

*Please ask for:*

Chris Wrein

*Direct dial:*

(023) 9254 5288

*Fax:*

(023) 9254 5587

*E-mail:*

chris.wrein@gosport.gov.uk

21 November 2007

## **S U M M O N S**

**MEETING:** Overview and Scrutiny Committee  
**DATE:** 29 November 2007  
**TIME:** 6.00pm  
**PLACE:** Committee Room 1, Town Hall, Gosport  
**Democratic Services contact:** Chris Wrein

LINDA EDWARDS  
BOROUGH SOLICITOR

---

### **MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE**

Councillor Philpott (Chairman)  
Councillor Dickson (Vice-Chairman)

|                        |                       |
|------------------------|-----------------------|
| Councillor Carr        | Councillor Kimber     |
| Councillor Davis       | Councillor Mrs Salter |
| Councillor Foster      | Councillor Mrs Searle |
| Councillor Foster-Reed | Councillor Train      |
| Councillor Jacobs      | Councillor Ward       |

### **FIRE PRECAUTIONS**

(To be read from the Chair if members of the public are present)

**In the event of the fire alarm (continuous ringing) or controlled evacuation alarm (intermittent ringing) sounding, please leave the room immediately.  
Proceed downstairs by way of the main stairs or as directed by GBC staff, follow any of the emergency exit signs. People with disability or mobility issues please identify yourself to GBC staff who will assist in your evacuation of the building.**

**IMPORTANT NOTICE:**

- If you are in a wheelchair or have difficulty in walking and require access to the Committee Room on the First Floor of the Town Hall for this meeting, assistance can be provided by Town Hall staff on request

If you require any of the services detailed above please ring the Direct Line for the Democratic Services Officer listed on the Summons (first page).

**NOTE:**

Please note that mobile phones should be switched off for the duration of the meeting.

## **AGENDA**

### **1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

*To receive apologies, if any, for inability to attend the meeting.*

### **2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

*All Members present are reminded to declare, at this point in the meeting or as soon as possible thereafter, any personal (including financial) or prejudicial interest in any item(s) being considered at this meeting.*

### **3. MINUTES**

*To confirm the Minutes of the meetings of the Committee held on 27 September and 10 October 2007 (attached)*

### **4. BEST VALUE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS**

*To consider performance information relating to Best Value Performance Indicators (BVPIs) and actions agreed by Chief Officers Management Team (briefing note attached)*

### **5. INTRODUCTION OF 20 MPH SPEED RESTRICTIONS**

*To decide on a recommendation to be put to the Community and Environment Board*

*Attached:*

- Minute extract from the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 27 September 2007(attached)*
- Briefing note from the Development Services Manager (attached)*

### **6. WATERFRONT ZONING WORKING GROUP**

*To approve the actions proposed by the Working Group to improve the information available to the public in respect of water recreation activities (report attached)*

### **7. CONSIDERATION OF A TIMETABLE FOR THE SCRUTINY OF CAR PARKING CHARGES IN THE BOROUGH AND A POLICY IN RELATION TO PARKING PERMITS FOR VOLUNTARY GROUPS**

*To determine the timetable, scope and format of the scrutiny of car parking charges*

**8. REQUESTS FOR SCRUTINY**

*To consider any requests received for matters to be scrutinised.*

**9. REVIEW OF PROGRESS OF SCRUTINIES BEING UNDERTAKEN**

*(i) Southern Water (note attached)*

*(ii) Travel Token Service (note attached)*

**10. DEVELOPMENT OF A WORK PROGRAMME**

*To consider the work programme (attached) for the Committee and any suggestions from Members for issues to be scrutinised*

**11. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

**\* MEMBERS ARE REQUESTED TO BRING THEIR DIARIES  
WITH THEM TO THIS MEETING\***

**A MEETING OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE  
WAS HELD ON 27 SEPTEMBER 2007**

Councillors Carr (P), Davis (P), Dickson (P), Farr (P), Foster, Foster-Reed (P), Jacobs, Kimber (P), Philpott (P), Mrs Salter (P), Train and Ward (P).

It was reported that Councillors Foster and Jacobs would be replaced at this meeting by Councillors Allen and Clinton.

**24. APOLOGIES**

Apologies for inability to attend the meeting were submitted on behalf of Councillors Foster, Jacobs and Train.

**25. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Dixon declared a personal interest in item 7(iii) on the agenda (Travel Token Service).

**26. MINUTES**

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 26 July 2007 be approved and signed by the Chairman as a true and correct record.

**27. INTRODUCTION OF 20 MPH SPEED RESTRICTIONS IN GOSPORT**

The Chairman welcomed Graham Carter (Hampshire County Council), Angela Gill (Portsmouth City Council) and Chris Laycock (Police) who were attending the meeting to assist the Committee with its scrutiny of this matter. Hampshire County Council was the Highway Authority and its policies and practices would be applied in respect of 20 mph limits. Portsmouth City Council had recently implemented 20 mph speed limits in a number of areas in liaison with the police, who were responsible for enforcement.

A number of questions were raised by Members and responses received as follows:

Councillor Allen asked whether speed restrictions could be policed. Chris Laycock replied that, if the environment was correct, no enforcement would be necessary as it would be self enforcing. However, it was important to introduce appropriate speed limits. The number of road policing officers was low and therefore policing priorities had to be decided using relevant data, for example, casualty levels.

Councillor Clinton asked whether there were any statistics to prove the effectiveness of speed restrictions in Hampshire. Graham Carter replied that there were thirty 20 speed restriction zones in Hampshire which were backed up by traffic calming measures. Such a zone had been introduced at Leigh Park in 1999 which included road humps. It was understood that this had been successful in reducing speed and accidents. Schemes had first been introduced in the early 1990s only where there had been accident justification. Latterly they had been introduced for other reasons such as environmental enhancement. There had been local involvement in setting up the schemes with resident panels and signs being designed by local schoolchildren.

Councillor Clinton asked whether entrances to schools were key to such decisions. Graham Carter replied that past initiatives had come about by reviewing speed limit policies in the light of Department for Transport guidelines. The limits should be self explanatory and self enforcing.

Mr Carter advised that the County Council was keen to address inappropriate driving outside schools by engaging both the schools and parents. This had led to the introduction of the current "Twenty Is Plenty" campaign. This was a voluntary arrangement whereby motorists would be advised, using road safety posters attached to existing street furniture, to drive at no more than 20 mph whilst passing schools. It may not be reasonable to have 20 mph speed limits at all times and to enforce different speed limits at different times during the day in one location would involve the use of very expensive signage. Such signage had been used in another local authority at a cost of £15,000 for one site. This was successful for only two or three weeks after which speeds gradually increased to their former level.

Prior to the summer holidays, all schools had been written to about the campaign and in September an information pack had been sent inviting the children to take part. The intention was that people would be more vigilant during school arrival and departure times and that parents would buy into the idea by promoting it in association with the schools.

Councillor Farr asked what action the police could take when instances of speeding were reported to them. Chris Laycock replied that there was a Community Reassurance Team and a Traffic Policing Unit to deal with speeding and anti social driving.

Councillor Farr asked how effective the introduction of 20 mph speed restrictions had been in Portsmouth. Angela Gill replied that an average drop of two to three miles per hour had been achieved in areas subject to this restriction. The speed limits had been introduced in roads where the average speed limit before the restrictions was 24 mph or less i.e. within 20% of what it was hoped to achieve. This was in accordance with Government guidelines for schemes without traffic calming. Where there were higher initial speeds the measures were unlikely to be effective using signs alone.

Councillor Davis asked whether the schools and communities were required to pay for "Twenty Is Plenty" campaigns. Graham Carter replied that they were but this might be via sponsorship.

Councillor Davis asked what leeway was given to drivers in 20 mph zones. Chris Laycock replied that, due to speedometer inaccuracies, a tolerance of 10% was allowed plus 2 mph in accordance with with Association of Chief Police Officers guidance. Although speed limits were expected to be self enforcing, if reports of excessive speeding were received, patrols would target the areas affected.

Councillor Davis asked whether speed restrictions were linked to parking controls. Graham Carter replied that all were linked by the Safer Routes to Schools programmes. The key element was persuasion, there were very few accidents outside schools but the "Twenty Is Plenty" campaign would enhance existing initiatives to create a safer environment and encourage walking and cycling.

