NOTICE OF MEETING

CABINET

will meet on
Thursday, 11 January 2007
beginning at
6:00 pm
in the
Committee Room, Civic Offices, Leigh Road, Eastleigh

TO: Members of Cabinet

Councillor Keith House (Chair) Cabinet Member for Policy and Resources
Councillor Anne Winstanley (Vice-Chair) Cabinet Member for Social Policy
Councillor David Airey Cabinet Member for Transport & Streetscene
Councillor Louise Bloom Cabinet Member for Environment
Councillor Alan Broadhurst Cabinet Member for Leisure
Councillor Cathie Fraser Cabinet Member for Health
Councillor Chris Thomas Cabinet Member for Business and Skills

Staff Contact: Alison Wright, Democratic Services Officer
(Tel: 023 8068 8111; Email: alison.wright@eastleigh.gov.uk)

RICHARD WARD
Head of Legal and Democratic Services

Copies of this and all other agendas can be accessed via the Council’s website -
http://www.eastleigh.gov.uk/meetings
as well as in other formats, including Braille, audio, large print and other languages, upon request.

Members of the public are invited to speak on general items at the start of the meeting, and on individual agenda items at the time the item is discussed. To register please contact the Democratic Services Officer above.
AGENDA

1. Minutes (Pages 1 - 14)
2. Apologies
3. Declarations of Interest
4. Recommendation from Eastleigh Local Area Committee- 12 December 2006: Nightingale Centre (Pages 15 - 18)
5. Best Value Review of ICT Governance and Management (Pages 19 - 36)
6. A Parking Strategy for Hamble-le-Rice Village (Pages 37 - 56)
7. Cycling Strategy 2006-2011 (Pages 57 - 60)
8. Consultation responses on Draft Parks & Green Spaces Strategy (Pages 61 - 66)
   A copy of the strategy can be found on the Council’s website www.eastleigh.gov.uk or if you would like a paper copy please contact Democratic Services.
9. Draft Hamble Conservation Area Appraisal Supplementary Planning Document (to follow)
10. General Fund Revenue Budget 2006/07- Briefing Note
11. CIP Schemes Approvals (Pages 67 - 72)

DATE OF NEXT MEETING
Thursday, 8 February 2007 at 6:00 pm
in the Committee Room, Civic Offices, Leigh Road, Eastleigh
PRESENT:

Councillor House (Chair); Councillors Airey, Bloom (until 7.05pm), A Broadhurst, Mrs Fraser and Winstanley

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Thomas

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Mr Ted Ingram advised that two surface water gullies in Woodside Avenue were blocked and requested that this be rectified. The Chair confirmed that this was the responsibility of Hampshire County Council but that his concerns would be passed on.

Mr Ingram also asked that there be a regular article in the Borough News providing details on how individuals can help local wildlife. The Chair advised that the Council’s biodiversity strategy contains details of how habitats can be enhanced and conserved and that Mr Ingram’s suggestion would be considered.

RECOMMENDED ITEM (REQUIRING A DECISION)

28. FEES AND CHARGES

Issue

To consider the proposed Fees and Charges for 2007/08 (Paper 12)

Considerations

The Fees and Charges report is produced as part of the annual budget process, to ensure that all fees and charges levied by the Council are reviewed on an annual basis. This report provides the Council with access to a schedule of all fees and charges in one document.

Where possible, the review reflects the budget requirement to achieve a 3.5% minimum increase in yield for all fees and charges. It is anticipated that this increase will generate in excess of £220,000 of additional income in 2007/08, assuming that the demand for services is maintained.

Resources Scrutiny Panel, at its meeting on 6 December 2006, considered this report and made the following recommendations:
(1) That the Cabinet be RECOMMENDED to consider on-street parking charges in High Street and Market Street, Eastleigh be free for the first 30 minutes and 60p for an hour;

(2) That the Panel review the Council’s policies on car park and cemetery charges.

Members carefully considered the recommendations from Resources Scrutiny Panel but considered that the balance was in favour of the original recommendations.

RECOMMENDED -

(1) That Council be recommended to approve the annual Fees and Charges report as part of the Budget preparation process; and

(2) That all charges set out in Appendices B to G to the report come into effect on the 1 April 2007;

(3) That car park charges, as detailed in Appendix A to the report, be approved, to commence from 5 March 2007; and

(4) That the concessionary rate be reduced to 50% for the Single Items Refuse Collection Service.

RESOLVED ITEMS (SUBJECT TO QUESTIONS ONLY)

29. MINUTES

RESOLVED -

That the minutes of the meetings held on 5 October 2006 and 26 October 2006 be agreed as a correct record.

30. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members were invited to declare interests in relation to items of business on the agenda. Any interests declared are recorded in the relevant minute below.

31. RECOMMENDATION FROM RESOURCES SCRUTINY PANEL: 26 OCTOBER 2006

Issue

To consider a request to address, in relation to procurement, organisational structure, resourcing, monitoring, collaborative working and training (Paper 4).

Considerations
At its meeting on 26 October 2006, Resources Scrutiny Panel considered the draft Procurement Workplan. The Panel agreed to support the intention to develop an effective and efficient procurement regime and requested that the Cabinet, as matter of urgency, address the organisational structure, resourcing of procurement, monitoring, collaborative working and training.

RESOLVED -

That the Minute from Resources Scrutiny Panel relating to Cabinet addressing the organisational structure, resourcing of procurement, monitoring, collaborative working and training be noted.

32. VEHICLE AND PLANT REPLACEMENT PROGRAMME

Issue

To consider the Vehicle and Plant Replacement Programme for 2007/08 (Paper 5).

Considerations

The report sets out the requirements for the acquisition of replacement vehicles and plant during the 2007/08 financial year. Prior to 2004/05 the Council had used operating leases to acquire new or replacement vehicles, plant and equipment. Since 2005/06 the most favourable option has been to use the freedom to borrow, under the Prudential Code, as the means of financing these purchases. The Council agreed in January 2006 to delegate authority to the Assistant Chief Executive (CFO) and the Head of Direct Services to determine the most appropriate source of finance for future purchase of vehicle and plant by evaluating the costs of leasing against borrowing using external consultants to carry out the actual evaluation.

The 2007/08 programme allows for like for like replacement of vehicles which will reach the end of their leasing agreements. Also included in the programme is a replacement for a roller-breaker owned by the Council, which was not acquired under an operating lease.

RESOLVED-

(1) That the Vehicle and Plant Replacement Programme for 2007/08 be approved; and

(2) That the total cost of £398,000 be added to the CIP 2007/08 to be financed from borrowing/leasing following a full financial evaluation.
33. PLANNING POLICY ANNUAL MONITORING REPORT

**Issue**


**Considerations**

The report introduces the second Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) to be prepared under the new planning legislation. The AMR provides data and information on key planning policy issues and records the progress being made on various elements of the Local Development Framework (LDF). The AMR covers the period 1 April 2005 to 31 March 2006 and must be submitted to the Secretary of State by the end of December 2006.

The report advises that all the Local Development Scheme targets have been met with the exception of those relating to The Mount Development Brief, which it has been decided not to continue with. Data for the core indicator 3.a, which is the amount of non-residential development which complies with parking standards set out within the LDF, has not been included in the AMR and work needs to be done to assess how to collect the data for this indicator.

**RESOLVED-**

That the Annual Monitoring Report be approved for submission to the Government.

34. SOUTHAMPTON CORE STRATEGY- PREFERRED OPTIONS

**Issue**

To consider a response to the consultation by Southampton City Council on their Core Strategy (Paper 7).

**Considerations**

Southampton City Council has published its “Core Strategy – Preferred Options” for consultation which sets out the City Council’s strategic priorities up to 2026. This document will form the basis for the Core Strategy that the City Council will submit to Government in September 2007. The Strategy does not include draft policies but is an indication of the direction of future policies.

The report outlines the issues in the Strategy that are of relevance to Eastleigh Borough including the lack of identification of the broad locations of proposed for new residential development, the lack of reference to the links between the city centre and the SDA north/ north east of Hedge End,
the location of Park and Ride facilities, the absence of details on the Rural Urban Fringe and the encouragement of joint working.

There was some discussion on whether it would be useful to have greater clarity on the location of new housing in the City.

RESOLVED-

(1) That Southampton City Council be thanked for consulting Eastleigh Borough Council on their “Core Strategy – Preferred Options”;

(2) That support be given to:

(a) the City’s vision for 2026, as the region’s economic, social and cultural driver;
(b) the references to joint working with partners and neighbouring authorities; and
(c) the emphasis placed on improving the ‘green grid’;

(3) That objection be made to:

(a) the lack of clarity with regard to the broad location of new residential development which, on the scale envisaged, could have a significant impact on the transport corridors into the City and on a range of issues outside the City boundary;
(b) the lack of a reference in the transport policies to the need to secure appropriate links between the City and the SDA north/ north east of Hedge End via the A3024 Bursledon Road and the Windhover park and ride site to junction 8 of the M27 and not via Thornhill and junction 7 of the M27 (and seeks amendments to the key diagram and other plans accordingly); and
(c) the lack of reference in the open space policies, to the Rural Urban Fringe, which is identified on the Key Diagram as being mostly outside the City boundary;

(4) That it be requested that the Park and Ride designation on the “Transport Preferred Options Diagram” and “Key Diagram” be moved westwards, as its current location could be interpreted as being linked to Southampton International Airport and that any references to the SDA refer to it as ‘north/ north east of Hedge End’.

35. THE MOUNT DRAFT DEVELOPMENT BRIEF

Issue

To consider the Draft Mount Development Brief for public exhibition in Bishopstoke (Paper 8).
Considerations

The Mount site on Church Road, Bishopstoke consists of healthcare buildings and areas of woodland administered by the Winchester and Eastleigh Healthcare NHS Trust and Hampshire County Council. The NHS Trust is seeking to vacate and sell all of its property on this site in the near future.

The report summarises the main objectives of the Development Brief and asks the Cabinet to approve the draft development brief, as attached to the agenda, for public exhibition at Bishopstoke Community Centre on two dates in January 2007.

RESOLVED-

That the Draft Mount Development Brief be agreed for public exhibition in Bishopstoke, subject to the consideration of any comments by Bishopstoke, Fair Oak and Horton Heath Local Area Committee by the Chair and Vice-Chair in consultation with the Head of Planning Policy and Design.

36. MOORGREEN HOSPITAL, BOTLEY ROAD, WEST END

Issue

To consider proposals for the Moorgreen Hospital site (Paper 9).

Considerations

The Moorgreen Hospital site is administered by the Southampton City Primary Care Trust and they have indicated that they believe that part of the site will become surplus to future health service requirements and that services will be relocated to within the site or to other locations allowing part of this site to become available for development. The Council wants to be confident that any proposals reflect the health needs of the local population now and in the future. Buildings of architectural or historic value on the site need to be protected, and are identified in the report.

RESOLVED-

(1) That the Council enters into discussions with Southampton City Primary Care Trust which owns the site of Moorgreen Hospital, Botley Road, West End, with the Hampshire Primary Care Trust and the Strategic Health Authority about the appropriate use of the site for health purposes, in line with the resolution of Council on 23 November 2006; and

(2) That a request be submitted to English Heritage to consider key buildings on the site for listing as of Architectural and Historic Interest, and the owners be advised of this action.
(NOTE: Councillor Bloom declared an interest in this item and left the room during its consideration.)

37. STRATEGIC PRIORITIES 2005/06 PROGRESS UPDATE

Issue

To receive an update and discuss the on-going review of the strategic priorities (Paper 10).

Considerations

The Council currently has six strategic priorities, which are designed to provide community leadership and focus services and resources. These six priorities are directly linked to the Council’s Corporate Strategy and its mission of improving the quality of life for all local people. It is proposed that this year’s review should not only look at the detail but also the number and content of the strategic priorities. The review is currently underway with senior officers and Members of the Cabinet and it is not anticipated that this will be completed before the end of 2007. In the meantime it is proposed that the existing strategic priorities, suitably edited to remove activities already completed, are rolled over as strategic priorities until the revised strategic priorities are agreed by the Cabinet.

RESOLVED-

(1) That the current strategic priorities be rolled forward for 2006/7 whilst the strategic priorities review is undertaken;

(2) That progress against strategic priority outcomes be reported in June 2007 using evidence from 2006/7 statistics; and

(3) That progress against strategic priorities be noted.

38. CONCESSIONARY FARES- ANNUAL REPORT

Issue

To consider the annual Concessionary Fares report (Paper 11).

Considerations

A Concessionary Fares Annual Report has been prepared to set out the current issues affecting the Concessionary Fares Scheme including the outcome of the fifth year of Eastleigh’s Travel Token Scheme. The report gives details of the financial implications of the free bus pass scheme which has been in operation since 1 April 2006 replacing the mandatory ‘half fare’ bus travel scheme.

Appendix 1 to the report gives details of the total number of recipients and the total amount of tokens issued during the period 1 July 2005 to 30 June
2006 and the amount of tokens redeemed by bus companies and other transport providers. This year 75.8% of the tokens issued have been redeemed compared to 81.97% last year, leaving a balance collected but unused of £81,812 compared to £88,087 in 2004/2005.

The report also outlines the likely proposed changes by the Government to the national scheme which will be operational from April 2008.

The Environment and Transport Scrutiny Panel, at its meeting on 16 November 2006, considered and endorsed this report.

RESOLVED-

(1) That the rate of redemption of tokens for 2005/2006 and the savings from that year of £81,812 as shown in Appendix 1 to the report be noted;

(2) That the effect of the changes made in the scheme from 1 July 2005 shown in paragraphs 12-16 of the report and the level of take-up by area as shown in Appendix 2 to the report be noted;

(3) That the details of the mandatory ‘free’ travel pass scheme from 1 April 2006 and level of take-up as at 19 October 2006 be noted;

(4) That the estimated recurring budget growth of £35,000 as detailed in paragraphs 27-34 of the report for 2006/07 be approved;

(5) That from 2007 the Council produce plastic travel cards as detailed in paragraphs 44-47 to the report, with an additional budget provision of £7,205;

(6) That the budget implications for 2007/08, estimated at £188,000 shown in paragraphs 35-39 to the report along with the estimated scheme costs in Appendix 5 be noted;

(7) That the value of tokens from 1 July 2007 remain at £32 for those recipients aged 70-79 years of age and £52 for recipients over 80 years of age;

(8) That the value of TV licence payments from 1 July 2007 remain at £32; and

(9) That the remaining scheme administration details contained within the report be noted.
39. CORPORATE FINANCIAL MONITORING

Issue

To consider the Corporate Financial Monitoring report for the period 1 April to 30 September 2006 (Paper 13).

Considerations

The report presents the Council’s overall financial position for the period to 30 September 2006. The forecast to the end of the financial year shows an overspend of £375,000. This includes £73,000 relating to the Recruitment and Retention Budget which will be carried forward as a Budget Management item at the year end. The estimated additional spends in the second half of the year are in the most part covered by Growth Bids.

The Community Investment Programme budget for the year is £11.3M, of which £4.0M has been spent as at 30 September 2006.

RESOLVED –

(1) That General Fund Revenue position as at 30 September 2006 be noted;

(2) That the Staff Monitoring as at 30 September 2006 be noted; and

(3) That the Community Investment Programme as at 30 September 2006 be noted.

40. CIP SCHEMES APPROVALS

Issue

To approve schemes as part of the four-year Community Investment Programme (CIP) (Paper 14)

Considerations

The Council approved a 4-Year Strategy in April 2002 and since December 2002 reports have been submitted, on a regular basis, to the Executive/Cabinet seeking approval for schemes to progress. The Executive approved a revised Community Investment Strategy on 10 February 2005 which updated the programme for 2004/05 to 2007/08 and the programme was subsequently revised and approved by Cabinet on 18 July 2005.

This report seeks further approvals to be financed from funds earmarked for the CIP.
A supplementary report was circulated prior to the meeting, which sought approval for funding towards the combined Safer Routes to School and traffic calming projects in Bodycoats Road, Chandler’s Ford. It was agreed that the matter be taken as an urgent item, in order to avoid unnecessarily delaying the works.

RESOLVED-

(1) That the funding of up to £90,000 in 2006/07 and the ensuing 4 years for the purchase of wheeled bins, including provision for replacements, upgrades and new properties be approved;

(2) That all expenditure be financed from resources earmarked for the CIP e.g. Capital Receipts/Developers’ Contributions be noted;

(3) That funding of £398,000 in respect of the Vehicle Replacement Programme 2007/08 (see separate report on the Agenda) be approved;

(4) That funding of £20,000 in 2006/07 towards the combined Safer Routes to School (SRTS) and traffic calming projects in Bodycoats Road, Chandlers Ford be approved;

(5) That the impact on the Prudential Indicators as detailed in Appendix B to the report be noted.

41. MOTION: POLICE COMMUNITY SUPPORT OFFICERS

Issue

To consider a Motion submitted by Councillor Mrs Fraser in respect of funding for Police Community Support Officers.

Considerations

Councillor Mrs Fraser submitted the following Motion:

“That this Council:

1) condemns the lack of consultation by the Home Office over proposals which will reduce funding available for Police Community Support Officers;

2) seeks confirmation that joint funding for PCSOs provided in partnership with EBC, Parish and Town Councils is safeguarded against reductions in 2007/8; and

3) asks for a meeting with the Home Office Minister, Eastleigh MPs and the police to discuss the matter.”
Although this item did not appear on the agenda, it was agreed that it be taken as urgent business in order to respond swiftly to the recent Government announcement in respect of new Police funding arrangements.

RESOLVED

That the Motion be adopted.

42. EXEMPT BUSINESS

RESOLVED -

1) That, in pursuance of Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they are likely to involve the disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraphs 2 and 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act; and

2) That, in pursuance of the public interest test, the public interest in disclosing the information contained in the following item of business was outweighed by the public interest in maintaining the exemption.

43. PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS

Issue

To consider a proposed land disposal and a land acquisition and to receive an update on the replacement of the foul sewers at Grange Park Mobile Homes (Paper 16).

Considerations

Hamble-le-Rice Parish Council has requested that a parcel of land adjoining Copse Lane be transferred to them. The report identifies the terms on which this transfer should be made to ensure the Council’s financial interests are safeguarded as no capital receipt is being received for the land.

The report also provides an update on the works at Grange Park Mobile Homes. The contract for the renewal of the foul sewer has been awarded to A E Yates and the cost of these works has been less than originally estimated, providing a saving of over £180,000.

The report recommends that efforts be made to acquire the freehold of a parcel of land on terms to be agreed by the Head of Property Services in consultation with Chief Executive, Leader and Hampshire County Council subject to finances being made available.
RESOLVED -

(1) That the request from Hamble-le-Rice Parish Council to take the transfer of land north of Copse Lane be approved on the terms set out in the report;

(2) That the addition of A E Yates to the Grange Park Replacement Sewer Tender list be noted;

(3) That the Leader’s action in approving the terms of the contract awarded to A E Yates for the renewal of the foul sewer at Grange Park Mobile Homes be noted;

(4) That the revised budget for the works including additional pavement improvements to Grange Park Mobile Homes be approved;

(5) That subject to the availability of the necessary finance the principal of acquiring the freehold of the land identified in the report be agreed on terms to be approved by the Head of Property Services in consultation with the Chief Executive, Leader and Hampshire County Council; and

(6) That recommendation (f) of the report relating to the acquisition of land be approved.

44. STAFFING MATTERS

Issue

To note a staffing matter (Paper 17).

Considerations

The report sets out proposals relating to a staffing matter.

This item had not appeared on the agenda but the Cabinet agreed that it be considered as ‘urgent business’ in order not to unnecessarily delay the proposals.

RESOLVED-

That the recommendation in the report be endorsed.

45. MANAGEMENT TEAM REVIEW

Issue

To note the management review (Paper 18).
Considerations

The report sets out proposals relating to the management review.

This item had not appeared on the agenda but the Cabinet agreed that it be considered as ‘urgent business’ in order not to unnecessarily delay the proposals.

RESOLVED-

That the recommendation in the report be endorsed.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Declarations of interest were made as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minute Title</th>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moorgreen Hospital, Botley Road, West End</td>
<td>Councillor Bloom</td>
<td>Personal and prejudicial interest due to her employment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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MINUTE FROM EASTLEIGH LOCAL AREA COMMITTEE 12 DECEMBER 2006:

FINANCE MONITORYING AND EXPENDITURE REPORT

Consideration was given to two reports of the Area Co-ordinator giving recommendations for expenditure from the Committee’s capital and revenue budgets.

RESOLVED –

(1) That Developer Contributions totalling £50,374 be allocated for enhanced sports facilities at The Hub, Bishopstoke Road;

(2) That £500 from revenue reserves be allocated towards the costs of providing the Costa Coffee youth evenings;

(3) That Developers Contributions totalling £37,480 be allocated towards the Leigh Road Recreation Ground play area improvements;

(4) That Developers Contributions totalling £11,158 be allocated to improve safety at the Lawn Road open space;

(5) That Developers Contributions totalling £5,170 be allocated to provide replacement gates at various play areas;

(6) That a provision of £61,700 be made in the Revenue Budget for 2007/8 for contribution to Hampshire County Council towards the costs of the Eastleigh Museum, and

(7) That Developer Contributions totalling £37,699, as identified in the tabled report, be made available to the Nightingale Centre project, that corporate receipts be used to repay this amount to this Committee in 2007/8 and the Cabinet is asked to endorse this agreement.
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EASTLEIGH LOCAL AREA COMMITTEE
Tuesday 12 December 2006
FINANCE MONITORING & EXPENDITURE
Report of the Area Co-ordinator

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that this Committee’s Developer Contributions totalling £37,699 as identified in the body of the report be made available to the Nightingale Centre project and that corporate receipts will be used to repay this amount to this Committee in 2007/08 and the Cabinet is asked to endorse this agreement.

Summary

This report contains a recommendation that Developers Contributions be used to fund the Nightingale Centre project and that this amount is repaid from corporate receipts to this Committee.

Statutory Powers


Introduction

1. It is anticipated that a large number of planning applications about building development on the Velmore Estate will be brought for consideration to the Eastleigh Local Area Committee meeting on 23 January 2007. In order to keep this meeting clear for these applications this report is being tabled at the 12 December 2006 meeting.

2. Unless this report is considered in December it could potentially be delayed until 6 March 2007 with consequent delay in the release of funding for the Nightingale Centre Project.

Nightingale Centre

3. With the pressure on corporate finance for capital projects, Area Committees have been asked to review priorities for the Community Investment Programme. This Committee has several Developers Contributions which are not due to be spent in the current financial year.

4. The replacement Nightingale Centre will utilise a considerable amount of capital resources. It is proposed that some of this Committee’s capital budget from Developers Contributions totalling £37,699 as identified below should be made available with immediate affect to the Nightingale Centre project. This
finance will be repaid to the Area Committee in the next financial year, 2007/08.

DC F/06/56286, 195 Chestnut Avenue  1,977
DC F/05/54528, 2 Spencer Road  996
DC F/06/56891, 52-54 Nightingale Avenue  4,041
DC 53462, 14 Maple Square  986
DC F/06/57853, 35 Monks Way  2,027
DC Z/37127/003, Burns Close  6,078
DC F/05/55380, 1 Chestnut Close  1,519
OS F/06/56286, 195 Chestnut Avenue  2,154
OS F/05/57528, 2 Spencer Road  1,085
OS F/06/56891, 52-54 Nightingale Avenue  2,202
OS 53462, 14 Maple Square  2,117
OS F/06/57853, 35 Monks Way  1,014
OS Z/37127/003, Burns Close  9,846
OS F/05/55380, 1 Chestnut Close  1,657

£37,699

Financial Implications

5. If Members approve this recommendation this Committee will receive £37,699 from capital receipts in 2007/08.

Conclusion

6. Members are requested to agree expenditure from this Committee’s capital budget from Developers Contributions to be repaid with corporate receipts in 2007/08.

