

15 November 2013

NOTICE OF MEETING

ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

will meet on

Monday, 25 November 2013

beginning at

6:00 pm

in

Committee Room, Civic Offices, Leigh Road, Eastleigh

TO: Councillor Anne Winstanley (Chair), Councillor Daniel Clarke (Vice-Chair)
Councillor Mrs Cathie Fraser Councillor Keith House
Councillor Wayne Irish Councillor Godfrey G Olson
Councillor Derek R Pretty Councillor Steve Sollitt
Councillor Mrs Jane Welsh

Staff Contacts: Cheryll Kemsley, Democratic Services Officer Tel: 023 8068 8112;
Email: cheryll.kemsley@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

Please be aware that Eastleigh Borough Council permits filming,
sound recording and photography at meetings open to the public.

AGENDA

1. Minutes (Pages 1 - 2)

To consider the Minutes of the meeting held on 5 September 2013.

2. Apologies

3. Declarations of Interest

Members are invited to declare interests in relation to items of business on the agenda. Any interests declared will be recorded in the Minutes.

4. Community Governance Review - West End Parish Wards (Pages 3 - 10)

5. Individual Electoral Registration (Pages 11 - 20)

6. Proposed Policy for the Installation of Clock/Calendar Controlled Meters in Hackney Carriages (Pages 21 - 26)

<p style="text-align: center;">DATE OF NEXT MEETING Monday, 10 February 2014 at 5:30 pm in the Committee Room, Civic Offices, Leigh Road, Eastleigh</p>

Your Council's electronic news service - e-news -

Register your email address free with the Council and keep up to date with what's happening in the Borough. Simply select your topics and we will send you email updates with news as it happens including new Council Jobs, What's On, Recycling, Transport plus lots more. www.eastleigh.gov.uk/enews

Agenda Item 1

ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

Thursday, 5 September 2013 (5:30 pm – 5:45 pm)

PRESENT:

Councillor Winstanley (Chair); Councillors Clarke, House, Olson, Sollitt and Mrs Welsh

Also in attendance: Councillor Grajewski

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Mrs Fraser, Irish and Pretty

RESOLVED ITEMS (SUBJECT TO QUESTIONS ONLY)

1. MINUTES

RESOLVED -

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 1 July 2013 be confirmed and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest on this occasion.

3. SCRAP METAL DEALERS ACT 2013

Consideration was given to a report of the Head of Legal and Democratic Services which set out changes brought about as the result of new legislation.

The Scrap Metal Dealers Act 2013 would come into force on 1 October 2013 and would require scrap metal dealers (including mobile collectors) or motor salvage operators to be licensed with their local authority. Previously there had been an obligation to register with local authorities but there had been no requirement for licenses to be issued.

This new legislation would allow local authorities to refuse to grant a licence where the applicant was judged not to be a suitable person to operate as a scrap metal dealer. It was anticipated that this would improve the operating standards of those dealers who did not operate in the same way as the majority of reputable dealers.

There would be two different types of licence – site licence and collectors or mobile licence. The former would be required for any site where the licensee carried on a business as a scrap metal dealer and the latter would be required for any person who wished to operate as a collector in

the area of the issuing authority. A dealer would only be able to hold one type of licence in any local authority area.

The legislation allowed the Council to charge a fee for the issue of these licenses to recover the costs relating to administering and seeking compliance with the scheme. The report set out the costs involved and suggested that a charge be made of £267 for a mobile licence and £351 for a site licence. These fees must be set by Cabinet and the report requested this Committee make any comments for consideration by Cabinet when setting these fees.

At the meeting the Head of Legal and Democratic Services advised that he was currently aware of two motor salvage operators in the Borough registered with the Council but it was much more difficult to know how many mobile scrap metal dealers operated in the area. He was not aware of any additional funding for enforcement and this could not be taken into consideration when setting the fees. He also stated that a further report would be presented to Council as changes would need to be made to the Council's Constitution to reflect the additional powers in the new legislation.

Councillor Welsh asked whether the rules would apply to the household waste and recycling centres (HWRC) run by Hampshire County Council (HCC) in the Borough as she was aware that they accepted scrap metal. The Head of Legal and Democratic Services did not think the new legislation applied to HWRCs but he would look into this and report back to Members. Other Members were surprised that the HWRCs paid for scrap metal and it was agreed to ask HCC for a note for circulation to Members on the operation of HWRCs.

Councillor Olson suggested working with neighbouring authorities on the changes required and recommended that unsuspected site visits would be a useful enforcement tool.

RESOLVED -

- (1) That the changes made by the introduction of Scrap Metal Dealers Act 2013 be noted; and**
- (2) That Cabinet be RECOMMENDED to approve the fees proposed in the report of £267 for a Mobile Licence and £351 for a Site Licence.**

(NOTE: Councillor Grajewski spoke on this item asking whether any budget had been allocated for pro-active enforcement.)