Councillor Carr asked whether the twenty mph zones were enforced. Chris Laycock stated that they should be backed up by traffic calming measures. When visible police officers were on duty in the area the speed limits were adhered to so enforcement was difficult. He noted there was a need to educate people that speed can kill and create a wider acceptance that speeding is a real crime.

Councillor Carr asked about enforcement of areas where the "Twenty Is Plenty" scheme had been applied. Graham Carter advised that the scheme was not enforceable but more to do with "winning hearts and minds".

Councillor Kimber asked about the costs and funding involved in introducing schemes in Portsmouth. Angela Gill replied that funding was provided via the Local Transport Fund over a period of two years. Approximately £130,000 had so far been spent on 20mph speed sectors in residential areas. If it could be shown that speeds became low enough, it would represent good value for money.

Ms Gill advised that the city was divided into sectors for speed zoning purposes. Surveys using radar equipment had been carried out. Consultation with local people, including neighbourhood forum meetings, had taken place before proceeding to the Traffic Regulation Order.

Councillor Kimber expressed the view that illuminated speed limit reminder signs were useful but their impact did not last long. Graham Carter advised that such signage was often installed temporarily and, once some benefit had been gained, continually moved around different locations.

27 September 2007

Councillor Clinton asked about the use of speed cameras. Graham Carter advised that the policy in Hampshire was that such cameras were only employed where there were above average numbers of speed related accidents. They were regarded as successful and mobile cameras meant that checks could be carried out in different areas.

Councillor Allen expressed concern that a great deal of money could be spent to deal with problems caused by a minority and there was a danger that not much would be achieved. Angela Gill advised that there were many narrow roads in Portsmouth where it would be inappropriate for anyone to drive at 30 mph or more. The average speed travelled on these roads should therefore be low. The speed limit would be clearly indicated by signs at 200 metre intervals. It was hoped that local people would then expect this standard of driving and users change their perception of the way roads should be used.

Graham Carter advised that it was important to learn any lessons and that community involvement was essential. There was also a need to reinforce messages from time to time otherwise roads would have to be re-engineered at great cost. In villages people had been generally supportive of 30 mph speed limits. In rural areas they had not wanted physical traffic calming measures but were happy with illuminated signs.

Chris Laycock advised that generally the culture was that speed limits did not represent proper law. Compliance with the law could be encouraged by a combination of direct enforcement, engineering, education of motorists and changing perceptions by providing an appropriate street environment.

Graham Carter advised that, on occasions, there had been a tendency to over engineer but there was no single solution to speeding. The right techniques should be applied in the right places for the right reasons. There would always be a hard core who take no notice of speed restrictions and therefore the local community should assist the police in targeting any problems.

Councillor Mrs Salter suggested that "Twenty Is Plenty" could be advertised, for example, on the sides of buses. Chris Laycock advised that the Road Safety Team at Hampshire had designed a banner for school gates and fences.

Angela Gill advised that, in Portsmouth, the road safety education team were gradually engendering increasing interest amongst the schools.

Councillor Philpott asked how successful speed restrictions had been in London. Angela Gill replied that, from her experience, speed restrictions backed up by traffic calming measures had been successful.

The Chairman thanked Ms Gill and Messrs Carter and Laycock for attending the meeting and for their contributions.

RESOLVED: That:

- a) a note of the discussion at this meeting be forwarded to all Members of the Committee; and
- b) the scrutiny of the introduction of 20 mph speed restrictions in Gosport be further considered at the next ordinary meeting of the Committee.

## **28. COMMUNITY STRATEGY**

Consideration was given to a briefing note by the Head of Corporate Policy and Performance which advised Members that the Community Strategy was a policy framework document, although owned and produced by the Local Strategic Partnership. The approach and process for reviewing and revising the strategy had been scrutinised by the Policy Overview and Scrutiny Committee in October 2006.

Members were asked to consider the revised Community Strategy.

Members were advised that the vision gave generic views based on statistics. The Local Strategic Partnership Action Plan would require specific outcomes.

The question of domestic violence was raised and whether there would be outcomes associated with this issue. Members were advised that this would be dealt with by the Community Safety Partnership.

Concerns were raised as to whether the Strategy had moved on since 2003. Members were advised that the real value of the process would be seen in the Action Plan, which had been restricted to a realistic number of actions which would make a difference to the community.

With regard to page 8 of the Strategy, Members requested that the wording "disabled people" be amended to read "people with disabilities".

With regard to page 9, Members questioned the use of the wording "growing population" and officers were requested to check the projected population statistics.

Officers undertook to report progress as a standing item to the Committee twice a year.

**RESOLVED:** That, subject to the words "disabled people" in the final paragraph on page 8 of the Strategy being changed to "people with disabilities", the scrutiny of the Community Strategy be concluded by recommending Gosport's Sustainable Community Strategy i.e. the output of the 2006 scrutiny, to the Policy and Organisation Board and then to Council for endorsement.

## **29. REQUESTS FOR SCRUTINY**

### a) Free Car Parking Permits

Consideration was given to a briefing note of the Borough Solicitor regarding a request from the Chairman of the Community and Environment Board (Councillor Wright) for the issue of free car parking permits to be scrutinised. This followed requests that had been made to Councillor Wright and the lack of a clear policy on this matter.

The Chairman advised that the Leader of the Council would be requesting that car parking charges as a whole be scrutinised and it was agreed that this aspect of car parking charges should be looked at as part of that wider scrutiny. The Leader of the Council's request for scrutiny would be considered at the extraordinary meeting of the Committee to be held on 10 October 2007.

### b) Notice of Motion

Members were presented with a notice of motion from Councillor Taylor at the meeting of the Community and Environment Board held on 10 September 2007 for a review of car parking charges to be undertaken with immediate effect to ensure parity for all traders in the Borough of Gosport.

The Board had resolved that this be deferred until such time as the Overview and Scrutiny Committee had reported its findings to the Board.

No action by this Committee was required at this stage.

RESOLVED: That the issue of free car parking be looked at as part of the scrutiny of car parking charges as a whole.

## **30. REVIEW OF PROGRESS OF SCRUTINIES UNDERTAKEN**

### Southern Water

Councillor Davis updated the Committee on the progress made by the Working Group, which had met on 18 September 2007.

The Southern Water Business Plan had been obtained from Ofwat. However, information regarding investment plans for the next five years and the identification of flood risk areas had not been included due to it being of a confidential nature. It was not clear why these areas of work were regarded as confidential and the Working Group would be pursuing this matter.

The Working Group had identified its priorities which were detailed as follows:

27 September 2007

- To look at Gosport Borough Council's responses to flood and environmental issues
- To obtain details of Southern Water's formal position regarding the adoption of sewers
- To look at the flood prevention policy in the short and long term with regard to rising water levels
- To look at the repeated failure of some pumping stations and to obtain details of the Southern Water maintenance regime
- To look into communications between the various bodies

Councillor Davis advised that Southern Water would be invited to the next meeting of the Working Group on 19 November 2007.

#### Waterfront Zoning Working Group

The Waterfront Zoning Working Group had not met since before the last meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 26 July 2007 and there was therefore nothing to report. A further meeting of the Working Group had been scheduled for 11 October 2007. Members were advised that Councillor Carter would be attending this meeting as there were issues he wished to draw to the attention of the Working Group.

#### Travel Token Service

Councillor Dixon declared a personal interest in this item but remained in the meeting room during its discussion.

Consideration was given to a note of the meeting of the Travel Tokens Working Group held on 20 August 2007.

Members were advised that Malcolm Daughtry of National Travel Tokens had made a presentation to the Community and Environment Board on 10 September 2007 regarding the operation of COPS smartcards.

It was felt that the presentation had been useful but there were concerns that the cards could only be used for travelling by taxi and that there would be a cost to taxi drivers.

### **31. DEVELOPMENT OF A WORK PROGRAMME**

A copy of the current work programme for the Committee was circulated to Members. The programme contained brief details of areas which were currently being or were due to be scrutinised together with dates for appropriate reports to be made to Committee.

The Borough Solicitor advised that details of the Members' scrutiny training programme would be brought to the next ordinary meeting of the Committee together with suggested dates for the scrutiny of the Community Strategy.

