

Runnymede Borough Council

CORPORATE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

APPENDIX 'A'

24 March 2022 at 7.30 p.m.

Members of the Committee present: Councillor N Prescott (Chairman) T Gracey (Vice-Chairman), A Alderson, M Cressey, J Gracey, M Heath, C Howorth, D Whyte and M Willingale.

Members of the Committee absent: Councillor D Cotty and Councillor L Gillham.

Fire Precautions

The Chairman read out the Fire Precautions.

Minutes

The Minutes of the meeting held on 24 February 2022 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor D Cotty and Councillor L Gillham.

Declarations Of Interest

None declared.

Constitution Review 2022

The Committee considered proposed changes to the Council's Constitution resulting from periodic updating and recommendations arising from a review of the Constitution by the Constitution Member Working Group (MWG). Section 37 of the local Government Act 2000 required local authorities to adopt and keep up to date constitutions. Many of the changes proposed had emanated from the MWG which had met regularly, had achieved cross party consensus on proposed changes and had made a valuable contribution to the review of the Constitution. An updated Constitution would be produced and be made available on the Council's website from 18 May 2022. A hard copy of the updated Constitution would be published in the summer in order to reflect any necessary further changes made since 18 May 2022.

The Committee noted a summary of proposed changes to the Constitution for 2022. The proposed changes for 2022 included minor updates, corrections and clarifications of wording, changes to dates, spellings, post titles, formatting, revised managerial responsibilities and changes authorised by Committees or the Urgent Action procedure during the Municipal Year. Other changes included alterations to the wording of matters reserved to the Planning Committee and Planning Policy functions delegated to specific officers, authorisation of officers to set fees for deployable (i.e. mobile) CCTV subject to financial thresholds, introducing a provision for Committees to end meetings by resolution and new procedures for appointments to outside bodies, for signing of contracts to expand the range of individuals that could sign them and to contract value thresholds to reflect Government changes to VAT treatment. The 2022 changes would include a new Members Code of Conduct, a new Scheme of Members' Allowances and a revised Council Management Structure diagram.

The Committee noted that under the new procedure for appointments to outside bodies, the persons appointed would be expected to report back to the Council on the activities of the organisation to which they were appointed. This report would not have to be an annual report, although an annual report would be acceptable if the person appointed chose to report annually. It was agreed that when they were appointed, the persons appointed would be advised that they would be expected to report back to an appropriate Committee of the Council.

The Committee agreed to recommend to Full Council that all of the proposed changes to the Council's Constitution be approved.

Recommend to Full Council on 28 April 2022 that –

- i) the changes to the Council's Constitution be approved;**
- ii) the revised Constitution be effective from 18 May 2022; and**
- iii) the Corporate Head of Law and Governance be authorised to settle the final form of the Constitution for adoption in accordance with the above decisions, and the Corporate Head of Law and Governance be authorised to incorporate any delegations to Officers subsequently authorised by Committee(s) after 24 March 2022 and prior to printing, and make any minor editing changes necessary to correct errors or omissions discussed after 18 May 2022.**

Corporate Key Performance Indicators – Proposed Indicators and Targets for 2022/23

The Committee considered a report on the proposed Corporate Key Performance Indicator (CKPI) set for 2022/23. The Committee also noted the latest Quarter 3 (Q3) report for the 2021/22 CKPIs showing performance against targets which provided them with data to assist their consideration of this item.

In 2020/21, the Customer, Digital and Collection Services CKPI CDCS2 target on the percentage of lost Customer Service calls per quarter was 12% and the full year achievement was 8.5%. This result was mainly due to a stable fully resourced Customer Services team over the year. As a result, the decision had been made to reduce the target to 7% for 2021/22. This had proved to be a challenging target during this year due to staff sickness and problems with staff retention and turnover. Some Community Services staff had moved to other positions within Runnymede. The team was still carrying vacancies and staff who had recently joined were still in training. At the end of Q3 in 2021/22 the actual performance across the year to date had been 10.9% against the target of 7%. Officers proposed therefore that the target for CDCS2 for 2022/23 be changed to 10% per quarter on the basis that this should be achievable. The Committee was advised that 10% per quarter presented good performance when compared to industry standards and to other neighbouring local authorities. Some Members of the Committee did not think that the Council should be guided by levels of performance in this area of work by other organisations and other local authorities. They questioned whether by setting a target of 10% the Council would be sending a good message to its customers and suggested that the Council's senior officers should be discussing ways of improving performance on lost customer service calls.

