



LOCAL COMMITTEE
(RUNNYMEDE)

WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS
13th FEBRUARY 2009

1. Question on Tulk Bequest from Cllr Chris Norman

In relation to the Tulk Bequest:

What was the original name of the Behest (pre-2006) and the 'charitable objects', and may I receive a copy of the report, recommendation and resolution of the Executive meeting that approved the change of the above in 2006?

Can I be informed of what schools are now eligible under the 'new' terms? Is there a reason why the County has not submitted accounts to the Charity Commission since September 2005? Were any of the funds in the original trust allocated between the date of registration in 1962 and the change in 2006, or any allocated and spent since the change in 2006? and can I be advised of the current value of the behest?

Answer from Surrey County Council's education and legal teams:

"The name of the original charity was "J A Tulk Playing Field Trust" (charity no. 312006) and is now "The Tulk Fund for School Sports Facilities" (no. 312006).

The bequest of £10,000 was " towards the purchase and layout (but not equipment) of playing fields for any type of Maintained County Secondary School within the administrative County".

The current scheme states:

"The object of the charity is to provide recreational facilities and advance education by providing or assisting in the provision or improvement of outdoor sports facilities (not including equipment) for County maintained secondary schools in Surrey."

All maintained secondary schools in Surrey are eligible.

The report to the County Council Executive in 2004 is attached. The charity commission scheme was sealed by them in 2006.

The reason that no accounts were submitted to the Charity Commission after September 2005 was that unfortunately, no accountant had been allocated to deal with this charity. This has now been rectified and accounts will be presented as soon as external auditors can validate them.

No funds were deployed before the new scheme was made and none have been deployed since, though an invitation to bid for funds was included in the school bulletin in October and bids are being assessed now. The value of the Bequest as at September 2008 was:

Capital balance £244,070, revenue balance available to spend is £581,360.”

Extract from the Executive report January 20th 2004:

“It is recommended that application be made to the Charity Commission for a scheme to vary the objects of the JA Tulk Playing Fields Trust (321006) to benefit secondary school sports facilities (not including equipment) within the administrative area of the County Council.”

The minutes of this meeting record that the recommendation was agreed.

2. Question from Mr Ray Walker of Virginia Water

(Please see attached photographs taken 14/1/09 of the location referred to on the north section of Lyne Lane. Mr Walker comments that both sites appear to be used for what are normally considered to be inappropriate green belt activities. He notes “the entrance to the site opposite, last occupied by Hanson for green composting appears to be becoming neglected. There was a broken and hazardous drain grating, a displaced broken kerb and the verge was furrowed by heavy vehicles, probably accessing the SCC sites. Whilst there for an obvious reason the blocks across the entrance do not enhance this supposedly rural road in the green belt”.)

“Is it possible to improve the appearance of this green belt locality extending from the northern Surrey County Council site to the southern boundary of “the tip”, and also to give attention to the opposite side of Lyne Lane, in an endeavour to give it a more rural, rather than an industrial, appearance?”

Reply from Surrey County Council’s Mr Keith Barker, Estates and Property division

“The attached map indicates land owned by Surrey County Council in Lyne Lane on the northern side (adjacent to the sewage treatment works). I can confirm that the county council uses the land to the right (as seen in the photograph) as a highways site for the contractor Ringway to store materials, and leases the other portion of land to the left to a motorcycle club. Land on the opposite side of Lyne Lane is not owned by the county.”

Mr Richard Parkinson, contract manager for the Surrey Waste Management recycling site, adds:

“Plans are being taken forward to deter fly tipping by installing a fixed surveillance camera at the entrance to the recycling site in Lyne Lane. Our

contractor has planning applications in for the poles required and we are finalising the specification for the cameras with our contractor, Surrey Waste Management, with a view to installation this Spring.”

Response from Surrey Highways

“The county council will write to its contractor asking them to be mindful of the appearance within the site, giving due consideration to its function as an operational depot.”



Photographs of Surrey County Council site in Lyne Lane