27 September 2007

RESOLVED: That the work programme and the report dates contained therein be approved.

**32. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

There was no further business to discuss.

The meeting ended at 8.20 p.m.

CHAIRMAN

**AN EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY  
COMMITTEE WAS HELD ON 10 OCTOBER 2007**

Councillors Carr (P), Davis, Dickson (P), Foster, Foster-Reed, Jacobs (P), Kimber (P), Philpott (P), Mrs Salter (P), Mrs Searle (P) Train (P) and Ward (P).

It was reported that Councillors Mrs Cully and Allen had been nominated to replace Councillors Davis and Foster respectively for this meeting.

Before the meeting commenced, a minutes silence was observed in memory of Ron Wilson, a former officer of the Council, who had died the previous day.

**33. APOLOGIES**

Apologies for inability to attend the meeting were submitted on behalf of Councillors Davis, Foster and Foster-Reed.

**34. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

**35. DISPARITY IN SHORT-STAY CAR PARKING CHARGES AT LEE-  
ON-THE-SOLENT IN COMPARISON WITH THE REST OF THE  
BOROUGH**

The Chairman welcomed Mrs Liz Driver (petition organiser), Mr Richard Mackay (Lee-on-the-Solent Residents Association), Mr Peter Patterson (Lee-on-the-Solent traders Association), Councillor Cully (Leader of the Council) and Councillor Carter (Councillor for Lee West), who had been invited to the meeting to make observations and answer questions to assist the Committee in its scrutiny of this area of work.

The Chairman briefly reminded Members that it had been agreed at the meeting on 7 June 2007 that this subject be scrutinised at a future whole meeting of the Committee.

A number of questions were raised by Members to the invitees and the following responses made.

Councillor Cully advised that he was unaware of the thinking behind the proposal at Council to introduce two hours free short-stay car parking in the Town but not at Lee-on-the-Solent. He had recognised this disparity when it was raised by the Conservative Group. He felt there was a case for giving parity to short-stay parking in Lee-on-the-Solent but consideration would also have to be given to bringing long-stay charging in line with that at the Town Centre i.e. that charging should begin at 8.00 a.m. as opposed to 10.00 a.m.

Councillor Cully said that he had voted for the introduction of long-stay car parking charges at Lee-on-the-Solent beginning at 10.00 a.m. but there had been no free short-stay car parking at that time. He had not considered making changes to car parking charges during the February 2007 budget process. The Labour Group had only taken over Leadership of the Council in December 2006; there was a limited period in which to work on the budget and there had been other priorities. He had no objection to the proposal to scrutinise car parking charges and would like a review to take place. Following this, any judgement should be based on the evidence of the review and in the best interests of Gosport.

Officers advised that, should Lee-on-the-Solent short-stay car parking charges be given parity with those in the rest of the Borough, it was estimated that £50,000 in revenue would be lost on an annual basis.

Mr Mackay told the Committee that, should car parking charges at Lee-on-the-Solent receive parity, including long-stay charges beginning at 8.00 a.m. he felt there would be a much more contented feeling in the area. Elmore was a seafront car park and, if it were treated differently to Stokes Bay, there could be problems.

Mr Patterson advised that most traders operated from 8.30a.m. until 5.30 p.m. Generally, Lee Traders Association were in favour of car parking charges provided they were fair and reasonable. Free car parking in the short –stay car parks would probably suit some people but principally they were looking for parity with the Town Centre.

Mrs Driver advised that approximately 2,500 people had signed the petition to introduce parity with a further 150 signing that day. A further petition had been signed by 72 business representatives. She felt people would be happy with charging at long-stay car parks beginning at 8.00 a.m. and would like to see two hours free short-term parking.

Since the introduction of car parking charges, businesses had suffered. A large number of people had lost trade and 10 or 11 businesses had disappeared. There was a need to encourage people, even Lee residents, into Lee-on-the-Solent shopping area again.

Mr Patterson advised that car parking charges were an element contributing to the downturn of business in Lee-on-the-Solent. There were, however, more important issues to consider in order to bring businesses back to the area. Invitations had been extended to people to attend meetings of the Lee Traders Association to discuss car parking charges but the invitations had not been accepted.

Councillor Carter advised that residents were mainly concerned about the lack of parity with the rest of the Borough. The High Street had numerous cars parked on it and not many people were asking for free car parking, only parity.

Mrs Driver advised that the petition she organised started due to the introduction of free short-stay car parking in the Town Centre. Some concern was expressed by Members that a number of the signatories appeared to have addresses outside the area. Mrs Driver confirmed that they were visitors.

In response to the suggestion that there had been an increase in the use of car parks at Lee-on-the-Solent since the introduction of free parking in the Town Centre, Mrs Driver agreed that the weather may have been a factor as it was a seaside area. She stressed that people who did not live within walking distance of Lee-on-the-Solent no longer came to the area, preferring instead to go to Stubbington where the parking was free for one hour.

Mrs Driver agreed there were opportunities for people to park in Lee High Street, an opportunity not available in Gosport, but works carried out by Hampshire County Council did not help the situation.

Mr Patterson advised that these were safety road works which were of great importance.

Mr Mackay advised that, since the building of Cherque Farm, there had been an increase in the number of young visitors to the High Street. However, the estate was somewhat cut off from the centre of Lee. Many people living at Cherque Farm drove elsewhere to work and would do their shopping close to their workplace. A number of supermarkets in Gosport had their own car parking facility but this was not the case with the Co-op at Lee.

Mrs Driver said that, if car parking charge parity were given, there would be an improvement in trade provided the new arrangement was properly publicised.

Mr Patterson said that business was encouraging at the moment. A hard core of people shopped at Lee and he did not envisage any significant increase in trade should parity be given. He did, however, accept that his business was of a different nature to that of Mrs Driver; Mrs Driver's being service provision and his being retail.

Mr Mackay suggested the difference would be marginal. People were in the habit of shopping elsewhere. Most people considered the car parking charges to be unfair but not wrong.

Councillor Cully said he felt there should be parity for all car parks in the Borough. The proposer of free car parking in the Town Centre had invited the Conservative Group to put forward an amendment to include Lee short-stay car parks but this had not happened. He would have supported such an amendment but stressed that he considered it the responsibility of the Lee Councillors to put such a motion or amendment forward.

Councillor Cully said he would await the Committee's findings. If he felt that two hours free parking in Lee short-stay car parks was justified he would not be opposed to it but would wish long-stay charges to begin at 8.00 a.m.

In response to a question from a Member, Mr Mackay said that he did not blame any Councillor for the lack of parity but was unhappy that the matter had been under debate for so long.

Mr Patterson said he did not blame any one group. It was a matter of how important the funds were to the Council's finances.

Mrs Driver said that car parking charges had been introduced by the Conservative Group. The Lee Councillors should have done their best to bring parity to Lee but she felt they had not.

Councillor Cully said that he would be happy with the re-introduction of free car parking for two hours at Jamaica Place as with all other short-stay car parks. However, such a decision would have to be based on evidence.

The Chairman thanked the invitees for attending the meeting and for their contributions. At this point the invitees left the meeting.

Having listened to the views of the attendees, Members debated the way forward and the following views were expressed:

- there was a general consensus that parity was desired and would be fair
- free short-stay car parking in Lee-on-the-Solent would be at a cost of approximately £50,000 a year to the Borough
- should this be introduced, charges for long-stay car parks at Lee should start at 8.00 a.m. and not, as was the current arrangement, at 10.00 a.m.
- the invitees representing Lee-on-the-Solent felt the current charging arrangements to be unfair and none had appeared to object to the concept of parity in both short and long stay car parks
- should parity be introduced, it would be necessary to consider the impact on other services
- there was enough information available over the last two years regarding, for example, foot fall information and the impact on trade, to make a considered judgement
- an evidence based report should be brought to an extraordinary meeting of the Committee in four to six weeks time to consider a full scrutiny of car parking charges within the Borough

Members accordingly supported the last view and decided that a report should be presented to the Committee at a future meeting to enable a full scrutiny of car parking charges in the Borough to be carried out.

**RESOLVED:** That an evidence based report be brought to an extraordinary meeting of the Committee in four to six weeks time to consider a full scrutiny of car parking charges within the Borough.

