and to take action now to achieve this.

Other Members of the Council commented that they were supportive of the ‘green agenda’ and that the improvement of the environment was a priority as evidenced by various measures taken and to be taken by the Council.

In order to assess the wider implications arising from the Motion, Cllr Heath moved an amendment that-

The proposal to implement Environmental Impact Assessment across the work of the council must be considered by the Environment & Sustainability Group to decide what such an assessment would include, how it would function and any wider implications on the Council. The assessment would seek to ensure that environmental impact is considered in any decision making in all areas of the council and to be included in all reports to provide transparency.”

Following further debate and confirmation that the wider implications of the proposal would be considered via the Committee process as part of Cllr Gillham’s Motion, Cllr Heath agreed to withdraw her amendment. Accordingly it was-

RESOLVED that

In light of the encouraging conversations and the current awareness within both this Council and the country at large, we submit that this Council must

now commit to an environmental impact assessment be undertaken when any decision is made, funding agreed or actions taken. This assessment must ensure that we are able to be held to account when such impact is not treated with the importance it deserves and requires.

The matter be remitted to the Environment and Sustainability Committee and, if appropriate, the Corporate Management Committee for further consideration.

143 SCC NIGHT STREET LIGHTING POLICY – MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR R KING

Councillor R King moved the following Motion

- *‘The Community Services Committee review this policy and form a report and recommendation for full council this report should consider the following options.*
- *If RBC should enter into negotiations with SCC for a deal to fund the streetlights being switched back on all night.*
- *A phased approach to such a switch back on (rather than all in one go) is agreed should it focus on*
 - *Crime and anti-social behaviour hot spots (such as Addlestone and Egham Hythe)*
 - *Areas that RBC believes are important ‘spill out’ from night time economy areas*
 - *Areas that RBC believes are likely to have large numbers of shift workers or students*
- *RBC to SCC to voice a formal request for the PFI contract renegotiation to include*
 - *Roads presently affected by the night time switch offs to replace their lighting units over the attrition of the asset, with motion sensitive LED lighting units, in order to keep the benefits of reduced emission due to lower electrical usage and lower cost to the public purse.*
 - *To switch to a zero-carbon energy supply for all street lighting in Runnymede including, if necessary, purchasing renewable energy assets, smart grid technology including battery storage.’*

In submitting the Motion, Councillor King referred to supporting comments as set out in the Summons which included public safety concerns and public perception thereof, impact on night time workers and students and undermining of night time economy, impact on crime levels and environmental factors. The Motion was seconded by Cllr Neathey who requested that the Motion be remitted to the Community Services Committee. Councillor Neathey supported the reasoning behind the Motion and considered that the Council should consider funding the reinstatement of the lighting in the way Spelthorne Borough Council had done.

Some Members commented that there had been a mixed response to the switching off of lights with some objections and some in favour on the grounds that it was beneficial for wildlife. The Leader of the Council did not consider that there was evidence that the SCC decision to turn off street lighting had contributed to an increase in crime. Lights remained on for busy roads and in town centres. Surrey Police could request lights be turned on to address anti-social/crime issues and he mentioned the future increase in Police officers. Notwithstanding this, it was considered that the most appropriate forum to consider the matter was the Runnymede Joint Committee, not the Community Services Committee, as this would enable County and Borough Councillors and Officers to debate the matter.

An amendment was moved to the Motion that the matter be remitted for consideration to the Runnymede Joint Committee instead of Community Services Committee and this was carried.

The following substantive Motion was duly moved and seconded, and

RESOLVED that-

The Runnymede Joint Committee review this policy and form a report and recommendation for full council this report should consider the following options:

- **If RBC should enter into negotiations with SCC for a deal to fund the streetlights being switched back on all night.**
- **A phased approach to such a switch back on (rather than all in one go) is agreed should it focus on**
 - **Crime and anti-social behaviour hot spots (such as Addlestone and Egham Hythe)**
 - **Areas that RBC believes are important ‘spill out’ from night time economy areas**
 - **Areas that RBC believes are likely to have large numbers of shift workers or students**
- **RBC to SCC to voice a formal request for the PFI contract renegotiation to include**
 - **Roads presently affected by the night time switch offs to replace their lighting units over the attrition of the asset, with motion sensitive LED lighting units, in order to keep the benefits of reduced emission due to lower electrical usage and lower cost to the public purse.**
 - **To switch to a zero-carbon energy supply for all street lighting in Runnymede including, if necessary, purchasing renewable energy assets, smart grid technology including battery storage.**

Cllr R King had requested a named vote on the substantive Motion, as amended, and the voting was as follows:

For (32) Councillors Adams, Alderson, Anderson- Basse, Brierley, Broadhead, Chaudhri, D Clarke, Cotty, Dennett, Edis, Furey, Gillham, Gill, J Gracey, T Gracey, Harnden, Heath, Howorth, Hulley, N King, R King, Kusneraitis, Lewis, Mackay, Maddox, Mullens, Neathey, Prescott, Snow, J Sohi, P Sohi, and Walsh.