JOHN GASSON
Area Co-ordinator

Civic Offices
Leigh Road
Eastleigh
Hampshire. SO50 9YN

Date: 8 December 2006
Contact Officer: John Gasson
Tel No: 023 8068 3369
e-mail: john.gasson@eastleigh.gov.uk
Appendices Attached: 0
Report No: AC530JG

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 – SECTION 100D

The following documents disclose facts or matters on which this report or an important part of it is based and have been relied upon to a material extent in the preparation of this report:

Nil
RECOMMENDATION(S)

It is recommended that Cabinet

1. Approve the attached Improvement Plan (Appx A) and thereby add clarity to the decision making process
2. Consider options for ICT investment as part of the Medium Term Budget Strategy (MTBS)
3. Consider the need for a customer services champion at operational level; and
4. Recommend that a Member champion for ICT be appointed, and that the role of Resources Scrutiny Panel include specific responsibility for ICT (supported by appropriate training and Member development)

Purpose

Management Team requested a Best Value Review of ICT focusing on Governance and Management Issues. A review team was formed in May and has met periodically to identify and discuss the key issues for consideration. Our objective is to help the Council demonstrate a record of achieving a return on ICT investment and a consistently sound record of decision making about ICT investment and priorities. This report seeks to identify a number of issues constraining this objective and submits for approval an improvement plan to provide a sense of direction.

Introduction

1. In October 2005, Management Team agreed to sponsor a Best Value Review of ICT Governance and Management. A report to Management Team in May this year identified a Project Manager and asked for an initial review to be completed for them by September. This report therefore embraces the wishes and views of Management Team.

2. The aim of the review is to give the Council new abilities to make decisions about ICT investment that reflect and further the Council’s key priorities, to identify realised benefits and to maximise a return on the investment.
3. The project team and authors of this report comprise Cllr Keith House, Christine Holloway, Jo-Anne Heathcote, Andy Milner, Alan Mitchener, Loraine Radford and Andrew Walmsley. We were unable to identify and agree a suitable external representative which, although disappointing, was not viewed as an unacceptable risk.

**Present Position**

4. At present the Council can demonstrate neither a record of achieving a return on ICT investment nor a consistently sound record of decision making about ICT investment and priorities. Even so the position has improved dramatically in recent years with capital from the Government (IEG) and Council funding being closely monitored by the e-government programme board and individual implementations generally being subject to project management based on PRINCEII methodology.

5. A disciplined approach to current activities has certainly improved the Council’s ability to manage change but provides no evidence, in its own right, of value for money or direction (and pace) of travel. There is almost an element of complacency around the belief that project management will ensure implementations are successful when the first rule of project management – to provide a dedicated project management resource - is ignored in all but a few projects. In other cases, the mere completion of a project is seen as success.

6. Equally significantly, the Council’s ICT strategy was last published in 2002 and the current review, which is underway, was held up by lack of time and is long overdue.

7. In summary, our ICT support is geared up to be a responsive service. It provides a first class service across the Council maintaining desktop support, day to day management of third party application software, hardware support and assistance with service specific implementations.

8. All this is achieved at a very modest cost but leaves limited capacity for research, development and strategic planning. As a result, we tend to be led by what the market considers to be an appropriate way forward for local government rather than taking a strategic view on how technology can best assist the Council in delivering key priorities. Technology at Eastleigh is used to make existing processes easier rather than adopting the private sector approach of using technology to drive change.

**Object of Review**

9. The object of the review has been to focus on those issues that demonstrate and evidence sound investment, that strengthen the decision making process, determine priorities and help build capacity for delivering those priorities. We specifically avoided any discussion around the contents of the e-Government programme, the content of the ICT strategy and operational issues which were adequately covered in the 2001 review.
10. We tried to avoid actually saying what should go into the strategy. There are, however, clearly areas where we are failing to make effective use of technology and these need to be brought into the improvement plan at the appropriate time. So we reluctantly included the following within the scope of the review.

- Integration of voice and data communications (we were specifically asked to look at this)
- Use of technology to simplify field work

11. We used as our starting point the rather long list of questions presented to Management Team in May. From this we extracted the following questions which believed impacted directly on the governance issues that concerned us:

**What?**

(a) What is the long-term vision for the role of ICT in the Council’s delivery of improved quality of life for all local people, and the delivery of services to achieve this?

(b) How will it be funded? How much should the Council invest in ICT?

(c) What should we take into account in making investment decisions?

(d) What is the relative importance of corporate versus business unit investment? Do actual investment practices reflect their relative importance?

It was also considered necessary to debate the merits of Process re-engineering

**Who?**

(a) Who sets the long-term vision for ICT in the Council?

(b) Who owns the outcomes of each project and institutes organisational changes to secure return on investment?

The need for a customer services champion was also identified.

**How?**

(a) How should the Council make decisions about investment in ICT (globally and case-by-case) that are based on “business needs” and reflect the Council’s priorities (what structures? what rules?)?

(b) How should the Council quantify and measure return on investment?

(c) What are the respective roles of Management Team, unit heads, and the Head of ICT Services?
It is necessary to separate needs from wants. There are also issues to consider around transfer of skills and capacity.

12. In summary, the review focuses on five key areas with the challenge, compete, compare and consult philosophies applied to each equally –

- Costs and level of investment
- Roles, responsibilities and accountabilities
- Voice / data integration
- Decision making process and structure
- Resource usage and capacity issues

13. Of course, many of the other questions need to be answered to satisfy our governance requirements and these should be revisited after six months as part of the agreed improvement plan.

Section One: Roles Responsibilities & Accountabilities

14. The current roles and responsibilities were considered from existing policy and procedure documents including a recommended format proposed by Alison Houselander. It is questionable whether the Council has yet taken full ownership of these roles and responsibilities.

15. The group concluded that there are a number of areas where responsibilities are duplicated at different levels within the organisation. This has had the effect of diluting accountability for decision making. For example, the responsibilities of management team and elected Members are almost identical with the exception that elected Members approve the level of global funding. Having approved that global provision, there is no subsequent role for Members in approving how the resources are used and no mechanism at Member level for ensuring that spending is in line with corporate priorities.

16. The lack of Member involvement has been evident since Eastleigh 96 was launched but, given the importance of ICT in everything we plan and do, this is not sustainable in the long term. There is clearly a role for Members to take ownership of the vision and longer term strategy, and a scrutiny role to reflect on the lessons learnt from previous implementations. These are not roles that require detailed technical expertise but may involve some Member training to understand how ICT can help progress our corporate objectives. Cllr Gupta has agreed to take a Member lead on ICT developments as an interim arrangement and Members will need to consider how reporting arrangements to Cabinet and Scrutiny are formalised.

17. Outside of the democratic arena, the sole responsibility for providing leadership and vision lies with Management Team and the e-Government programme Board. There is no professional ICT expertise at Management Team level. This is covered under the ‘costs’ section where the role of the Head of ICT and that of the Management Team lead on ICT are explored in greater detail.
18. The role of programme co-ordinators is not unique to Eastleigh. As a largely administrative role it adds value to the overall process and provides sound support to the Programme Board. They do not benefit project managers and any further involvement such as managing exceptions would have the effect of diluting the role of the project manager and risks clouding accountability.

19. The organisation of projects boards, sponsors and project managers is consistent with PRINCEII methodology and works well. It needs to be stressed that for all but the most significant projects, the role of project sponsor and project manager could be combined although some concern has been expressed as to whether this is really true for e-Government projects. The corporate commitment to the development of ICT related projects could be further strengthened by the attendance of the relevant overviewer and portfolio lead where practicable.

20. Clarification is required on how project management training is built into the Management Development Programme by Graham Robb Associates. No one should be expected to act as a project manager without the appropriate training.

21. There is need to distinguish the role of the Chair of the Programme board from the Programme Board itself – particularly where the Chair is responsible for securing resources from the board that he or she chairs!

22. The role of an ICT user group has been revisited on a number of occasions at Eastleigh. There is evidence within other Councils that these groups have tended to hold together the general direction of travel simply where Cabinet and Management Teams have neither understood the technology nor been prepared to allow technology to drive change. Eastleigh is perhaps more advanced than others and the ICT User Group recently considered the matter and concluded that they did want to continue meeting as a networking group rather than as a decision making body.

23. The role of Programme Boards tends to vary across the Council and is currently under review. In theory, they are there to support Project Boards with difficult decisions such as resourcing issues or revising overall objectives. In practice, many of these decisions are taken by the project board themselves. Clarity and consistency is required to resolve these varying working practices and management team need to consider whether programme boards need to be more involved in projects.

Conclusion

24. It is recommended that

- the roles and responsibilities are simplified. A diagrammatic proposal for simplification has been presented to Management Team for consideration.
- An improvement plan identifies the urgent need for an updated strategy underpinned by a funding plan
Section Two: Voice and Data Integration

25. A review of Eastleigh’s Technical Architecture was conducted by external consultants (the NCC Group) during September and October 2005 in conjunction with ICT Services. The main deliverable of this review was a report containing recommendations by the NCC Group entitled “Eastleigh Borough Council – Technical Architecture Strategy v3.0 (Release)” dated 25/10/05. The following extract relates to NCC’s views on our existing telephony arrangements and the introduction of VoIP.

Extract from the NCC Report – Section 6.3.3 Telephony:

26. The current Ericsson telephone system at the Civic Offices and the Depot is over five years old and operates over a completely separate network to the data. Although no comprehensive maintenance and support activities and costs have been provided it is likely that it is becoming more expensive to support and maintain and to upgrade to the latest software version as EBC are currently several versions behind the latest release. Furthermore, billing is not centralised for all sites, several system maintainers are used, and intercouncil telephone calls will utilise the public network therefore incurring unnecessary costs.

27. For organisations with fast wide area networks, the market trend has been to introduce voice systems that utilise the network. Voice over IP (VoIP) will offer EBC many benefits including a reduction in the cost of calls and the integration of voice and data applications. Crucially, the voice and data networks must be integrated in order to get the true benefits out of the forthcoming CRM implementation.

28. It is recommended that EBC initiates a project to evaluate the cost of replacing the existing telephone system with a voice system that utilises and integrates with the wide area network. The EBC WAN is not capable of supporting VoIP in its current form, therefore, this activity should be undertaken in line with the WAN recommendation (increasing EBC’s WAN resilience). EBC should attempt to select a best of breed solution that integrates easily with the existing networking infrastructure.

29. Whilst some other sites, such as Enterprise House, do have newer telephone systems these could be either integrated into new VoIP solution or phased out over a planned timeframe.

30. Whilst the Head of ICT Services agrees broadly with the views of the NCC Group, it was felt that a more detailed assessment of our arrangements would be needed before moving forward with VoIP.

31. The Facilities Manager has indicated that there are no firm plans to complete a major upgrade the Council’s current telephone system at present, although the upgrade will be required in the future. Some minor upgrade activity and configuration enhancements are planned for the early stages of CRM roll-out in order to improve call handling capability for the initial units going live with
CRM (principally Environmental Health and Direct Services). These enhancements will not enable VoIP functionality.

32. When the full telephony upgrade is eventually carried out we will have the option (at extra cost) to install a VoIP card and therefore be able to trial VoIP on a small number of phones - details are not currently known about likely costs per card, but the pack that the phone system is upgraded to will contain VoIP capability.

33. We have received mixed reports from Telecoms colleagues external to EBC who have not had positive experiences from installing VoIP. Some have reported a degradation of service including problems with sound quality call distribution accuracy. Formal feedback from other Local Authority colleagues who have installed VoIP has not yet been sought.

34. ICT Services would like to withhold judgment or recommendations on this issue pending further investigations.

Conclusion

35. Eastleigh’s current organisational structure is such that Telecomms and ICT Services are not linked within one unit. Whilst the two teams try to work closely at a strategic level, operational demands mean that this is not easily achieved. Management Team is addressing this through COMPASS and will be taken up as part of the general business review.

36. Nevertheless, both agree that a formal investigation into the Council’s requirements for VoIP and available solutions in the marketplace (including a full assessment of likely costs / benefits / impacts / risks) should be conducted. This investigation should include the gathering of feedback from other authorities with similar operating environments who have implemented VoIP.

37. In summary, our initial impressions of VoIP have not been favourable based on a trial at IVCP and on the experience of other authorities. Whilst we included the VoIP as part of our Best Value Review it has very little to do with ICT Governance and Management. Apart from call recognition (where not suppressed by the caller) there appears to be limited benefits in terms of our emerging CRM culture. It does, however, have considerable potential for revenue savings offset by a considerable capital investment. The recommendation to undertake further research is a sound and allows time for both the technology to be refined and for the pitfalls to be thoroughly understood.

Section Three: Costs & Return on Investment

38. The ICT service at Eastleigh comprises of 15 staff providing a broad range of services including –

   a. Produce and maintain the ICT strategy (has not happened in practice);
b. Support business units in the selection, specification and procurement of new systems;
c. Procurement, installation and maintenance of desktop services;
d. Provide user support for licensed software packages;
e. Provide ongoing technical support for range of hardware platforms and over 450 desktops;
f. Maintain security and back up data for all critical systems;
g. Maintain the internal network and links to remote sites including Hedge End Depot and the Town Centre Office;
h. Help desk service to all staff and elected Members; and
i. Help manage and maintain the Council internet and intranet web sites.

39. The staffing levels compare favourably with other authorities. A survey undertaken in 2001 showed that we support 190 workstations per ICT support officer compared with an average of 105 elsewhere. User satisfaction with the help desk service remains high despite the added challenge of managing multiple sites.

40. Further information is required to evidence the investment in our own ICT staff to develop their knowledge of emerging technologies. Given the pace of technological change, this is a key area for investigation.

41. Additional resources are contracted in to support the team where existing capacity or skill levels are exceeded.

42. The current cost of the ICT service at Eastleigh is around £900,000 per annum which equates to approximately 6% of the total Gross Revenue Spend (GRS). Research is required to confirm that this is a sensible indicator to use and clarify whether this includes capital as well as revenue expenditure.

43. Expenditure against GRS is a complex measure of value for money. Expenditure has traditionally been quite low but at a time when we are being asked to use technology to improve access to services this is not necessarily viewed in a positive light. In the private sector, it is not unusual to see investment at around 8% GRS (Source: IT Governance by Weill & Ross, Harvard Business School 2004). In the public sector a more cautious use of funds has traditionally held this at a slightly lower level.

44. The advent of e-government has, however seen investment rise substantially. SOGIM reported in December 2005 that spending on ICT systems, services and staff had risen nationally by 23% It remains to be seen whether that increase will be maintained now that Government funding for e-Government initiatives has ended.

45. The following table illustrates how Eastleigh compares with other Councils in the South of England using data extracted from the Annual Statement of Accounts 2004/5. There is no standard format for the Annual Statement of Accounts so I have only used those that listed the ICT costs separately in the summary. It highlights the dangers of benchmarking in that you can never be entirely sure how the figures have been put together. As an example, we checked with New Forest’s Head of ICT who claimed that their actual
expenditure was more like £1.65 million. The table is included in the review to stimulate a discussion around benchmarking and no conclusions should be drawn from it.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>IT Costs (£)</th>
<th>Gross Revenue Spending (£)</th>
<th>Costs as % GRS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Dorset</td>
<td>895,000</td>
<td>23,611,700</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch</td>
<td>446,180</td>
<td>11,349,114</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Forest</td>
<td>522,000</td>
<td>10,541,000</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastleigh</td>
<td>882,229</td>
<td>14,800,000</td>
<td>5.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Oxon</td>
<td>953,000</td>
<td>12,400,000</td>
<td>7.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Published Annual Statement of Accounts 2004/5

46. The largest area of investment in recent years has been through the capital programme and has been largely financed by IEG Government funding although EBC has also invested £198,000 of its own money in ICT initiatives each year. Significant work around Customer Relationship Management, performance management, web site development and the new Planning system together with research around document management, NLIS and corporate printing has provided a good foundation for moving forward. The legacy is an associated increase in revenue expenditure.

47. Over the last few years, the investment at Eastleigh has risen from 5.92% GRS to around 6.13%. Half of this increase is attributable to the employment of temporary staff supporting major project implementations. Other increases in costs include internet running costs, application software, telephone costs and IT consumables. The potential for savings on consumables has already been identified and is being progressed as part of the Print Review.

48. The potential for integrating voice and data communications has already been identified and should be viewed as a reasonably high priority given the escalating telephone costs. At a time when consumables are falling in price, the increase in costs over recent years should be another area of concern.

**Demonstrating a Return on the Investment (Corporate Strategy)**

49. To demonstrate a return on the investment corporately one needs to consider the strategic vision of ICT at Eastleigh, how performance is measured against the IT Service Plan and whether the service can be most effectively delivered...
by an in-house team, an FM (Facilities Management) company or by partnership with other local authorities or companies in the private sector.

50. Eastleigh has yet to state its vision in respect of ICT, possibly because of different understandings of what a ‘vision’ might be. We appear to be caught in a circular argument where the Cabinet and Management Team are invited to provide a steer on where we are going but do not have the technical expertise to answer the question, while IT Services have the technical expertise but are reluctant to speak on behalf of the corporate body. The fact that Communications are currently separate from IT Services adds to the problems of producing a co-ordinated strategy, and up to now, the strategy addressed only IT.

51. The last IT Strategy was published in May 2002 and defines certain standards in respect of IT usage. It does not contain an improvement plan which links objectives with measurable targets. The Strategy is currently being re-written. It was posted to the intranet in January 2005 has not been modified since March 2005. This is because there was pressure on staff time to meet e-Government targets up to March 2006.

52. The IT Unit’s Service Development Plan was last published in 2002 covering the period 2002 to 2005. It similarly contains no detailed action or improvement plan and is in need of re-writing. There is currently a draft for the period 2006-2008. It would seem sensible to schedule further update after the strategy work is complete. Either way, it is perhaps more relevant to internal clients who seek to demonstrate a return on their investment.

53. The issue of service provision was touched upon in the last Best Value Review. It concluded that change in any form was a good driver to improving quality and VFM. There was anecdotal evidence that the short term benefits of change can be overtaken by the constraints of a long term commitment where FM suppliers are involved. Established FM contracts generally produced lower satisfaction levels and very few had a built in mechanism for ongoing investment in new technology or an incentive for the contractor to improve efficiency. This is mirrored in our own experience with contractors in other disciplines (e.g. contract services).

54. The 2002 Best Value report concluded in favour of the current model for service provision which reflected a healthy partnership with the private sector. 32% of the service costs in 2001/2 were attributed to bought in goods and services. There was strong evidence of flexibility in service provision and a high level of client satisfaction. Notwithstanding this, the group that met in 2002 felt that there was a clear need to explore the relative costs and benefits of different styles of service provision with the emphasis on partnerships with other authorities.

55. There is little evidence of partnerships with other local authorities other than with the HIOW group and with individual software implementations. Partnerships should be considered in conjunction with other authorities in Hampshire. Given the ‘politics’ that may deter positive progress, private partnerships should also be further researched.
Demonstrating a Return on the Investment (Individual Projects)

56. The current process for demonstrating value for money is through the Council’s project management system. Each proposal must be approved by the relevant project board, and the Project Initiation Document requires the inclusion of a cost benefit analysis and a risk assessment for the project. Each project is also required to produce a post implementation review, comparing outcomes with predicted benefits.

57. There is a tendency for projects to be approved where budgetary provision exists for the implementation. Value for money is more often than not evidenced by more effective use of existing resources as opposed to real savings. There is no evidence of a robust test around the ‘more effective use of resources’. More significantly there is little track record of producing post implementation reviews, and less of scrutinising the effectiveness of implementations against the original objectives.

58. Project management is only one way of demonstrating value for money. Another way is to benchmark costs and performance indicators with neighbouring authorities or with those in the audit commissions established ‘family’ group. There are no procedures in place for sharing and benchmarking information. The last exercise was undertaken in 2002 as part of the last Best Value Review.

59. There are no national key performance indicators that measure performance on ICT. The Implementing Electronic Government return focuses on performance in ICT but measures outcomes as opposed to value for money indicators.

60. It is recommended that a robust approach to benchmarking with other local authorities be adopted as a high priority.

Linking Responsibility with Accountability

61. The present method of recharging IT costs to service users is not clear to all interested parties. It may reflect the true cost of the service to users but without the transparency of an agreed model there will always be uncertainty. The problem that this creates is that users tend to accept with little question the level of recharge which they view as an internal recharge outside their control.

62. The IT Unit is accountable for demonstrating value for money from IT but do not have the responsibility for the delivery of service that the IT solution facilitates.

63. A review of the way the Council recharges the cost of ICT to individual units is required to reconcile accountability with responsibility. This should be considered in a way that involves a proportional amount of work for both parties involved. There should, for example, be a clear understanding of the quality of service received and a transparent approach to the accumulation of
charges that enables service units to benchmark their own costs with neighbouring authorities.

64. The extent to which this debate involves service level agreements or annual service determinations is another matter entirely. A flexible approach should be considered that ensures users experience the true cost of ICT whilst both client and provider share the responsibility for evaluating processes that secure better value for money. In this way both inputs and outputs are measured.

**Conclusion**

65. There is very little evidence to show whether ICT investment in Eastleigh is either competitive or delivering good value for money. This could be explored further with benchmarking and a transparent approach to recharging. There are undoubtedly areas where further investigation could produce additional savings (VoIP and consumables) and where partnership working could increase the Council’s capacity to deliver.

66. The ICT Strategy should include a strategic approach to upgrading or replacing applications as well as hardware. This needs to address how it will be done as well as funding for it.

**Section Four: Resource Usage and Capacity**

67. Whilst partnerships are an obvious way of increasing the capacity of the Council to deliver, there are other issues to consider around the capacity to learn, innovate and share knowledge.

68. Partnerships include working with other local authorities to promote community based initiatives consistently across the County, with software suppliers for the day to day management and development of mission critical systems (such as planning and revenue systems), and with private sector support organisations to ‘top up’ ICT skills developed in house. There is evidence of partnership working being explored through HIOW but the pace of progress suggests that alternative partnerships should be explored if significant short to medium term benefits are to be achieved.

69. Training and personal development are the traditional approach to capacity building and probably more important in relation to ICT than any other aspect of our work due to the fact that technology is constantly changing (see Management Team report dated 13 September). Training is essential for users to make the most effective use of their desktop facilities and for support staff who are called upon for advice and are expected to be familiar with new technology as it reaches the market.

70. Good budget management can further increase the capacity of the organisation by reducing costs, maximising income and exploring new funding sources. The ICT unit has performed well in this area and the service plan identifies annual efficiency savings in excess of £13,000 for 2006/7.
71. Technology in itself is seen as the catalyst for a huge amount of capacity building in local government. At user level it revolves around the automation of manual processes and with so many officers serving customers away from the office, the ability to collect the data electronically whilst with a client has huge potential. Centrally, capacity building techniques include automation of back office routines, re-engineering of day to day to services and, indeed, the way the unit is structured and managed.

**Project Management**

72. It is clear that the adoption of PRINCEII has considerably helped the management of change at Eastleigh by introducing a disciplined approach that ensures key topics such as quantifying resources, costs, benefits and risks are documented and fully debated.

73. We have failed to learn the first principle of project management; that a project is far more likely to succeed where resources are dedicated to the task in hand. We still expect project managers (and other team members) to take on their role concurrently with the day job. This inevitably leads to milestones not being met and a difficult debate around costs, time or reviewing the original objectives.

74. Back filling of posts is successfully employed by Heads of Service to cover long term sick leave and maternity leave, and is clearly an option to enable project managers to fully commit to the task in hand. There may be an additional cost in terms of honorariums and temporary staff but this needs to be built into the original cost benefit analysis.

**Unit Planning and Management**

75. The current situation is that the IT unit has a service plan which details the role of the unit, the resources available, and how it is intended for those resources to be utilised. Although the framework provides potential for effective management, there is a considerable amount of work still required.

76. For example, the learning and development plan is constrained by the available budget whereas in reality it should be driving the need for an adequate training budget.

77. The allocation of resources is based on the demands of various projects rather than the availability of resource, so there is an over-commitment of resources at the outset. This approach relies on projects slipping to the following financial years. We need a more robust approach to resource management.

78. The average level of training across the UK in both the public and private sector averages at 0.5% of salary costs. Underinvestment of ICT training over the years has resulted in us playing catch up with very limited budgetary provision.
79. This way of working makes it impossible to gear work programmes to produce maximum benefit from the investment of training. Staff have occasionally found themselves with long gaps after training before they are able to implement the new skills. This can considerably reduce the effectiveness of the training.

80. The service plan is a plan for the IT Services Unit, focusing on the performance of the unit in isolation to the rest of the Council. The performance management indicators are designed to measure the performance of the unit (for example, satisfaction with the help desk); there are no performance measures for the Council’s use of ICT. Yet unless the Council attempts to evaluate the performance of ICT across the whole organisation, key lessons will not be identified. For example, a KPI identifying capital projects +/- 10% of the original estimate for property related projects has been used in the asset management plan. No such comparable indicator exists for ICT related projects. If these are to be introduced, there needs to be a clear understanding on how you measure a return on the investment.

81. There are a number of areas where improvements could be made by developing a stronger link between KPIs and corporate priorities. There also needs to be a link between the ICT work plan and the service plans produced elsewhere in the Council. The recommended stronger role of the Head of ICT described under the section ‘Roles and Responsibilities’ would place a responsibility on Heads of Service to consult the Head of ICT on the ICT aspects of all service plans.

Conclusion

82. The Unit has started to address capacity building but there are numerous areas still to be explored and these are referred to in the suggested improvement plan.

Section Five: Decision Making

83. The current process and structure is detailed below:

- Units identify need for new/replacement ICT
- A project brief is prepared by the project manager or sponsor
- The brief is taken to the e-Government Board for consideration
- If the project is agreed in principle, a Project Initiation Document (PID) is produced by the project manager or sponsor. The PID would identify cost and benefits (basically a business case for acquisition) of the requested software/IT equipment. It would also include a full risk analysis with detailed contingency plans where appropriate
- This is then taken back to the e-Government Board for further consideration and approval and where necessary allocation of budgets.
- In a few instances, where other considerations need to be taken into account (i.e. size of budget requirement etc), the e-Government Board may refer the request to Management Team or Cabinet.
84. Although this appears to be a simple system, it is recorded nowhere nor is it advertised, and there is considerable confusion amongst officers as to the correct process for acquisition of ICT hardware and software.

85. Historically the e-Government Board has had £230k to allocate to projects which has in the past been topped up by the ODPM. The budget allocation is currently being reviewed with e-Government funding coming to an end.

**Conclusion**

86. The confusion around the process for acquisition of ICT hardware and software must be addressed. Clarity on decision making is clearly required. A revised structure that appropriately engages Members, Management Team and the Head of ICT is essential.

87. Furthermore, significant change takes place outside the project management arena (e.g. software upgrades to reflect legislative changes) which are nevertheless ‘mission critical’. There is no current process for ensuring that these are corporately managed. This has not presented any problems to date, probably because they involve all users for that particular software application and failure is simply not an option, but they should be brought into the decision-making process.
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### APPENDIX A
#### Improvement Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Completed by</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>Articulate top level vision and review annually</td>
<td>Alignment with strategy documents and corporate priorities</td>
<td>A Walmsley B Topham K House</td>
<td>Mar 2007</td>
<td>Initiated by high level external presentation to Members &amp; senior mgt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT Strategy</td>
<td>Produce business strategy &amp; technology strategy defining pace and direction of travel</td>
<td>Adoption by Cabinet. Endorsement under scrutiny by District Audit</td>
<td>A Walmsley</td>
<td>Mar 2007</td>
<td>Should be reviewed annually and cover 3-5 year period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How will future ICT investment be funded?</td>
<td>Incorporate into MTFS</td>
<td>Benchmarks favourably with other authorities</td>
<td>N Tustian</td>
<td>Feb 2007</td>
<td>Previously funded from Central Gov IEG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Investigate and pursue UK and EU funding</td>
<td>Successful bids where criteria met.</td>
<td>A Walmsley</td>
<td>Oct 2007</td>
<td>Review annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify options for investment</td>
<td>Appraise within corporate and service planning processes</td>
<td></td>
<td>A Walmsley</td>
<td>Feb 2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Role</td>
<td>Specific Member champion needed</td>
<td>Advise Council on strategy and e-Gov't</td>
<td>J Brown K House</td>
<td>May 2007</td>
<td>Training needed at Member level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scrutiny Role</td>
<td>Scrutinise Post Implementation Reviews for all major ICT projects</td>
<td>ICT Strategy or other documents amended to reflect lessons learnt</td>
<td>A Walmsley C Holloway</td>
<td>Dec 2006</td>
<td>Need to consider what is meant by ‘major’ project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Team</td>
<td>Clarify and define roles and responsibilities of management team and individual elected Members</td>
<td>Incorporate in role profiles</td>
<td>C Holloway</td>
<td>Dec 2006</td>
<td>Need for ICT professional at management team level requires careful consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of ICT</td>
<td>Clarify and define role</td>
<td>Incorporate in role profile</td>
<td>C Holloway</td>
<td>Dec 2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Who</td>
<td>Completed by</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark costs, service standards, working methods and staffing levels</td>
<td>Identify and canvass existing benchmarking groups</td>
<td>Demonstrate value for money and best working practice</td>
<td>A Walmsley</td>
<td>July 2007</td>
<td>Alternative option if no facility exists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Create benchmarking club from similar Councils</td>
<td>Demonstrate value for money &amp; best practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research &amp; Development</td>
<td>Identify personal development needs to meet corporate priorities</td>
<td>Investment should exceed 0.5% of the annual salary costs</td>
<td>A Walmsley</td>
<td>Dec 2006</td>
<td>Need to ensure skills put to use immediately following training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop KPIs for ICT Services</td>
<td>e.g. Linking to corporate priorities</td>
<td>e.g. tangible savings, increased customer satisfaction improved effectiveness, efficiency</td>
<td>A Walmsley</td>
<td>Dec 2006</td>
<td>Need to specifically separate those measures for unit and corporate measures of ICT progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop KPIs for Council use of ICT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C Holloway</td>
<td>March 2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capacity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigate mobile technology for field officers</td>
<td>Enable remote input of data – reduce manual duplication of effort</td>
<td>Cost effective savings at service level</td>
<td>A Walmsley L Radford P Ruta C Peters</td>
<td>Oct 2007</td>
<td>Need to consider network security around remote input of data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research public sector partnerships</td>
<td>Consider potential economies of scale on joint working with other authorities</td>
<td>Agency fee produces cost saving or acting as agency generates additional income</td>
<td>C Holloway</td>
<td>Jul 2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research private sector partnerships</td>
<td>Use private sector to bridge skills gap and to deliver appropriate training</td>
<td>Targets agreed with contractor for each project</td>
<td>A Walmsley</td>
<td>Dec 2007</td>
<td>May additionally provide benefits for R&amp;D work if consultancy services not required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that Bursledon, Hamble-le-Rice and Hound Local Area Committee:

(1) Note that car park charges are to be recommended to Cabinet in The Square car park and consider the options for the scale of charges such that an LAC view can be submitted to Cabinet.

(2) Support the view that the Foreshore car park be managed by the Borough Council through an Agreement to be negotiated with the Parish Council.

(3) Progress a residents parking scheme for a section of Satchell Lane as depicted on Appendix 3 and set the charge for permits (recommended at £50 per year) but limited to 1 permit for those properties with no parking within curtilage in the vicinity of The Square subject to public consultation.

(4) Appoint consultants to undertake a scheme design and consultation exercise with residents in the roads around Hamble House Gardens and Spitfire Way with a view to protecting these roads from inappropriate extraneous parking.

(5) Further investigate through the Parish Council the use of the Roy Underdown Pavilion and a section of Spitfire Way (see Appendix 4) for longer term parking.

(6) Consider the availability of the Village Green for uncontrolled parking and instruct officers on any action to prohibit this activity.

(7) Support the continued use of Donkey Derby field by the Parish Council for event parking on up to 28 days a year.

It is recommended that Cabinet:

(1) Note the views of the Local Area Committee and the Parish Council on the level of charges to be introduced in the Square and decide on which Option is
advertised for public comment.

(2) Note the level of charge for residents’ permits for Satchell Lane to be advertised through the Local Area Committee.

(3) Progress an Agreement to be negotiated with the Parish Council for the foreshore car park to be managed by the Borough Council.

---

**Summary**

As an outcome of the decision to upgrade Hamble Square and reconstruct the car park it was agreed to appoint consultants to advise on a parking strategy for the village as a whole to include recommendations on off-street car parking provision and any complimentary on-street parking controls.

The report also advises on the need to introduce charges at The Square and to consider its relationship to The Foreshore car park where charges are already in force.

**Statutory Powers**


---

**Introduction**

1. Following on from the decision to produce a parking strategy for the village RTA Associates were appointed earlier this year with a brief to report back on both short term and longer term car parking provision, the need for on-street parking controls and car park charges.

2. The report has now been received and is available on the Internet at Hamble Parking Study (http://www.eastleigh.gov.uk/ebc-3303).

3. Hamble-le-Rice is a small village with a very long standing association with the sea and the yachting industry. The old village is in a conservation area immediately adjacent to this industry but is also a tourist attraction in its own right for access to the seafront and the various pubs and eating establishments.

4. The old village is served by two public car parks, Hamble Square and the Foreshore with larger private parking facilities for customers provided by the marinas.

5. Yachting activity takes place from the marina, river berths, the dinghy park and the public hard all on the waterfront and the parking
associated with the large influx of visitors is centred on the old village with peak time pressure affecting both residential and commercial way of life.

The Study

6. A plan of the study area is attached as Appendix 1.

7. Surveys were undertaken to establish the parking patterns under 'normal' conditions and were repeated on the Saturday of the 'Round the Island' race representing 'peak' conditions.

8. In addition, questionnaires were sent to both residents of Hamble-le-Rice and businesses within the old village to establish views and parking problems.

9. The detailed results of both the surveys and analysis of questionnaires can be found in the consultants report but the main conclusions to be drawn were:

• The two public car parks managed by different Councils do not complement each other.
• Hamble Square car park (free and with no time limit) suffers from over-parking and high long stay occupancy.
• The unsatisfied demand spills over into residential streets.
• At peak time, parking in the village and marina area increases by 280% although the pressures are confined to a relatively local area around the old village.
• The uncontrolled section of High Street suffers from too much parking to the detriment of traffic flow.
• Some 67% of residents visit the village at least once per week.
• 79% of residents stay less than 2 hours.
• Just over 50% of residents would support charges in Hamble Square car park.
• 88% of residents in the area accessed by Hamble House Gardens would support priority for residents parking.
• Some 52% of businesses have parking for visitors.
• 67% of businesses rely on public spaces for customers.
• 56% of business would support charges in Hamble Square car park.

10. The main recommendations from the consultant were:

• The objectives and management of the Hamble Square and Foreshore car parks should be combined.
• Policies in respect of residents' permits for car parks to be reviewed.
• Enforcement of all off-street car parks should be carried out by one single
Authority; the Borough Council as the decriminalised parking authority.

- Enforcement of parking regulations should be a regular feature of the village with greater emphasis at major event times.
- Charges and a 4 hour limit on length of stay in Hamble Square car park.
- Controls in the Foreshore car reviewed so that the charges and time limits coincide with those in Hamble Square car park.
- Parking at the Village Green should be prevented to comply with the legal status of the land.
- A scheme of waiting restrictions at junctions with controlled ½ hour limited waiting should be introduced on those sections of High Street which are currently uncontrolled.
- A residents parking scheme should be considered for the housing area at Hamble House Gardens to operate full time.
- The situation of other residents in the old village who have no parking facilities and prohibition of parking in their streets should be addressed.
- The limited waiting and unrestricted parking areas in Satchell Lane south of Marina Drive should be limited to either ½ hour limited waiting or residents permit only.
- A formal car park of up to 100 spaces at the Donkey Derby Field or at the dinghy parking area should be provided for long term parking of vehicles displaced by the above measures.
- Any new long stay car park could be provided free of charge during the winter months and an enlarged version available at a charge during summer months.
- In the longer term, to meet specific high demand at event times, park and ride facilities at Hamble railway station, Ensign Way or Windhover Roundabout should be considered.

**Car Park Charges**

11. Following on from the Consultants report and after discussions with the Parish Council it is proposed that charges should be applied in The Square with a maximum stay period for 4 hours only, with charging period applicable from 8.00am – 6.00pm on Mondays – Saturdays. The enforcement will be undertaken by the Borough Council’s Parking Attendants.

12. It is also proposed that there should be one agency for enforcement purposes to ensure consistency and cost effectiveness.

13. This proposal is subject to agreement with the Parish Council where the Borough Council will undertake enforcement of the Foreshore Car Park with any income generated by Penalty Charge Notices going to the Borough Council to cover enforcement costs and income generated from the ticket machines to be retained by the Parish Council.
14. Discussions with the Parish Council have led to a number of charging options having been examined for The Square car park the outcome of which are two possible options which are attached in Appendix 2.

15. The Cabinet would welcome the views of the Local Area Committee on the two (or other) options to be considered at their meeting in January. The views of the Local Area Committee on the two (or other) options will be presented to the Cabinet for consideration at its meeting in January.

16. The Parish Council’s Car Parking Working Group has indicated that their preferred choice is Option 2.

17. This option gives the short stay motorist the facility to park for 30 minutes free of charge to encourage the short stay shopper. Ticket machines can be figured to issue a free ticket by the motorist simply pushing the ticket issue button. There are similar operations in Bishops Waltham and Wickham.

18. It is also recommended that due to the amount of parking spaces and the desire to only encourage short stay users that any type of resident or business permit is not permitted in The Square car park.

19. Therefore Members need to give careful consideration that any proposed levels of charges should take into account the desire to encourage the short stay balanced against income generation. The final decision on charges rests with the Cabinet who will consider any views at their meeting in January.

Residents Parking

20. The consultants report concluded that there was a need to consider a residents parking scheme in the Hamble House Garden’s area to protect the roads being used for both longer term and short term parking.

21. There is also a desire to cater for residents in the vicinity of The Square who have no parking facility at all within their properties as it is not recommended that this demand be met from the refurbished car park. There are around 30 properties in this situation. It is considered that some limited spaces (around 15 in total) could be provided at the southern end of Satchell Lane in the lay-by and at the top of the retaining wall (as shown on Appendix 3) for a residents parking scheme.

22. Although these 15 spaces may not entirely satisfy the potential demand for permits, it should be noted that the car park will be available for free parking from 6pm to 8am (overnight).

23. Strict criteria would need to be applied to the issuing of permits for these limited spaces and it is recommended that a charge of £50 per
year is made for permits to help control demand for these spaces. It is recommended that the number of permits to be limited to one per household, however, this will be subject to public consultation.

24. There is also the need to set the charge at a sufficient level to offset the costs of administration and enforcement in accordance with Cabinet policy. Any variation in this amount will need to be costed and paid for by the Local area Committee. Residents parking zones need to reflect local circumstances and even though requiring formal ratification by Cabinet it is for the Area Committee to agree the charging structure that applies based on the merits of each individual scheme. As a result there will not be a consistent level of charge applied to all schemes across the Borough. The Area Committee does however need to recognise the financial implications of setting charges other than those recommended by the Commercial Services Manager.

25. It is suggested that the Satchell Lane residents parking scheme be progressed at the same time as the TRO for the car park charges which are due to be brought in with the completion of the car park in May next year.

26. The wider scheme for Hamble House Gardens area will require consultation with residents and further design work and is therefore likely to take a little longer but if approved could be introduced later in 2007.

Longer Term Parking

27. One of the main conclusions from the consultants was that there is a shortage of up to 100 spaces for longer term parking at peak times.

28. With the tighter controls planned for the village it is necessary to consider how much of this demand can be catered for (and should be catered for) within the vicinity of the village centre.

29. There is also the need to consider the future use of the informal car parking area at Hamble Green which cannot be controlled through the use of TRO’s due to its status as a village green.

30. The consultant has recommended the use of ‘Donkey Derby’ field on a more permanent basis but recent research connected with the temporary use of this field as a car park has revealed that there are legal difficulties in achieving this.

31. Other long term parking facilities have been investigated and it is suggested that there are opportunities to meet the demand at both the Roy Underdown Pavilion (when there are no conflicting events at the recreation ground) and on-street in Spitfire Way.
32. Appendix 4 shows that up to 58 vehicles can be accommodated in this way both locations of which are only a 5 minute walk from the village centre.

33. The continued use of the Donkey Derby field on a temporary basis for up to 28 days a year will need to provide for the shortfall of 40 or so long term spaces as recommended by the consultant.

34. In the longer term, to meet specific high demand at event times, park and ride facilities could be considered at locations to be identified in Hamble Lane further to the north.

35. Long term facilities should be provided free of charge.

**Other On–Street Parking Controls**

36. With the introduction of charges in The Square and residents parking schemes there will be a need to introduce waiting restrictions elsewhere in the village that remain uncontrolled to prevent long term parking.

37. These are likely to include both ‘no waiting at any time’ and ‘limited waiting’ restrictions.

38. Areas adjacent to the church in High Street and possibly Hamble House Gardens could be designated ‘limited waiting’ to allow for visitors to the church for services etc.

39. The uncontrolled areas of the roads off Spitfire Way may also need some form of restriction to prevent long term parking but this may not need to be a full blow residents parking scheme as in the Hamble House Gardens area.

40. This aspect of the Study needs further work and consultation before any firm decisions can be taken.

**Financial Implications**

41. At its meeting on the 26th October 2006 the Cabinet considered the financial implications of progressing the recommendations and resolved:

“**That funding of £34,000 (£5,000 in 2006/07 and £29,000 in 2007/08) for the set up costs for implementing car park charges at Hamble Square be approved**”.

42. This cost also provided for the consultation and design of further parking controls and resident parking schemes as outlined in this report, but not their implementation. This will be subject to the outcome of the consultation which will be reported on in due course.
43. The establishment of the charge is initially considered by the Local Area Committee who will make appropriate recommendations to Cabinet to formally ratify the charges. As previously stated the aim of Residents Parking schemes is ultimately to break even and it is the Commercial Services Manager’s recommendation that a charge of £50 per permit will cover the administration and enforcement costs. This will yield income of approximately £1500 each year.

44. The £1500 will be paid into the On Street Reserve which is a separate account required by law to hold income and expenditure relating to On Street and Residents Parking schemes. Any surplus on the Reserve can only be used on transport related schemes and only in agreement with Hampshire County Council.

45. The Area Committee can make a recommendation that is different from the suggested amount but in doing so must recognise that:

(i) Any deficit resulting from a charge less than the suggested £50 income must be met from within the Area Committees own budget (Each £10 reduction would result in an additional cost of £300).

(ii) Too low a charge may result in demand for spaces exceeding supply.

(iii) Any surplus resulting from a charge in excess of £50 will be held within the On Street Reserve and may not directly benefit the Area Committee.

Risk Management

46. The risk associated with not progressing any of these proposals will be further parking chaos in the village at peak times when the refurbished car park reopens in May.

Conclusion

47. Parking has been a contentious issue in Hamble-le-Rice village for many years. With the upgrading of The Square car park the opportunity has been taken to produce a parking strategy for the village to identify ways to better manage the available facilities.

48. A consultants report has suggested the need for charges to be introduced at The Square whilst at the same time controls to be introduced on the streets in the vicinity to include for resident parking schemes and opportunities for longer term parking.

49. The new car park opens in May next year and charges will need to be introduced at this time. The on-street controls are likely to follow soon after this but due to the need to consult and carry out detail design it is anticipated that further measures will be introduced later in the year.
50. To mitigate against the loss of resident parking in The Square it is proposed that a small residents parking scheme is introduced in Satchell Lane at the same time as the car park charges are introduced.

51. The Area Committee is required to set a charge for permits that ultimately covers the cost of administration, enforcement etc. This is estimated £50 per permit and although the Committee can, if it wishes, set an alternative charge it needs to recognise the financial implications of doing so.

DUNCAN MCVEY                  JOHN GREGORY
Head of Engineering            Head of Property Services

Civic Offices
Leigh Road
Eastleigh
Hampshire
SO50 9YN

Date: 4 December 2006
Contact Officer: Duncan McVey
Tel No: 023 8068 8234
e-mail: duncan.mcvey@eastleigh.gov.uk
Contact Officer: John Gregory
Tel. No: 023 8068 8132
e-mail: john.gregory@eastleigh.gov.uk
Appendices Attached: 4 No.
Report No: EN1037

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 – SECTION 100D

The following documents disclose facts or matters on which this report or an important part of it is based and have been relied upon to a material extent in the preparation of this report:

Nil
This page is intentionally left blank
This page is intentionally left blank
### OPTION 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Rate per day for 350 days</th>
<th>Total for 350 days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>40p</td>
<td>£50.00</td>
<td>£21,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
<td>60p</td>
<td>£21.60</td>
<td>£7,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3 hours</td>
<td>£1.00</td>
<td>£20.00</td>
<td>£7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>4 hours</td>
<td>£1.20</td>
<td>£24.00</td>
<td>£8,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Penalty Charge 2 per day at say 66% collection rate of £30.00 per year

| Total Income | £55,960 |
| Less VAT     | £47,525 |

### HAMBLE PARISH OPTION 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Rate per day for 350 days</th>
<th>Total for 350 days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>½ hour</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>50p</td>
<td>£37.50 (per day for 350 days)</td>
<td>£13,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
<td>£1.00</td>
<td>£36.00 (per day for 350 days)</td>
<td>£12,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3 hours</td>
<td>£1.50</td>
<td>£30.00 (per day for 350 days)</td>
<td>£10,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>4 hours</td>
<td>£2.00</td>
<td>£40.00 (per day for 350 days)</td>
<td>£14,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Penalty Charge 2 per day at say 66% collection rate of £30.00 per year

| Total Income | £62,225 |
| Less VAT     | £52,957 |
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12 resident permit spaces (eastern side of Satchell Lane)

3 resident permit spaces (in layby)

Locations of permit bays are shaded black
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Locations of long stay parking areas are shaded black.

Possible long stay on-street parking for approx 22 vehicles (western side of Spitfire Way)
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A PARKING STRATEGY FOR HAMBLE LE RICE VILLAGE

Consideration was given to a report of the Head of Engineering and Head of Property Services giving details of a parking strategy for Hamble le Rice Village and the need to introduce charges at The Square.