10 October 2007

**36. CONSIDERATION OF REQUEST FOR SCRUTINY DEFERRED FROM THE 27 SEPTEMBER 2007 MEETING**

Members considered a request for scrutiny submitted by Councillor Wright, the Chairman of the Community and Environment Board, regarding the issuing of free parking permits to various organisations.

RESOLVED: That:

- a) the issue be scrutinised; and
- b) the scrutiny be carried out as part of the full scrutiny of car parking charges in the Borough.

**37. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

There was no further business to discuss.

The meeting ended at 8.10 p.m.

CHAIRMAN

**GOSPORT BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

**29 November 2007**

**ITEM FOR DISCUSSION**

**TITLE:** Best Value Performance Indicators

**AUTHOR:** Development Services Manager

**PURPOSE:** To consider performance information relating to Best Value Performance Indicators (BVPIs) and actions agreed by Chief Officers Management Team

**1.0 BACKGROUND**

1.1 The Council produces an Annual Best Value Performance Plan which is a policy framework document. The annual document contains a section on the Council's performance and BVPI's in particular.

**2.0 REPORT**

- 2.1 The purpose of Best Value is to establish a culture within local government that encourages good management practices delivering efficient, effective and economic services that meet the needs of our communities.
- 2.2 BVPIs are a mechanism for measuring our effectiveness in facilitating service improvement. Our performance is independently audited on an annual basis and we report our progress against BVPIs in the Best Value Performance Plan which is published by the Council in June of each year.
- 2.3 The analysis and comparison of BVPIs enables Government to monitor our progress; allows us to compare our performance with other local authorities; and provides our residents with information about our performance.
- 2.4 Our BVPI performance is regularly monitored by a sub group of the Chief Officers Management Team (CMT), the Performance Sub Group. I chair that group and am tasked with preparing exception reports to CMT in cases when performance is perceived to be likely to fall short of year end targets. This provides an early warning system to ensure that

high levels of performance are achieved at the earliest possible opportunity.

- 2.5 The Appendix to this report shows our BVPI performance at the end of the second quarter i.e. at September 2007 and, where appropriate, shows remedial actions that were agreed by CMT at its meeting on 20 November 2007.
- 2.6 The Committee is invited to consider and review this information.

### **SUPPORTING INFORMATION**

**Financial Implications:** None

**Legal Implications:** None

**Risk Assessment:** *Performance monitoring is essential to ensure services are being delivered effectively and efficiently, and to provide the earliest possible indication of the likelihood of service failure.*

**Background Papers:** *Best Value Performance Indicators 2007/8.*

**Appendices:** *BVPIs – Performance Sub Group Q2 review 2007/8.*

**Contact:** Mike Jeffery ext 5459

|       |  | 06/07<br>Actual | 07/08<br>Target | Focus | 07/08<br>End Q1 | 07/08<br>End Q2 | Comments/Remedial action   | Assess<br>Ment             |
|-------|--|-----------------|-----------------|-------|-----------------|-----------------|--|----------------------------|
|       | <b>CORPORATE HEALTH</b>  |                 |                 |       |                 |                 |  |                            |
| BV2a  | The level (if any) of the Equality Standard for Local Government to which the authority conforms.  | Level One       | Level One       | MED   | Level One       | Level One       |  | On Target                  |
| BV2b  | The duty to promote race equality – the percentage score against a checklist of 19 questions.  | 42%             | 42%             | MED   | 42%             | 42%             |  | On Target                  |
| BV8   | The percentage of invoices for commercial goods and services which were paid by the authority within 30 days of such invoices being received by the authority. | 95.82%          | 97.50%          | HIGH  | 97.47%          | 97.51%          |  | On Target                  |
| BV9   | Percentage of Council Tax collected (within the year).   | 96.97%          | 96.80%          | HIGH  | 29.72%          | 57.41%          |  | Target likely to be met    |
| BV10  | The percentage of non-domestic rates due for the financial year which were received by the authority.  | 97.92%          | 98.00%          | HIGH  | 47.77%          | 69.02%          |  | Target likely to be met    |
| BV11a | The percentage of top 5% of earners that are women.  | 26.97%          | 26.00%          | LOW   | 26.97%          | 26.97%          |  | On Target                  |
| BV11b | The percentage of top 5% of earners from black and minority ethnic communities.  | 0%              | 1.68%           | LOW   | 0.00%           | 0.00%           | Vacancies in top 5% are infrequent. Continue to monitor situation and related data.  | Target likely to be missed |
| BV11c | The percentage of top 5% of earners who have a disability.   | 0%              | 4.00%           | LOW   | 0.00%           | 0.00%           | Vacancies in top 5% are infrequent. Continue to monitor situation and related data.  | Target likely to be missed |
| BV12  | The number of working days/shifts lost due to sickness absence.<br>Cumulative indicator  | 8.82 days       | 8.29 days       | HIGH  | 1.92 days*      | 4.65 days       | Regular reports are considered by CMT. Procedures for dealing with sickness absence have been improved during 2007. Continue to monitor effectiveness of these procedures. | Target likely to be missed |
| BV14  | The percentage of employees retiring early (excluding ill-health retirements) as a percentage of the total work force.   | 0.30%           | 1.00%           | LOW   | 0.59%           | 1.47%           | No action  | Target likely to be missed |
| BV15  | The percentage of employees retiring on grounds of ill health as a percentage of the total workforce.  | 0.0%            | 1.00%           | LOW   | 0.00%           | 0.00%           |  | On Target                  |

|                         |   | 06/07<br>Actual | 07/08<br>Target | Focus | 07/08<br>End Q1 | 07/08<br>End Q2 | Comments/Remedial action | Assess<br>Ment          |
|-------------------------|---|-----------------|-----------------|-------|-----------------|-----------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| BV16a                   | The percentage of employees declaring that they meet the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 disability definition compared with...  | 4.03%           | 4.00%           | LOW   | 4.27%           | 4.15%           |                          | On Target               |
| BV16b                   | ...the percentage of economically active disabled people in the authority area.   | 12.92%          | ~               | LOW   | 12.92%          | 12.92%          |                          | n/a                     |
| BV17a                   | The percentage of employees from minority ethnic communities compared with...   | 1.9%            | 1.7%            | LOW   | 1.9%            | 2.0%            |                          | On Target               |
| BV156                   | The percentage of authority buildings open to the public in which all public areas are suitable for and accessible to disabled people.  | 20.00%          | 20.00%          | LOW   | 20.00%          | 20.00%          |                          | On Target               |
| <b>HOUSING SERVICES</b> |   |                 |                 |       |                 |                 |                          |                         |
| BV63                    | Energy Efficiency – the average SAP rating of local authority owned dwellings.  | 79              | 80              | LOW   | n/a             | 81              |                          | On Target               |
| BV64                    | The number of private sector vacant dwellings that are returned into occupation or demolished as a direct result of action by the local authority.<br>Cumulative indicator              | 259             | 240             | LOW   | n/a             | 140             |                          | On Target               |
| BV66a                   | Local authority rent collection and arrears: proportion of rent collected.  | 99.19%          | 99.00%          | HIGH  | 93.81%          | 96.64%          |                          | Target likely to be met |
| BV66b                   | The number of local authority tenants with more than seven weeks of (gross) rent arrears as a percentage of the total number of council tenants.  | 4.76%           | 4.15%           | HIGH  | 5.43%           | 5.58%           |                          | Target likely to be met |
| BV66c                   | Percentage of local authority tenants in arrears who have had Notices Seeking Possession served.  | 42.86%          | 42.00%          | LOW   | 10.45%          | 17.31%          |                          | On Target               |
| BV66d                   | Percentage of local authority tenants evicted as a result of rent arrears.  | 0.13%           | 0.27%           | LOW   | 0%              | 0.13%           |                          | On Target               |
| BV183b                  | The average length of stay in (ii) hostel accommodation of households which include dependent children or a pregnant woman and which are unintentionally homeless and in priority need. | 10.73 weeks     | 10.50 weeks     | HIGH  | 5.80 weeks      | 8.83 weeks      |                          | On Target               |
| BV184a                  | a) The proportion of LA homes which were non-decent at the start of the year (1 April).   | 23%%            | 21%             | HIGH  | 21%             | 21%             |                          | On Target               |