The Committee agreed that the proposal to change the target for CDCS2 to 10% per quarter would be referred to the Service and Digital Transformation Member Working Party (MWP) for consideration. If that MWP agreed that the target for CDCS2 should be changed, officers would prepare an Urgent Action under Standing Order 42 to be signed by the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Committee in order to obtain approval of the target recommended by the MWP.

The Committee was pleased to note that the number of street cleansing reports (CKPI ES4) had reduced and it was suggested that it would be appropriate to reduce this target for 2022/23 from 150 a quarter to a lower figure of either 100 or 125 a quarter. It was agreed that officers would liaise with the Corporate Head of Environmental Services on whether the 2022/23 quarterly target for ES4 should be reduced to 100 or 125 and prepare an Urgent Action under Standing Order 42 to be signed by the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Committee in order to obtain approval of the reduced target as recommended by the Corporate Head of Environmental Services.

The Regulator of Social Housing (RSH) was introducing national Tenant Satisfaction Measures (TSMs) from April 2023 which would require Social Housing landlords to submit data returns on these measures. Therefore, the Committee agreed that three new CKPIs be introduced from 2022/23 to ensure that data was available as a baseline for the required TSM returns in due course. Two of these three new CKPIs were H1: Percentage of Repairs completed within target timescale and H6: Percentage of homes that do not meet the Decent Homes Standard. The third new CKPI (H10) related to anti-social behaviour. The Committee agreed that the description for this CKPI be changed to read "H10: Number of reported anti-social behaviour cases per 1,000 properties". The Committee considered that it was appropriate to change this description to reflect the fact that only a fraction of the anti-social behaviour that occurred was reported.

As there was a requirement to align relevant corporate indicators for Housing with RSH Tenant Satisfaction Measures, it was agreed that two indicators, (H1 : Percentage of dwellings re-let to deadline per quarter and H6: Percentage of tenants with more than 7 weeks rent arrears at the end of each quarter), would be removed from the set of CKPIs for 2022/23. However, it was noted that these measures would continue to be tracked by the Housing Team.

CKPI C2 on the Number of befriending referrals per quarter had been included in the data set for 2021/22 as a CKPI but as the service was not yet in place, no data was available. The befriending service project was ongoing with currently an estimated end date of July 2022. Therefore, the Committee agreed that this Corporate KPI would only be monitored in 2022/23 and that no targets would be set. This CKPI would be removed from the data set but would be added to the report at the relevant Quarter once the service was commissioned and had data to provide.

The Committee approved all of the other 2022/23 CKPI descriptions and quarterly/annual targets as set out in Appendix 'A' to the agenda report.

Resolved that –

- i) **the 2022/23 Corporate Key Performance Indicator descriptions, as set out in Appendix 'A' to the agenda report, be approved apart from the description for H10 to be changed to read as follows:-**

H10: Number of reported anti-social behaviour cases per 1,000 properties;

- ii) **officers liaise with the Corporate Head of Environmental Services on whether the 2022/23 quarterly target for ES4: Number of street cleansing reports (overflowing litterbins, overflowing dog bins and general litter/detrítés) should be reduced to 100 or 125 and prepare an Urgent Action under Standing Order 42 to be signed by the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Committee in order to obtain approval of the target as recommended by the Corporate Head of Environmental Services;**

- iii) **the proposed change set out in the report to the target for CDCS2 : Percentage of lost Customer Service calls per quarter be considered by the Service and Digital Transformation Member Working Party (MWP) and, if that MWP agrees that the target should be changed, officers prepare an Urgent Action under Standing Order 42 to be signed by the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Committee in order to obtain approval of the target as recommended by the MWP; and**
- iv) **the remainder of the proposed 2022/23 quarterly/annual targets, as set out in Appendix 'A' to the agenda report, be approved.**

Governance Arrangements for the Magna Carta Trust

The Magna Carta Trust (MCT) contained senior representatives from significant bodies including the judiciary, church, various district/borough councils, the English Speaking Union, The Pilgrims of Great Britain and The Royal Empire Society. Given the significance of the Magna Carta to Runnymede, Runnymede Borough Council had been an active member of the MCT, and had provided its Honorary Treasurer, Honorary Secretary, and administrative support to the MCT's 1-2 meetings per year. The serving Mayor of Runnymede had been a Trustee.