Against (2) Councillors Cressey and Olorenshaw.

144 **RBC FORMAL POLICY OF OPPOSITION TO CUTS BY SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL TO EGHAM FIRE STATION NIGHT SERVICES – MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR NEATHEY**

Councillor Neathey moved the following Motion

RBC will adopt a policy to actively condemn these cuts whereby RBC will write to SCC to voice a formal objection to any cuts to Egham Fire Station and the Mayor or Leader of Runnymede Borough Council will write an open letter (sent to the local paper) to the leader of SCC voicing RBC member's concerns. This letter will permit Group leaders to co-sign.

In addition The Chief Executive will write to all SCC Councillors in Runnymede advising them that RBC's official position is to condemn and oppose these cuts (and urging them to vote accordingly at Surrey County Council meetings)

Supporting comments to the Motion were included in the Summons namely the implications of proposed future cuts by Surrey County Council on the Surrey Fire and Rescue service which would see a reduction in firefighter posts, reduction in number of fire engines and crews at night, reduction in fire cover in Surrey, and adverse impact on residents of the proposed closure of Egham Fire Station after 18:00 hours.

In moving the Motion Cllr Neathey referred to the Government's Austerity programme and its impact on local service provision and on lives of residents. Following advice from the Mayor, Cllr Neathey commented that his capacity to fully expand on his Motion was being suppressed by the Mayor.

Cllr R King seconded the Motion and in doing so commented on the impact on effectiveness and efficiency of the service of further cuts to the service, delays in responding to fire incidents and potential impact on elderly and vulnerable residents particularly at night time.

The Leader of the Council commented that there would be no reduction in the number of fire engines, no fire station closures or any firefighter redundancies. The impact of this proposal on response times had also been modelled and independently verified. In terms of the Runnymede area specifically, the proposals meant a fire engine would be available at Egham fire station during the day (7am – 7pm) when it was known the risk was higher and the service was busier. From 7pm until 7am, if a fire engine was needed in the area, this would come from a neighbouring fire station. The Leader believed the impact of these changes was small and that residents would certainly be made safer because the increased prevention work would reduce the likelihood of emergencies happening in the first place.

Cllr J Gracey emphasised that an efficient and effective Fire Service in the borough was a priority and referred to the Council's previous response in May to Surrey County Council consultation 'Making Surrey Safer Plan', a copy of which would be circulated to all Members.

In light of this, Cllr J Gracey moved the following amendment which reflected the fact that the Council had an established position and reaffirmed the Council's official policy in the borough:

"RBC reaffirms its policy to oppose any reduction in service at Egham Fire Station; notes that RBC has written to SCC setting out this position via consultation response on 24 May; and that the Leader of RBC will write an open letter to the leader of SCC reiterating our concerns. This letter will permit Group leaders to co-sign.

In addition the Chief Executive will write to all SCC Councillors in Runnymede setting out our position."

The amendment was carried. The following substantive Motion was duly moved and seconded, and

RESOLVED that-

RBC reaffirms its policy to oppose any reduction in service at Egham Fire Station; notes that RBC has written to SCC setting out this position via consultation response on 24 May; and that the Leader of RBC will write an open letter to the leader of SCC reiterating our concerns. This letter will permit Group leaders to co-sign.

In addition the Chief Executive will write to all SCC Councillors in Runnymede setting out our position."

Cllr R King had requested a named vote on the substantive Motion, as amended, and the voting was as follows:

For (34) Councillors Adams, Alderson, Anderson-Bassey, Brierley, Broadhead, Chaudhri, D Clarke, Cotty, Cressey, Dennett, Edis, Furey, Gillham, Gill, J Gracey, T Gracey, Harnden, Heath, Howorth, Hulley, N King, R King, Kusneraitis, Lewis, Mackay, Maddox, Mullens, Neathey, Olorenshaw, Prescott, Snow, J Sohi, P Sohi, and Walsh.

Against (0).

145 ASHDENE REGENERATION PROJECT – INCREASE IN CAPITAL BUDGET

Council considered a recommendation from Corporate Management Committee held on 27 June 2019 regarding an increase in capital budget which was necessary to reflect cost of construction cost inflation since the original budget had been prepared.

Questions regarding the financial viability of the project were raised and addressed.

RESOLVED that -

the capital budget for the redevelopment of the former Ashdene House site be increased by the sum reported to reflect the construction cost inflation since the original budget was agreed for the previous project to redevelop the site.

(Councillor Kusneraitis requested a named vote which was undertaken on this confidential matter.)

(The meeting ended at 9.40pm)

Mayor