|          |  | 06/07<br>Actual | 07/08<br>Target | Focus | 07/08<br>End Q1 | 07/08<br>End Q2 | Comments/Remedial action | Assess<br>Ment          |
|----------|--|-----------------|-----------------|-------|-----------------|-----------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| BV184b   | b) The percentage change in proportion of non-decent LA homes during the year.   | 7.8%            | 10.0%           | HIGH  | n/a             | 3.96%           |                          | On Target               |
| BV202    | The number of people sleeping rough on a single night within the area of the authority.  | 4               | 4               | LOW   | n/a             | 4               |                          | On Target               |
| BV212    | Average time taken to re-let authority housing.  | 32 days         | 30 days         | HIGH  | 33.9 days       | 31 days         |                          | Target likely to be met |
| BV213    | Number of households who considered themselves as homeless, who approached the local housing authority's housing advice service(s), and for whom housing advice casework intervention resolved their situation.                      | 6               | 6               | HIGH  | 1.99            | 4.37            |                          | Target likely to be met |
|          | <b>HOUSING BENEFIT and COUNCIL TAX BENEFIT</b>   |                 |                 |       |                 |                 |                          |                         |
| BV76b    | The number of fraud investigators employed, per 1,000 caseload.  | 0.34            | 0.25-0.30       | LOW   | 0.29            | 0.30            |                          | On Target               |
| BV76c    | The number of fraud investigations, per 1,000 caseload.  | 20.11           | 10.00           | LOW   | 4.32            | 6.65            |                          | Target likely to be met |
| BV76d    | The number of prosecutions and sanctions, per 1,000 caseload.  | 6.08            | 4.20            | LOW   | 1.83            | 3.99            |                          | Target likely to be met |
| BV78a    | Speed of processing: a) Average time for processing new claims.  | 26.0 days       | 29.0 days       | HIGH  | 31.44 days      | 27.9 days       |                          | On Target               |
| BV78b    | Speed of processing: b) Average time for processing notifications of changes of circumstance.  | 20.5 days       | 20.0 days       | HIGH  | 17.96 days      | 13.8 days       |                          | On Target               |
| BV79a    | Accuracy of processing: a) Percentage of cases for which the calculation of the amount of benefit due was correct on the basis of the information available for the determination, for a sample of cases checked post-determination. | 99.00%          | 98.00%          | MED   | 100.0%          | 98.80%          |                          | On Target               |
| BV79b(i) | The amount of HB overpayments recovered during the period as a percentage of HB deemed recoverable overpayments for the period.  | 87.36%          | 64.00%          | HIGH  | 72.90%          | 69.62%          |                          | On Target               |

|             |  | 06/07<br>Actual | 07/08<br>Target | Focus | 07/08<br>End Q1 | 07/08<br>End Q2 | Comments/Remedial action  | Assess<br>Ment             |
|-------------|--|-----------------|-----------------|-------|-----------------|-----------------|---|----------------------------|
| BV79b(ii)   | HB overpayments recovered during the period as a percentage of the total amount of HB overpayment debt o/s at the start of the period plus the amount of HB overpayments identified in the period.       | 35.38%          | 35.00%          | HIGH  | 12.94%          | 13.14%          |   | Target likely to be met    |
| BV79b (iii) | HB overpayments written off during the period as a percentage of the total amount of HB overpayment debt o/s at the start of the period plus the amount of HB overpayments identified during the period. | 11.25%          | 10.00%          | HIGH  | 0.36%           | 0.71%           |   | On Target                  |
|             | <b>ENVIRONMENT</b>   |                 |                 |       |                 |                 |   |                            |
| BV82a(i)    | Percentage of the total tonnage of household waste arisings which have been recycled. (The Government target is to achieve 27% combined recycled and composted waste by 2007/8)                          | 22.80%          | 26.00%          | HIGH  | 24.45%          | 24.44%          | Contamination of recyclables with other waste is still an issue that is affecting performance. Public education campaigns are continuing. | Target likely to be missed |
| BV82a(ii)   | Total tonnage of household waste arisings which have been sent by the Authority for recycling.   | 6059.10 tonnes  | 6149.9 tonnes   | LOW   | 1598.14 tonnes  | 3243.81 tonnes  |   | Target likely to be met    |
| BV82b(i)    | Percentage of the total tonnage of household waste arisings which have been sent for composting.   | 1.32%           | 1.00%           | HIGH  | 1.82%           | 2.05%           |   | On Target                  |
| BV82b(ii)   | The tonnage of household waste sent by the Authority for composting or treatment by anaerobic digestion.   | 351.96 tonnes   | 357.24 tonnes   | LOW   | 119.80 tonnes   | 271.84 tonnes   |   | Target likely to be met    |
| BV84a       | Number of kilograms of household waste collected per head.   | 343.8 kg        | 349.0 kg        | HIGH  | 83.9 kg         | 169.7 kg        |   | Target likely to be met    |
| BV84b       | Percentage change from the previous financial year in the number of kilograms of household waste collected per head of the population.   | +0.73% Increase | 1.50%           | MED   | -4.3%           | -2.51%          |   | Target likely to be met    |
| BV86        | Cost of waste collection per household.  | £38.77          | £40.23          | HIGH  | £40.13          | £40.07          |   | On Target                  |
| BV91a       | Percentage of households resident in the authority's area served by kerbside collection of recyclables.  | 100%            | 100.0%          | LOW   | 100%            | 100%            |   | On Target                  |
| BV91b       | Percentage of households resident in the authority's area served by a kerbside collection of at least two recyclables.   | 86.0%           | 88.0%           | HIGH  | 94%             | 89%             |   | On Target                  |

|        |   | 06/07<br>Actual | 07/08<br>Target | Focus | 07/08<br>End Q1 | 07/08<br>End Q2 | Comments/Remedial action | Assess<br>Ment          |
|--------|---|-----------------|-----------------|-------|-----------------|-----------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| BV199a | The proportion of relevant land and highways as defined under EPA 1990 Part IV section 86 (expressed as a percentage) that is assessed as having combined deposits of litter and detritus (eg, sand, silt and other debris) across four categories of cleanliness (Clean, Light, Significant, Heavy). | 8.7%            | 10%             | HIGH  | 8.77%           | 9.57%           |                          | On Target               |
| BV199b | The proportion of relevant land and highways (expressed as a percentage) from which unacceptable levels of graffiti are visible.  | 4%              | 4%              | HIGH  | 0.42%           | 0.58%           |                          | On Target               |
| BV199c | The proportion of relevant land and highways (expressed as a percentage) from which unacceptable levels of fly-posting are visible.   | 0%              | 0%              | MED   | 0%              | 0%              |                          | On Target               |
| BV199d | The year-on-year reduction in total number of incidents and increase in total number of enforcement actions taken to deal with 'fly-tipping'.   | 1               | 2               | HIGH  | 2               | 3               |                          | Target likely to be met |
|        | <b>ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH</b>   |                 |                 |       |                 |                 |                          |                         |
| BV166a | Score against a checklist of enforcement best practice for environmental health.  | 100%            | 100%            | LOW   | 100%            | 100%            |                          | On Target               |
| BV216a | Number of 'sites of potential concern' [within the local authority area], with respect to land contamination.   | 186             | 180-200         | LOW   | 186             | 188             |                          | On Target               |
| BV216b | Number of sites for which sufficient detailed information is available to decide whether remediation of the land is necessary, as a percentage of all 'sites of potential concern'.   | 6%              | 6%              | LOW   | 6%              | 7%              |                          | On Target               |
| BV217  | Percentage of pollution control improvements to existing installations completed on time.   | 100%            | 90%             | HIGH  | 23%             | 27%             |                          | Target likely to be met |
| BV218a | Percentage of new reports of abandoned vehicles investigated within 24hrs of notification.  | 91.63%          | 92.00%          | HIGH  | 94.83%          | 93.83%          |                          | On Target               |