M5296

ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

Monday 25 November 2013

COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW

- WEST END PARISH WARDS

Report of the Head of Legal and Democratic Services

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that:

- (1) The findings of the community governance review in respect of the warding arrangements at West End Parish Council be noted, and residents thanked for their contributions;
 - (2) The warding arrangements be revised as per West End Parish Council's original request and as per paragraph 21 of this report, following no substantially adverse comments received during the consultation; and
 - (3) The revised arrangements be progressed so as to take effect from the next elections for West End Parish Council in May 2015.
-

Summary

In February of this year, the Committee approved a request from West End Parish Council to conduct a community governance review, with the aim of reducing the size / increasing the number of wards within West End Parish Council. The review, and related consultation, has now taken place and the Committee can consider the findings.

Statutory Powers

Local Government & Public Involvement in Health Act 2007

Introduction

1. Earlier this year, a request was received from West End Parish Council to conduct a community governance review in respect of its warding arrangements. The Parish Council suggested that it would be more accountable if it had more and smaller wards. The Parish Council was not seeking to change its membership number (14).

2. Chapter 3 of Part 4 of the Local Government & Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 devolves the power to take decisions about matters such as the creation of parishes and their electoral arrangements to principal councils such as Eastleigh Borough Council.
3. The Committee, at its meeting on 11 February 2013, agreed that a community governance review around this proposal be conducted.

The proposal in detail

4. Currently, the parish warding arrangement for West End Parish Council is as follows:
 - (a) **Kanes Hill** - a one member ward with 564 electors which consists of one polling district (BD) from the Bursledon and Old Netley EBC ward
 - (b) **West End North** - a six member ward with 4,070 electors which consists of three polling districts (HH, HI and HJ) and which shares the same boundaries as the West End North EBC ward
 - (c) **West End South** - a seven member ward with 4,651 electors which consists of three polling districts (HK, HL and HM) and which shares the same boundaries as the West End South EBC ward
5. West End Parish Council was content that its composition should remain at 14 Members, but that the potential for those members representing geographically smaller parish wards should be investigated.

The reasons for suggesting the review that had been put forward by the Parish Council were that:

- (a) It would be better to have smaller wards which are attended to by a smaller number of councillors
- (b) Smaller wards enable parish councillors to become far more familiar with the issues in their area and to “take ownership” of those issues
- (c) With the transfer of assets it would be positive for councillors to become more involved and aware of issues relating to open spaces in their ward which are managed by the Parish Council
- (d) Open spaces such as Hatch Grange and West End Copse would have a smaller number of councillors representing the specific area they are in (making it easier for residents to know which parish councillors to contact)
- (e) It would be easier for residents to develop relationships with their parish councillors

- (f) Rather than residents having six or seven parish councillors spread across a whole Borough Council ward, they will have two or three representing their polling district
 - (g) It will be easier for residents to get to know their parish councillors and to hold them to account
6. This could be achieved by moving from three Parish Council wards (with two based on the West End Borough wards) to seven Parish Council wards based on each of the polling districts in the parish.
7. If approved, the result would be the following (electorate figures are those of December 2012):
- (a) Kanes Hill – a one member ward with 549 electors which consists of one polling district (BD) from the Bursledon and Old Netley EBC ward (no change)
 - (b) HH - a two member ward with 873 electors which consists of one polling district from the West End North EBC ward
 - (c) HI - a two member ward with 1532 electors which consists of one polling district from the West End North EBC ward
 - (d) HJ - a two member ward with 1,628 electors which consists of one polling district from the West End North EBC ward
 - (e) HK - a three member ward with 2251 electors which consists of one polling district from the West End South EBC ward
 - (f) HL - a two member ward with 1,444 electors which consists of one polling district from the West End South EBC ward
 - (g) HM - a two member ward with 997 electors which consists of one polling district from the West End South ward
8. The Parish Council had also considered the issue of naming the new wards, should the proposal be successful. It was suggested that different areas had certain characteristics which ought to be celebrated. The Parish Council felt that the public should be involved in any naming of new wards but each polling district had open spaces and features which could be put forward. BD has the name Kanes Hill already, HH covers Allington Lane and IVCP, HI covers Hatch Grange, HJ covers the Moorgreen area, HK covers Chartwell Green and West End Copse, HL covers St James's Church and HM covers Telegraph Woods and the Ageas Bowl.
9. Keeping Borough Ward and Parish Ward names different would also help to prevent confusion both for the Councils and for the public, and the Council's Electoral Services Team asked that this be borne in mind with any naming / re-naming that takes place.

