

Agenda

Runnymede
Local Committee

**We welcome you to
Runnymede Local Committee**
Your Councillors, Your Community
and the Issues that Matter to You

Discussion

Creating Opportunities for Young People	2.50
Queen Marys Drive	3.15
Community Safety	3.40



Venue

Location: The Council Chamber,
Civic Centre, Station
Road, Addlestone KT15
2AH

Date: Monday, 29 September
2014

Time: 2.30 pm

You can get involved in the following ways

Get involved

Ask a question

If there is something you wish know about how your council works or what it is doing in your area, you can ask the local committee a question about it. Most local committees provide an opportunity to raise questions, informally, up to 30 minutes before the meeting officially starts. If an answer cannot be given at the meeting, they will make arrangements for you to receive an answer either before or at the next formal meeting.

Write a question

You can also put your question to the local committee in writing. The committee officer must receive it a minimum of 4 working days in advance of the meeting.

When you arrive at the meeting let the committee officer (detailed below) know that you are there for the answer to your question. The committee chairman will decide exactly when your answer will be given and may invite you to ask a further question, if needed, at an appropriate time in the meeting.

Sign a petition

If you live, work or study in Surrey and have a local issue of concern, you can petition the local committee and ask it to consider taking action on your behalf. Petitions should have at least 30 signatures and should be submitted to the committee officer 2 weeks before the meeting. You will be asked if you wish to outline your key concerns to the committee and will be given 3 minutes to address the meeting. Your petition may either be discussed at the meeting or alternatively, at the following meeting.

Thank you for coming to the Local Committee meeting

Your Partnership officer is here to help. If you would like to talk about something in today's meeting or have a local initiative or concern please contact them through the channels below.

Email: sylvia.carter@surreycc.gov.uk

Tel: 01932 794081

Website: <http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/runnymede>



Follow on Twitter @LCRunnymede



SURREY



Surrey County Council Appointed Members

Mr Chris Norman, Chertsey (Chairman)
Mrs Yvonna Lay, Egham (Vice-Chairman)
Mrs Mary Angell, Woodham and New Haw
Mr Mel Few, Foxhills, Thorpe and Virginia Water
Mr John Furey, Addlestone
Miss Marisa Heath, Englefield Green

Borough Council Appointed Members

Cllr Derek Cotty, Chertsey Meads
Cllr Richard Edis, Chertsey St Ann's
Cllr Alan Alderson, Egham Town
Cllr Paul Tuley, Chertsey Meads
Cllr Patrick Roberts, Englefield Green East
Cllr J M Edwards, Chertsey South & Rowtown

Chief Executive
David McNulty

			
Chris Norman (Chairman) Chertsey	Yvonna Lay (Vice-Chairman) Egham	Mary Angell Woodham & New Haw	
			
John Furey Addlestone	Marisa Heath Englefield Green	Mel Few Foxhills, Thorpe & Virginia Water	
		 <p>SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL Local Committee (RUNNYMEDE)</p> <p>County Councillors 2013-17</p>	

For councillor contact details, please contact Sylvia Carter, Community Partnership and Committee Officer (sylvia.carter@surreycc.gov.uk / 01932 794081)

			
Derek Cotty Chertsey Meads	<i>Richard Edis</i> Chertsey St Anns	Alan Alderson Egham Town	
			
Pat Roberts Englefield Green East	<i>JM Edwards</i> Chertsey South and Row Town	Paul Tuley Chertsey Meads	
		 Local Committee RUNNYMEDE BOROUGH Borough Council Co-optees 2014-15	

For councillor contact details, please contact Sylvia Carter, Community Partnership and Committee Officer (sylvia.carter@surreycc.gov.uk / 01932 794081)

If you would like a copy of this agenda or the attached papers in another format, e.g. large print, Braille, or another language please either call Sylvia Carter on 01932 794081 or write to the Community Partnerships Team at Surrey County Council, Runnymede Civic Centre, Station Road, Addlestone, KT15 2AH or sylvia.carter@surreycc.gov.uk

This is a meeting in public. If you would like to attend and you have any special requirements, please contact us using the above contact details.

Use of social media and recording at council meetings

Reporting on meetings via social media

Anyone attending a council meeting in the public seating area is welcome to report on the proceedings, making use of social media (e.g. to tweet or blog), provided that this does not disturb the business of the meeting. To support this, County Hall has wifi available for those visiting the building so please ask at reception for details.

Members taking part in a council meeting may also use social media. However, members are reminded that they must take account of all information presented before making a decision and should actively listen and be courteous to others, particularly witnesses providing evidence.

Webcasting

In line with our commitment to openness and transparency, we webcast County Council, Cabinet and Planning & Regulatory Committee meetings as well as the Surrey Police and Crime Panel. These webcasts are available live and for six months after each meeting at www.surreycc.gov.uk/webcasts.

Generally, the public seating areas are not covered by the webcast. However by entering the meeting room and using the public seating areas, then the public is deemed to be consenting to being filmed by the Council and to the possible use of these images and sound recordings for webcasting and/or training purposes.

We also webcast some select and local committee meetings where there is expected to be significant public interest in the discussion.

Requests for recording meetings

Members of the public are permitted to film, record or take photographs at council meetings provided that this does not disturb the business of the meeting and there is sufficient space. If you wish to film a particular meeting, please liaise with the council officer listed in the agenda prior to the start of the meeting so that the Chairman can give their consent and those attending the meeting can be made aware of any filming taking place.

Filming should be limited to the formal meeting area and not extend to those in the public seating area.

The Chairman will make the final decision in all matters of dispute in regard to the use of social media and filming in a committee meeting.

Using Mobile Technology

You may use mobile technology provided that it does not interfere with the PA or induction loop system. As a courtesy to others and to avoid disruption to the meeting, all mobile technology should be on silent mode during meetings.

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

To receive any apologies for absence.

2 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

(Pages 1 - 10)

To approve the Minutes of the previous meeting as a true record. A copy of the minutes will be available in the room for half an hour prior to the meeting.

3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

To receive any declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests from Members in respect of any item to be considered at the meeting.

Notes:

- In line with the Relevant Authorities (Disclosable Pecuniary Interests) Regulations 2012, declarations may relate to the interest of the member, or the member's spouse or civil partner, or a person with whom the member is living as husband or wife, or a person with whom the member is living as if they were civil partners and the member is aware they have the interest.
- Members need only disclose interests not currently listed on the Register of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests.
- Members must notify the Monitoring Officer of any interests disclosed at the meeting so they may be added to the Register.
- Members are reminded that they must not participate in any item where they have a disclosable pecuniary interest.

4 PETITIONS

To receive any petitions in accordance with Standing Order 65. No petitions were received in time for this meeting.

5 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS

To receive and answer any questions from Surrey County Council electors within the area in accordance with Standing Order 66.

6 WRITTEN MEMBER QUESTIONS

To receive any written questions from Members under Standing Order 47.

7 CREATING OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUNG PEOPLE: EARLY HELP (Pages 11 - 20)

Mr Leigh Middleton (Youth Services, West Lead) will present this report for decision.

8 QUEEN MARY'S DRIVE NEW HAW: REPLACEMENT TRAFFIC CALMING (Pages 21 - 28)

This report details consultation undertaken with New Haw residents following a discussion at the Local Committee in June 2014.

9 MAJOR SCHEMES (EGHAM) (Pages 29 - 38)

This report updates the Local Committee on discussions with the Major Schemes (Egham) Task Group and the chairman concerning a contribution from the Local Committee's budget towards the cost of the Runnymede Roundabout and Egham Sustainable Package schemes.

10 HIGHWAYS UPDATE (Pages 39 - 44)

Mr Andrew Milne (Area Highways Manager) will present this report which summarises budgets and progress towards road schemes in the Runnymede area.

11 COMMUNITY SAFETY IN RUNNYMEDE: ANNUAL UPDATE (Pages 45 - 64)

Sylvia Carter (Community Partnerships, Surrey County Council), Inspector Roger Nield (Surrey Police) and Shazia Sarwar (Runnymede BC community safety officer) will present this update report.

12 LOCAL COMMITTEE & MEMBER ALLOCATIONS FUNDING (Pages 65 - 72)

This report is for information only.

13 FORWARD PLAN

The Local Committee is asked to agree the following items for its meeting on 1 December 2014:

- * Annual review of on-street parking
- * Highways Update
- * Update on Flooding resilience and readiness
- * Member Allocations
- * Youth Services – commissioning for 2015

14 LOCAL CONSULTATIONS [FOR INFORMATION ONLY]

Heathrow Airport is consulting (closing date 12 October) on its compensation proposals in the event of a third runway being agreed for Heathrow – there is a public event in Runnymede on Tuesday 7 October from 1400 to 2100 at St Paul's Church, Egham Hythe TW18 3HD.

Runnymede BC is holding a Community Flood Fair event for residents to discuss concerns and questions about flood risk on Tuesday 30 September from 1730 to 2100 in the Hythe Centre TW18 3HD.

DRAFT

Minutes of the meeting of the
Runnymede LOCAL COMMITTEE
held at 1.30 pm on 9 June 2014
at The Hythe community centre, Thorpe Road, Egham Hythe TW18 3HD.

Surrey County Council Members:

- * Mr Chris Norman (Chairman)
- * Mrs Yvonna Lay (Vice-Chairman)
- Mrs Mary Angell
- * Mr Mel Few
- * Mr John Furey
- * Miss Marisa Heath

Borough / District Members:

- * Cllr Derek Cotty
- * Cllr Richard Edis
- * Cllr Alan Alderson
- * Cllr Paul Tuley
- Cllr Patrick Roberts
- * Cllr J M Edwards

* In attendance

25/14 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 1]

The minutes of the February 2014 meeting of the Local Committee were approved and signed by the chairman.

26/14 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 2]

Councillor Mary Angell gave apologies for absence.

27/14 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

Councillor John Furey declared that, as the Cabinet Member responsible for Highways, he would not take part in discussion on item 11 regarding Stonehill Road, which would be brought to him for decision in due course.

Councillors Edwards, Edis, Cotty and Mrs Yvonna Lay declared an interest in item 10 regarding Royal Holloway University as they were on the Runnymede Borough Council Planning Committee.

28/14 PETITIONS [Item 4]

There were no petitions received.

ITEM 2

29/14 RESPONSE TO TITE HILL PETITION [Item 5]

The Local Committee received a petition at its meeting on 24 February 2014 signed by 102 local residents concerned about vehicle speeds and road safety in Tite Hill, Englefield Green.

Traffic survey data shows that a significant number of drivers travel in excess of the 30mph speed limit in Tite Hill. However, the road has a relatively good safety record compared to many other roads within Runnymede.

A number of road safety improvements are already proposed for Tite Hill and these were due to be installed shortly – including vehicle activated signs. It was therefore recommended that the impact of these measures on vehicle speeds and road safety be assessed before consideration was given to additional measures.

The Local Committee (Runnymede) agreed that:

- (i) the impact of existing developer funded proposals to reduce vehicle speeds and improve road safety in Tite Hill be monitored and assessed.
- (ii) the possible introduction of further highway safety measures in Tite Hill be considered when the Committee assesses schemes for inclusion in its 2015/16 programme of works.

Mrs Wendy Locker, representing the Tite Hill Speedwatch Group, thanked the Committee and Highways Officer for the detailed response. She reported that residents were pleased with the vehicle activated signs that were being installed but were also disappointed that there were no immediate actions to install speed tables or a crossing. She noted that it was ironic that these could not be implemented as the Police had stated that vehicles were travelling too fast.

Mrs Locker welcomed the monitoring of the new measures in place, but further asked whether signs could be installed in the interim to advise motorists to drive carefully and to warn of pedestrians / students crossing. If funding for signage were an issue, she asked whether residents could help to fund. The Highways Officer agreed to look at signage – but stated that this would need to comply with Highways regulations.

30/14 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 6]

A written question was received from Mr Graham Mitson of Guildford Road, regarding the A320 Guildford Road, Ottershaw

“Will the Local Committee investigate making improvements to the A320 between the Otter roundabout and Christ Church to reduce noise and vibration.”

The answer given at the meeting was:- A written answer will be given to the petitioner outside of the meeting. Surrey County Council will be in contact with the questioner as soon as reasonably possible.

31/14 WRITTEN MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 7]

There were none.

32/14 FLOODING IN RUNNYMEDE [Item 8]

In December 2013 the County of Surrey was hit by extreme weather conditions resulting in a prolonged spell of flooding affecting several districts and boroughs.

Surrey declared major incidents on 24 December 2013 and 9 February 2014 to coordinate the response to flooding across the County, which saw over 600 households and nearly 30 commercial premises in Runnymede being internally flooded.

A coordinated multi agency response was implemented involving officers from the Environment Agency (EA), District and Borough Councils, the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) Surrey Police, Surrey Fire and Rescue Service (SFRS), Her Majesty's Armed Forces, Surrey County Council (SCC), various utility companies including Thames Water and Public Health England (PHE).

Members noted the challenges faced and the lessons learnt. Members of the public were encouraged to apply for repair and renewal grants, especially as the process had been simplified. Members also discussed the Lower Thames Flood Relief Scheme and that the authorities were working together to try to find a way of meeting the shortfall needed for the £250million scheme.

The Local Committee (Runnymede) noted the multi-agency response to the flooding event and the flood recovery work taking place.

33/14 RUNNYMEDE MAJOR SCHEMES UPDATE [Item 9]

Members received an update on the current status and feedback from the consultation for the Runnymede Major Schemes. The Runnymede Roundabout and Egham sustainable transport package are two separate Major Projects but located within the Egham area and adjoin each other.

Both projects require a minimum of 25% of local contribution funding which can be made up of funding from several sources, but must be available at the time of the Business Case submission (30 September 2014).

Both projects are currently programmed to commence works in the 2015/16 financial year and cover two financial years.

The Local Committee (Runnymede) agreed :

- (iii) To note the progress made so far with the Major Schemes submission;
- (iv) To note the positive feedback from the public consultation;

ITEM 2

- (v) To delegate authority to the Area Team Manager, in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman, the Member Task Group for Egham Major Schemes, and the Project Manager, to consider allocation of funding **of up to £50,000 per annum** towards these projects from the Local Committee capital budget for the 2015/16 and 2016/17 financial years **(subject to budget discussions later in the year)**, and commit to a fixed sum if appropriate, reporting the outcome of these findings to the next available Local Committee.

34/14 ROYAL HOLLOWAY UNIVERSITY OF LONDON MASTERPLAN DEVELOPMENT PLANNING APPLICATION - A30 EGHAM HILL HIGHWAY WORKS [Item 10]

Members received information about the highway works proposed on the A30 Egham Hill, associated with a current planning application for a 'masterplan' development at the Royal Holloway University of London, Egham.

Members expressed concerns over the installation four toucan crossings and the impact this would have on traffic flows. It was noted that Mayer-Brown had undertaken the traffic flow surveys and used modelling to reach the impact figures as stated.

The Local Committee (Runnymede) noted the report.

35/14 STONEHILL ROAD - UPDATE ON HIGHWAY SAFETY MEASURES [Item 11]

Members received a report outlining a review of the safety measures previously installed in Stonehill Road, in response to the issue being highlighted by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee of Runnymede Borough Council. It was noted that the report contained an error and that 2.9 should read lamp columns and not vehicle activated signs. The Committee was asked to note that the multi-agency Runnymede Road Safety Working Group would undertake a further site visit in the summer to consider whether additional measures could be recommended.

The Local Committee (Runnymede) noted the review of safety measures already installed in Stonehill Road.

36/14 MAGNA CARTA - HIGHWAY SAFETY MEASURES [Item 12]

On 15 June 2015 it will be the 800th Anniversary of the sealing of the Magna Carta in Runnymede. Members noted the date and highlighted the importance of getting the works completed in time.

Surrey County Council has been working with various partners to develop a range of proposals to help both celebrate the 800th Anniversary itself and create a lasting legacy.

These proposals cover an area that includes sites on both sides of the busy A308 Windsor Road. A package of highway improvements has therefore

been developed to help support these celebrations and enhance future visitor safety.

The highway improvements proposed will help reduce the impact of the A308 Windsor Road on the Magna Carta site and enhance safety for visitors by encouraging lower vehicle speeds and providing improved crossing facilities for pedestrians and cyclists. These proposed measures will support plans to create a legacy and attract increased numbers of visitors to the area.

To enable delivery of the proposed measures in time for the 2015 celebrations it is essential that all necessary permissions are obtained in this Committee cycle.

The Local Committee (Runnymede) agreed that:

- (vi) A speed limit of 40mph be introduced for the section of the A308 Windsor Road currently subject to a 60mph speed limit, conditional upon the formal approval of Surrey Police and a speed limit assessment confirming that this proposed limit is appropriate.
- (vii) Subject to the conditions in recommendation (i) that a Traffic Regulation Order for the proposed speed limit change be promoted.
- (viii) The Area Team Manager be authorised to advertise the necessary legal notice for the introduction of a signal controlled crossing adjacent to the Lutyens Buildings on the A308 Windsor Road.
- (ix) The Area Team Manager be authorised to consider and resolve any objections received in response to both the Traffic Regulation Order and the notice as described above with the Chairman and Divisional Member.

The Local Committee (Runnymede) also noted:

- (x) The other highway improvements included as part of the package of measures proposed by the Magna Carta Highway Resolution Group.

37/14 QUEEN MARY'S DRIVE, NEW HAW - REPLACEMENT TRAFFIC CALMING [Item 13]

The full length of Queen Mary's Drive was due to be resurfaced as part of the Surrey Highways capital works programme. There are 2 round top humps within this length of road that need to be removed as part of the resurfacing work due to their poor condition.

Round top humps are no longer used as a method of traffic calming in Surrey and so cannot be reinstated after the resurfacing work. Members were informed that installation of speed cushions would cost between £7,000 to £10,000. Members queried the need for traffic calming measures in this area as parked cars along the route already slowed traffic. A vote was held and a show of hands recorded 4 rejected the recommendations, 3 voted for the proposal and 3 abstentions.

ITEM 2

The Local Committee (Runnymede) rejected the recommendations in the report to replace the speed humps.

38/14 HIGHWAYS UPDATE [Item 14]

The Committee received a report on progress made with the delivery of proposed highways schemes, developer funded schemes, and revenue funded works for the 2014/15 financial year. An update was also received on the latest budgetary position for highway schemes, revenue maintenance and Community Enhancement expenditure.

An additional update was given by Cllr Furey on planned maintenance in Runnymede.

The Local Committee (Runnymede) agreed to:

- (xi) Note the progress with schemes and revenue funded works for the 2014/15 financial year.
- (xii) Note the budgetary position.
- (xiii) Note that a further Highways Update will be brought to the next meeting of this Committee.

39/14 CREATING OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUNG PEOPLE: LOCAL RE-COMMISSIONING FOR 2015 - 2020 [Item 15]

Services for Young People (SYP) currently operates nine commissions which contribute towards the overall goal of full participation in education, training or employment with training for young people to age 19 and to age 25 for those with special educational needs or disabilities (SEND). These commissions are delivered through in-house services and external providers, where contracts were let generally for a 3 year period, all expiring in 2015.

Members received a report which outlined plans to build on the successes of Services for Young People and proposed greater integration and working together for the commissioning of the Local Prevention Framework (LPF), Centre Based Youth Work (CBYW) and potentially other more integrated commissioning with partners such as Runnymede Borough Council, Public Health, Surrey Police and Active Surrey. The report explained how Services for Young People plans to achieve its overall goal of employability for all young people.

Members were supportive of the increased involvement of the Youth Task Group in the commissioning of Centre Based Youth Work, but had reservations over commissioning on a five year cycle.

The Local Committee (Runnymede) agreed asked to:

1. Support increased delegation of decision-making to include the current Centre Based Youth Work so that it can be re-commissioned alongside the current Local Prevention Framework.

2. Agree that local priorities for the newly delegated commissions within Services for Young People will be decided by the Runnymede Local Committee, informed by the work of the constituted Youth Task Group.
3. Reconstitute Runnymede Youth Task Group.

40/14 ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT FROM SERVICES FOR YOUNG PEOPLE [Item 16]

The Committee received a report updating them on the progress that Services for Young People have made towards participation for all young people in Runnymede in post-16 education, training and employment during 2013-14. This is the overarching goal of Services for Young People and the strategy to achieve it is set out in 'The young people's employability plan 2012-17'.

In particular the Local Committee report focused on the contribution of the different commissions to this goal and how they have performed during the year.

Next steps were also included to set out how they would keep the Local Committee informed about developments and progress during the year ahead. Members particularly noted that 29 young people at risk of homelessness were supported in 13/14 and welcomed this outcome measure.

The Local Committee (Runnymede) noted the progress Services for Young People made during 2013/14 to increase participation for young people in education, training or employment, as set out in the appendix to the report

41/14 LOCAL COMMITTEE BUDGET AND TASK GROUP REPRESENTATION 2014-15 [Item 17]

The Local Committee reviewed and agreed the terms of reference and membership for the Youth Task Group, the Major Schemes (Egham) Task Group and the CPE Parking Task Group for 2014-5. It also agreed to delegate the community safety funding contribution, and nominate a county councillor representative to the Community Safety Partnership. The Local Committee's three task groups enable the Local Committee to carry out its work in an efficient and expedient manner. Representation on the Community Safety Partnership at member and officer level enables the Local Committee to monitor and raise issues of concern in the area.

The Local Committee (Runnymede) agreed:

- (xiv) The terms of reference for the Youth Task Group, Major Schemes (Egham) Task Group and the Parking Task Group, as set out in Annexes 1, 2 and 3.
- (xv) The membership for these task groups for 2014-15 as set out below:

Youth Task Group
Mr Cllrs Norman
Mr Mel Few (Yvonna Lay as substitute)

ITEM 2

Cllr Gill Warner
Runnymede Borough Council to confirm the second
representative

Parking Task Group
Mr Chris Norman
Mrs Yvonna Lay
Cllr John Edwards
Cllr Derek Cotty

Major Schemes (Egham) Task Group
Mrs Yvonna Lay
Ms Marisa Heath
Cllr Patrick Roberts
Cllr Alan Alderson

To nominate **County Councillor Yvonna Lay** to represent the
Local Committee on the local Community Safety Partnership in
2014-15;

- (xvi) To **delegate to the Community Partnerships Team Leader, in consultation with the Chairman and Cllr Furey, agreement** that the community safety budget of £3 294, delegated to the Local Committee, be transferred to the Runnymede Community Safety Partnership, **pending clarification of Police funding.**
- (xvii) To agree that the Community Partnerships Manager manages and authorises expenditure from the budget delegated to the Local Committee in accordance with (iv) above.

42/14 LOCAL COMMITTEE & MEMBERS' ALLOCATION FUNDING - UPDATE [Item 18]

Surrey County Council Councillors receive funding to spend on local projects that help to promote social, economic or environmental well-being in the neighbourhoods and communities of Surrey. This funding is known as Members' Allocation.

For the financial year 2014/15 the County Council has allocated £10,300 revenue funding to each County Councillor and £35,000 capital funding to each Local Committee.

It was noted that further projects had been received since the report was written. Members attention was drawn to bids for "Grass Roots" garden project who needed £6,000 and the White Lodge "Face to Face" project. Further details on these projects would be circulated to members for decision.

The Local Committee (Runnymede) noted:

- (xviii) The amounts that have been spent from the Members' Allocation and Local Committee capital budgets, as set out in Annex 1 of the report.

Meeting ended at: 3.45 pm

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**LOCAL COMMITTEE (RUNNYMEDE)****DATE:** 29 September 2014**LEAD OFFICER:** Leigh Middleton, Lead Youth Officer (West Surrey)**SUBJECT:** Creating Opportunities for Young People – Early Help**SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

Services for Young People is re-commissioning services for 2015-2020 and the new service model will be presented to Cabinet on 23 September 2014. The current Local Prevention commission ends on 31 August 2015 and new funding agreements will be awarded for provision to start on 1 September 2015, subject to Cabinet approval of the new service model.

The Youth Task Group (YTG) has developed a set of priorities for Local Prevention in Runnymede which is based on local needs. Providers who bid for Local Prevention will be asked to respond to the local needs and priorities identified.

The Local Committee is asked to approve the Runnymede priorities so that the procurement exercise can start in October.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Local Committee (Runnymede) is asked to :

- (i) Approve the local priorities (**Annex 1**), to be considered by providers, focusing on the identified needs of Runnymede and the geographical neighbourhoods prioritised by the Youth Task Group.
- (ii) Note that approval is subject to approval of the Services for Young People model by Cabinet on 23 September 2014.
- (iii) Note the changes to the council scheme of delegation which provides increased decision making to local commissioning in relation to youth work and Surrey Outdoor Learning (SOLD).

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

Local Prevention has been in place across Runnymede since 1 April 2012. It has contributed significantly to the reduction in young people becoming Not in Education, Employment or Training (NEET). It is therefore recommended that this early help commission is re-commissioned for 2015-20. Continuation of the contract or funding agreement will be dependent on satisfactory delivery of agreed performance levels.

These recommendations will:

ITEM 7

- a) Support the Council's policy of Creating Opportunities for Young People.
- b) Support the Council's priority to provide early help for children, young people and their families.
- c) Note the changes to the council scheme of delegation which provides increased decision making to local commissioning in relation to youth work and Surrey Outdoor Learning and Development (SOLD).

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:

Local Prevention is a commission which aims to reduce risk factors and increase protective factors for young people who are identified as being most at risk of becoming Not in Education, Employment or Training (NEET). Local Prevention commissions preventative opportunities for young people in school years 8 to 11. The commission is delivered outside of core school hours all year round.

- 1.1 The first Local Prevention was awarded to The Youth Support Service and ran until 31 August 2013.
- 1.2 Re-commissioning took place in 2013 and a funding agreement was awarded to Eikon to deliver the provision.
- 1.3 Current provision is delivered outside youth centres but the new provision will be linked more closely to youth work delivery to provide a seamless service for young people at risk of becoming NEET.
- 1.4 In the last bidding round providers could bid for any amount above 25% of the funding available. Providers will now be able to bid for any amount above 10% of the funding available to encourage smaller providers of specialist niche services to bid.
- 1.5 The amount allocated to each of the eleven Boroughs and Districts is reviewed each commissioning cycle and is based on the needs of each area based on the NEET and Risk of NEET Indicator (RONI) cohorts.
- 1.6 Local Prevention targets priority neighbourhoods with the highest numbers of young people at risk of becoming NEET, who are NEET or who have offended. Providers must operate in these neighbourhoods.
- 1.7 The new provision will place a stronger emphasis on Early Help referrals and will build the role of the Lead Professional into the commission. This is where a lead professional takes a primary role to ensure front-line services are co-ordinated, coherent and achieving the intended outcomes for the young person.
- 1.8 Services for Young People previously came to the Local Committee in June 2014 to seek views on increased delegation in relation to Centre Based Youth Work (CBYW) and SOLD. The Local Committee welcomed this change which is now being formally put to Cabinet for approval on 23 September. Changes will be made to council delegation. Please see **Annex 1A**.

2. ANALYSIS:

- 2.1 Services for Young People's strategic objective is for all young people to be employable. Local Prevention contributes to this by reducing risk factors that may lead to a young person becoming NEET.
- 2.2 This provision improves outcomes for young people in response to the priorities identified by the YTG. It supports localism by providing highly targeted services in the Borough of Runnymede.
- 2.3 The drop in minimum bids from 25% to 10% of funding available will open up the market for smaller organisations.
- 2.4 The Runnymede Youth Task Group has been consulted on local priorities for commissioning which are included in **Annex 1**.
- 2.5 The local priorities are based on an assessment of the local needs which are summarised below:
 - Englefield Green West had the highest number of young people who were NEET during 2013-14 at 16, followed by Egham Hythe (15) and Addlestone Bourneside (13). Addlestone Bourneside also has the highest number of those identified as at risk of becoming NEET (33), followed by Englefield Green West and Chertsey St. Ann's (both 29).
 - Englefield Green West includes the most deprived area in the district (Runnymede 002F), which ranks 20th in Surrey.
 - Both at 12, Egham Hythe and Addlestone Bourneside had the highest number of young people who received substantive outcomes or Youth Restorative Interventions (YRIs) as a result of offending behaviour.
 - A higher proportion of young people who were NEET in Runnymede were in Year 12, perhaps suggesting progression from school may be an issue, whilst over half had been NEET for a relatively short time of less than 12 weeks – 10 percentage points above the Surrey average.
 - Looking at the RONI cohort, notable characteristics are young people who have a moderate level of special educational needs but don't receive the support of an SEN statement (i.e. School Action Plus) and young people who are Children in Need.
 - Chertsey Meads is one of the few wards in Surrey where the rate of under-18 conception is significantly higher than the national average, according to latest available Public Health England data (2009-11).
 - Runnymede's 10-19 year old population is estimated to be 9,600 (7.2% of Surrey's 10-19 year old population). This is forecast to increase by 4.2% over the next five years.*

*ONS 2012-based Subnational Population Projections

ITEM 7

3. OPTIONS:

- 3.1 The Runnymede local priorities have been developed in consultation with the Youth Task Group and identify the key priorities for Runnymede to prevent young people from becoming NEET.
- 3.2 The recommendations focus on key geographical neighbourhoods and community priorities. The Youth Task Group agreed that there should be borough-wide access to any commissioned services particularly for Early Help referrals.

4. CONSULTATIONS:

- 4.1 The proposals for re-commissioning Services for Young People including Local Prevention were published on the 1 July 2014 for response by 31 July 2014 in the document Creating Opportunities for Young People, Re-commissioning for 2015 to 2020, Engagement Paper.
- 4.2 During July 2014 engagement events were run to obtain feedback from all Services for Young People staff (full and part time), partners, providers, elected members and young people in target groups.
- 4.3 A survey was carried out on the Surrey Says website.
- 4.4 A Provider Conference was held for existing and potential new providers to get feedback on the Engagement paper.
- 4.5 Over 170 people attended the above events.
- 4.6 The Engagement Paper feedback was presented to the Creating Opportunities for Young People Project Board and as a result of this the decision to closely align Local Prevention to Youth Work provision was made.
- 4.7 On 23 September 2014 the Services for Young People model will be presented to Cabinet for approval.

5. FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS:

- 4.8 The re-commissioning of service addresses planned savings included in the Medium Term Financial Plan 2014-2019. The model also includes flexibility in the eventuality of future savings being required either for 2015-16 or subsequent years. All contracts include standard break clauses and the ability to revise funding level if budget changes occur.

6. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS:

- 6.1 Runnymede's devolved commissioning budget is targeted to groups who are vulnerable or at risk of becoming NEET.
- 6.2 Young people are expected to benefit from a holistic service model which has been developed and informed by experience, good practice and feedback from a range of stakeholders.

- 6.3 The EIA has highlighted that localised decision-making might disadvantage those who have protected characteristics because of the small number of young people with protected characteristics in each borough / district resulting in their needs being missed (protected characteristics means age; disability, gender reassignment, race, religion or belief, marriage and civil partnership, sex, sexual orientation, pregnancy or maternity. Such protected characteristics may lead to young people facing barriers to participation). It is proposed, therefore, that priority is given to young people with protected characteristics, where this impacts negatively on their employability when allocating individual grants and youth small grants. This would enable specialist organisations to secure funding to provide services for these young people.

7. LOCALISM:

The following areas have been identified by the Youth Task Group as communities which would benefit from Local Prevention delivery:

8. OTHER IMPLICATIONS:	
Area assessed:	Direct Implications:
Crime and Disorder	Set out below.
Sustainability (including Climate Change and Carbon Emissions)	Set out below.
Corporate Parenting/Looked After Children	Set out below.
Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults	Set out below.
Public Health	Set out below.

8.1 Crime and Disorder implications

Evidence shows that young people who are participating in education, training or employment are less likely to commit crime.

8.2 Sustainability implications

By commissioning local organisations, it is anticipated that there will be a reduction in the need for travel. This will contribute to the reduction in carbon emissions.

8.3 Corporate Parenting/Looked After Children implications

Young people who are looked after are a key target group for Services for Young People.

8.4 Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults implications

Services for Young People plays a key role in safeguarding vulnerable children and young people in Surrey.

8.5 Public Health implications

ITEM 7

Services for Young People deliver a number of services that improve the health of young people in Surrey, in particular providing them with information so that they make informed choices about healthy lifestyles, including sexual health.

9. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

The local set of priorities has been developed in consultation with the Youth Task Group to ensure that bids are tailored to meet local needs.

The Local Committee is asked to:

- a) Approve the Runnymede local priorities (Annex 1) to be considered by providers focusing on the identified needs of Runnymede and the geographical neighbourhoods prioritised by the Youth Task Group.
- b) Note that approval is subject to approval of the Services for Young People model by Cabinet on 23 September 2014.
- c) Note the changes to the council scheme of delegation which provides increased decision making to local commissioning in relation to youth work and Surrey Outdoor Learning and Development (SOLD).

10. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

- 10.1 The Services for Young People model will be presented to Cabinet on 23 September for approval.
- 10.2 Subject to approval by Cabinet, officers will develop a prospectus to provide those organisations who wish to bid with the necessary local information.
- 10.3 Officers will invite organisations to submit bids which will be short-listed by the Commissioning and Development Team.
- 10.4 Bidder presentations will take place where the short-listed providers will present their proposals to the Youth Task Group.
- 10.5 A recommendation to award Runnymede Local Prevention funding agreements will be brought to the first meeting of the Local Committee in 2015 for approval.
- 10.6 It is anticipated that the new provider(s) will be in place for 1 September 2015.

Contact Officer:

Leigh Middleton, Lead Youth Officer (West Surrey)
07854 870393

Consulted: Officers, members, public, stakeholders, partners.

Annexes:

Annex 1 – Runnymede Local priorities

Annex 1A - Proposed amendments of Constitution Part 3. Executive Functions of Local Committees

Local Early Help Priorities – Runnymede

Funding available: TBC

Young people who are NEET and identified as at risk of becoming NEET

In July 2014, 41 young people in Runnymede were NEET and 4 young people were RONI.

Overview of Local Prevention in Runnymede

The priority for the Local Prevention Framework in Runnymede is to prevent young people of secondary school age from becoming NEET by removing barriers to participation for young people who are identified as most at risk of becoming NEET and building their resilience.

Prevention activities should be co-produced with young people and delivered in the local community. Preventative services must demonstrate high-quality delivery and a focus on meeting the individual needs of young people identified as being at Risk of NEET (RONI).

Local Prevention Framework activity must take place outside the school day and be delivered from premises other than the Youth Centres. Initial contact can be made in schools.

Identified Neighbourhoods

Based on knowledge of local need, the Runnymede Local Committee Youth Task Group have identified the following neighbourhoods as being in need of this type of provision. Providers must deliver from one or more of these areas of Runnymede:

- Pooley Green, Egham
- Middlesex Court, Addlestone
- Surrey Towers and Green Lane, Addlestone
- Englefield Green West Ward
- Chertsey – Gogmore Farm Park
- Heathervale, New Haw
- Egham –Ripley Springs

Local Needs

- Lower level Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) – a particular focus on support for young people who do not have a statement of educational needs but exhibit learning disabilities or difficulties to anticipate their needs moving forward towards PETE.
- Literacy and numeracy – some young people need extra support through innovative approaches to attain Level 2 in maths, English and ICT (core skills)
- Mental health and emotional wellbeing –some young people have mental health needs, including social skills and low self esteem, as well as low aspirations and motivation.
- Workplace skills – young people need opportunities to develop the skills prior to 12 for understanding and being successful in the workplace. This could include work experience opportunities.
- Teenage parents- support for teenage parents (mums and dads) to remain in education.

ITEM 7

ANNEX 1

- Drugs and alcohol –substance misuse limits young people’s future employability and their resilience to remain in mainstream education
- Positive Activities – Young people in areas of need require increased access to youth work provision. This must include provision for young people with protected characteristics (young carers for example).

Priority Outcomes:

- 1.1 – Sufficient, quality education and training post -16 provided
- 1.2 – Successful transition made to post-16 education, training and employment
- 1.4 – Numeracy and literacy improved
- 2.2- Emotional wellbeing improved
- 2.4- Mental wellbeing improved
- 2.5 Social wellbeing improved
- 5.1 Informed decisions made about education, training and careers
- 5.2 Informed decisions made about leading a healthy lifestyle
- 5.3 Informed decisions made about use of free time
- 5.4 – Informed decisions made about accessing services and support

Local Ways of working

- Any projects on drug or alcohol use should be about education rather than enforcement
- Any projects should take into account organisations already in the area and should complement rather than duplicate provision
- Young people's views should be sought in deciding how to best meet their needs

Annexe 1a

Proposed Amendments to Constitution Part 3

Executive Functions of Local Committees

Changes to Section 1 Paragraph 7.2

Proposed additions are shown in italics and proposed deletions are shown in brackets in bold.

b) Decisions on local services and budgets

In relation to the District or Borough they serve each local committee will take decisions delegated to them by the Leader and/or Cabinet on the following local services and budgets, to be taken in accordance with the financial framework and policies of the County Council, within a framework of agreed performance and resources:

(iv) In relation to youth services:

a) The approval of prevention priorities for Young People (**not in education, employment or training (NEET)**), for the relevant borough or district area after consideration of any local needs assessment.

b) To apportion the delegated funding for young people between Local Prevention (**Framework**), Grants and Individual Prevention Grants categories of funding, in accordance with the allocated budget.

c) Approve the award of Local Prevention (**Framework**) *funding agreements* for the provision of local prevention services for the relevant borough or district in accordance with the allocated budget (**and to pre-qualified providers**).

This power to be exercised by the Portfolio Holder in the event that the relevant local committee is unable to award a (**grant(s)**) *funding agreement(s)* (due to the presence of conflicts of interest which result in the body being inquorate).

d) To approve Youth Task Group advice on the allocation of Community Youth Work and SOLD Local Offer resources to meet local priorities for young people in the local area.

Changes to Section 1 Paragraph 7.3

Service Monitoring, Scrutiny & Issues of Local Concern

The Local Committees may:

xii) Scrutinise the impact of Local Prevention (**Framework**), *Community Youth Work and SOLD Local Offer* in accordance with prevention priorities for Young People (**not in education, employment or training (NEET)**) in the local area.

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE (RUNNYMEDE)

DATE: 29 SEPTEMBER 2014

LEAD OFFICER: ANDREW MILNE

SUBJECT: QUEEN MARY'S DRIVE, NEW HAW – REPLACEMENT TRAFFIC CALMING

DIVISION: WOODHAM AND NEW HAW

**SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

At its meeting on the 9 June 2014, the Local Committee agreed that alternative traffic calming measures should not be installed in place of 2 road humps that needed to be removed from Queen Mary's Drive as part of resurfacing works. This decision went against the Officer Recommendation to install speed cushions in place of the humps.

The report previously presented to the Local Committee did not include an analysis of the potential impacts of removing the humps without replacing them with alternative measures. In addition, no consultation had been undertaken about this option with local residents or Surrey Police.

It was therefore subsequently agreed that a further report should be presented to the Local Committee once a public consultation had been undertaken. This would then allow the Local Committee to review its original decision with the benefit of having considered the views expressed by local residents, Surrey Police and other key parties.

RECOMMENDATIONS:**The Local Committee (Runnymede) is asked to :**

- (i) Revoke its resolution made on 9 June 2014 and agree that :
 - a) Speed cushions are installed in place of the 2 round top humps removed when Queen Mary's Drive was resurfaced.
 - b) A notice is advertised in accordance with the Highways Act 1980 detailing the proposed introduction of speed cushions.
 - c) Any objections received should be considered and resolved by the Area Team Manager for Highways in consultation with the Divisional Member and Chairman of the Runnymede Local Committee.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

Local residents have been consulted and the majority (68%) of those that responded supported the installation of speed cushions in place of the road humps that have been removed.

Queen Mary's Drive currently has a very good safety record with no personal injury accidents having occurred between Copthall Way and Kingston Rise (western junction) since the traffic calming measures were installed in this length of road in 1991.

If alternative speed reducing measures are not installed then vehicle speeds are likely to be higher and this may adversely affect road safety. This would be particularly concerning due to the large number of child pedestrians at the location.

Surrey Police also have concerns that there will be negative impacts on road safety if the humps are not replaced with alternative measures. As such, the police do not support the removal of the humps without alternative speed reducing measures being introduced.

Failing to replace the humps with alternative speed reducing measures may also result in an increased number of vehicles using the road as it becomes a more attractive route compared to adjacent roads (a number of which are traffic calmed).

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:

- 1.1 Queen Mary's Drive is a residential road that forms part of a convenient route between Rowtown and New Haw which avoids the need to use a longer route via higher class roads that are often congested at peak times.
- 1.2 The site of the Grange Community Infant and New Haw Junior Schools bounds Queen Mary's drive and there is a pedestrian access to the schools from the road.
- 1.3 Queen Mary's Drive is a bus route.
- 1.4 In 1991 traffic calming measures were installed in Queen Mary's Drive (between its junction with Copthall Way and its western most junction with Kingston Rise). These measures consisted of 2 round top road humps and a flat top speed table. In 2012, a zebra crossing was installed across the flat top table which is located near the pedestrian access to the schools.
- 1.5 At its meeting on the 9 June 2014 the Local Committee considered a report which advised that these traffic calming measures would shortly have to be removed as part of resurfacing works. The Local Committee were informed that the road table complies with SCC's current traffic calming policy and would there be replaced (together the Zebra Crossing over it) following the resurfacing. However, round top humps (which were an acceptable form of traffic calming at the time they were installed) are no longer installed in Surrey. As such, they cannot be replaced.
- 1.6 There are two main forms of vertical traffic calming that are now used in Surrey which could be installed in place of the humps. They are flat top road tables or speed cushions.
- 1.7 Having considered relevant factors (such as the position of driveways, nature of the road, type of traffic and drainage requirements), speed cushions were

identified as the most appropriate alternative form of traffic calming for the location.

- 1.8 It was therefore recommended that speed cushions should be installed in place of the humps to be removed. However, the Local Committee decided not to approve the Officer recommendation and instead agreed that no alternative measures should be installed in place of the round top humps.
- 1.9 The report presented to the Local Committee did not include a detailed analysis of this option. Furthermore, residents had not been consulted about the traffic calming measures being removed.
- 1.10 Following the decision made, it was therefore agreed that a further report should be presented to the Local Committee including details of the following. The Local Committee would then have the opportunity to reconsider its original decision in the light of this additional information.
- an analysis of the potential impacts of removing the humps without providing any alternative measures to reduce vehicle speeds.
 - the results of a public consultation seeking the views of residents and other key stakeholders including Surrey Police, bus operators and the local schools.
- 1.11 Since the original report was considered by the Local Committee, the resurfacing works have been completed and the traffic calming measures removed. The flat top table and Zebra crossing have subsequently been replaced.

2. ANALYSIS:

- 2.1 The traffic calming measures were originally installed in Queen Mary's Drive in 1991 by Runnymede Borough Council.
- 2.2 It has not been possible to locate copies of the Committee report(s) that would have been considered prior to the measures being installed. As such, the specific reasons why the traffic calming was installed cannot be confirmed. However, such measures are generally introduced to improve road safety by reducing vehicles speeds or/and to manage problems with vehicles "rat running" along inappropriate roads.

Accidents

- 2.3 Personal injury accident data is only available from January 1989. As such, it is only possible to establish the safety record for a relatively short period prior to the installation of the traffic calming. However, from January 1989 to December 1990 there was one personal injury accident between Copthall Way and Kingston Rise (western junction). This accident resulted in a serious injury.
- 2.4 Since the traffic calming measures were installed there have been no personal injury accidents over the same length of road. This is a very good safety record.

Vehicle Speeds

[www.surreycc.gov.uk/Choose an item.](http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/Choose%20an%20item)

ITEM 8

- 2.5 Information about vehicle speeds before and after the installation of the traffic calming measures is not available. As such, the impact of the measures in reducing vehicle speeds cannot be accurately assessed. However, it is reasonable to assume that speeds will have increased since the humps were removed.
- 2.6 Further to the above comments, removing the humps without installing any alternative traffic calming measures could have the following impacts:
- Vehicle speeds are likely to increase which may adversely affect safety at a location which currently has a very good safety record and where there are high levels of child pedestrians (due to the schools).
 - Vehicles may approach the existing flat top table/zebra crossing at higher speeds which could adversely impact on safety for pedestrians using the zebra crossing and increase the risk of loss of control.
 - The number of vehicles using the road may increase as it becomes a more attractive route for motorists compared to adjacent roads (a number of which are traffic calmed).

3. OPTIONS:

- 3.1 The Local Committee is being asked to revoke its original decision and instead agree that speed cushions should be installed in place of the 2 round top humps that have been removed. However, it could decide to maintain its original decision.

4. CONSULTATIONS:

- 4.1 A questionnaire (together with a pre-paid envelope) was delivered to 105 local residents asking them to indicate their preference. 62 responses were received (which is a very good response rate) with the majority (68%) of residents wanting speed cushions installed in place of the humps that have been removed. The table below gives a summary of the views expressed.

Option	Number or residents in favour
Install speed cushions in place of humps	42 (68%)
Remove humps without installing alternative measures	20 (32%)

- 4.2 Below is a summary of the other comments received in response to the consultation.
- 4.3 Surrey Police do not support the removal of the humps without alternative speed reducing measures being introduced. They have highlighted that Queen Mary's Drive's has a very good safety record which suggests the traffic calming measures have helped create a safe road environment with low vehicle speeds, which especially benefits pedestrians going to and from

the schools. The Police are also concerned that removing the humps without providing alternative measures would set a precedent when other roads with traffic calming measures are resurfaced. This could result in significant amounts of traffic calming being removed from some areas which would have a measurable negative impact on road safety in the area.

- 4.4 The Grange Community Infant and New Haw Junior Schools School have advised that the safety of their pupils is their primary concern. They therefore support the use of traffic calming measures to reduce vehicle speeds in roads in the immediate vicinity of the school.
- 4.5 Abellio buses support the introduction of speed cushions since they do not affect buses passing over them (unlike the humps that have been removed). However, they feel that appropriate parking restrictions are also required to ensure parked vehicles do not prevent buses from being able to straddle the cushions. They also stated that, on balance, they support this form of traffic calming on a residential road of this nature because there is a tendency for cars to speed in the absence of traffic calming which increases the risk of collisions.
- 4.6 South East Coast Ambulance Service NHS Foundation Trust and Surrey Fire and Rescue Service have both confirmed they have no objection to speed cushions being installed in Queen Mary's Drive.
- 4.7 Runnymede Borough Council has also been consulted but no comments have been received at the time this report was prepared.

5. FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS:

- 5.1 The total estimated cost of the proposed cushions is £10,000.
- 5.2 The funding source is to be determined and will be confirmed at the Committee meeting.

6. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS:

- 6.1 There are no Equalities and Diversity implications.

7. LOCALISM:

- 7.1 The views of local residents have been sought as part of the public consultation undertaken.

8. OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

Area assessed:	Direct Implications:
Crime and Disorder	No significant implications arising from this report.
Sustainability (including Climate Change and Carbon Emissions)	No significant implications arising from this report.
Corporate Parenting/Looked After Children	No significant implications arising from this report.
Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults	No significant implications arising from this report.

ITEM 8

Public Health	No significant implications arising from this report.
---------------	---

9. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 9.1 Failing to replace the 2 round top road humps with alternative traffic calming measures could lead to increased vehicle speeds and adversely impact on road safety
- 9.2 The majority of residents (68%) that responded to the public consultation support the introduction of speed cushions in place of the road humps, as do the local schools.
- 9.3 Surrey Police do not support the removal of the humps without alternative speed reducing measures being introduced.
- 9.4 The Local Committee is therefore being asked to revoke its resolution made on 9 June 2014 and instead agree that speed cushions are installed in place of the 2 round top road humps that have been removed.

10. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

- 10.1 If the Local Committee revokes its original decision and agrees that speed cushions should be installed in place of the round top humps then the following will happen next:
 - The statutory public notice (detailing the intention to replace the 2 existing round top humps with pairs of speed cushions) will be advertised.
 - The speed cushions will be constructed.

Contact Officer:

Jason Gosden – Senior Engineer – tel: 0300 200 1003

Consulted:

Local residents, Surrey Police, Runnymede Borough Council, Surrey Fire and Rescue Service, the Grange Community Infant and New Haw Junior Schools, Abellio buses and South East Coast Ambulance Service NHS Foundation Trust.

Annexes:

Sources/background papers:

“Queen Mary’s Drive, New Haw – Replacement Traffic Calming” report presented as item at the Runnymede Local Committee meeting on 9 June 2014.

This page is intentionally left blank

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE (RUNNYMEDE)

DATE: 29 September 2014

LEAD OFFICER: Paul Fishwick, Project Manager, Transport Policy

SUBJECT: Runnymede Major Schemes

DIVISION: Egham and Englefield Green

**SUMMARY OF ISSUES:**

This paper is to update members on the outcome of a recent meeting related to Local Committee funding being used for the Major schemes in the Runnymede area.

The decision of the Local Committee on the 9 June 2014 is set out below, with amendments to the original recommendation in bold:

At the Local Committee meeting held on 9 June 2014, this committee (minute ref 33/14) agreed to delegate authority to the Area Team Manager, in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman, the Member Task Group for Egham Major Schemes, and the Project Manager, to consider allocation of funding **of up to £50,000 per annum** towards these projects from the Local Committee capital budget for the 2015/16 and 2016/17 financial years **(subject to budget discussions later in the year)**, and commit to a fixed sum if appropriate, reporting the outcome of these discussions to the next available Local Committee.

The paper presented to the Local Committee on 9 June is attached as **Annex A** (excluding its annex), together with a note of the recent meeting attached **Annex B**.

The meeting concluded that it was decided that no Committee funding should be allocated for this purpose. However, it was recognised that there is considerable support from Members for the major schemes in progress.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Local Committee (Runnymede) is asked to agree :

- (i) To note the outcome from the Joint Member Task Group discussion (Egham Major Schemes).

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Local Committee capital budget is essential to enable the funding of minor local infrastructure improvements, which range from changes to speed limits, through to more substantial works such as the provision of safe crossing facilities. In making this recommendation it was recognised that the Local Committee capital budget is the only avenue by which minor local infrastructure needs can be responded to and promoted, and that removing money from this budget for major schemes would have an impact on the Committee's ability to respond to local needs in the future.

However, it was also recognised that the potential major schemes funding could bring an investment into the Egham area of over £8 million, removing many of the current issues in the area that would need to be funded in some way in the future.

The members also felt that any funding put towards major schemes from the local Committee budget would be negligible when considered against the funding needed.

Contact Officer: Paul Fishwick
Job title; Project Manager, Transport Policy
Contact number 03456 009 009

Consulted:
Surrey County Council project officer: Andrew Milne

Annexes:
Annex A – 9 June 2014 Local Committee report
Annex B – 8 September 2014 Delegated member meeting notes

Sources/background papers:

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE (RUNNYMEDE)

DATE: 9 June 2014

LEAD OFFICER: Paul Fishwick, Project Manager, Transport Policy

SUBJECT: RUNNYMEDE MAJOR SCHEMES UPDATE

DIVISIONS: Egham and Englefield Green

**SUMMARY OF ISSUES:**

This paper is to **update** members on the current status and feedback from the consultation for the Runnymede Major Schemes and **request** a percentage (or amount) of Local Committee transport funding towards the Local Contribution required for the projects as determined by the EM3 Local Enterprise Partnership.

The Runnymede Roundabout and Egham sustainable transport package are two separate Major Projects but located within the Egham area and adjoin each other.

Both projects require a minimum of 25 percentage local contribution funding which can be made up of funding from several sources, but must be available at the time of the Business Case submission (30 September 2014).

Both projects are currently programmed to commence works in the 2015/16 financial year and cover two financial years.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Local Committee (Runnymede) is asked to agree :

- (i) To note the progress made so far with the Major Schemes submission;
- (ii) To note the positive feedback from the public consultation;
- (iii) To delegate authority to the Area Team Manager, in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman, the Member Task Group for Egham Major Schemes, and the Project Manager, to consider allocation of funding towards these projects from the Local Committee capital budget for the 2015/16 and 2016/17 financial years, and commit to a fixed sum if appropriate, reporting the outcome of these findings to the next available Local Committee.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

To ensure that the Local Committee are kept informed, the Local Committee are asked to note the progress made so far with the two Major scheme projects, which are planned to be submitted to the EM3 on 30 September 2014.

The consultation undertaken during the 8-week period provided good support from the public and local businesses (Annex A), and presented to the Member Task Group on 20th January 2014.

To enable the business cases for both projects to show local commitment, the Local Committee is being asked to put forward a percentage (or amount) towards these projects to support the local contribution requirement.

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:

- 1.1 The Local Committee received a report at its meeting on 30 September 2013 that provided an update on the development of Major Schemes within the Egham area for the period 2015-19, and requested approval to carry out a consultation on both projects.
- 1.2 Both the Runnymede roundabout and the Egham Sustainable Transport Package have been developed in tandem and are currently scheduled to be submitted to the EM3 Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) on 30 September 2014.
- 1.3 Although the two schemes are still in development the economic case for each must provide a Benefit Cost Ratio of at least a score of 2. If any scheme does not achieve this score it is unlikely to proceed towards funding. Officers are confident that both schemes will achieve at least this minimum rating.
- 1.4 EM3 will know in July 2014 what funding will be made available from Government for the period 2015/16 and 2016/17. If both schemes are scheduled and the business case submissions successful, it is anticipated to commence the Egham Sustainable Transport Package scheme in April 2015 and the Runnymede Roundabout scheme in September 2015 (delay is due to the Magna Carta 800 year celebrations in June 2015).

2. ANALYSIS:

Runnymede roundabout and Egham sustainable transport package

- 2.1 The two major schemes have been developed further and initial design has been completed. Detailed design has commenced on both projects to enable them to be ready for tender/contractor documentation and implementation. Advanced utility diversionary works may be able to start during the April and May period of 2015 for the Runnymede roundabout project.
- 2.2 Approvals for legal orders and notices for both projects will be the subject of a Local Committee report on 29 September 2014. Subject to agreement, these would be advertised during the 'autumn/winter' period.

3. OPTIONS:

- 3.1 A consultation was undertaken over an 8-week period Monday 14 October to Sunday 8 December 2013 on what was considered to be the most suitable scheme for both the Runnymede roundabout and the Egham sustainable transport package. However, the consultation has allowed for people and

businesses to express their ideas on minor amendments to the proposals that have already been developed.

- 3.2 This style of consultation, allows us to be forewarned about any potential issues, which could be designed out during the development process.
- 3.3 We also looked for support for the two projects, which can then be reflected within the detailed business case.

4. CONSULTATIONS:

- 4.1 A consultation took place from Monday 14 October to Sunday 8 December 2013 and the summary of the feedback is attached in Annex A. These details were presented to the Member Task Group on 20 January 2014.
- 4.2 Overall the support was considered very good for both projects and this will be included within the Business cases for both projects.

5. FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS:

- 5.1 The detailed business case for the schemes that are to be submitted will require, as part of the business case, value for money statements, derived through the calculation of the benefit cost ratio.
- 5.2 The current estimated cost for each project is as follows:
 - Runnymede roundabout £4.8 million (grant fund £3.60 million and local contribution requirement £1.20 million).
 - Egham sustainable transport package £3.7 million (grant fund £2.78 million and local contribution £0.93 million)
- 5.3 With the above estimates in mind, the local contribution must be available at the time of submission of the Business cases for each project. Funding from other sources has been investigated such as developer section 106 / section 278 etc, but both projects are lacking funding in this area with only the Egham sustainable transport package having £0.1 million available.
- 5.4 Funding for the local contribution is also being sought from elsewhere, but some financial support from the Local Committee capital budget would be welcomed and would assist in negotiations with other potential sources.
- 5.5 With this in mind, it is recommended that the Area Team Manager is authorised to agree to a fixed sum of funding, if appropriate, from the Local Committee capital budget for the financial years 2015/16 and 2016/17 in conjunction with the Chairman, Vice Chairman, the Member Task Group for Egham Majors, and the Project Manager.
- 5.6 The sum agreed will be reported to the next available Local Committee.

6. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS:
--

- 6.1 It is the objective of Surrey Highways to treat all users of the public highway equally and with understanding. An Equalities Impact Assessment will be carried out for each Major scheme as part of the detailed business case.

7. LOCALISM:

- 7.1 The headline benefits for the Major schemes within Egham are as follows:
- Boosting economic growth by;
 - Tackling congestion
 - Improved journey time reliability
 - Reduced journey times
 - Reduced vehicle operating costs
 - Increased walking and cycling
 - Improved connectivity from business areas to railway stations

8. OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

.Area assessed:	Direct Implications:
Crime and Disorder	No significant implications arising from this report
Sustainability (including Climate Change and Carbon Emissions)	Set out below
Corporate Parenting/Looked After Children	No significant implications arising from this report
Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults	No significant implications arising from this report
Public Health	Set out below.

Sustainability and Public Health implications

- 8.1 Increased walking and cycling, where it replaces motorised forms of transport such as the car, will improve air quality and reduce carbon emission levels, which is a key objective of the Surrey LTP. Passenger transport and modal shift from the car to buses/rail are a further key objective of the Surrey LTP.
- 8.2 Transport is responsible for one third of carbon emission in Surrey. Surrey's Local Transport Plan has a target to reduce carbon emissions from (non-motorway) transport by 10% (absolute emissions) by 2020, increasing to 25% reduction by 2035 from 2007 baseline of 2,114k tonnes.
- 8.3 Increased walking and cycling has a positive impact on the health of a person. The NHS identifies cycling as an activity which provides significant health benefits. The emerging Surrey Health and Well-being Strategy has identified obesity as one of the priority public health challenges.
- 8.4 The whole project including the improved walking and cycling facilities will be marketed to residents and businesses and cycle training will be offered to those less confident of cycling to encourage take up and to maximise the benefits of the new infrastructure.

- 8.5 It is also expected that increased levels of walking and cycling to and around the town centre will have a positive effect on Egham's retail economy with recent studies suggesting that pedestrians and cyclists actually spend more on a trip into a town than a motorist.

9. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 9.1 Work has been carried out on both the Runnymede roundabout and the Egham sustainable transport package schemes to an initial design stage and the detailed design for each project has recently begun.
- 9.2 The Local Committee are asked to note the progress made so far with the two major project schemes located in the Egham area.
- 9.3 The results of the consultation have been very helpful and provided us with support for the schemes locally and with businesses.
- 9.4 There is a requirement by the EM3 to provide at least 25% local contribution funding. Whilst this can be obtained through several sources, there is a significant shortfall for both projects in Runnymede, with zero currently allocated to Runnymede roundabout and only £0.1 million allocated to the Egham sustainable transport package.
- 9.5 With this in mind, the Local Committee are asked, through delegated authority, to consider what, if any financial contribution they could make towards the two schemes during 2015/16 and 2016/17 financial years from the Local Committee capital budget.

10. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

- 10.1 Subject to the approval of this Local Committee, through delegated authority, for some funding towards these two schemes, this would be added towards the funding requirement for the Financial case section of the full Business case.
- 10.2 The Business case for both projects is due to be submitted to the EM3 LEP by 30 September 2014, and if successful works on both schemes should commence next financial year.

Contact Officer: Paul Fishwick
Job title Project Manager, Transport Policy
Contact number 03456 009 009

Consulted:

Surrey County Council officers: Lyndon Mendes, David Stempfer, Andrew Merritt, Caroline Tuttle, Andrew Milne, David Ligertwood
Runnymede Borough Council officer: Steve Fuggles
Runnymede Major Schemes Member Task Group (20th January 2014).

Annexes: Annex A

Sources/background papers:

EM3 LTB Major schemes submissions (July 2013), DfT letter dated 18th July 2013.
EM3 Expressions of Interest (February 2014), Consultation Monday 14th October to Sunday 8th December 2013

This page is intentionally left blank

Delegated Member meeting

Notes 8th September 2014

Meeting held at Runnymede Borough Council Civic Offices, Members Room

Present: County Members Chris Norman (Chairman) and Marisa Heath. Borough Member Alan Alderson

Officers; Andrew Milne and Paul Fishwick

Apologies: County Member Yvonna Lay and Borough Member Patrick Roberts

Purpose of meeting; To determine what contribution should be made to the major schemes within the Runnymede area from the 2015/16 and 2016/17 Local Committee Capital budgets.

Background;

At the Local Committee meeting held on 9 June 2014 (item 9) (minute ref 33/14) a request was made for the Committee to contribute capital funding towards major schemes in the Runnymede area from the 2015/16 and 2016/17 budgets.

The Committee determined that up to £50,000 per annum should be made available and this decision should be delegated to the Area Team Manager (NW), in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman, the Member Task Group for Egham Major Schemes, and the Project Manager.

Analysis

Members were updated on the two Runnymede area major schemes and the requirement by the LEP that 25% of the total scheme cost should be met by local contribution.

Following a discussion and, based on the consensus views of those members present, it was decided that no Committee funding should be allocated for this purpose. However, it was recognised that there is considerable support from Members for the major schemes in progress, but also that the present level of Committee capital funding is limited, and any reduction in it over the next couple of years would have a significant impact on the Committee's ability to respond to local needs.

This page is intentionally left blank

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**LOCAL COMMITTEE (RUNNYMEDE)****DATE: 29 SEPTEMBER 2014****LEAD OFFICER: ANDREW MILNE – AREA HIGHWAYS MANAGER (NW)****SUBJECT: HIGHWAYS UPDATE****DIVISION: ALL****SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

To report progress made with the delivery of proposed highways schemes, developer funded schemes, and revenue funded works for the 2014/15 financial year.

To provide an update on the latest budgetary position for highway schemes, revenue maintenance and Community Enhancement expenditure.

To highlight other Highways service related matters.

RECOMMENDATIONS:**The Local Committee (Runnymede) is asked to:**

- (i) Note the progress with schemes and revenue funded works for the 2014/15 financial year.
- (ii) Note the budgetary position.
- (iii) Note that a further Highways Update will be brought to the next meeting of this Committee.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

The above recommendations are made to enable progression of all highway related schemes and works.

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:

- 1.1 Surrey County Council's Local Transport Plan (LTP) states the aim of improving the highway network for all users, through measures such as reducing congestion, improving accessibility, reducing personal injury accidents, improving the environment and maintaining the highway network so that it is safe for all users.

2. ANALYSIS:

2.1 Capital works for 2014/15

- 2.1.1 Following the Committee meeting held on 2 December 2013, it was agreed that the full anticipated 2014/15 capital allocation (ITS and maintenance) of £266,572 be committed to the installation of the pedestrian improvements at the junction of A30 Egham Hill/London Road with St Jude's Road and Bakeham Lane.
- 2.1.2 Phase 1 (site clearance works) of this scheme has been completed. Phase 2 (relocation of utility apparatus and drainage works) is still in progress. Drainage improvement works are partially complete and ducts have been installed ready for utility equipment to be relocated. The mobile phone mast has been relocated and the remainder of the utility works are due to be completed by the end of October 2014. Phase 3 (road widening/enlarging refuges/installing signal equipment) will then commence in November and is expected to be completed by February 2014.
- 2.1.3 If, for any reason, the anticipated 2014/15 capital allocation is not fully utilised for this project, then the ITS and capital maintenance proposals shown in Tables 1 and 2 have been agreed as contingency works.

Project	Budget estimate (£k)	Details
Annual Parking Review	10	Implementation of the recommendations of the 2013 parking review.
Low cost measures	10	To enable delivery of small items such as responding to requests for new dropped kerbs or signage during the course of the year.
Total	20	

Table 1 – 2014/15 ITS Programme (Contingency)

Location	Cost (£)	Comment
B386 Holloway Hill	80,500	
D3160 Langton Way	11,000	
D3069 Faris Barn Drive	13,000	
D3178 Oak Tree Close	73,500	Possible 2 year programme.
Total	178,000	

Table 2 – 2014/15 LSR Programme (Contingency)**2.2 Revenue maintenance allocations and expenditure 2014/15**

2.2.1 The 2014/15 revenue maintenance allocation for Runnymede is £210,025. Table 3 shows how these funds were allocated and the spend progress to date.

Item	Allocation (£)	Committed Spend to date (£)
Drainage / ditching	60,000	38,795
Carriageway and footway patching	80,025	49,971
Vegetation works	30,000	24,415
Signs and markings	20,000	1,056
Low cost measures	20,000	16,541
Contractor OHP	Included in allocation figures	7,069
Total	£210,025	£137,847 committed

Table 3 – 2014/15 Revenue Maintenance Expenditure**2.3 Community Enhancement Fund**

2.3.1 The total 2014/15 Community Enhancement allocation for Runnymede was £30,000. Committee have previously determined to divide this fund equally between County Councillor Committee Members. A summary of spend progress is shown in Table 4.

2.3.2 County Members have all agreed that their allocations are used to fund a programme of repairs and upgrades to illuminated bollards across the Borough. This programme of works is currently being delivered.

Member	Allocation (£)	Spend to date (£)
Chris Norman	5,000	5,000 committed.
Yvonna Lay	5,000	5,000 committed
John Furey	5,000	5,000 committed.
Mel Few	5,000	5,000 committed.
Marisa Heath	5,000	5,000 committed.
Mary Angell	5,000	5,000 committed.
Total	30,000	30,000 committed

Table 4 – 2014/15 Community Enhancement Fund spend progress

2.3 OTHER HIGHWAY RELATED MATTERS

2.3.1 Magna Carta Highway Measures

Work on designing and implementing the agreed highways improvements is progressing. 3 new refuges were installed in conjunction with the resurfacing works recently completed in Windsor Road. The speed limit assessment has been completed and has confirmed that a reduced speed limit of 40mph can be introduced. Surrey Police has no objection to the proposal and therefore SCC is currently advertising its intention to introduce a 40mph speed limit. The new speed limit is expected to be introduced in October 2014 (subject to the consideration of any objections received). Detailed design of the proposed signalised pedestrian crossing near the National Trust Tea Rooms is substantially complete.

2.3.2 Parking Update

The Traffic Regulation Orders were made on 18 July 2014 for the parking restrictions agreed following the 2013-14 parking review and the signing/lining works have now been completed.

Site visits for the 2014/15 parking review will be undertaken during September/October 2014. The recommendations of the review are then due to be reported to the Local Committee at its meeting in December 2014.

2.3.2 Customer Enquiry Responses

The second quarter of the year has seen a reduction in the level of enquiries compared to the extremely high volume during the first quarter. This is mainly due to the better weather. For the first half of the year 87775 enquiries have been received, giving an average of almost 14600 per month for the calendar year, down from 19000.

For Runnymede specifically, 4129 enquiries have been received since January of which 2205 were directed to the local area office for action, 96% of these have been resolved. This response rate is slightly above the countywide average of 95%. Although the response rate remains high, we are working hard in conjunction with our contractors to improve and also reduce the need for customers to chase for an answer.

The reduction in customer contacts has also been reflected in the volume of complaints received, 208 for the 6 months to the end of June compared to 143 for the first quarter. The North West area including Runnymede have received 28 stage 1 complaints. The main reasons for these being communication and the failure to carry out works to either the required standard or timescale.

The Service is reviewing the customer service Key Performance Indicators and is particularly looking at advance notification of works on the highway through our Customer Stakeholder Engagement Plan.

3. OPTIONS:

3.1 Options, where applicable, are presented in this report.

4. CONSULTATIONS:

- 4.1 Consultation is routinely carried out for highway-related schemes with relevant key parties, including residents, Local Members, Surrey Police and Safety Engineering. Specific details regarding consultation and any arising legal issues are included in individual scheme reports as appropriate.

5. FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS:

- 5.1 Proposed ITS schemes are prioritised to ensure that the maximum public benefit is gained from any funding made available. So far as is practicable, officer proposals follow the countywide scheme assessment process (CASEM) and the prioritisation order determined by this.
- 5.2 The Committee Capital and Revenue Maintenance budgets are used to target the most urgent sites where a specific need arises, to keep up with general maintenance activities that reduce the need for expensive repairs in the future, and to support local priorities. The nature of these works is such that spend may vary slightly from that indicated.

6. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS:

- 6.1 It is an objective of Surrey Highways to treat all users of the public highway equally and with understanding. An Equalities Impact Assessment is undertaken for each Integrated Transport Scheme as part of the design process.

7. LOCALISM:

- 7.1 Through the views and needs expressed by local communities, and accommodating where possible the involvement of local communities in looking after the public highway, localism is routinely considered as part of the consultation and bidding processes for highway-related works. Specific details regarding localism are included in individual reports as appropriate.

8. OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

- 8.1 Other implications, such as the contribution that a well-managed highway network can give to reducing crime and disorder, are considered in relation to individual schemes, and specific details are included in individual reports as appropriate.

Area assessed:	Direct Implications:
Crime and Disorder	No significant implications arising from this report.
Sustainability (including Climate Change and Carbon Emissions)	No significant implications arising from this report.
Corporate Parenting/Looked After Children	No significant implications arising from this report.
Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults	No significant implications arising from this report.
Public Health	No significant implications arising from this report.

9. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 9.1 The Committee is asked to note the progress with all schemes and budgets.
- 9.2 It is recommended that a further Highways Update is presented at the next meeting of this Committee.

10. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

- 10.1 Officers will continue to progress delivery of all schemes and ensure effective use of all budgets.

Contact Officer:

Jason Gosden, Senior Engineer (NW) – 0300 200 1003

Consulted:

-

Annexes: 0

-

Sources/background papers:

-

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE (RUNNYMEDE)

DATE: 29 SEPTEMBER 2014

LEAD OFFICER: SYLVIA CARTER, COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIPS OFFICER

SUBJECT: ANNUAL REPORT ON THE SAFER RUNNYMEDE PARTNERSHIP

DIVISION: RUNNYMEDE



SUMMARY OF ISSUE:

To provide an update on the activity and impact of the Safer Runnymede community safety partnership in the year 2013/14.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Local Committee (Runnymede) is asked to:

- (i) Note the contents of the report and the progress made in 2013/14.
- ii) Agree that the community safety budget of £3,294 delegated to the Local Committee be transferred to the Community Partnership Manager to authorise expenditure, in line with the proposals set out in paragraph 5.3 of this report.
- iii) agree that a report will be brought to the Local Committee at its June 2015 meeting confirming which projects were funded.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

The delegation of the community safety funding is recommended to facilitate timely decision making when allocating funding to addressing crime and disorder in Runnymede. Details of suggested projects for expenditure are laid out in the report (5.3).

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:

1.1 The 1998 Crime and Disorder Act gave local agencies shared responsibility for developing and introducing strategies to reduce crime and disorder in their area. The agencies come together as the Community Safety Partnership (CSP), known as the Safer Runnymede Partnership. Statutory members include:

- a. Surrey Police
- b. Runnymede Borough Council
- c. Surrey County Council
- d. Surrey Fire and Rescue Service
- e. Surrey and Sussex Probation Trust
- f. Partners from Health.

1.2 A Surrey County Councillor sits on the Community Safety Partnership alongside an officer from the Community Partnerships Team. They contribute to the debates and influence decisions which will affect local residents in Runnymede and report back to the Local Committee, as appropriate.

Police and Crime Commissioner

1.3 Kevin Hurley, the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) for Surrey, was elected on 15 November 2012. He is responsible for overseeing the work of Surrey Police, holding the Chief Constable to account and helping to tackle the crime issues.

1.4 The PCC has overall responsibility for reducing crime and disorder, working with CSPs and criminal justice partners to achieve their objectives. The PCC is able to call CSP chairmen to meetings, request reports and commission services. From April 2013 the Community Safety Fund was transferred to the PCC to support this change of arrangements, and several Runnymede projects have bid successfully for PCC funding over the last year.

1.5 The first local Police and Crime Summit was held in Runnymede in February 2014 and was attended by a large number of partner agencies and residents, with total attendance around 100. The principal issues of concern, as voted on by those present, were in line with other local survey results:

1. Anti-social, inconsiderate and dangerous driving
2. Dog fouling
3. Anti-social and inconsiderate parking
4. Cycling and skate-boarding on pavements

However, the issue of fraud was also raised as a concern, including bank fraud and identity theft. These crimes are now dealt with by a central agency funded by the Home Office, as many cases of fraud are perpetrated online or beyond local boundaries. For more information and data for Surrey, see www.actionfraud.police.uk

1.6 Further information on the PCC is available via <http://www.surrey-pcc.gov.uk>

2. ANALYSIS:

2.1 The Safer Runnymede Partnership undertook its annual strategic assessment of crime, disorder and anti-social behaviour in the borough in 2013. This informed an update to the Safer Runnymede Partnership Plan which identifies the key community safety priorities for 2013/14, set out in **Annex 2**.

2.2 Crime trends

2.3 Reducing crime (total notifiable offences), increasing the detection rate and building public confidence were the focus for Surrey Police over the past year. The most recent available crime data, produced monthly, is included at **Annex 1** (borough totals by category, August 2014 release) and compares reports for 2013/14 with the year 2014/15 to date. (The crime categories included in Serious Acquisitive Crime include dwelling burglaries, theft of and from motor vehicles, robbery and aggravated vehicle taking). Serious violent crime includes murder, attempted murder and grievous bodily harm (GBH).

- a. The overall number of offences reported in the borough has remained largely static over the preceding two years.
- b. Serious acquisitive crime has fallen slightly again, with the greatest reduction in domestic burglaries which have reduced by one third;
- c. Vehicle crime has risen (in line with an improved economic climate) with 27 more offences compared to this time last year.
- d. There has been an increase in violence with injury reports (43 more than last year), whilst the number of violence without injury incidents has remained similar to the previous year. Many of these reports relate to domestic abuse in the home, where people are actively encouraged to report incidents, in order to get help and advice.

2.4 Overall, crime figures in Runnymede are broadly similar to the previous year, and remain at a historic low. The detection rate for crimes reported in Runnymede is one of the highest in the county, with around 1 in 3 crimes having been detected and resolved over the last year. Surrey is still one of the safest counties in England.

2.5 Residents can report criminal behaviour or incidents to the Surrey Police Safer Neighbourhood Team on 101, or if it is a genuine emergency call 999. Details of the local team are included in full via www.surrey.police.uk

Partnership success in 2013/14

2.6 The Joint Action Group (JAG) examines reports of anti social behaviour on a geographic or crime type basis and identifies partnership actions to address problems. Over the year in question the group have looked at a number of locations including Addlestone Town, Row Town, Chertsey, Coopers Hill (Englefield Green) and Egham. Despite the flooding in February which displaced households, there was no discernible increase in thefts but police patrols in Egham Hythe were increased.

- 2.7 A range of interventions have been put in place including the Designated Public Places Order (to restrict alcohol consumption in public in Addlestone) and “crack house closure” orders. However, in the majority of incidences anti-social behaviour has been nipped in the bud through a co-ordinated partnership approach including issuing warning letters and cautions.

The Community Incident Action Group (CIAG), which focuses on individuals whose behaviour is having a negative impact on the community, continued to monitor incidents. At March 2013 there were a total of seven ASBO's in place. ASBO recipients are reviewed quarterly to assess progress or developments and adjustments to the ASBO's are made accordingly. The CIAG reports quarterly to the Community Safety Partnership and at the end of the year there were five individuals on CIAG.

Interventions used included warning letters, Acceptable Behaviour Contracts, housing related enforcement, referrals to support agencies, diversionary activities, informal mentoring, rewards and incentives.

- 2.8 There was a range of activities to deal with speeding, anti-social driving and road casualty reductions during the year. These include: Drive Smart events, REEDs days and School Speedwatch. These events are undertaken once a month. Community Speedwatch is supported plus local officers undertake speed enforcement where community concerns are recorded. These are managed on a rolling programme of work. Over-arching this local work is the Roads Policing Unit's work, the ANPR (Automatic Number Plate Recognition) team and Safer Runnymede.

- 2.10 In October 2013 another successful Junior Citizen programme was delivered to young people aged 10-11 in Year 6 from all primary schools across the borough. This was hosted by Chertsey Fire Station and supported by Runnymede Borough Council, Surrey Police, Surrey Fire and Rescue. The Junior Citizen scheme provides a series of safety awareness sessions over a morning or afternoon. Each session is divided into a range of interactive scenarios experienced in small group, covering roads, on-line, home, first-aid, water, fire, and railway safety and includes instructions on how to make a 999 call. This helps them to develop their skills in managing risk and making decisions about important day-to-day situations.

- 2.11 Domestic Abuse outreach continued to be provided by yourSanctuary, which is contracted by Surrey County Council and partners to provide this service, as part of a county-wide consortium, in three boroughs in North West Surrey. The majority of those seeking help were female (88-89%) and in 49% of cases the abuse was perpetrated by an ex-partner. Individuals can contact this service for advice on 01483 776822, or see www.surreyagainstda.info

- 2.12 In December 2013 the Community Safety Manager for Runnymede BC retired from the post and following an interim period, a new officer was appointed and took up the role in June 2014.

- 2.13 The Family Support Programme was launched in summer 2013 in Runnymede and Surrey Heath, and the number of cases nominated has been higher than originally anticipated, such that the team will shortly have a base in the Civic Centre rather than being situated at Surrey Heath Borough Council and visiting from there. Surrey's approach to Family Support (known nationally as the Troubled Families initiative) has won praise from the national lead, Louise Casey.

3. OPTIONS:

The report sets out a number of actions and initiatives which have taken place over the past year to address priorities identified within the Safer Runnymede Partnership Plan. As well as mainstreamed resources, Surrey County Council has made available £3,294 to the Local Committee for addressing Community Safety issues through designated projects.

4. CONSULTATIONS:

- 4.1 Surrey Police conduct regular neighbourhood panel meetings at local level with members of the public, as part of the neighbourhoods' agenda. The Safer Runnymede Partnership Plan is reviewed at each community safety partnership meeting (held quarterly).
- 4.2 It is intended that there will be an annual Police Crime Summit within the Borough to give residents an opportunity to feed back to a range of agencies, to take place in Spring 2015.

5. FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS:

- 5.1 In 2013/14 **£3,226** was received by the community safety partnership from the Local Committee for community safety work in the borough. This was allocated to the costs of signage for the no public drinking zones, advertising notices to residents, and contributing to the cost of the three-yearly Community Safety Survey. Additional funding to the Partnership from other sources for one off projects included £1,100 for the QR code project, and £2,550 from the Police and Crime Commissioners Office for SCAM leaflets and the Junior Citizen event. Other crime and disorder funding was secured via 106 developer monies for specific projects such as new CCTV cameras.
- 5.2 In addition to the above funding, the domestic abuse outreach service provided locally by yourSanctuary was and is funded by Surrey Police, the Police and Crime Commissioner, and Surrey County Council.
- 5.3 In 2014/15, **£3 294** is available from Surrey County Council for community safety work in Runnymede. It is proposed that this should be allocated to:
- * Community Safety Plan 2014-17 printed booklets for the public;
 - * Publications to highlight how the new Community Trigger will work;
 - * Prevent (counter-terrorism) awareness day planned for school and other professionals to advise them on what to look out for.

Members are invited to comment on this proposed expenditure.

6. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS:

- 6.1 Funding is provided countywide for a domestic abuse outreach service which is provided and managed county-wide by Surrey’s Community Safety Unit.
- 6.2 Steps are taken to ensure that the Neighbourhood Panel meetings are accessible for all and hard to reach groups are targeted. Surrey Police has a minicom number - 01483 53 99 99.
- 6.3 Incidents of hate crime are monitored carefully by Surrey Police.

7. LOCALISM:

- 7.1 The Safer Runnymede Partnership aims to make all communities in the borough a safe and pleasant place to live. Where issues arise, the partners work together, with residents as appropriate, to address them.

8. OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

Area assessed:	Direct Implications:
Crime and Disorder	Set out below.
Sustainability (including Climate Change and Carbon Emissions)	No significant implications arising from this report
Corporate Parenting/Looked After Children	No significant implications arising from this report
Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults	No significant implications arising from this report
Public Health	No significant implications arising from this report

8.1 Crime and Disorder implications

The production of the strategic assessment and the publication of the Partnership Plan fulfil some of the statutory requirements of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998.

9. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 9.1 There has been continued positive work by the Safer Runnymede Partnership to address community safety issues within the borough over the past year.
- 9.2 Members are asked to
 - a. note the contents of the report,
 - b. agree that the community safety budget of £3,294 delegated to the Local Committee be transferred to the Partnership and the Community Partnership Manager, to authorise its expenditure in accordance with the Local Committee’s decision.

www.surreycc.gov.uk/runnymede

10. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

Partners have reassessed the priorities for the Safer Runnymede Partnership and will work to continue to address these during the coming year.

The Community Partnership Team will transfer the Community Safety funding in accordance with the decision of the Local Committee.

Contact Officer:

Sylvia Carter, Community Partnership and Committee Officer, Surrey County Council
Shazia Salwar, Community Safety Officer, Runnymede BC;
Neighbourhood Inspector Roger Nield, Surrey Police.

Annexes:

Annex 1 – Crime data for year to date

Annex 2 - Partnership Plan 2014

Sources/background papers:

- Safer Runnymede Annual Report 2013-14
 - Quarterly Community Safety reports to the Partnership
-

ANNEX 1 – CRIME DATA

**Notifiable offences for Runnymede Borough
Financial Year to Date: July 2013 to July 2014**

CRIME for Runnymede fytd (July-2014)			
Category	FYTD 2014-15	FYTD 2013-14	%
Criminal damage	144	195	- 26.2%
Domestic burglary	46	68	-32.4%
Drug offences	131	110	19.1%
Fraud and forgery	2	3	-33%
Violence with injury	121	78	55.1%
Non-domestic burglary	76	78	-2.6%
Other criminal offences	54	32	68%
Other violence against the person (without injury)	202	203	0.5%
Robbery	8	8	0%
Serious Sexual offences	26	9	188.9%
Theft (other than vehicle) & handling stolen goods	332	361	-8%
Vehicle crime (excluding interference)	102	83	22.9%
Vehicle interference and tampering	11	9	22.2%
Serious Acquisitive	156	159	-1.9%
Serious Violence and acquisitive	277	237	16.9%
TNO (total notifiable offences)	1262	1242	1.6%

ACTION PLAN FOR RUNNYMEDE 2014/15.

Identified Priority	Current or proposed response	Agency	Current position	Target or expected outcome
Road related concerns				
Reduce congestion	Continue to run Yellow school buses, which along with other initiatives takes 250,000 car journeys per year off local roads.	Runnymede Business Partnership with RBC	Seven buses carry 500 students to 4 secondary schools daily. 410 pupils use the service daily which based on a 36 week school year and a return trip is 147,600 individual car journeys saved.	Maintain service and promote to new intake of year 7 Continue to negotiate income through agreements with developers and business sponsors. Advise the PCC of the value of the service as there is less ASB and RTC's around schools at the start and end of the day.
	Work with businesses to reduce employee and business car mileage	RBC /SCC	Travel plans negotiated with developers	Continue to require sustainable transport plans
Reduce antisocial use of motor vehicles.	A comprehensive Drive SMART Road Safety and anti-social driving campaign,	SCC/Police primarily + Borough & Fire service involvement if resources are available	No of Vehicle nuisance/ inappropriate use incidents reported	In line with Drive SMART: *Reduce anti-social driving on Surrey's roads; *Increase public confidence that Surrey

	which aims to reduce road casualties and anti-social driving.		to Police in 2013/14 = 387	County Council and Surrey Police will work together to tackle anti-social driving; and to Locally reduce the number of reported incidents
	Promote and participate in REEDs days (Roadside Education Engagement Days)	All	2013/14 2 days undertaken	These will continue to be supported
	SFRS will continue to deliver Road Traffic Collision reduction initiatives and will include aspects of Anti-Social use of motor vehicles.	SF & R service	In 2013/14 939 young people attended safe drive stay alive from 5 schools, youth support service and alternative learning programme	Continue to deliver the programme
	Surrey County Council's Local Committee will consider new locations for on-street parking control. And Highways	SCC (RBC enforcing)	Local committee reviews parking restrictions on an annual basis. Last report in Sept 2013 identified a number of new	This will continue to be reviewed on an annual basis.

	schemes to reduce the risk of accidents.	SCC	areas. On street parking restrictions are enforced by the Runnymede team.	
Address speeding issues	REEDs days (Roadside Education Engagement Days) & PAD's (Public Action Days – Police led and can be used to educate in the same way as REED's but there are few REED's appropriate venues in Runnymede)	All	12 in 2013/14	These were successful in addressing the key priority of anti-social use of motor vehicles and will continue.
	Enforcement by Casualty Reduction	Police	There were 103 hours of work	Continue to deliver the programme

	Officer		undertaken by the CRO/RPCSO team. This supported the community speed watch scheme	
	Encourage Community Speed watch	Police	3 schemes in 2013/14	Well run and effective and will continue to be run.
	Undertake school speed watch sessions	Police	9 sessions in 2013/14	As above
Tackle antisocial parking	Parking enforcement staff are directed to problem areas by public complaints and CCTV monitoring	RBC (acting as agents for SCC) and Police	Complaints responded to when received	Ensure that 'hotspots' are targeted
	Monitor through Police survey how much of a problem Anti Social Parking is.	Police	Joint meeting held, plan in place for enforcement and publicity	School drop off and pick up points tend to be difficult points. Work with head at the start of term and use the media. Also take on comments of parents and Councilors
	Concentrate on main area where complaints received (currently A30 by	All	Actions in place from 2012	Fewer complaints in the last year.

	Royal Park)			
Working together to reduce Crime				
Reduce levels of crime in Runnymede.	Continue partnership working Address arising issues via JAG Proactive policing operations Divert potential offenders using JC, YES, BIZ, PCYP, Joint engagement and media events/briefings	All Agencies All Agencies	Crime levels remain low with obvious fluctuation during seasonal periods and when known offenders are in the community. Total Notifiable offences for 2013/14 was 3631 falling from 4040 with 29.1% detected.	Ensure appropriate cases are referred to CIAG & JAG. Highlight & encourage Agencies not participating to be represented. At the end of the 2013/14 year there were 5 people on CIAG and 3 priority areas for JAG these being Addlestone Town Centre, ECO village and flooding recovery work in particular around Egham Hythe. Improve detections
Reduce serious acquisitive and serious violent crime incidents.	Target Identified hot-spots and known offenders via CIAG, JAG, IOMU & POMPP Retain focus on Domestic Abuse	All Agencies	Burglary Dwelling 224 down 98 Burglary other 265 down 71 Vehicle Crime 288 down 94 Violence with injury 546 up 16	Injury stats are up but this is an area of focus. Encouraging more DA victims to report. Continuing this downward trend is going to be difficult to maintain with changes to policing.

			Criminal damage 555 down 64	
Reduce repeat instances of Domestic Abuse	Focus on repeat offenders and support repeat victims	All Agencies using MARAC process & IDAP (Integrated Domestic Abuse Programme) & DA SAR (Domestic Abuse Specified Activity Requirement)		

Reducing Drug and Alcohol Misuse

Reduce level of drug & alcohol related crime	Act on information received via JAG, CIAG & Police processes.	All agencies	6 crack house closures and 400 offences down 5.	To continue the joint agency working, and target perpetrators
	Use JAG information to target Ion tracker activity		Number of times ION tracker used 37 in 2013/14	
Increase the number of	Promote those treatment services	All partners		Monitor and promote services at every opportunity

people receiving treatment for drug and alcohol issues,	delivering best results, following advice given by the DAAT Provide information about making sensible choices and support alcohol awareness week (Autumn 2013) Diversion of potential subjects via the BIZ/early intervention schemes, education	NHS Surrey/DAAT & all agencies (if resources allow) All Agencies	In 2012/13, 329 or 0.58% of the Boroughs population were in treatment over the year. Surrey wide figure is 0.55%. The split in use was 64% drugs, 36% alcohol.	
Reduction of alcohol consumption	Monitor and respond to trends and patterns as they emerge. Work with partners to give correct and most up to date advice.	Health Colleagues, treatment agencies, DAAT and all partner agencies	Working with Health colleagues and treatment agencies on appropriate messages and events	To continue the current work – DPPO's are still operating Chertsey and Addlestone Runnymede Alcohol and Teenage Pregnancy Reduction Strategy launched to encourage greater parental responsibility and reduce young people's alcohol intake – group responsible for implementation the Runnymede Health and Wellbeing Task Group
Anti Social				

Behaviour & Public Disorder				
Reduce Anti Social Behaviour (ASB) including repeat reports.	Speed of response & accessible / variable reporting avenues Highlight the negative effects of ASB on all occasions when engaging with Youth Groups. Maintain pressure on anti-social driving through Drive SMART Use ICAD preventatively	RBC All agencies Primarily SCC & Police	Number of ASB reports received by RBC in 2013/14 was 1761 compared to 1817 in 2012/13	Continue proportionate and appropriate response
Prevent young people from entering the criminal justice system	Support delivery of the Youth Local Prevention Framework, to prevent, support and divert young people away from ASB	SCC	9 first-time entrants to the youth justice system in 2013/14, the same as 2012/13 and fewer than 15 in 2011/12	Using the Community Hubs in the areas of relative deprivation engage with young people via youth cafes/alternative activities and raise aspirations in terms of training and employment – relative deprivation task groups led by Runnymede Borough Council lead on this.

			<p>29 disposals given to young people as a result of offending in 2013/14 compared to 33 in 2012/13</p> <p>65 Youth Restorative Interventions (YRIs) employed with young people involved in low-level offending this year, compared to 82 last year</p>	
Encourage rt services for victims.				
Increase levels of DA reporting.	Surrey County Council & RBC services will continue to train staff to encourage individuals to report domestic abuse and seek appropriate support, whilst safeguarding any	<p>SCC , Children, Schools and Families Directorate primarily +RBC staff as appropriate</p> <p>All agencies</p> <p>All agencies</p>	Incidents of Domestic abuse reported to Police	<p>Continue current work</p> <p>There has been an increase in disclosures at the Forest Estate Community Hub at the fun days resulting in the Children's Centre working with these families. Again the task groups in the areas of relative deprivation can lead on this and are happy to join in any raising awareness campaigns.</p> <p>There is still generally an under reporting of DA.</p>

		children involved. Raise public awareness through joint media briefings. Report success, clearer signposting from all agencies towards support services - reporting of more incidents.			
Increase support available to children of Domestic Abuse		Explore County wide support services and increase access for children. Support the seeking of resources to continue and develop the "Feeling Safe" work piloted in Children's centres.			What is needed for these children so we can provide it via the task groups in the areas of relative deprivation and put this in the Runnymede Young People's Mental Health Pilot recommended actions.
Advertise support services more widely		Actively promote mediation, victim support, DA support services and other support groups meeting locally for all victims	All agencies	Links on community safety web pages and leaflets available to hand to victims. RBC e-newsletter.	Continue with current response and look for new social network opportunities

Encourage good citizenship				
Promote inclusion activities for young people	Encourage young people into education by the various options available	All agencies		Monitor current activities and encourage Referrals to CRISP (inclusion project) What has been delivered locally through YSS, LPF, Junior Citizen, Youth Centre, Youth Festival, Youth Council. This has been the approach at the Forest Estate Community Hub by putting on activities for 8-13 year olds as this age group was identified by the Police on the estate as 'getting into trouble' as there was nothing to do. The other task groups in relative deprivation can target age groups identified by the Police.
Encourage community groups - Neighbourhood Watch, residents associations	Promote groups via agency websites, facilitate meetings & encourage networking & training opportunities	All agencies		The Forest Estate Community Group was set up, which resulted in the Forest Estate Community Hub. There are plans to set up an Egham Hythe Community Group with the launch of the youth portacabin in Pooley Green.
Support Junior Citizen scheme	Offer & deliver the scheme to all year 6 children in the Borough over 2 week period	Police, SF&R SCC & RBC	Numbers who attended in 2013 was 766 from 15 schools	Deliver again Oct/Nov 2014 to be offered to all Runnymede Schools with year 6 pupils.

This page is intentionally left blank

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE (RUNNYMEDE)

DATE: 29 SEPTEMBER 2014

LEAD

OFFICER: SANDRA BROWN / MICHELLE COLLINS

SUBJECT: LOCAL COMMITTEE & MEMBERS' ALLOCATION FUNDING -
UPDATE

DIVISION: ALL

**SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

Surrey County Council Councillors receive funding to spend on local projects that help to promote social, economic or environmental well-being in the neighbourhoods and communities of Surrey. This funding is known as Members' Allocation.

For the financial year 2014/15 the County Council has allocated £10,300 revenue funding to each County Councillor and £35,000 capital funding to each Local Committee. This report provides an update on the projects that have been funded since April 2014 to date.

RECOMMENDATIONS:**The Local Committee (Runnymede) is asked to note:**

- (i) The amounts that have been spent from the Members' Allocation and Local Committee capital budgets, as set out in **Annex 1** of this report.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

The allocation of the Committee's budgets is intended to enhance the wellbeing of residents and make the best possible use of the funds. Greater transparency in the use of public funds is achieved with the publication of what Members' Allocation funding has been spent on.

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:

- 1.1 The County Council's Constitution sets out the overall Financial Framework for managing the Local Committee's delegated budgets and directs that this funding should be spent on local projects that promote the social, environmental and economic well-being of the area.
- 1.2 In allocating funds councillors are asked to have regard to Surrey County Council's Corporate Strategy 2010-14 Making A Difference that highlights five themes which make Surrey special and which it seeks to maintain:
- A safe place to live;
 - A high standard of education;
 - A beautiful environment;
 - A vibrant economy;
 - A healthy population
- 1.3 As with all expenditure by the Council, spending of members' allocations 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;
 - 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.
- 1.4 Member Allocation funding is made to organisations on a one-off basis, so that there should be no expectation of future funding for the same or similar purpose. It may not be used to benefit individuals, or to fund schools for direct delivery of the National Curriculum, or to support a political party.

2. RECENT COMPLETED PROJECTS:

- 2.1 Several projects have been taken place within the last 3 months, here are a couple of the projects:

Royal Holloway - Volunteering Week 2014

Surrey County Councillors Marisa Heath, Mel Few, and Yvonna Lay, contributed a total of £1,100 for the volunteering week from member's allocation funding.

Royal Holloway's volunteering week is in its ninth year as an annual community initiative. National Volunteers' Week this year celebrated its 30th anniversary.

The week was hosted by Community Action in partnership with RHUL Sport and the Students' Union, and ran from 3 to 6 June.

Voluntary Support North Surrey – New automatic door

Voluntary Support North Surrey has recently received £5383 funding from Surrey County Councillor John Furey's member allocations. The funding provided enabled the replacement and installation of a new automatic front door at the resource centre premises within the Sainsbury Centre, Chertsey.

As well as providing the premises with increased security this has allowed disabled users of the conference facility and visitors and staff to Voluntary Support North Surrey better access to the premises.

3. ANALYSIS:

- 3.1 All the bids detailed in **Annex 1** have been considered by and received support from the local county councillor and been assessed by the Community Partnerships Team as meeting the County Council's required criteria.

4. OPTIONS:

- 4.1 The Committee is being asked to note the bids that have already been approved.

5. CONSULTATIONS:

- 5.1 In relation to new bids the local councillor will have discussed the bid with the applicant, and Community Partnerships Team will have consulted relevant Surrey County Council services and partner agencies as required.

6. FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS:

- 6.1 Each project detailed in this report has completed a standard application form giving details of timescales, purpose and other funding applications made. The county councillor proposing each project has assessed its merits prior to the project's approval. All bids are received and scrutinised by officers in the County's Community Partnership Team. We also contact officers from other services and departments for advice if we require additional information or

specialist knowledge to assess the suitability of projects. We ensure that bids comply with the Council’s Financial Framework which contains the financial rules and regulations governing how Members’ Allocations funding can be spent.

- 6.2 The current financial position statements detailing the funding by each member of the Committee are attached at **Annex 1**. Please note these figures will not include any applications that were approved after the deadline for this report had past.

7. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS:

- 7.1 The allocation of the Members’ Allocation and Local Committee’s budgets is intended to enhance the wellbeing of residents and make the best possible use of the funds. Funding is available to all residents, community groups or organisations based in, or serving, the area. The success of the bid depends entirely upon its ability to meet the agreed criteria, which is the same for all projects.

8. LOCALISM:

- 8.1 The budgets are allocated by the local members to support the needs within their communities.

9. OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

Area assessed:	Direct Implications:
Crime and Disorder	No significant implications arising from this report
Sustainability (including Climate Change and Carbon Emissions)	No significant implications arising from this report
Corporate Parenting/Looked After Children	No significant implications arising from this report
Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults	No significant implications arising from this report
Public Health	No significant implications arising from this report

10. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 10.1 The spending proposals put forward for this meeting have been assessed by officers in the Community Partnerships Team, against the County standards for appropriateness and value for money within the agreed Financial Framework.

11. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

- 11.1 Payments to the organisations have, or will be paid to the applicants, and organisations are requested to provide publicity of the funding e.g posters, leaflets, articles in newsletters. We also require evidence that the funding has been spent within 6 months e.g receipts, photos, invoices.

Contact Officer:

Adele Seex, Local Support Assistant, 01932 794079.

Consulted:

- Local Members have considered and vetted the applications
- Community Partnership Team have assessed the applications

Annexes:

Annex 1 – The breakdown of spend to date per County Councillor, including the breakdown of spend to date per County Councillor of the Local Committee Budget.

Sources/background papers:

- All bid forms are retained by the Community Partnerships Team
-

This page is intentionally left blank

Runnymede Members Funding - Balance Remaining 2014-2015

Each County Councillor has £10,300 to spend on projects to benefit the local community, also an equal portion of the local committee's capital funding.

			REVENUE	LC CAPITAL	DATE PAID
Mary Angell	REFERENCE	ORGANISATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	£10,300.00	£5,833.00
	EF700241955	White Lodge	Face2Face is a one-to-one, free and confidential befriending service for pare	£2,000.00	08.08.2014
	No application	Surrey County Council	Looked After Childrens Bursary 2014-15	£2,000.00	
	EF800242767	New Haw & Woodham Community Events	Midsummer Community Event 2015 (TBC)	£2,500.00	
	EF700248386	Sebastian's Action Trust	Purchase of a mobile hoist and specialist play equipment adapted for disabled children (TBC)		£5,833.00
EF700248386	Sebastian's Action Trust	Purchase of a mobile hoist and specialist play equipment adapted for disabled children (TBC)	£1,167.00		
BALANCE REMAINING			£2,633.00	£0.00	

			REVENUE	LC CAPITAL	DATE PAID
Mel Few	REFERENCE	ORGANISATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	£10,300.00	£5,833.00
	EF700230353	Stroud Residents Association	Stroud Summer Spectacular 2014	£300.00	11.04.2014
	EF800225213	Thorpe Ward Residents' Association	WW1 Commemoration Project - Installation of Planters and tree	£600.00	19.05.2014
	EF700235922	Virginia Water Community Association	Carnival Capers 2014-samba workshop	£420.00	13.06.2014
	EF800229662	Ottershaw Village Hall	Ottershaw Village hall - Replacement Hall lighting	£3,000.00	13.06.2014
	EF700236345	Lyne Village Hall	Lyne Village Fete Falconry Display	£375.00	13.06.2014
	EF800230356	Royal Holloway & Bedford New College (RHBN)	Volunteering Week 2014	£400.00	19.06.2014
	EF700235673	Lyne Village Hall	Replacement Internal Dividing Doors		£3,613.96 19.06.2014
	No application	Surrey County Council	Looked After Childrens Bursary 2014-15	£500.00	
EF800237089	Surrey County Council - Highways	A320 Guildford Road, Ottershaw - Traffic Survey	£225.00	04.08.2014	
BALANCE REMAINING			£4,480.00	£2,219.04	

			REVENUE	LC CAPITAL	DATE PAID
John Furey	REFERENCE	ORGANISATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	£10,300.00	£5,833.00
	EF700234011	Addlestone Community Association	Musical Concerts with cream tea	£750.00	19.05.2014
	EF800227762	Eikon	A contribution towards the new building for Eikon charity		£2,000.00 02.07.2014
			£9,550.00	£3,833.00	

Runnymede Members Funding - Balance Remaining 2014-2015

Each County Councillor has £10,300 to spend on projects to benefit the local community, also an equal portion of the local committee's capital funding.

Marisa Heath	REFERENCE	ORGANISATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	REVENUE	LC CAPITAL	DATE PAID
				£10,300.00	£5,833.00	
	EF700231613	Egham & Thorpe Royal Agricultural & Horticultural Association	Egham Royal Show 2014 - animal & horticultural section	£5,000.00		19.05.2014
	EF800230376	Royal Holloway University of London	Volunteering Week 2014	£100.00		19.06.2014
	EF700240330	Englefield Green child contact centre	Englefield Green Child Contact Centre - Publicity Stand	£400.00		01.08.2014
BALANCE REMAINING				£4,800.00	£5,833.00	

Yvonna Lay	REFERENCE	ORGANISATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	REVENUE	LC CAPITAL	DATE PAID
				£10,300.00	£5,833.00	
	EF800228853	Runnymede Art Society	Egham Community Group (Adults with special needs) river trip and cream tea	£250.00		13.06.2014
	EF800230365	Royal Holloway University of London	Volunteering Week 2014	£600.00		19.06.2014
	EF700241955	White Lodge	Face2Face is a one-to-one, free and confidential befriending service for parents	£1,500.00		08.08.2014
	No application	Surrey County Council	Looked After Childrens Bursary 2014-15	£500.00		
	EF800237334	1215 Tenants Group	An away day to the coast for flood victims in Egham	£500.00		22.08.2014
	EF800242652	Runnymede Access Liaison Group	RALG -Runnymede Access Liaison Group Award Evening 2014 - (TBC)	£1,500.00		
BALANCE REMAINING				£5,450.00	£5,833.00	

Chris Norman	REFERENCE	ORGANISATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	REVENUE	LC CAPITAL	DATE PAID
				£10,300.00	£5,833.00	
	EF800227762	Eikon	A contribution towards the new building for Eikon charity		£2,000.00	02.07.2014
	EF700235593	Rotary Club of Chertsey	Black Cherry Fair 2014: Road Closure & hire of Marquee	£2,050.00		13.06.2014
	EF800232179	Head2Head Theatre	Mischief in the Wild Woods - Multi-sensory drama for children with disabilities	£250.00		19.06.2014
	No Application	Surrey County Council	Looked After Childrens Bursary 2014-15	£500.00		
	EF800239548	Chertsey Society	Hire of stand to promote Magna Carta Bell Ringing - (TBC)	£250.00		
BALANCE REMAINING				£7,250.00	£3,833.00	