|                 |   | 06/07<br>Actual | 07/08<br>Target | Focus | 07/08<br>End Q1 | 07/08<br>End Q2 | Comments/Remedial action   | Assess<br>Ment             |
|-----------------|---|-----------------|-----------------|-------|-----------------|-----------------|--|----------------------------|
| BV218b          | Percentage of abandoned vehicles removed within 24hrs from the point at which the Authority is legally entitled to remove the vehicle.                                  | 54.86%          | 50.00%          | HIGH  | 26.83%          | 36.36%          | Continued failure of HCC to negotiate a new contract is likely to result in a failure to meet this target at year end. The current contract does not require all removals to be undertaken within 24 hours.  | Target likely to be missed |
| <b>PLANNING</b> |   |                 |                 |       |                 |                 |  |                            |
| BV106           | Percentage of new homes built on previously developed land.   | 100%            | 96.00%          | LOW   | 100%            | 100%            |  | On Target                  |
| BV109a          | Percentage of planning applications determined in line with the Government's development control targets to determine 60% of major applications determined in 13 weeks. | 80.00%          | 60.00%          | HIGH  | 50.00%          | 33.33%          | Reduced current performance due to loss of staff resources and implementation of new legislation which is having a significant effect on the ability to process planning applications in accordance with targets. Temporary staffing arrangements are in place to offset recent resignation of Principal Planning Officer and experience of use of the new legislation should improve performance. | Target likely to be missed |
| BV109b          | Percentage of planning applications determined in line with the Government's development control targets to determine 65% of minor applications determined in 8 weeks.  | 89.13%          | 65.00%          | HIGH  | 79.31%          | 66.67%          |  | Target likely to be missed |
| BV109c          | Percentage of planning applications determined in line with the Government's development control targets to determine 80% of other applications determined in 8 weeks.  | 94.44%          | 80.00%          | HIGH  | 82.64%          | 79.20%          |  | Target likely to be missed |
| BV200a          | Did the local planning authority submit the Local Development Scheme (LDS) by 28 <sup>th</sup> March 2005 and thereafter maintain a 3-year rolling programme?           | Yes             | Yes             | LOW   | 20.00%          | Yes             |  | On Target                  |
| BV200b          | Has the local planning authority met the mile stones which the current Local Development Scheme (LDS) sets out?   | Yes             | Yes             | MED   | Yes             | Yes             | HCC have not produced adequate transport schemes to support projected growth. Core Strategy cannot be published in Q4. Target will therefore be missed for the year. Revised timetable to be agreed with GOSE.   | Target likely to be missed |
| BV204           | Percentage of appeals allowed against the authority's decision to refuse planning applications.   | 50.0%           | 33.3%           | HIGH  | 0%              | 0%              |  | On Target                  |
| BV205           | Quality of service checklist- the percentage score against a checklist of 18 questions.   | 100%            | 100%            | LOW   | 100.0%          | 100.0%          |  | On Target                  |

|                                      |   | 06/07<br>Actual | 07/08<br>Target | Focus | 07/08<br>End Q1 | 07/08<br>End Q2 | Comments/Remedial action   | Assess<br>Ment             |
|--------------------------------------|---|-----------------|-----------------|-------|-----------------|-----------------|--|----------------------------|
| <b>CULTURAL and RELATED SERVICES</b> |   |                 |                 |       |                 |                 |  |                            |
| BV170a                               | The number of visits to/usages of museums per 1,000 population, N.B. This figure includes website "hits". | 3060.00         | 2900            | MED   | 639             | 1251            | Original target agreed prior to reduction in opening hours. Explosion to be transferred to new operator from 2008/09.  | Target likely to be missed |
| BV170b                               | The number of those visits [in BV170a] that were in person per 1,000 population.                          | 188.00          | 65              | MED   | 20              | 41              |  | Target likely to be met    |
| BV170c                               | The number of pupils visiting museums and galleries in organised school groups.                           | 1361            | 750             | MED   | 69              | 109             | Original target agreed prior to reduction in opening hours. Explosion to be transferred to new operator from 2008/09.  | Target likely to be missed |
| BV219b                               | Percentage of conservation areas in the local authority area with an up-to-date character appraisal.      | 68.75%          | 72.22%          | LOW   | 68.75%          | 56.25%          |  | On Target                  |
| <b>COMMUNITY SAFETY</b>              |   |                 |                 |       |                 |                 |  |                            |
| BV126                                | Domestic burglaries per 1,000 households.   | 8.66            | 10.4            | HIGH  | 1.40            | 2.6             |  | On Target                  |
| BV127a                               | Violent crimes per year, per 1,000 population in the Local Authority area.                                | 29.91           | 24.1            | HIGH  | 7.3             | 15.7            | Implementation of Violent Crime Reduction Plan has increased Police presence which has also increased amount of recorded crime. Increased Police presence should eventually have desired effect of reducing violent crime. | Target likely to be missed |
| BV127b                               | Robberies per year, per 1,000 population in the Local Authority area.                                     | 0.45            | 0.4             | HIGH  | 0.09            | 0.26            | Continue to monitor data and performance.  | Target likely to be missed |
| BV128                                | Vehicle crimes per 1,000 population.  | 11.01           | 10.4            | HIGH  | 2.24            | 4.3             |  | On Target                  |
| BV174                                | The number of racial incidents recorded by the authority per 100,000 population.                          | 5.17            | 0-10            | MED   | 0               | 0               |  | On Target                  |
| BV175                                | The percentage of racial incidents that resulted in further action.                                       | 100%            | 100%            | HIGH  | n/a             | n/a             |  | Target likely to be met    |
| BV225                                | Actions against domestic violence - the percentage score against a checklist of 11 questions.             | 36.4%           | 45.4%           | HIGH  | 45.5%           | 45.5%           |  | On Target                  |

|        |   | 06/07<br>Actual | 07/08<br>Target | Focus | 07/08<br>End Q1 | 07/08<br>End Q2 | Comments/Remedial action | Assess<br>Ment |
|--------|---|-----------------|-----------------|-------|-----------------|-----------------|--------------------------|----------------|
| BV226a | Total amount spent by the Local Authority on Advice and Guidance services provided by external organisations.   | £157785         | ~               | HIGH  | n/a             | n/a             |                          | n/a            |
| BV226b | Percentage of monies spent on advice and guidance services provision which was given to organisations holding the CLS Quality Mark at 'General Help' level and above. | 58.10%          | 50.00%          | HIGH  | n/a             | n/a             |                          | n/a            |
| BV226c | Total amount spent on Advice and Guidance in the areas of housing, welfare benefits and consumer matters which is provided directly by the authority to the public.   | £856750         | ~               | HIGH  | n/a             | n/a             |                          | n/a            |

**INTRODUCTION OF 20 MPH SPEED RESTRICTIONS:  
MINUTE EXTRACT FROM THE MEETING OF THE OVERVIEW AND  
SCRUTINY COMMITTEE HELD ON 27 SEPTEMBER 2007**

**27. INTRODUCTION OF 20 MPH SPEED RESTRICTIONS IN GOSPORT**

The Chairman welcomed Graham Carter (Hampshire County Council), Angela Gill (Portsmouth City Council) and Chris Laycock (Police) who were attending the meeting to assist the Committee with its scrutiny of this matter. Hampshire County Council was the Highway Authority and its policies and practices would be applied in respect of 20 mph limits. Portsmouth City Council had recently implemented 20 mph speed limits in a number of areas in liaison with the police, who were responsible for enforcement.

A number of questions were raised by Members and responses received as follows:

Councillor Allen asked whether speed restrictions could be policed. Chris Laycock replied that, if the environment was correct, no enforcement would be necessary as it would be self enforcing. However, it was important to introduce appropriate speed limits. The number of road policing officers was low and therefore policing priorities had to be decided using relevant data, for example, casualty levels.

Councillor Clinton asked whether there were any statistics to prove the effectiveness of speed restrictions in Hampshire. Graham Carter replied that there were thirty 20 speed restriction zones in Hampshire which were backed up by traffic calming measures. Such a zone had been introduced at Leigh Park in 1999 which included road humps. It was understood that this had been successful in reducing speed and accidents. Schemes had first been introduced in the early 1990s only where there had been accident justification. Latterly they had been introduced for other reasons such as environmental enhancement. There had been local involvement in setting up the schemes with resident panels and signs being designed by local schoolchildren.

Councillor Clinton asked whether entrances to schools were key to such decisions. Graham Carter replied that past initiatives had come about by reviewing speed limit policies in the light of Department for Transport guidelines. The limits should be self explanatory and self enforcing.