The review process

10. Under the 2007 Act principal councils are required to consult both those local government electors in the area when a community governance review takes place, along with any others (including a local authority such as a county council) who appear to the principal council to have an interest in the review. Other bodies might include local businesses, and public and voluntary organisations. The principal council must take into account any representations it receives as part of a community governance review.
11. In reaching conclusions on the boundaries between parish wards, the principal council should take account of community identity and interests in the area, and consider whether any particular ties or linkages might be broken by the drawing of particular ward boundaries. Principal councils should seek views on such matters during the course of a review. This is unlikely to be an issue here as the Parish Council are proposing boundaries based upon long-standing, easily identifiable polling district boundaries.
12. Consideration to the levels of representation between each ward must also be given; that is, the number of councillors to be elected from each ward and the number of electors they represent.
13. In considering the names of parish wards, the principal council should give some thought to existing local or historic places so that, where appropriate, these are reflected and there should be a presumption in favour of ward names proposed by local interested parties.
14. The principal council must also consider any change in the number or distribution of the electors which is likely to occur in the period of five years beginning with the day when the review starts.
15. If the Boundary Commission consents to the changes it will inform the principal council which can then implement the proposed changes by local order.
16. A reorganisation order will then need to be prepared confirming the revised arrangements, together with a document setting out the reasons for the decisions it has taken (including where it has decided to make no change following a community governance review) and to publicise these reasons.
17. The principal council must publicise how it has given effect to the review, and that the order and map are available for public inspection. Other means of publicity it may wish to consider are through publication on the council's website, in local newspapers, on notice boards in public places, and in local libraries, and community buildings in the area concerned. In addition, after a principal council has made a reorganisation order, as soon as practicable, it must inform the following organisations that the order has been made:
 - (a) the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government
 - (b) the Boundary Commission

- (c) the Office of National Statistics
- (d) the Director General of the Ordnance Survey
- (e) the relevant County Council
- (f) the Audit Commission

The Review itself

18. The review was publicised in the local press in early April; notices were placed on all public notice boards in the parish; and information was placed on the Borough Council's website – all inviting representations from the public.
19. In addition, and as well as letters being sent to the statutory consultees, the Parish Council produced a consultation leaflet which was delivered to every household in the parish in May. This gave full details of the proposal.
20. 35 responses were received from residents to this direct consultation; 29 supported it; 5 did not support it; and one abstained. A summary of the comments has been produced by the Parish Council and are attached as Appendix 1.
21. As such, it was felt that the Parish Council's request should be supported, with the following names for the wards:

Polling District	New Ward Name	Number of Members to serve the ward
BD	Kanes Hill (as at present)	1
HH	Allington	2
HI	Hatch Grange	2
HJ	Moorgreen	2
HK	Chartwell	3
HL	St James	2
HM	Telegraph Woods	2

Financial Implications

22. The costs of the review will continue to be contained within existing resources.

Risk Assessment

23. The Borough Council has a responsibility to ensure that both it, and the parish councils within its area are, in electoral terms, structured and organised appropriately in order that they can serve the public need as effectively as possible.

Equality and Diversity Implications

24. The Parish Council, in requesting this review, recognises the diversity that exists within its area and asked the Borough Council to conduct a review in order to better reflect this. The Borough Council is content that all affected residents were given the opportunity to comment on the review through a variety of ways.

Conclusion

25. The community governance review has received both broad support and no substantial objections to the Parish Council's proposal, and it is therefore agreed that the revised warding arrangements should be made.

RICHARD WARD
Head of Legal and Democratic Services

Date: 25 June 2013
Contact Officer: Jon Brown
Tel No: 023 8068 8124
e-mail: jon.brown@eastleigh.gov.uk
Appendices Attached: One – summary of consultation responses received

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 - SECTION 100D

The following is a list of documents which 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. This list does not include any published works or documents which would disclose exempt or confidential information:

None

Appendix 1

West End Parish Community Governance Review – Comments received.

35 replies

29 - YES

5 - NO

1 - Abstention

COMMENTS:

OTHER	Preferred Telegraph Woods for HM. We think this will raise a number of fiefdoms all seeking attention and increasing bureaucracy.
	Preferred Allington, Hatch Grange, Moorgreen, Chartwell, St. James, Telegraph Woods. Kanes Hill sticks out like an appendix and suggest that this ward is transferred to Bursledon or Southampton.
NO	I do not understand why Parish Council tax is paid to West End (I live in West End Parish) yet we have been dumped in Bursledon/Old Netley.
	West End Councillors should be engaged with their whole community and not in sub divided areas.
	Your dedicated councillor may not support your views and going to another councillor who supports your views would not be an option. Some councillors have more time and/or more dedicated.
YES	Do we need so many councillors? While reconfiguring the wards why not look at reducing the number (and thereby the expense presumably – there must be expenses/stipend associated with being a councillor). Suggest a simple way is that every 1,000 electors or part thereof are represented by one councillor giving us a fair and simple system. Using current numbers this would reduce HH (West End Lodge or Allington, 873 electors) and HM (Telegraph Hill or Woods, 997 electors) wards to one councillor each, enough surely? Reducing the number from 14 to 12 will have no effect on the statistical stability of any vote. I know it seems small, but if this is mirrored across every ward in Eastleigh the result will be significant. Plus reducing total miles travelled to meetings etc.
	Preferred Allington, Chartwell , St James, Telegraph
	Good idea.
	Excellent proposal thank you for your continued good service – much appreciated.
	I am happy with the names suggested and any alternatives should be in keeping with the other ward names and West End related.
	Preferred Kanes Hill, Allington, Hatch Grange, Moorgreen, Chartwell, St. James, Telegraph Woods.

YES	HH Preferred Allington.
	No comment about names for the Wards, but pleased to see that Wessex Vale Crematorium is in West End and not in Hedge End.
	I live in what would be HH and I think it should be called Allington Ward as I believe we should be the hamlet called Allington.
	Allington for HH.
	As Allington Lane is the longest road in the HH Ward I think it should be called Allington Ward. Of course I am prejudiced as I live in Allington Lane.
	I have indicated preferred choice of names for new wards and hope the councillors representing these wards live within the boundaries they will be responsible for.
	I would name HK ward Chartwell Green – the name used by the locals hereabout and estate agents.
	Allington, Chartwell, St. James, Telegraph Woods. I have indicated my preferred names.
	HK - preferred West End Copse.
	Good idea in principle. Would suggest Telegraph Woods for HM Ward.
	I think Chartwell is the best name for HK.
	Ward HM you have two suggestions in your leaflet. Would like to see Telegraph Woods as the ward name. There are two main features in this ward. Telegraph Woods and the Cricket Ground. Rose Bowl ward would have been a good idea, but it would appear the name will change on a regular basis so this would not work.
	I have only one comment to make and that keeping the new crematorium in the boundary of West End. Keep up all the great work you have been doing on behalf of all the residents in our parish.
	I agree with the proposal to split the existing wards into smaller wards, and agree that the reasons given are valid.
	As I live in the polling district HK, I am in favour of the new suggested name of Chartwell.
	It does seem sensible to have councillors more linked to smaller wards.
	I agree with the new proposals as I believe communication with councillors will be so much easier and hopefully residents will get to know them. Preferred Ward Names HL - Chartwell, HL - St. James, HM - Rose Bowl.
We would like our ward to be called Moorgreen which is much more specific than West End North and relates very well to our area. A good idea.	

ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

Monday 25 November 2013

INDIVIDUAL ELECTORAL REGISTRATION (IER)

Report of the Assistant Head of Legal and Democratic Services

Recommendation

It is recommended that the Committee notes the implications of IER for the Council and endorses the awareness raising methods proposed.

Summary

To outline the proposals and implications for individual electoral registration due to come into force in 2014.

Statutory Powers

Electoral Registration and Administration Act 2013

Introduction

1. The current system of electoral registration has been in place for many years. Electors register to vote through the annual canvass of households carried out each year (August - November) and can register anytime throughout the year under the 'rolling registration' system. In 2006 the process was altered to allow registration up to 11 working days before an election, previously applications would have been required 6 to 8 weeks before an election. A new system of individual electoral registration is being introduced to have effect from 2014. However, initial work and testing has already commenced. This report aims to update the Committee on these revised arrangements for electoral registration, and the increased financial and staffing implications.

The Current Registration System

2. The purpose of the annual canvass is to check the accuracy of the register by identifying new electors and those who are registered but no longer eligible.
3. Canvass forms only need to be checked and completed by one member of household who can do this on behalf of all the other residents.

4. Residents can currently make a canvass return by post, freephone telephone or internet. The freephone and internet options can only be used where there are no changes to the existing registrations.
5. A new register is published on 1st December each year at the end of the canvass period.
6. Where an elector does not respond to the canvass, their name can be carried forward for one year if there is no evidence to indicate they have moved from the address.
7. Rolling registration applications are used to update the register on a monthly basis.
8. Reminder canvass forms are sent to properties and visits are made house to house by canvassers in order to encourage a response from every household.
9. There are different systems in place for special category electors; these include overseas electors and HM Forces Service voters.

Individual Electoral Registration - outline

10. Individual electoral registration (IER) is being introduced nationally to reduce electoral fraud and improve the completeness and accuracy of the electoral register. When introduced, each person wanting to appear on the register must make an individual application. It will be a matter of choice for the individual if they wish to register, which is different to the current property-based system.
11. Electoral Registration Officers (ERO's) should be satisfied that each application for registration is made in respect of a person who is eligible to register, that the person exists and that the person making the application is the person who is the subject of the application.
12. The new legislation requires individuals to provide their National Insurance Number (NINO) and date of birth (DOB). These can be checked electronically against Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) records via Government Digital Services. Existing elections software (Express) has been, and continues to be, upgraded to enable this communication between systems to take place. Fourteen national IER pilot schemes were run in 2012. This showed that a typical 'complete match' rate with DWP records was around 70%.
13. Eastleigh's test (or 'dry run') of this new process took place on 30 July 2013, and an 84% complete match with DWP records was received (one of the highest in the country). Work has now concluded to raise this figure even further with 'local matching' against the Council Tax register so that there is less work transferring across to an IER-based register next year. The 'complete match' or green figure now stands at 88%. Such 'local matching' is a new responsibility for the Electoral Registration Officer, year on year.

14. It was initially proposed that individuals should provide their signature as part of the IER process, however this provision has been dropped as it is not considered that a signature would add any significant security and the authenticity of a signature could not be verified. This removal will also facilitate future developments, for example registering by internet or telephone where it would not be possible to provide a signature.
15. If individuals are unwilling or unable to provide their NINO or DOB, there is an exceptions process. These individuals will be asked to provide other forms of identification such as a passport or photo driving licence. Such individuals will be required to produce two items from a specified list to include a form of ID which contains a photograph; an alternative to this is to require non-photographic ID combined with attendance at the Civic Offices.
16. Verification of addresses will continue as at present with ERO's checking their records with the Local Land and Property Gazetteer (LLPG).
17. Verification of a connection between an individual and an address is to be established either by an individual responding to a direct invitation sent to a known address by the ERO or, where an unsolicited application takes place, by the ERO seeking confirmation by writing to the individual at the address.

IER Process

18. A summary of the IER implementation timetable is as follows:

Outline IER Timetable	
• January 2013	ERA Act
• Early 2013	Secure data transfer connectivity tests
• April - September 2013	Draft regulations and guidance
• April 2013 onwards	Preparation plan, updates and monitoring
• April 2013 onwards	Project planning and issues/risk register
• July - August 2013	Confirmation dry run
• July – September 2013	Absent vote signature refresh
• October 2013 onwards	Postponed household canvass starts
• 8 November 2013	Final IER timetable confirmed by Government / Cabinet Office
• Winter 2013/early 2014	Conduct review of Polling Places
• By 17 February 2014	Publish revised register
• 2013 and 2014	Preparation and training for IER
• 22 May 2014	Triple Elections

• 1 July 2014	Start of IER and confirmation live run
• Summer/autumn 2014	National awareness campaign
• By 1 December 2014	Publish revised registers

19. A delayed canvass, on the current arrangements, has now commenced and will run to February 2014, so that the register is as up to date as possible for IER and the May 2014 elections. The Committee is reminded that the European, Borough and Parish elections are all being held on 22 May 2014, the first time ever that a 'triple election' has been run on the same day. This in itself has increased resource implications.
20. The first IER canvass begins on 1 July 2014 and ends on 1 December 2014. Currently, canvass forms refer to a relevant date of 15 October asking for details of individuals who are resident on 15 October. This relevant date will no longer be used.
21. Household Enquiry Forms (or HEFs) will now be sent to every residence each year. However, as a thorough canvass will be conducted under the current arrangements later this year, the 2014 canvass, will be 'light'; that is, everyone whose details remain unchanged from the 2013/14 'old' canvass will not have to apply to be re-registered under IER – they will just be transferred across to the new system.
22. The completion of a HEF will not automatically result in a 'new' elector being added to the Electoral Register, as an individual application must always be made. In many circumstances, then, this will require an elector to complete two forms rather than the current one (a HEF and application form). The Council must 'encourage' registration, including a personal visit to non-responders. A new problem, of course, is that a canvasser will be unlikely to get all occupiers of a property in at the same time, and many will be reluctant to supplying their NINOs and DOBs, particularly on their doorstep. Canvassing will therefore become more cumbersome and costly, with potentially multiple visits required.
23. Despite much 'soft' terminology being used (eg individuals being 'invited' and 'encouraged' to apply etc), civil penalties will be sought from individuals who do not register; the amount of this has yet to be set by the government.
24. The transition period will include carry forward arrangements; those electors who fail to respond in 2014 will be carried forward to the 2015 register (published on 1st December 2014) to ensure that they are able to vote in the 2015 General Election.
25. From 2015 onwards, those who are registered under IER will not be required to re-register; they will remain registered until the annual canvass suggests they are no longer resident, or they notify the ERO that their details have changed or information from other sources prompts further enquiries.

Arrangements for Absent Voters and Special Category Electors

26. Electors with existing absent vote arrangements can only retain their entitlement to vote by post or proxy if they are registered individually in time to be included in the revised register published by 1 December 2014. Those with existing proxy votes will additionally only retain their proxy appointment if their proxy is also registered individually in that revised register, or will be registered. There will be, therefore, a specific version of the invitation to register to use with these electors that explains these provisions.
27. The provisions described in the above paragraph only take effect on publication of the revised register by 1 December 2014. This means that any elector with an existing absent vote arrangement will retain it and will be able to vote by post or proxy as applicable if an election is held during the canvass (unless they ask to cancel in the meantime).
28. Persons nominated as proxies must be registered under IER.
29. Special category electors currently register under system of declarations which is separate to the annual canvass, these registrations last one year from the application date (five years for service voters). The proposal for these types of electors is that they are invited to register under IER at the time when their declaration is due for renewal.

Implications

30. Electors who were carried forward in 2013 to the 2014 register, and who fail to respond in 2014, will NOT be carried forward to the register published on 1st December 2014 as they will have already been carried forward for one year. These electors will not therefore be able to vote in the 2015 elections unless they make an application to register under IER before the election date.
31. If the NINO and DOB must be checked for every elector, this will mean that the registration of an elector will take longer. Electors registering using the exceptions process will potentially be more involved as they will be attending the offices in person to be seen by a member of staff.
32. Absent voters who fail to register under IER will lose their absent vote.
33. It is inevitable that there will be resource implications for all Councils when IER is introduced. Key here is the impact on technical IT services with the introduction of new processes and changes to systems. Initial system changes have been implemented already in conjunction with Legal and Democratic Services. However further work and support will be required going forward. This has been programmed into the Customer Services and ICT Unit's workload as a priority project.
34. Given the exceptionally high workload over the coming two years, but specifically the back-to-back delayed canvass / triple elections / IER launch, Management Team (at its meeting on 7 August 2013) supported a request to delay relocating the Elections Team to Eastleigh House until after the May 2014 elections. Any delayed move to the new offices will also incur extra

support from ICT with provision of support from two separate office locations. However this represents a much lower risk strategy for Legal and Democratic Services during this intense election period. A detailed work programme of the practical implications is now being drawn up in consultation with key staff, before seeking approval from the Civic Offices Project Board.

35. The Cabinet Office has provided Eastleigh with £7,131 for initial expenses. Currently, more funds can be applied for (in respect of communicating with 'hard-to-reach' groups), although applications have to be justified and fully quantified to the Cabinet Office. A summary of the main funding arrangements, though, are as follows:

IER FUNDING
<p><u>2013/2014 Financial Year</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 31 grant; formulaic grant, paid April 2013 • Cost of confirmation dry run (flat rate basis) • Change implementation (population basis) <p><u>2014/2015 Financial Year</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmation dry run results Sept 2013 - indicative funding allocations - ministerial letter October 2013 • Option to apply for additional funds - bidding open November 2013 to January 2014, outcome given in February 2014 • Ministerial letter with final allocations in March 2014 - initial allocations and additional funds • Section 31 grant paid April 2014 <p><u>2015/2016 Financial Year</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New burdens doctrine • Part of Government spending review

36. In the longer term, additional administrative support will likely be required to assist with an increase in queries, carrying out verification checks, assisting electors to understand the new process and handling a large increase in paper forms. Democratic Services staff, who will sit alongside Elections in Eastleigh House, will provide key support in the interim.
37. It is understood that, in time, there will be increased online registration options available. However, in the shorter term, stationery costs will effectively double.

38. Special consideration will need to be given to canvassing nursing homes and other similar residences where the elderly or vulnerable currently rely on the manager or matron to complete a form on behalf of all residents. Similarly, ensuring young people register will continue to be a challenge, as the onus is now on them to register individually rather than just be picked up on a household-based form.

Publicity

39. The Council is required by the Electoral Commission to prepare a detailed implementation plan for IER. Work is underway on this. However, alongside this, the Electoral Commission require Councils to draw up a separate, local Public Engagement Strategy to compliment the National Awareness Campaign being run by the Commission, in conjunction with the Cabinet office, in Summer/Autumn 2014.
40. The Public Engagement Strategy template and guidance gives Councils a number of ideas and steers as to how to make the public aware of the change in the registration process. Whilst, for example, the Elections Team can prepare a FAQs sheet, the help of the Communications Team will be needed to develop a comprehensive approach to engage with other different communities. Such related issues may well be picked up through the Review of Polling Places which the Council is required to do every five years. This is to take place at the start of 2014, and a member of the Democratic Services Team has been appointed to lead on this.

Financial Implications

41. There will be additional work to be undertaken with regards to the requirement for electors to provide a DOB and NINO and for these to be checked by the ERO. EROs will spend time checking these details and seeing those people who use the exceptions process. The result of this is that additional support staff will be needed in due course, but this cannot be accurately quantified at this stage.

Conclusion

42. Individual electoral registration is being introduced from 2014. The new process is summarised in the appendices. This will increase the workload for electoral registration. There are staffing and resource implications which will need to be planned for accordingly.

Date:	28 October 2013
Contact Officer:	Jon Brown
Tel No:	023 8068 8124
Email:	jon.k.brown@eastleigh.gov.uk
Appendices Attached:	1

EXISTING PROCESS (ALTHOUGH DELAYED THIS YEAR, OCT – FEB INSTEAD)

STEP 1

Mid August

- Pre-printed forms sent to household via canvasser

STEP 2

Mid October

- Reminder pre-printed forms sent to every non-responding household via canvasser

STEP 3

Late October - Mid November

- Canvassers visit non-responding properties with pre-printed forms and attempt to get a response
- Non-responding properties are left a leaflet reminding to return the form and indicating the canvasser will make one further visit

STEP 4

Late October - Mid November

- Canvassers re-visit non-responding properties with pre-printed forms and attempt to get a response
- Non-responding properties are left a further reminder form

IER – 2014 ONLY

STEP 1

From 1st July 2014 onwards

- Household Enquiry Form (HEF) sent to the household to identify potential eligible electors
- Where there is no change at the property, residents transferred across from the old to the new register
- Potential new electors, identified through the HEF canvass, sent application forms to apply to go on the register

STEP 2

- Send up to two reminders to IER and HEF non-responders

STEP 3

- Canvasser to visit IER non-responders on at least one occasion
- Discretion to send canvasser to HEF non-responders

STEP 4

- Notify non-responding absent voters that they have been carried forward (provided they were not carried in the previous year) but they have lost their absent vote and how to reinstate this

CROSS CHECK INFORMATION WITH DWP LOCAL MATCHING TO IMPROVE PERCENTAGE RATE

IER – 2015 ONWARDS

STEP 1

Timing to be determined by ERO, but will be earlier than at present, eg, July

- Pre-printed HEF sent to every property to identify those who are on the register and entitled to remain, those who are no longer eligible and new occupants or attainers. Only one person will be required to return this form.
- Online or after return/provision of information to be enabled.

*** Those who are registered under IER do not need to re-register***

STEP 2

- Potential electors identified from HEF forms to be followed up individually with a pre-populated IER form

STEP 3

- Send at least two reminders to HEF and IER non-responders

STEP 4

- Personal canvasser to visit HEF and IER non-responders on at least one occasion. Non-response will not result directly in elector removal - this has to be removed by the ERO

CROSS CHECK INFORMATION WITH DWP LOCAL MATCHING

NOTE

Removing electors from the register has also become more complex - simply telling the Elections Team that you have moved home out of the borough, for example, will not result in your deletion from the register. The ERO must review removed requests and can only remove someone from the electoral register when:

- they have received notice from the Government Digital Services or they have information from at least two data services (yet to be defined) or
- they are provided with a death certificate
- they are notified by the Registrar of Births, Deaths and Marriages

The ERO may make house to house enquiries for the purpose of deciding whether or not to determine an elector was not entitled to be registered or has ceased to be resident. Determination of removals must be made before the publication of the revised register.

ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

Monday 25 November 2013

PROPOSED POLICY FOR THE INSTALLATION OF CLOCK/CALENDAR CONTROLLED METERS IN HACKNEY CARRIAGES

Report of the Head of Legal & Democratic Services

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Administration Committee approve the proposed installation meter policy.

Summary

This report provides details of the proposed policy for the installation of clock/calendar controlled meters in hackney carriages that are licensed by Eastleigh Borough Council.

Statutory Powers

Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976

Background

1. Almost all hackney carriages have a taximeter fitted, but this is not a statutory requirement. There is nothing in either the Town Police Clauses Act 1847 (TPCA 1847) or the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 (LG(MP)A 1976) which requires hackney carriages to have meters, but most Local Authorities do make it a requirement, either by means of bylaws made under TPCA 1847, s68 or as a condition attached to the hackney carriage proprietor's licence under LG(MP)A 1976, s47(1). In each case, those provisions whether bylaws or conditions, will require the meter to be calibrated and sealed. LG(MP)A 1976, s68 allows inspection of the meter and subsequent suspension of the proprietor's licence if the accuracy of the taximeter is unsatisfactory.
2. It has been a longstanding policy of the Council to require that any taximeter to be used is approved by the Public Carriage Office (PCO). This is because, in the absence of any one clear technical statute or guidelines on meter suitability, there are no other instructions available to Local Authorities as to what is (and more importantly what is not) a competent and suitable meter.