RESOLVED

(1) That it be noted that car park charges in The Square car park, with a preference for Option 2, be recommended to Cabinet;

(2) That this Committee supports the view that the Foreshore car park be managed by the Borough Council through an Agreement to be negotiated with the Parish Council;

(3) That a residents parking scheme be progressed for a section of Satchell Lane as depicted on Appendix 3 and set the charge for permits at £50 per year limited to 1 permit for those properties with no parking within curtilage in the vicinity of The Square subject to public consultation;

(4) That consultants be appointed to undertake a scheme design and consultation exercise with residents in the roads around Hamble House Gardens and Spitfire Way with a view to protecting these roads from inappropriate extraneous parking;

(5) That further investigations via the Parish Council in respect of the use of the Roy Underdown Pavilion and a section of Spitfire Way (see Appendix 4) for longer term parking;

(6) Parking on the Village Green is illegal and therefore this area cannot be considered for uncontrolled parking, the Committee instructed officers to take action to prohibit this illegal activity at the earliest opportunity; and

(7) That support be given to the continued use of Donkey Derby field by the Parish Council for event parking on up to 28 days a year.

(NOTE one member of the public spoke in support of this report)
RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that:

(1) Approval be given to the Borough Cycling Strategy 2006-2011, which will assist planning and developing the cycle network;

(2) Note that the Local Area Committees will be asked to adopt the scheme hierarchy for each area for consideration in the expenditure of developer contributions, Community Investment Programme (CIP), Local Transport Plan (LTP2) and other external funding opportunities.

Summary

The existing Borough Cycling Strategy was adopted in 1998 and since then there has been substantial changes in local and national cycling policy. In this respect this report details a revision of the existing strategy, incorporating the current central government and additional sources guidance.

Statutory Powers


Introduction

1. Eastleigh Borough Council has had a Cycling Strategy with a sustained commitment to encourage cycling for over fifteen years. In 1990, the Council produced its first Cycling Strategy. This added impetus to existing cycling initiatives and aimed to do more to provide for the need of cyclists, making it a safer, more attractive mode of transport. Since that time, the Council in conjunction with Hampshire County Council, Southampton City Council and the cycle charity SUSTRANS has provided a growing network of cycle routes across the Borough.
Proposed Policy

2. The overall vision for cycling in the Borough of Eastleigh is to promote cycling as a viable transport choice. A Framework will be put in place in order to try and achieve this vision with the aims and objectives set out in the context of national, regional and local transport policy. The Cycling Strategy aims and objectives will not be looked at in isolation but will work towards the policy objectives of the County Councils Local Transport Plan 2006 – 2011 as well as ensuring that there is cohesion with the cycling strategies of neighbouring local authorities and other interested parties. The horizon of the strategy is meant to coincide with the expiry of the LTP2 in 2011. The Cycling Strategy will also compliment existing strategy documents such as the Sport & Recreation Strategy for the Borough 2002-2007, the proposed Parks and Green Spaces Strategy and the Eastleigh Borough Community Plan.

3. Eastleigh Borough Council’s Local Plan includes a commitment to cycling initiatives in its policies relating to Transport and Accessibility and there are similar obligations under the County Council’s Structure Plan and Local Transport Plan. In addition, the Borough Council Corporate Strategy includes a commitment to invest in cycleways and it is highlighted in the Council’s Local Agenda 21 document. The cycling policy will also form part of the background papers under the transport element of the LDF.

4. Eastleigh Borough Council has been investing in the Borough’s cycling infrastructure and has a continued commitment to encourage increasing levels of cycling in the Borough for trips to school, work and leisure. The aim is to increase levels of cycling by extending these facilities and further developing routes across the Borough and more locally to serve the needs of particular areas.

Primary Policy Objectives

5. One of the EBC strategic priorities is to promote sustainability through our planning. This includes promoting more sustainable transport systems, addressed through the strategic aim of increasing the numbers of people cycling, walking and using public transport.

6. The Cycling Strategy sets out the following objectives, which will assist in achieving the council’s strategic aims:
   - increasing the modal share of cycling and walking over the period of the strategy;
   - continually improving the cycling infrastructure within the Borough; and
   - increasing the safety of cycling and security of cyclists and their cycles.

7. The Cycling Strategy will focus on enhancing the main network and the local links to it. Whilst links to the major schools will be considered, specific links to individual schools will be focussed through the Safer Routes to School Programme.
Mechanisms to Achieve Change

8. Accompanying this report is the Cycling Strategy. This sets out the overall aims and objectives, which will be required in order to enhance the Borough’s Strategic Cycle Network as well as an Action Plan which summarises targets and timeframes for delivery. These targets are intended to be realistic and are in line with the aspirations of the Government Office for the South East (GOSE).

9. Included as part of the strategy, is a set of five appendices relating to each LAC. Each appendix provides a detailed scheme inventory of the proposed cycle links within the Borough, which have been prioritised relating to the size and type of the schemes, parties involved, barriers to implementation and the expected demand. Each appendix will act as a guide to implementation to work towards the enhancement of the existing cycle network, which is vital if the objectives set out within the strategy are to be achieved. The previous priority hierarchy, has, in many cases not been updated for some years so this re appraisal is considered timely.

10. The Cycling Strategy and the five appendices can be viewed on the EBC website and accessed from http://www.eastleigh.gov.uk/ebc-3104. Please contact Engineering Services if you require a paper copy. Each of the five Appendices will be taken to each LAC in turn for approval and adoption.

Funding

11. The Local Transport Plan 2 includes funding for local schemes for the period 2006 – 2011 including cycle scheme development and travel planning. However funds earmarked for cycling in LTP2 have been reduced compared to the LTP1. Accessibility is an area that GOSE have recently highlighted to the County needs to be improved (December settlement letter) and improved cycling facilities will help towards this goal.

12. As a result of this deficiency a greater reliance will be made on Developer Contributions to provide top up funding for proposed schemes as set out in The Local Plan Review policy number 191.IN paras. 12.20 to 12.24.

13. Funding may also be available through the Borough’s own Community Investment Programme (CIP) as well as Local Area Committees, if it is agreed that a particular scheme has sufficient priority to warrant funding from available (and inevitably constrained) resources. Given their high priority in the corporate strategy Local Area Committees should therefore be encouraged to allocate resources in this area.

Conclusion

14. Eastleigh Borough Council has a sustained initiative to promote and encourage cycling in the Borough as a primary corporate objective of EBC. This strategy and targets aim to guide the cycling developments in the Borough. Cycling will play a key role in future transport for both leisure and
work based journeys and this strategy aims to provide the necessary structure to ensure the needs of cyclists within the Borough are met.

DUNCAN MCVEY
Head of Engineering

Civic Offices
Leigh Road
Eastleigh
Hampshire
SO50 9YN

Date: 20 December 2006
Contact Officer: Peter Boustred
Tel No: 023 8068 8195
e-mail: peter.boustred@eastleigh.gov.uk
Appendices Attached: Cycling Strategy & 5 LAC Appendices - as hyperlinks above
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CABINET
Thursday 11th January 2007

EASTLEIGH PARKS AND GREEN SPACES STRATEGY
Report of the Head of Countryside and Recreation

RECOMMENDATION (S)

It is recommended that:

i) the Parks and Green Spaces Strategy (attached) and appended Action Plan be approved;

ii) the strategy is placed on the Council website;

iii) an executive summary be produced as a full colour electronic document and also placed on the Councils website;

iv) the strategy guides future capital and revenue investment in parks and green spaces and that each Local Area Committee be asked to agree a priority programme of improvements for which developers contributions will be identified.

Summary

At its meeting in May 2006, Cabinet approved a Draft Parks and Green Spaces Strategy and Draft Action Plan for the purposes of public consultation. Following consultation with all the councils main partners, the Strategy and Action Plan have been revised and Cabinet is now asked to endorse these.

Statutory Powers

Town and Country Planning Act, 1994; Planning Policy Guidance Note 17 (PPG17): Planning for open space, sport and recreation.

Introduction

1. At its meeting on the 18th May 2006, Cabinet approved a Draft of the Parks and Green spaces Strategy and the accompanying Action Plan (which summarised the key action points derived from the core strategy document) for the purposes of consultation.

2. This report updates Cabinet on the results of the consultation process and the revisions that have been made to the core strategy and Action Plan resulting
from that consultation and to complete the strategy, ensuring it is comprehensive and in compliance with all relevant guidance.

**Consultation Process**

3. The following individuals and organisations were consulted on the Draft Strategy and Action Plan:-

   Head of Direct Services – David Burton  
   Eastleigh Community Safety Partnership – Peter Baldry  
   Head of Planning Policy – Cliff Bowden  
   Head of Property Services – John Gregory  
   Head of Development Control – Colin Peters  
   Local Area Co-ordinators  
   Eastleigh Youth Service – Steve Willis  
   Eastleigh Council for Voluntary Service – Ken Dufton  
   Eastleigh and Test Valley PCT – Christine Jackson  
   Hampshire Constabulary –  
   Bishopstoke Parish Council  
   Botley Parish Council  
   Bursledon Parish Council  
   Fair Oak Parish Council  
   Hamble-le-Rice Parish Council  
   Hedge End Town Council  
   Hound Parish Council  
   West End Parish Council  
   Hampshire County Council

4. The consultation, carried out via e-mail went out on the 4th September 2006. The deadline for return of comments was 20th October 2006 giving 6 weeks. A reminder note was sent out to all consultees on 17th October 2006.
5. Responses were received internally from two Unit heads, and two Local Area Co-ordinators, externally, responses were received from two Parish Councils, Hound and Fair Oak and Horton Heath as follows:-

“Hound Parish Council unanimously agreed to pledge its support for the implementation of this extremely comprehensive plan and looks forward to the presentation and workshop to be held in November 2006.”

“Members of the Fair Oak and Horton Heath Parish Council would like to thank you for consulting them on the above, and following discussion at a Planning Committee meeting on Monday 9th October, wholeheartedly support the document.”

6. Whilst the level of response was disappointingly low, all those responses that were received were very supportive.

7. Comments were also received from several elected Members after copies of the Draft Strategy and Action Plan were e-mailed to all Members of the Council.

8. In addition the Social Policy Scrutiny Panel considered the strategy at its meeting on 19th July 2006.

9. Specific comments and issues were considered and where appropriate, additions and revisions to the Strategy and Action Plan were made.

**Completion of the Strategy**

10. When Cabinet originally considered the Strategy in May 2006, it was still a work in progress. The Strategy and Action Plan are now complete. Since May 2006 the following revisions and additions have been made:-

- Arithmetic errors and inconsistencies between figures have been resolved;
- Missing tables, graphs and other information have been incorporated;
- Sections 5 and 6 on sustainability and implementation have been written and incorporated;
- Typing and grammatical errors have been corrected;
- Appendices and references have been incorporated.

**Approval and implementation**

11. Cabinet is now recommended to approve the completed Core Strategy and Action Plan so that its implementation can proceed. If approved it is further recommended that the strategy be placed on the councils website.
12. In order to make the strategy more accessible to the public, it is also recommended that an Executive Summary be produced in full colour with photographs and also placed on the council’s website. Furthermore it is proposed that as soon as possible, a presentation of the strategy be organised for all Council Members and key partners, and that this event be used to launch a new Parks and Green Spaces Joint Working Group with representation from key partners, to plan and co-ordinate action to implement the strategy.

13. It is also recommended that work be progressed immediately on the Local Area Programmes as described in the May 2006 report to Cabinet. The Countryside and Recreation Unit will work with each Local Area Committee to agree a 5 year programme, which prioritises a list of projects for implementing the Parks and Green Spaces Strategy Action Plan.

14. These programmes will feed into the review of the Council’s Community Investment Programme (CIP) for 2008-2012 and will guide the future use of developers contributions for open space and social and recreational purposes.

15. As set out in the May 2006 report, these programme plans will amongst other things:-

(i) Identify areas with open space deficits, where now open spaces or improved access to existing open spaces are needed;

(ii) Identify potential sites for new open space provision;

(iii) Identify open spaces for comprehensive improvement;

(iv) Prioritise sites to be improved and submitted for Green flag Award status.

16. The aim of each programme plan is to ensure a consistent co-ordinated and prioritised approach to implementing the strategy across the borough and achieving comprehensive improvements by targeting resources to agreed priority sites as opposed to piecemeal improvements across all sites.

Financial implications

17. The main financial implications were set out in the May 2006 report. The availability of both Capital and Revenue provision to meet this Strategy will be dependant on the Council’s priorities as considered as part of the budget process and the receipt of developers contributions. All proposals in the strategy are subject to the identification of appropriate sources of funding.

18. To achieve the strategy will require additional staff resources. At its May 2006 meeting, Cabinet approved a new post of Assistant Parks and Green Spaces Project Manager to support the implementation of the Action Plan. It was envisaged that this post would be funded from developers contributions. To date, it has not been possible to recruit this new post as sufficient available projects have not yet been identified. This emphasises the urgency in getting
each Local Area Committee to agree a programme plan. When sufficient projects – and therefore developers contributions – have been identified, the new post can be filled, and projects can be implemented.

Risk Management

19. No risks have been identified as arising from the approval of this strategy, or its implementation. Indeed, adopting and implementing the strategy should reduce risks identified in the strategy including, crime, anti-social behaviour and community safety, health and safety, and the risks of failing to provide inclusive facilities accessible to all sectors of the community as required by legislation. Actions proposed in the strategy will be subject to consultation at all stages and will be implemented through established service procedures and project management processes.

Conclusion

20. Adoption and implementation of this strategy will fulfil the requirements arising out of PPG 17 and enable the Council to work towards transforming open space provision across the borough. For the first time, the Council has established the quantitative needs and quality expectations of the community for parks and green spaces, and to compare these with current provision. In adopting and implementing this strategy therefore, the Council and its partners can be confident that it is working towards increasing accessibility and satisfaction of provision and therefore directing resources effectively and efficiently.

PHIL LOMAX
Head of Countryside and Recreation

Civic Offices
Leigh Road
Eastleigh
Hampshire
SO50 9YN

Date: 18th December 2006
Contact Officer: Phil Lomax
Tel No: 023 8068 8212
e-mail: phil.lomax@eastleigh.gov.uk
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LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 – SECTION 100D

The following documents disclose facts or matters on which this report or an important part of it is based and have been relied upon to a material extent in the preparation of this report:
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COMMUNITY INVESTMENT PROGRAMME – 4 YEAR STRATEGY – APPROVAL OF SCHEMES

Report of the Assistant Chief Executive (CFO)

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that Cabinet:

(1) approve funding of £11,400 in 2006/07 for the purchase of a signature recognition software package;

(2) note that all expenditure be financed from resources earmarked for the CIP e.g. Capital Receipts/Developers’ Contributions and

(3) note the impact on the Prudential Indicators as detailed in Appendix B.

Summary

The Council’s 4 Year Community Investment Programme Strategy was first approved in April 2002. Since then reports have been submitted to the Cabinet on a regular basis seeking approval for schemes to progress. The Cabinet approved a revised Community Investment Strategy on 3 April 2006 which updated the programme for 2006/07 to 2010/11.

Statutory Powers

Section 151 and 153 of the Local Government Act 1972.

Background

1. On 18 April 2002 Council approved a 4 Year Strategy for the Community Investment Programme (CIP). Details of schemes comprising the Strategy were approved by the Executive on 10 December 2002, since when reports have been submitted to the Cabinet on a regular basis approving individual schemes. At its meeting on 3 April 2006 Cabinet approved the revised CIP for 2006/07 to 2010/11.

2. A further purpose of the update reports to the Cabinet is to provide regular information on the progress of the CIP and of the approvals given since approval of the last revised CIP as detailed in Appendix A. The reports also indicate any amendments to the Prudential Indicators (Appendix B) as required under the capital financing legislation.
Approvals

Signature Software Package - £11,400

3. The Electoral Administration Act is intended to be in force for the May 2007 elections and failure to be sufficiently prepared will mean that the Council will not be compliant with the law nor be able to conduct the election properly. All postal, proxy and postal proxy voters (of which there will be approximately 18,000 by January 2007) will need to be written to individually with a new form for them to complete and to include their date of birth and signature. Each form returned then has to be scanned in so that an electric copy is held by the Council and which will then be available for comparison when the voter returns their postal vote, accompanied with the new postal vote statement (this replaces the declaration of identity).

4. It will therefore be necessary to purchase a signature recognition software package which ‘bolts on’ to the existing software at a cost of £11,400. This has already been developed by the Council’s supplier and can be purchased and implemented relatively quickly. Ultimately 100% of postal votes will have to be checked so it is important that adequate software be purchased from the outset to enable this to happen.

Financial Implications/Risk Assessment

5. Financing the CIP is dependent on the sale of significant assets and although there has been a steady stream of Capital Receipts (including the amount from Dowds Farm) the larger amounts arising from the sale of major assets have yet to be realised. As a result expenditure is being incurred in advance of receipts being received and this is a risk that has to be managed.

6. The measurement of this risk is embodied in the new Prudential Code of Practice for Capital Finance. On 3 April 2006 Cabinet approved the Capital Financing Strategy including the Prudential Indicators. A requirement of the Code is to continually monitor the Indicators and report to the Cabinet any changes resulting from the CIP Strategy. Any proposed change in borrowing limits would require approval by the Council. The changes to the Indicators resulting from changes to the Strategy as a result of the schemes in this report are shown in Appendix B. There is no change that has any additional financial impact and does not change the borrowing requirement; therefore the Cabinet is simply required to note the change in the Indicators.

Conclusion

7. Work is progressing on the 4 Year CIP Strategy and this report seeks approval for the following additional capital expenditure:

- £11,400 in 2006/07 for the purchase of a signature recognition software package

NICK TUSTIAN
Assistant Chief Executive (CFO)
LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 – SECTION 100D

The following documents disclose facts or matters on which this report or an important part of it is based, and have been relied upon to a material extent in the preparation of this report:-

Section 15 of the Local Government Act 2003
Section 151 and 153 of the Local Government Act 1972
Community Investment Programme 2001/02 to 2003/04 – Council 18 April 2002
Community Investment Programme – 4 Year Strategy – Executive 10 December 2002
Community Investment Programme – 4 Year Strategy – Executive 13 February 2003
Community Investment Programme Strategy Review and Approval of Schemes – Executive 12 February 2004
Community Investment Programme – Strategy Review and Approval of Schemes – Executive 10 February 2005
Community Investment Strategy Programme – Strategy Review and Approval of Schemes – Cabinet 3 April 2006
Community Investment Programme – 4 Year Strategy – Approval of Schemes – Cabinet 18 May 2006
Community Investment Programme – 4 Year Strategy – Approval of Schemes – Cabinet 15 June 2006
Community Investment Programme – 4 Year Strategy – Approval of Schemes – Cabinet 13 July 2006
Community Investment Programme – 4 Year Strategy – Approval of Schemes – Cabinet 5 September 2006
Community Investment Programme – 4 Year Strategy – Approval of Schemes – Cabinet 5 October 2006
Community Investment Programme – 4 Year Strategy – Approval of Schemes – Cabinet 26 October 2006
Community Investment Programme – 4 Year Strategy – Approval of Schemes – Cabinet 11 December 2006
## Appendix A

### CIP – 4 YEAR STRATEGY

### APPROVALS OF SCHEMES GRANTED SINCE 1 APRIL 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Cabinet 3 April 2006</td>
<td>1,028,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase of all plant and equipment in 2005/06 and a previously approved tranche of purchases to be made in 2006/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To implement new and make improvements to existing visitor and staff facilities at Itchen Valley Country Park</td>
<td>205,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cabinet 18 May 2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade of the Swan Shopping Centre Roof Top Car Park lining and signs</td>
<td>90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamble Square project work</td>
<td>350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention of a Temporary Scientific Officer</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To enable a second phase of external improvements to Bishopstoke recreation Ground</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cabinet 15 June 2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding for a cycleway link from Doncaster Drove northwards to the Town Centre</td>
<td>17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of Leigh Road Environmental Improvements</td>
<td>186,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Cabinet 13 July 2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant from DEFRA for the purchase of continuous oxides of nitrogen monitor</td>
<td>11,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Housing renewal budgets</td>
<td>626,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress work at The Point to planning permission stage</td>
<td>97,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Cabinet 5 September 2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase of new Christmas lighting displays</td>
<td>26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retrospective funding of £28,000 for arts related enhancements to Factory Road environmental improvements</td>
<td>28,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  Cabinet 5 October 2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virement of £75,000 from CCTV Future Maintenance and CCTV Extended coverage to purchase a CCTV Digital System</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in Private Sector housing renewal budgets in 2006/07</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.  Cabinet 26 October 2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair of a number of cameras and multiplexes damaged by lightning together with the installation of lightning protection equipment</td>
<td>34,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set up costs for implementing car park charges at Hamble Square</td>
<td>34,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension and refurbishment and the introduction of car park charges within Hedge End Station Car Park</td>
<td>81,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.  Cabinet 11 December 2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase of wheeled bins including provision for replacements, upgrades and new properties in 2006/07 and the ensuing 4 years</td>
<td>90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Replacement Programme</td>
<td>398,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashtrim Nursery (separate report on Agenda)</td>
<td>625,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Prudential Indicators - December 2006

### Affordability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006/07</th>
<th>2007/08</th>
<th>2008/09</th>
<th>2009/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Capital Expenditure:</td>
<td>£’000</td>
<td>£’000</td>
<td>£’000</td>
<td>£’000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved (previously 26/10/06)</td>
<td>11,568</td>
<td>18,560</td>
<td>4,330</td>
<td>1,713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised</td>
<td>11,523</td>
<td>20,053</td>
<td>5,121</td>
<td>2,547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Financing Costs to Revenue Stream:</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Impact on Council Tax:</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>126.96</td>
<td>128.86</td>
<td>130.79</td>
<td>132.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised</td>
<td>126.96</td>
<td>128.86</td>
<td>130.79</td>
<td>132.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Capital Financing Requirement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006/07</th>
<th>2007/08</th>
<th>2008/09</th>
<th>2009/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>£’000</td>
<td>£’000</td>
<td>£’000</td>
<td>£’000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised</td>
<td>£’000</td>
<td>£’000</td>
<td>£’000</td>
<td>£’000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Authorised Limit on External Debt:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006/07</th>
<th>2007/08</th>
<th>2008/09</th>
<th>2009/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>£’000</td>
<td>£’000</td>
<td>£’000</td>
<td>£’000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised</td>
<td>£’000</td>
<td>£’000</td>
<td>£’000</td>
<td>£’000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Operation Limit:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006/07</th>
<th>2007/08</th>
<th>2008/09</th>
<th>2009/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>£’000</td>
<td>£’000</td>
<td>£’000</td>
<td>£’000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised</td>
<td>£’000</td>
<td>£’000</td>
<td>£’000</td>
<td>£’000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Prudence

### Net Borrowing at 31 March:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006/07</th>
<th>2007/08</th>
<th>2008/09</th>
<th>2009/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>£’000</td>
<td>£’000</td>
<td>£’000</td>
<td>£’000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised</td>
<td>£’000</td>
<td>£’000</td>
<td>£’000</td>
<td>£’000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Interest Rate Exposure:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Maturity Structure:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved – Upper</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved – Lower</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Principal Sums Invested (> 364 days)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006/07</th>
<th>2007/08</th>
<th>2008/09</th>
<th>2009/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>£’000</td>
<td>£’000</td>
<td>£’000</td>
<td>£’000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised</td>
<td>£’000</td>
<td>£’000</td>
<td>£’000</td>
<td>£’000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Earmarked Receipts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006/07</th>
<th>2007/08</th>
<th>2008/09</th>
<th>2009/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>£’000</td>
<td>£’000</td>
<td>£’000</td>
<td>£’000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised</td>
<td>£’000</td>
<td>£’000</td>
<td>£’000</td>
<td>£’000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>