Mr Carter advised that the County Council was keen to address inappropriate driving outside schools by engaging both the schools and parents. This had led to the introduction of the current "Twenty Is Plenty" campaign. This was a voluntary arrangement whereby motorists would be advised, using road safety posters attached to existing street furniture, to drive at no more than 20 mph whilst passing schools. It may not be reasonable to have 20 mph speed limits at all times and to enforce different speed limits at different times during the day in one location would involve the use of very expensive signage. Such signage had been used in another local authority at a cost of £15,000 for one site. This was successful for only two or three weeks after which speeds gradually increased to their former level.

Prior to the summer holidays, all schools had been written to about the campaign and in September an information pack had been sent inviting the children to take part. The intention was that people would be more vigilant during school arrival and departure times and that parents would buy into the idea by promoting it in association with the schools.

Councillor Farr asked what action the police could take when instances of speeding were reported to them. Chris Laycock replied that there was a Community Reassurance Team and a Traffic Policing Unit to deal with speeding and anti social driving.

Councillor Farr asked how effective the introduction of 20 mph speed restrictions had been in Portsmouth. Angela Gill replied that an average drop of two to three miles per hour had been achieved in areas subject to this restriction. The speed limits had been introduced in roads where the average speed limit before the restrictions was 24 mph or less i.e. within 20% of what it was hoped to achieve. This was in accordance with Government guidelines for schemes without traffic calming. Where there were higher initial speeds the measures were unlikely to be effective using signs alone.

Councillor Davis asked whether the schools and communities were required to pay for "Twenty Is Plenty" campaigns. Graham Carter replied that they were but this might be via sponsorship.

Councillor Davis asked what leeway was given to drivers in 20 mph zones. Chris Laycock replied that, due to speedometer inaccuracies, a tolerance of 10% was allowed plus 2 mph in accordance with with Association of Chief Police Officers guidance. Although speed limits were expected to be self enforcing, if reports of excessive speeding were received, patrols would target the areas affected.

Councillor Davis asked whether speed restrictions were linked to parking controls. Graham Carter replied that all were linked by the Safer Routes to Schools programmes. The key element was persuasion, there were very few accidents outside schools but the "Twenty Is Plenty" campaign would enhance existing initiatives to create a safer environment and encourage walking and cycling.

Councillor Carr asked whether the twenty mph zones were enforced. Chris Laycock stated that they should be backed up by traffic calming measures. When visible police officers were on duty in the area the speed limits were adhered to so enforcement was difficult. He noted there was a need to educate people that speed can kill and create a wider acceptance that speeding is a real crime.

Councillor Carr asked about enforcement of areas where the "Twenty Is Plenty" scheme had been applied. Graham Carter advised that the scheme was not enforceable but more to do with "winning hearts and minds".

Councillor Kimber asked about the costs and funding involved in introducing schemes in Portsmouth. Angela Gill replied that funding was provided via the Local Transport Fund over a period of two years. Approximately £130,000 had so far been spent on 20mph speed sectors in residential areas. If it could be shown that speeds became low enough, it would represent good value for money.

Ms Gill advised that the city was divided into sectors for speed zoning purposes. Surveys using radar equipment had been carried out. Consultation with local people, including neighbourhood forum meetings, had taken place before proceeding to the Traffic Regulation Order.

Councillor Kimber expressed the view that illuminated speed limit reminder signs were useful but their impact did not last long. Graham Carter advised that such signage was often installed temporarily and, once some benefit had been gained, continually moved around different locations.

Councillor Clinton asked about the use of speed cameras. Graham Carter advised that the policy in Hampshire was that such cameras were only employed where there were above average numbers of speed related accidents. They were regarded as successful and mobile cameras meant that checks could be carried out in different areas.

Councillor Allen expressed concern that a great deal of money could be spent to deal with problems caused by a minority and there was a danger that not much would be achieved. Angela Gill advised that there were many narrow roads in Portsmouth where it would be inappropriate for anyone to drive at 30 mph or more. The average speed travelled on these roads should therefore be low. The speed limit would be clearly indicated by signs at 200 metre intervals. It was hoped that local people would then expect this standard of driving and users change their perception of the way roads should be used.

Graham Carter advised that it was important to learn any lessons and that community involvement was essential. There was also a need to reinforce messages from time to time otherwise roads would have to be re-engineered at great cost. In villages people had been generally supportive of 30 mph speed limits. In rural areas they had not wanted physical traffic calming measures but were happy with illuminated signs.

Chris Laycock advised that generally the culture was that speed limits did not represent proper law. Compliance with the law could be encouraged by a combination of direct enforcement, engineering, education of motorists and changing perceptions by providing an appropriate street environment.

Graham Carter advised that, on occasions, there had been a tendency to over engineer but there was no single solution to speeding. The right techniques should be applied in the right places for the right reasons. There would always be a hard core who take no notice of speed restrictions and therefore the local community should assist the police in targeting any problems.

Councillor Mrs Salter suggested that “Twenty Is Plenty” could be advertised, for example, on the sides of buses. Chris Laycock advised that the Road Safety Team at Hampshire had designed a banner for school gates and fences.

Angela Gill advised that, in Portsmouth, the road safety education team were gradually engendering increasing interest amongst the schools.

Councillor Philpott asked how successful speed restrictions had been in London. Angela Gill replied that, from her experience, speed restrictions backed up by traffic calming measures had been successful.

The Chairman thanked Ms Gill and Messrs Carter and Laycock for attending the meeting and for their contributions.

RESOLVED: That:

- a) a note of the discussion at this meeting be forwarded to all Members of the Committee; and
- b) the scrutiny of the introduction of 20 mph speed restrictions in Gosport be further considered at the next ordinary meeting of the Committee.

**NOTE TO OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE: 29 NOVEMBER 2007**

**INTRODUCTION OF 20 MPH SPEED RESTRICTIONS**

'The Development Services Manager advises that the Borough, as Hampshire County Council's (HCC) agent, could be requested by HCC to identify such schemes but have never been encouraged to do so by HCC, who have no defined policy on their application. Any request by the Borough Council to identify schemes should be made to HCC. However, significant additional resources would need to be provided to my Traffic Management Team by HCC to take the process forward even to the consultation stage.

Funding is likely only to be available from the Local Transport Plan programme for Safety Schemes which are subject to a fairly rigorous appraisal process and are unlikely to be supported by HCC unless they are considered to be the most appropriate solution for a proven accident problem.

HCC do keep an accident database and, if they considered that there was evidence of problems in specific locations in Gosport, then these would have already been flagged up through the LTP Safety Scheme Programme'

## AGENDA ITEM NO. 6

|                         |  |
|-------------------------|--|
| <b>Board/Committee:</b> | <b>OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE</b>             |
| <b>Date of meeting:</b> | <b>29 NOVEMBER 2007</b>                            |
| <b>Title:</b>           | <b>WATERFRONT ZONING WORKING GROUP</b>             |
| <b>Author:</b>          | <b>LEISURE &amp; CULTURAL SERVICES<br/>MANAGER</b> |
| <b>Status:</b>          | FOR APPROVAL                                       |

### **Purpose**

The report provides the Committee with an update on progress made by the Waterfront Working Group.

### **Recommendation**

The Committee are requested to approve the actions proposed by the Working Group to improve the information available to the public in respect of water recreation activities.

#### **1. Background**

1. The Waterfront Zoning Working Group was set up to examine in greater detail the arrangements for management of the various issues arising from use of the water at Lee on the Solent and Stokes Bay. A series of meetings have been held in November 2006, July 2007 and October 2007.
2. The discussions have proved to be very fruitful and have resulted in a set of proposals for action and implementation that it is believed will improve the future management of the water areas. In addition to this, the proposed new map designs will also be informative for other visitors to the seafront areas whether they are taking part in water recreation or not.
3. At the meeting of the Group in July 2007 the following actions were agreed:
  - Provide a map showing the potential zoning of Stokes Bay Waterfront at the next meeting of the Working Group
  - Provide an extended map of Lee-on-the-Solent Waterfront showing zoning and usages at the next meeting of the Working Group
  - Once a draft layout was agreed, to carry out a consultation exercise with stakeholders and interested persons/organisations and report back to the Working Group prior to presenting reports to Overview and Scrutiny Committee and C&E Board

- Investigate sources of external funding for Waterfront Projects and report back to a future meeting of the Working Group
4. At the meeting of the Waterfront Zoning Working Group on October 11, Members agreed that the work of the Group was now complete and that a final report be made to this Committee together with supporting documentation and information on the following
- sea and land based zoning maps for Lee-on-the-Solent and Stokes Bay. [Copies are attached to this report]
  - details on the concept of the provision of petanque facilities at Stokes Bay together with ideas on possible sponsorship
  - details on how to address the question of illegal trading on the beaches
- 5.1 Officers have been making enquiries in respect of the potential for developing and operating petanque facilities. An update may be able to be given to the Committee if further progress has been made.
- 5.2 Comments have been received from Officers in Environmental Health and Legal Services in respect of illegal trading. These are contained within Appendix A of this report.

|   |                                    |
|---|------------------------------------|
| <b>Financial Services comments:</b>           | None directly from this report.    |
| <b>Legal Services comments:</b>               | Contained within the report.       |
| <b>Service Improvement Plan implications:</b> |                                    |
| <b>Corporate Plan:</b>                        |                                    |
| <b>Risk Assessment:</b>                       |                                    |
| <b>Background papers:</b>                     |                                    |
| <b>Appendices / Enclosures:</b>               |                                    |
| Appendix 'A'                                  | Street Trading Consent Information |
| <b>Report Author / Lead Officer:</b>          | David Martin                       |

## APPENDIX A

The entire Borough is subject to street trading consents (except Ann's Hill Road outside of the cemetery). This makes it an offence to trade without the consent of the Council, which has to be purchased, and is subject to street trading policy. Where Leisure & Cultural Services have issued a concession, this is deemed to also be a consent.

The real issue is not the offence, but how to enforce it. The most obvious resource would be the Streetscene Enforcement Officers and the PCSOs who could witness the offence i.e. sale of goods without the necessary consent, and provide witness statements and details of the offenders to the Licensing Team.

The Licensing Officers can also respond to complaints, but they have limited 'out of hours' working arrangements to monitor the situation. Once evidence is produced, the Licensing Team will identify the most appropriate course of action to undertake in line with the Council's Enforcement Policy.

A second statutory requirement is for all food businesses to be registered; this can be with the local authority in whose area they trade, or where they base their vehicle. If the Council is looking to discourage street traders who provide food, they can require details of registration (trading without a registration is an offence).

Streetscene/PCSO are not authorised under food legislation so they would have to provide details of traders to the Environmental Health Commercial Team to follow up. The registering authority does not have to provide documented proof of registration so it would be an oral response.

Any food vendor will have to comply with the Food Safety Act requirements and, as such, are subject to inspection by food officers of the Council at any time. The result of any inspection will be posted on the 'Safe2eat' web site; this is a further discouragement to unsatisfactory traders.

Vehicles used by vendors must comply with Health and Safety requirements; however, this is principally a Health and Safety Executive responsibility as traders are not trading from fixed sites. There are issues with gas fittings and inappropriate siting of vehicles.

It will also be possible to take action, if the land in question belongs to the Council, under the law of trespass. If a notice is placed on the land that trading is not permitted without our consent and then traders come on to our land, they will not be abiding by our rules and we can take an action in trespass. Injunctions could be obtained to prevent further trading.



STOKES BAY Water  
Activity Leaflet 2007.



LEE Water Activity  
Leaflet 2007.pdf

**AGENDA NO. 9(i)****BRIEFING NOTE**

|          |  |
|----------|--|
| To:      | <b>OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE</b> |
| Date:    | 29 November 2007                       |
| Title:   | Southern Water Working Group           |
| Author:  | Borough Solicitor                      |
| Purpose: | For Information                        |

**BACKGROUND**

It was resolved at a meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 5 April 2007 to set up a Working Group of 3 Members (1:1:1) to investigate strategic and operational concerns connected to Southern Water's management of the Borough's wastewater system. Councillors Davis, Carr and Jacobs were nominated to lead the investigation.

**PROGRESS**

There have been three meetings of the Working Group in July, August and September.

At the first meeting, Members agreed the Scoping Report which set out the objectives of the group.

At the second meeting, Members received a set of responses from a consultation on flooding which had been carried out with all Councillors and a report on the Southern Water planning consultation responses received by the Council. The Group also discussed the problem of sewers and drains that had not been adopted by the Water Company.

The third meeting saw Members receive a set of responses from HCC Highways on the flooding issues raised by Councillors during the earlier consultation. Members also received an update on the Southern Water Business Plan and requested that a Freedom of Information Request be made for information that Southern Water had deemed confidential. The group continued to concentrate the scope of the enquiry and identified several wastewater issues that needed closer attention.

A further meeting of the Working Group has been scheduled for late November. Amongst other items, this meeting will see Members decide on some questions to be submitted to Southern Water, and hear evidence from Borough residents who have had dealings with the water company over previous years.

**AGENDA NO. 9(ii)****BRIEFING NOTE**

|          |  |
|----------|--|
| To:      | <b>OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE</b> |
| Date:    | 29 November 2007                       |
| Title:   | Update on Travel Token Working Group   |
| Author:  | Borough Solicitor                      |
| Purpose: | For Information                        |

**Background**

At its meeting on 26 July 2007, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee considered a request for scrutiny of the Travel Token scheme operated by the Council and established a 1:1:1 Working Group comprising Councillors Mrs Salter, Train and Ward.

**Progress of the Working Group**

In the two meetings of the Working Group in August and November, consideration has been given to the current Travel Token scheme operated by the Council; Tokens to the value of £40 in fifty pence denominations have been issued for use on buses, the Gosport and Isle of Wight Ferries and local taxis. The disadvantage of this system is that there is no way of monitoring the use of the tokens or of recouping the cost of tokens that are not used.

As an alternative, Members requested information on the National Transport Tokens Limited travel scheme involving the use of smart cards in taxis. These smart cards could be credited at the beginning of a year and set to allow a maximum fare to be deducted for each journey made. Any unused credit would be refunded to the Council at the end of the year.

A representative of National Transport Tokens Limited was invited to give a presentation of the scheme to the Community and Environment Board on 10 September 2007. It was noted that Milton Keynes and Dumfries and Galloway Councils were already operating the Smart Card scheme and officers were requested to ascertain from these Councils their satisfaction with the scheme.

The Working Group have considered the presentation by Mr Daughtrey, Managing Director of National Transport Tokens Limited. Accordingly, the cost of the installation of terminals in taxis to read the smart cards has been considered. In this light, officers were requested to discuss with Licensing Officers whether or not part of the cost could be recouped by way of an increase in the licence fee or directly from taxi operators. Officers were also asked to look at the current taxi tariff to ascertain the most appropriate maximum amount to debit from a card for each taxi journey taken.

A further meeting of the Working Group is scheduled for February 2008.

## OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE: WORK PROGRAMME

| Work Area  | Lead Officer   | Date to be reported to Committee   |
|--|----------------|--|
| Best Value Performance Indicators:<br><i>Policy Framework Document:</i><br><i>Consideration of performance information relating to BVPIs and actions agreed by CMT</i> | Mike Jeffery   | At 6-monthly intervals<br>See Q dates<br>June/Nov                          |
| Community Strategy Action Plan:<br><i>Policy Framework Document</i>  | Julie Petty    | At 6-monthly intervals   |
| Scrutiny Training:<br><i>Training for Members on Modules of "Why Scrutiny Matters"</i>   | Linda Edwards  | To be completed by<br>27 March 2008  |
| Southern Water Working Group   | Joe Martin     | Update 29 November 2007  |
| Waterfront Zoning Working Group  | David Martin   | Report 29 November 2007  |
| Travel Tokens Working Group  | Julian Bowcher | Update 29 November 2007  |
| Disability Equality Scheme:<br><i>Receive progress report on an annual basis</i>   | Julie Petty    | June 2008  |
| Introduction of 20 mph speed restrictions  | Dave Duckett   | 29 November 2007   |
| Car Parking in the Borough (including Lee-on-the-Solent)   | David Jago     | Consideration of timetable, scope and format of scrutiny: 29 November 2007 |
| Work areas: <i>Review at each meeting</i>  |                |  |