3. Accordingly, taximeter manufacturers have to submit “test” meters to the PCO and also to the British Standards Institute (BSI) for testing. The BSI carry out heat dissipation, accuracy, general working procedures and inherent security tests on taximeters submitted for approval.
4. Once BSI approval is granted for a particular taximeter – it is then used in a London taxi for at least 2,000 miles before the PCO approval is finally given. Local Authorities neither have the resources, structure or competence to engage in such lengthy product testing and this is why the use of the policy directive requiring PCO approved meters has been used by this Council.
5. Most local authorities have a number of different types of meter which are acceptable to them and hackney carriage proprietors can use any from the approved list. The EU Measuring Instrument Directive (MID) (2004/22/EC – OJ No. L135 30.4.04) has been carried into national regulations in the Measuring Instruments (Taximeters) Regulations 2006. These govern the overall approval of taximeters and are not of a direct concern to local authorities, who will only approve taximeters which have already been shown to comply with the regulations.
6. With the progress of the on-board computer, the taximeter has been able to deal with more complex tariffs. A progressive tariff which is now used in some areas changes its rate per mile at different distances (even now some new meters cannot do this) but the major advance with the ‘calendar tariff’ means the meter tariff alters at the correct time and day. This means the meter not only has to have the tariff charges, it also has to have an on board calendar containing public and bank holidays as well as a real time clock.
7. The Council has a 3 tariff system (0700-2300, 2300-0700 and Bank Holidays & New Year Eve from 0001-0700) which is relatively simply but is open to mistakes and/or misinterpretation. This is because the tariff changes are completely controlled by the driver, resulting in the passenger, on some occasions, being overcharged.
8. With clock calendar meters the driver does not select the tariffs making this popular with licensing authorities that try to protect the public from drivers that accidentally select the wrong tariff.
9. A meter will calculate a fare payable on the basis of distance travelled and the duration of the hiring. In simple terms, a meter either counts distance or counts time using the in-built clock. When the speed of the car drops below a certain level the meter automatically recognises this (say in slow moving, road works or stationary traffic) and accordingly calculates the fare in time units. This change is known as change-over speed.
10. The use of the clock/calendar controlled meter will lead to absolute public protection, universal charging and will ensure no pre-loading of fares. The driver will have to do little more than either switch on or switch off the meter.
11. The Council should ensure that there are not any additional buttons fitted to the meter that allow the driver to alter/override any of the settings or tariff

rates on the taximeter. The clock/calendar control function must be locked into the taximeter and the automation of the fares in this way leaves no room for interpretation of the fare charge by the driver, and be a positive step forward.

12. Should this Committee be minded to approve the introduction of clock/calendar control meters, it is recommended that fares be reviewed on a regular basis to ensure that any up to date calendar information can be programmed into the meter for future bank and public holidays.
13. Informal discussion with the trade has identified a willingness to accept the imposition of clock/calendar control meters. The majority of taxis have the new style fitted and this policy will only affect a small number of vehicles that have old style meters.

Financial Implications

14. There are no financial implications to the Council if the clock/calendar control meter is adopted, however there will be a financial implication to the trade where the current meter is not clock/calendar controlled.
15. To have a new approved clock/calendar meter fitted and calibrated by a Council authorised meter installer the current price is in the region of £246.

Risk Assessment

16. There are no risk implications arising from this report. It will, once implemented, provide fairness for the travelling public

Equality and Diversity Implications

17. The policy will ensure equality for all.

Conclusion

18. It is recommended that the Administration Committee adopts the policy for the installation of clock/calendar control meters in hackney carriages from 1 January 2014 with all meters that require changing to be fitted and tested by 1 April 2014.

RICHARD WARD
Head of Legal and Democratic Services

Date: 6 November 2013
Contact Officer: Shaun EADE
Tel No: 023 80688128
e-mail: shaun.eade@eastleigh.gov.uk
Appendices Attached: 1

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 - SECTION 100D

The following is a list of documents which 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: This list does not include any published works or documents which would disclose exempt or confidential information.

This page is intentionally left blank

WHAT OTHER LOCAL AUTHORITIES DO IN HAMPSHIRE

Appendix 1

Local Authority	Do you require calendar controlled meters
New Forest DC	No requirement
Test Valley	No requirement
Rushmoor	Require them to be calendar set annually when the fare review is brought into place
East Hants	Automatic + combination
Gosport	Meters time and date locked. This works well but only lasts for 18 months as chip only holds that information for that long. Every 18 months the meters have to be re-chipped at a cost to the plate holder
Basingstoke & Deane	Require calendar controlled meters
Fareham DC	Required on all their vehicles.
Portsmouth UA	Calendar controlled meters been in place over 10 years.
Havant	No requirement
Hart	Require calendar controlled meters
Winchester	The Taximeter in any new vehicle or any replacement Taximeter shall be of the calendar type which, when recalibrated cannot be altered by the Driver
Southampton	Require calendar controlled meters
IOW	We haven't required calendar locked meters since 1995 when we became a unitary authority, as one of the former boroughs did, and one of them did not previously have them. We allowed them to be 'unlocked' on the understanding that if we received lots of complaints of overcharging we would revert to calendar locked meters

This page is intentionally left blank