Discussions about the MCT converting to a Charitable Incorporated Organisation (CIO) had been ongoing since soon after the Magna Carta's 800th anniversary in 2015, and after a lengthy application process the Charity Commission had approved the application to CIO status in December 2021. At the MCT's most recent meeting in February 2022, the Trustees had resolved to both formally disestablish the Magna Carta Trust in favour of the Magna Carta Trust CIO, and transfer its assets to the new CIO. The new MCT ICO had asked the Council to decide whether it would wish to put forward an individual as a trustee to serve on the MCT ICO. The MCT ICO would then decide whether or not that individual would become a Trustee of the MCT ICO. The direction of the Committee was sought to establish whether Runnymede should seek to identify, in principle, a person who would wish to become a trustee, or whether to fulfil a more informal role within the Trust, such as an associate organisation or ambassador.

Historically Runnymede's trustee on the MCT had been the incumbent Mayor which meant that they were a trustee only for the year of their Mayoralty. This was by virtue of the fact that in order to be a trustee a person had to hold what was termed a qualifying office. However, a significant change to the set up of the CIO would mean that trustees would be appointed on their own merits on a three or four year term rather than because of the qualifying office they held.

Given the significance of the Magna Carta to the whole borough, if the Committee decided to identify a person who could be approached to be a trustee it could be any Councillor, or a resident of Runnymede or someone from the local community who had a strong interest in Magna Carta. Should Runnymede decide to identify a person to approach to be a trustee, that individual's responsibilities would be exclusively to serve the interests of the MCT. They would not be the Council's spokesperson or representative but would use their judgement in the best interest of the MCT. The Council could not instruct them to take a particular stance on a matter. A trustee of the new MCT ICO would be a person who was interested in the work of the charity and committed to its work. The Committee asked about the personal liability of a Trustee of the new MCT ICO. It was noted that it was envisaged that the ICO would take out insurance exempting their trustees from personal liability for the actions of those trustees except in the case where those actions were criminal.

Clarification was being sought from the preliminary trustees of the MCT CIO to establish what the costs of various types of membership would be and the extent of involvement of Runnymede officers in the new MCT ICO.

The Committee indicated that it would like to be able to put forward an individual to serve as a Trustee and also to become an associate or ambassadorial member of the Trust. This was because the Trustee would be serving the interests of the MCT whereas it was understood that the associate or ambassadorial member position would be serving the interests of the Council. However, the Committee was advised that the MCT CIO had given the Council the option of either putting forward a person to become a Trustee or taking up an ambassadorial or associate position.

The Committee agreed to defer a decision on this item and agreed that a further report would be submitted to the Committee with further information about the ambassadorial member and associate member roles.

River Thames Scheme – Service Level Agreements

The Committee considered the arrangements for signing off two Service Level Agreements (SLA)s associated with the River Thames Scheme (RTS). These SLAs needed to be signed off at the earliest opportunity so that work could progress on the Development Consent Order (DCO) to meet the planned timetables and permit the recruitment of staff to the coordination role to be carried out by Runnymede Borough Council. The Committee's agreement was sought to delegating the signature of both SLAs to the Chief Executive Officer on behalf of Runnymede Borough Council in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Corporate Management Committee.

The RTS was being delivered by the Environment Agency (EA) and Surrey County Council (SCC) (both the EA and SCC were jointly referred to as "the Applicant") in partnership with Runnymede Borough Council and various other organisations which were noted by the Committee. The SLAs between the Applicant and the Local Planning Authority (the Applicant SLA) and between the 4 key local planning authorities (the Inter Authority SLA) in respect of the River Thames Scheme (RTS) were almost finalised. The SLAs would define the contractual relationship between the parties, the structure which the pre-application consultation would follow, the support which the Applicant would provide to the Consulting Local Authorities and the role of Runnymede Borough Council (RBC) as the Coordinating Authority for Surrey County Council (SCC), Spelthorne (SBC), Elmbridge (EBC) and Runnymede Borough Council (RBC) in their capacity as statutory consultees.

The River Thames between Egham and Teddington was one of the largest areas of undefended developed floodplain in England. There was a history of flooding in the area over the past 100 years with major floods occurring in 1947, 1968, 2003 and 2014. UK climate change projections forecasted that the problem of flooding would worsen over time. The estimated impact of a major flood in this area was currently estimated at £1 billion. Due to the impact of climate change this could be doubled by 2055. More than 11,000 homes and 1,600 businesses would benefit from reduced flood risk and rail, power and water networks would be more resilient. The River Thames Scheme (RTS) flood relief scheme would consist of two new flood channels through the Boroughs of Runnymede and Spelthorne in Surrey. There would also be increased capacity at the weirs in Sunbury, Molesey and Teddington and the Desborough Cut. The RTS would ensure that there was no increased flood risk to any community in the area and was also projected to contribute to a vibrant local economy, to enhance the social and environmental value of the river and to create new green spaces and recreation opportunities.

The direct planning implications of the RTS were confined to 4 key Planning Authorities: RBC, SBC, EBC and SCC. Approval of the outline business case had been given by HM Treasury in Spring 2021. Final business case approval would follow when the Scheme received DCO consent. The DCO was a particular process which could be used for obtaining permission for a development categorised as a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP). The Government had directed that the RTS be treated as a NSIP in December 2020 and the current estimate for completion of the Project was 2030. The DCO automatically removed the need to obtain several separate consents, including

planning permission and was designed to be a much quicker process than applying for these separately.

The RTS was unusual in regard to the DCO Application as the project Applicant (EA and SCC) and the 4 key planning authorities were all partners in the RTS and contributors to the capital costs. In addition, all parties were statutory consultees under the DCO process. This complexity created the requirement to establish an internal 'glass wall' within the Project Applicant side and within the key local authority partners contributing to the capital cost of the RTS in order to maintain the independence and integrity of the key Planning Authorities. It had been agreed that the complexity of the consultation and the importance of maintaining the integrity of the interparty relationships required the creation of a Secretariat to manage this operation. RBC had been chosen to host this function as the Borough was the Coordinating Authority, was the location of the largest channel section and was expected to experience the majority of the impacts of the Scheme.

There were two SLAs currently being finalised. The Applicant SLA related to the proposed RTS and was between the Applicant and the 4 key Planning authorities. This SLA addressed the funding mechanism for the independent consultant supporting the 4 key planning authorities, as well as the internal delineations to ensure that the planning advice provided was demonstrably independent from the Applicant. This SLA also identified RBC as the Co-ordinating Authority for the DCO process and the host for the Secretariat. The costs of the Secretariat would be met by the Applicant. The draft Applicant SLA at Appendix 'D' to the report was noted by the Committee.

The other SLA was the Inter Authority SLA between the 4 key planning authorities (RBC, EBC, SBC and SCC). This addressed RBC's role as the Coordinating Authority on behalf of EBC, SBC and SCC for the management of the independent consultant in assessing the DCO information in detail on behalf of the collective planning authorities, facilitating and managing the transfer of information from the Applicant's consultant and returning the responses from the 4 key local planning authorities. The Inter Authority SLA would also cover those aspects of the DCO process which the Applicant had not agreed to pay for, but which would be required by the local planning authorities in fulfilment of their statutory duties and would consist mainly of Legal Counsel costs. In large part the Inter Authority SLA would mirror the Applicant SLA.

The Committee noted that the Council had a statutory duty to make a Planning response to the RTS proposals and that it had the Planning resource to make this response. The staffing requirements for the Secretariat would be clarified when the SLAs were finalised and the Council would seek further resources from the EA for the work of the Secretariat if further resources were required. The Committee would receive regular reports about the progress of the RTS.

The RTS was an opportunity to provide greater protection to residents and businesses in the Borough against major flooding. The Committee noted that it was vital that RBC maintained its commitment to the RTS in order to maximise the primary and secondary benefits which would be delivered by its construction. The Committee approved the arrangements for the execution of the SLAs as set out in the resolution below. The SLAs provided security of funding for the RBC Planning Authority to be fully involved within the DCO process and enabled it to submit detailed responses to ensure that the RTS was fit for purpose. The SLAs also defined and confirmed the role of RBC as the Coordinating Authority and host to the Secretariat and secured the funding for this function.

Resolved that –

the RTS Applicant SLA be approved in principle and authority be delegated to the Chief Executive Officer to sign the Applicant SLA and the Inter Authority SLA in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Corporate Management Committee.

Shared Management Arrangements for Building Control

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 proposed shared management arrangements for Building Control. The forthcoming Building Safety Act would result in a greater volume of work. A number of Runnymede Building Control Staff had retired or were due to retire in the near future. The Building Control market was highly competitive and it was a challenging time to be seeking new staff. The Council needed to plan appropriately for the correct structure and personnel to ensure the resilience of the service.

It was proposed that Runnymede would share a Building Control Manager with Surrey Heath Borough Council (SHBC) so that strategic Building Control Management would be in place for both Councils with shared costs. The Council had a number of successful partnership working arrangements with SHBC for other areas. The structure under the shared management team was noted by the Committee. This structure would build resilience in both Councils and would result in increased efficiency and economies of scale. The Committee agreed that the Building Control budget would be restored to 2021/22 levels and approved a supplementary revenue estimate in the sum reported to restore resources to enable the shared management arrangements to proceed.

The Committee noted that while the new structure would not yield significant short term savings it would provide potential benefits in increasing market share and income and would assist in recruiting and retaining staff. The new structure would be an interim arrangement for up to 12 months which would be regulated by a Service Level Agreement. Once the joint management arrangements were in place, there would be discussion regarding potential setting up of a full partnership. If a full shared partnership were to be recommended in the future, the details would be reported to the Committee for consideration. It was noted that SHBC had approved the interim arrangement.

Resolved that –

- i) the Chief Executive be authorised to implement the proposed new Building Control shared arrangements and structure contained in the report with Surrey Heath Borough Council and to restore the Building Control budget to 2021/2022 levels in order to achieve this;**
- ii) the Chief Executive be authorised to progress work with a view to implementing a full shared service arrangement with Surrey Heath Borough Council before 31 March 2023; and**
- iii) a supplementary revenue estimate be approved in the sum reported to restore resources to enable the shared management arrangements to proceed.**

Proposed Letting Of Commercial Property

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 report on proposals for the letting of a part of a commercial property and noted the proposed terms of the letting as set out in the report.

The gross revenue income from the letting was noted. The letting would also save the Council void costs. The letting would require capital funding for works to be undertaken which could be taken from the Provision for Asset Management held within the Capital Programme. The Committee approved the letting, noting that the rent was at a level in line with the post Covid market. The Committee noted the current Tenancy Schedule for lettings at this property.

Resolved that -

- i) the letting to the company reported of part of the property reported be approved on the terms set out in the report including the Landlord's Works and the Landlord's Contribution; and**
- ii) a supplementary capital estimate be approved in the sum reported for the associated work, to be taken from the Provision for Asset Management in the Capital Programme.**

Financial Services Restructure

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 a proposed restructure of the Financial Services section to ensure that it remained fit for the current Council transformation programme and potential future additional partnership working arrangements whilst at the same time providing extra resilience to parts of the team.

The additional work taken on by the section during the last few years was noted and a number of members of the section had been granted Voluntary Redundancy which resulted in the loss of experience in the team. The restructuring proposals were designed to increase the resilience of the Accountancy team, to increase the number of applications received for Finance posts in Runnymede by broadening career grades, to provide a broader outlook in decision making and service provision and to make various changes to staff reporting arrangements, job responsibilities and to the grading of particular posts. One of the key objectives of the changes was to develop the team's business partner role. While the changes would required the approval of a supplementary revenue estimate it was noted that this should be viewed in the context of savings which had already been made in the section.

The Committee approved the changes set out in resolutions i) to iv) below and the supplementary revenue estimate required to take account of these changes. The Committee noted the revised structure for the section that would result from the changes as set out in Exempt Appendix '2' to the report.

It was noted that the various partnership working arrangements entered into by the Council in recent years for the provision of various services had had an effect on the capacity and working practices of the Financial Services section. It was suggested that officers should consider whether there was scope for the outsourcing or insourcing of any of the functions provided by the Financial Services section.

Resolved that –

- i) the post as reported be disestablished and replaced with a new post as reported on the grade reported; and**
- ii) the regrading of the posts as reported to the grades reported be approved and a new post be created as reported;**
- iii) the post as reported be regraded to the grade reported to reflect additional responsibilities;**
- iv) the post as reported be deleted;**
- v) the post as reported be created at the grade reported; and**
- vi) a supplementary revenue estimate be approved as set out in the report in the sum reported to take account of the above changes.**

(The meeting ended at 9.25.p.m.)

Chairman