

CABINET

**Monday, 1st August, 2011
at 4.30 pm**

**Consideration of the Executive
Business will start no earlier
than 5:00 pm**

Committee Rooms 1 and 2

This meeting is open to the public

Members

Councillor Smith, Leader of the Council
Councillor Moulton, Cabinet Member for Children's
Services and Learning
Councillor Baillie, Cabinet Member for Housing
Councillor Fitzhenry, Cabinet Member for
Environment and Transport
Councillor Hannides, Cabinet Member for
Resources, Leisure and Culture
Councillor White, Cabinet Member for Adult Social
Care and Health

(QUORUM – 2)

Contacts

Cabinet Administrator
Judy Cordell
Tel: 023 8083 2766
Email: judy.cordell@southampton.gov.uk

Director of Economic Development
Dawn Baxendale
Tel: 023 8091 7713
Email: dawn.baxendale@southampton.gov.uk

BACKGROUND AND RELEVANT INFORMATION

The Role of the Executive

The Cabinet and individual Cabinet Members make executive decisions relating to services provided by the Council, except for those matters which are reserved for decision by the full Council and planning and licensing matters which are dealt with by specialist regulatory panels.

Executive Functions

The specific functions for which the Cabinet and individual Cabinet Members are responsible are contained in Part 3 of the Council's Constitution. Copies of the Constitution are available on request or from the City Council website, www.southampton.gov.uk

The Forward Plan

The Forward Plan is published on a monthly basis and provides details of all the key executive decisions to be made in the four month period following its publication. The Forward Plan is available on request or on the Southampton City Council website, www.southampton.gov.uk

Key Decisions

A Key Decision is an Executive Decision that is likely to have a significant

- financial impact (£500,000 or more)
- impact on two or more wards
- impact on an identifiable community

Decisions to be discussed or taken that are key

Implementation of Decisions

Any Executive Decision may be "called-in" as part of the Council's Overview and Scrutiny function for review and scrutiny. The relevant Overview and Scrutiny Panel may ask the Executive to reconsider a decision, but does not have the power to change the decision themselves.

Southampton City Council's Seven Priorities

- More jobs for local people
- More local people who are well educated and skilled
- A better and safer place in which to live and invest
- Better protection for children and young people
- Support for the most vulnerable people and families
- Reducing health inequalities
- Reshaping the Council for the future

Procedure / Public Representations

Reports for decision by the Cabinet (Part A of the agenda) or by individual Cabinet Members (Part B of the agenda). Interested members of the public may, with the consent of the Cabinet Chair or the individual Cabinet Member as appropriate, make representations thereon.

Smoking policy – The Council operates a no-smoking policy in all civic buildings.

Mobile Telephones – Please turn off your mobile telephone whilst in the meeting.

Fire Procedure – In the event of a fire or other emergency, a continuous alarm will sound and you will be advised, by officers of the Council, of what action to take.

Access – Access is available for disabled people. Please contact the Cabinet Administrator who will help to make any necessary arrangements.

Municipal Year Dates (Mondays)

2011	2012
6 June	16 January
4 July	6 February
1 August	13 February
5 September	12 March
26 September	16 April
24 October	
21 November	
19 December	

CONDUCT OF MEETING

TERMS OF REFERENCE

The terms of reference of the Cabinet, and its Executive Members, are set out in Part 3 of the Council's Constitution.

BUSINESS TO BE DISCUSSED

Only those items listed on the attached agenda may be considered at this meeting.

RULES OF PROCEDURE

The meeting is governed by the Executive Procedure Rules as set out in Part 4 of the Council's Constitution.

QUORUM

The minimum number of appointed Members required to be in attendance to hold the meeting is 2.

DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

Members are required to disclose, in accordance with the Members' Code of Conduct, **both** the existence **and** nature of any "personal" or "prejudicial" interests they may have in relation to matters for consideration on this Agenda.

PERSONAL INTERESTS

A Member must regard himself or herself as having a personal interest in any matter:

- (i) if the matter relates to an interest in the Member's register of interests; or
- (ii) if a decision upon a matter might reasonably be regarded as affecting to a greater extent than other Council Tax payers, ratepayers and inhabitants of the District, the wellbeing or financial position of himself or herself, a relative or a friend or:-
 - (a) any employment or business carried on by such person;
 - (b) any person who employs or has appointed such a person, any firm in which such a person is a partner, or any company of which such a person is a director;
 - (c) any corporate body in which such a person has a beneficial interest in a class of securities exceeding the nominal value of £5,000; or
 - (d) any body listed in Article 14(a) to (e) in which such a person holds a position of general control or management.

A Member must disclose a personal interest.

Cont/...

Prejudicial Interests

Having identified a personal interest, a Member must consider whether a member of the public with knowledge of the relevant facts would reasonably think that the interest was so significant and particular that it could prejudice that Member's judgement of the public interest. If that is the case, the interest must be regarded as "prejudicial" and the Member must disclose the interest and withdraw from the meeting room during discussion on the item.

It should be noted that a prejudicial interest may apply to part or the whole of an item.

Where there are a series of inter-related financial or resource matters, with a limited resource available, under consideration a prejudicial interest in one matter relating to that resource may lead to a member being excluded from considering the other matters relating to that same limited resource.

There are some limited exceptions.

Note: Members are encouraged to seek advice from the Monitoring Officer or his staff in Democratic Services if they have any problems or concerns in relation to the above.

Principles of Decision Making

All decisions of the Council will be made in accordance with the following principles:-

- proportionality (i.e. the action must be proportionate to the desired outcome);
- due consultation and the taking of professional advice from officers;
- respect for human rights;
- a presumption in favour of openness, accountability and transparency;
- setting out what options have been considered;
- setting out reasons for the decision; and
- clarity of aims and desired outcomes.

In exercising discretion, the decision maker must:

- understand the law that regulates the decision making power and gives effect to it. The decision-maker must direct itself properly in law;
- take into account all relevant matters (those matters which the law requires the authority as a matter of legal obligation to take into account);
- leave out of account irrelevant considerations;
- act for a proper purpose, exercising its powers for the public good;
- not reach a decision which no authority acting reasonably could reach, (also known as the "rationality" or "taking leave of your senses" principle);
- comply with the rule that local government finance is to be conducted on an annual basis. Save to the extent authorised by Parliament, 'live now, pay later' and forward funding are unlawful; and
- act with procedural propriety in accordance with the rules of fairness.

AGENDA

Agendas and papers are now available via the Council's Website

1 APOLOGIES

To receive any apologies.

2 DISCLOSURE OF PERSONAL AND PREJUDICIAL INTERESTS

In accordance with the Local Government Act 2000, and the Council's Code of Conduct adopted on 16th May 2007, Members to disclose any personal or prejudicial interests in any matter included on the agenda for this meeting.

NOTE: Members are reminded that, where applicable, they must complete the appropriate form recording details of any such interests and hand it to the Democratic Support Officer

TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS

3 PROPOSED CHANGES TO PERMITS AND PERMIT CHARGES FOR RESIDENTS PARKING SCHEMES ZONES 1-12 & 16 (TRO)

Report of the Head of Highways Infrastructure Services seeking approval for proposed changes to permits and permit charges, attached.

EXECUTIVE BUSINESS

4 STATEMENT FROM THE LEADER

5 RECORD OF THE PREVIOUS DECISION MAKING

Record of the decision making held on 4th July 2011, attached.

6 MATTERS REFERRED BY THE COUNCIL OR BY THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE FOR RECONSIDERATION (IF ANY)

There are no matters referred for reconsideration.

7 REPORTS FROM OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEES (IF ANY)

There are no items for consideration

8 EXECUTIVE APPOINTMENTS

To deal with any executive appointments, as required.

ITEMS FOR DECISION BY CABINET

9 SOUTHAMPTON BUS PARTNERSHIP

Report of the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport seeking approval to sign the Southampton Quality Bus Partnership with bus operators, attached.

10 HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT (HRA) CAPITAL PROGRAMME PROJECT APPROVALS 2011/12 - PHASE 2

Report of the Cabinet Member for Housing seeking approval for various projects, attached.

11 DISPOSAL OF HRA EMPTY PROPERTIES

Report of the Cabinet Member for Housing seeking approval for the sale of empty Housing Revenue Account Dwellings, attached.

12 2012 - 2013 GRANTS TO VOLUNTARY ORGANISATIONS

Report of the Cabinet Member for Housing seeking approval in principle for the grants for 2012 - 2013, attached.

NOTE: This report is presented as a general exception item in accordance with paragraph 15 of the Access to Information Procedure Rules of Part 4 of the Council's Constitution, as it has not been included in the Council's Forward Plan.

Friday, 22 July 2011

HEAD OF LEGAL AND DEMOCRATIC SERVICES

Agenda Item 3

DECISION-MAKER:	CABINET
SUBJECT:	PROPOSED CHANGES TO PERMITS AND PERMIT CHARGES FOR RESIDENTS PARKING SCHEMES ZONES 1-12 AND 16 (TRO)
DATE OF DECISION:	1 AUGUST 2011
REPORT OF:	CITY PATROL AND PARKING SERVICES MANAGER
STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY	
None	

BRIEF SUMMARY

A Traffic Regulation Order was proposed on 27th May 2011 proposing changes to permits and permits charges in Zones 1-12 and 16 (see Appendix 1). In response to the public notice there are objections and concerns that are following due process in being brought to the Cabinet of the Council to consider and to decide whether the proposed changes are approved, amended or withdrawn.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- (i) That the Cabinet approve the proposed introduction of charges for (day) Visitor Permits and the introduction of an Annual Visitor Permit, with consideration of any additional conditions of use that may be required to prevent misuse. Also that the Cabinet approves changes to the issue and conditions of use for Business Permits.
- (ii) That subject to the approval of the above changes, that the charge for a Second Residents Parking Permit is reduced from £60 to £30 per year.

REASONS FOR REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the proposals align with Council Local Transport Policy in promoting sustainable travel and Parking Policy in assisting with the funding of the design, administration, and enforcement of permit parking schemes.
2. The proposed changes provide a framework in which the issue, conditions of use and enforcement of parking permits can be managed by Parking Services to deliver benefits to residents and commercial users, where appropriate.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

3. Taking no action was rejected on the basis that this could put at risk the level of enforcement of existing schemes and the capacity for the Council to promote sustainable transport and continue its policy of responding to community demands for permit parking.

DETAIL (Including consultation carried out)

4. Consultation

The budget review in July 2010 (including the proposed charges for Visitor Permits) was covered extensively by local media. A public notice detailing the proposed changes to permits and permit charges was then advertised in the Daily Echo in May, as is Council practice for variations in parking charges.

5. **Objections / Concerns**

Any prospective charges or increased charge for any Council service is unwelcome, particularly when many households are under financial pressure. In the case of permit charges, this is particularly the case, as most residents view the problem of non-resident parking, as not of their making. There are also often views presented by residents that the Council is infringing upon the right of residents to park freely outside their own property.

In terms of the specific responses to the Public Notice, the point that Mrs Roux raises (see extract below and at Appendix 2) on having to pay for visitors permits is therefore likely to be shared by many residents.

“I object to paying for visitors parking permits. I pay for my 2nd car, I pay road tax also council tax, therefore why should I pay for permits, so people can visit me.”

Mrs Roux also understandably highlights the impact on elderly people, who may not have vehicles but still would be expected to pay in circumstances where there are already financial pressures on the community from rising prices. Mrs Roux also objects to Annual Visitors Permits as they would extend the scope for misuse by enabling households to park a third vehicle. She also highlights the current misuse of Visitor Permits to support this view.

The practicalities of Annual Visitor Permits working in inner city areas such as the Bevois Ward, with the shortage of parking and potential for misuse is also stated by Councillor Rayment (see Appendix 2) in her objection. She also highlights the existing difficulties for residents finding available parking, with existing demands for short stay parking.

6. **Officer’s comments – