

Local Committee Budgets 2010/11

Surrey County Council Local Committee (Guildford)

22 September 2010

Key issue

To receive a report on the uses to be made of the Members' capital and revenue budgets for 2010-2011, noting actions carried out under delegated authority.

Summary

The report summarises the framework and principles that govern the various delegated budgets available to the Committee in 2010/11, along with options for managing these. It also gives information on funding applications approved under delegated authority after the last meeting of the Committee.

Recommendations

The Committee is asked to:

- a. note the actions carried out under delegated authority.
- b. agree the principles for allocating the capital budget of £30,000.
- c. approve the proposed expenditure from the Members' Revenue Allocation budget.
- d. approve the return of revenue committed in 2009/10 and no longer required.

Background

1 The County Council's Constitution sets out the overall Financial Framework for managing the Local Committee's delegated budgets. The underlying principle is that Local Committees are at liberty to spend on locally determined purposes that promote social, economic or environmental wellbeing, as required by the Local Government Act 2000.

- 2 Grants should:
 - Be directed to activities for which the County Council has legal powers
 - Meet demonstrable local needs
 - Deliver value for money so that there is evidence of the outcomes achieved
 - Be consistent with County Council policies
 - Not duplicate or replace funding for core SCC services
 - Be for one-off projects, not requiring on-going funding (e.g. staffing costs)
 - Be approved through a process that is open and transparent, consultative, accountable and auditable
 - Where appropriate, allow opportunities to be taken to pool funds with partner organisations.
- 3 County Members have been recently been consulted as part of a countywide review of Members Revenue Allocations. Officers are currently developing some recommendations, which will be presented to Cabinet and full Council in due course. It is anticipated that any agreed changes will be implemented from 20011/12.

Revenue budget for 2010/11

- 3 The following projects have been agreed by the Area Director under delegated authority since the Local Committee meeting held on 23 June 2010:
 - a. £1,000 for SW Surrey DA Outreach counselling (Fiona White)
 - b. £110 for a rollator for Guildford library (Mark Brett-Warburton)
- 4 The Committee is asked to note the actions of the Area Director, under delegated authority.

Revenue budget for 2010/11

- 5 The following proposals are for consideration and decision at this committee and listed in Annex A:
 - a. £1,500 for removal of rumble strips in Compton (Tony Rooth)
 - b. £3,000 for construction of a gully in The Street, Puttenham (Tony Rooth)
 - c. £1,193 for Effingham Learning Partnership (ELP) bike club equipment (Bill Barker)
- 6 In addition the Committee is asked to approve the return to the Revenue budget for 2010/11 of:

a. £23 from SW Surrey mobile physiotherapy service – full amount of funding agreed not required (Keith Taylor)

Capital budget for 2010/11

- 7 The Local Committee has a capital budget of £30,000 to support voluntary and community groups, which is a reduction of £5,000 from 2009/10. Capital means that it must be used for building or equipment that has an asset value of at least 12 months duration. Capital funds cannot be used for revenue purposes.
- 8 It has previously been the practice of the Committee that members allocate this budget as a committee, rather than individually. In the past the Committee has identified specific themes and invited voluntary groups to put in bids.
- 9 At the Committee held on 23rd June 2010 members agreed to identify potential projects over the summer to be considered at the next meeting. If one or more suitable projects could not be identified by September, it was agreed that the Committee would divide the funding equally amongst the County Council Members. If the pot is to be retained as a larger pot, rather than divided equally to the Members, then officers suggested that possible themes could be Climate Change, Digital Inclusion (Technology), Healthy Living.
- 10 The committee is asked to confirm its preferred approach for the current year.

Consultations

11 The appropriate SCC services and partner agencies are consulted when bids are submitted.

Implications (Financial, Equalities, Community Safety, Environmental)

12 The allocation of the Committee's budgets are intended to enhance the wellbeing of Guildford residents and make best possible use of the funds. The Committee has in previous years allocated a significant proportion of its budgets to projects that promote social inclusion, self-reliance and stronger communities. Members have in the past also allocated grants from their revenue and capital budgets to projects that contribute to community safety and prevent criminal and anti-social behaviour.

Conclusion and reasons for recommendation

13 The Committee is invited to make decisions that will allow the timely and effective deployment of its various budgets throughout the year. The Committee is required to agree arrangements for the allocation of its budgets.

What happens next

14 The Local Partnerships Team will administer the Committee's budgets in line with the decisions taken.

Contact details

Responsible Officer:	Dave Johnson Area Director South West 01483 517 301 dave.johnson@surreycc.gov.uk
Contact Officer:	David North Local Committee & Partnership Officer

d.north@surreycc.gov.uk

01483 517530

Name of Member:		Tony Rooth
Name of project:		Rumble strips, Compton
	nsible for carrying out the	Surrey County Council
will it address? Wh	ect: e expected? What needs at geographical area will it nefit? How many people?	Planing out of rumble strip and resurfacing of area. Will remove a VERY unpopular speed deterrent following petition, benefiting the residents of Compton who have complained about noise and vibration disruption.
Who has been con		Numerous complaints & petition received signed by majority of village, representations from parish and county councillors + Anne Milton MP. Agreement with Tony Rooth regarding
When will the proje completed? When	ect be started and will outcomes be seen?	Should be completed week commencing 19 th July 2010
What is the total co Estimate/breakdow		Circa £9500.00
Amount and purpo Committee funding	se of proposed Local ?	£1500.00
secured?	nds have been sought or	Matching bid from Local Committee allocation + Revenue budget.
been approached f	of Surrey County Council or this funding?	No
Has the Local Com this purpose in the	mittee given funding for	No
If this project will ne will that be met?	eed funding in future, how	N/a
Area Director's / So comments	CC Service Manager's	The Area Director recommends approval.
Date of Local Com	mittee	22 nd September 2010

Name	e of Member:	Tony Rooth
Name	e of project:	Gully - The Street,
	. ,	Puttenham/School Lane
	nisation responsible for carrying out roject?	Surrey County Council
What needs area	ription of Project: outcomes are expected? What s will it address? What geographical will it cover? Who will benefit? How people?	Construction of a new gully and connection to existing Surface Water system to prevent localised flooding affecting Puttenham residents and school users.
Who	has been consulted?	Have had representation from Tony Rooth following complaints but mostly arises from inspections.
	n will the project be started and leted? When will outcomes be ?	2010 financial year
	is the total cost of the project? ate/breakdown of costings.	Estimated to be £3500.00 +
	Int and purpose of proposed Local nittee funding?	£3000.00
What	alternative funds have been sought cured?	Local Committee allocation
	any other part of Surrey County cil been approached for this ng?	No
	he Local Committee given funding is purpose in the past?	No
	project will need funding in future, will that be met?	N/a
Area	Director's / SCC Service Manager's	The Area Director
comn	5	recommends approval.
Date	of Local Committee	22 nd September 2010

Name of Member:	Bill Barker
Name of project:	Effingham Learning Partnership Cycling Project -Start-up funding for Bike club equipment for The Raleigh School and Howard of Effingham School,
Organisation responsible for carrying out the project?	The Effingham Learning Partnership
Description of Project: What outcomes are expected? What needs will it address? What geographical area will it cover? Who will benefit? How many people?	Outcomes : Children will have more opportunity to practice their cycle skills & have their attainment regularly assessed. Both children & parents will have a better understanding of the child's current level of skills, where s/he can expect to cycle independently and the next steps to practice. Needs being addressed: This project will enable children to leave their primary school with a higher level of cycle skills than currently exists. Secondary children (and more experienced primary children) will be trained for Bikeability Level 3 ie busier roads, roundabouts and more complex junctions. All children will be encouraged to cycle more often. By embedding a cycle-culture at each school, we hope to reduce school-run congestion and therefore make it safer and more enjoyable for those who choose to cycle. Evidence of need: The travel culture in the local villages is car-based, even for relatively short journeys. Very few children currently cycle to school. Covering West Horsley & Effingham 60 Children per year attending club at The Raleigh in West Horsley &approximately 60 per year 60 children per year attending club at The Howard of Effingham.

Estimate/breakdown of costings.at each of the 3 participating schools.Amount and purpose of proposed Local Committee funding?£1,193, of which: £558 is for half the start-up costs at the Howard £635 is for the start-up costs for the Raleigh Training equipment for the Raleigh's cycle club (Horsley). Half the training equipment for the Howard of Effingham 's cycle club (Effingham). To fund each of the instructors to attend a First Aid course.What alternative funds have been sought or secured?£6,000 from the CTC. £1,193 from Mole Valley Local CommitteeHas any other part of Surrey County Council£1,193 from Mole Valley Local	Who has been consulted?	The schools have engaged with their pupils and parents about the relative unpopularity of cycling.
Estimate/breakdown of costings.at each of the 3 participating schools.Amount and purpose of proposed Local Committee funding?£1,193, of which: £558 is for half the start-up costs at the Howard £635 is for the start-up costs for the Raleigh Training equipment for the Raleigh's cycle club (Horsley). Half the training equipment for 		ii) this is expected to be an ongoing project that provides extra training to 120+ children
Committee funding?£558 is for half the start-up costs at the Howard £635 is for the start-up costs for the Raleigh Training equipment for the Raleigh's cycle club (Horsley). Half the training equipment for 		
secured? £1,193 from Mole Valley Local Committee Has any other part of Surrey County Council £1,193 from Mole Valley Local		£558 is for half the start-up costs at the Howard £635 is for the start-up costs for the Raleigh Training equipment for the Raleigh's cycle club (Horsley). <u>Half</u> the training equipment for the Howard of Effingham 's cycle club (Effingham). To fund each of the instructors
Has any other part of Surrey County Council £1,193 from Mole Valley Local	•	£1,193 from Mole Valley Local
	been approached for this funding?	£1,193 from Mole Valley Local Committee
Has the Local Committee given funding for no this purpose in the past?	o o	
costs of the club. Normal ELP policies will apply in case of family hardship.	will that be met?	parental donations will be requested to cover the ongoing costs of the club. Normal ELP policies will apply in case of
Area Director's / SCC Service Manager's comments The Area Director recommends approval. Date of Local Committee 22 nd September 2010	comments	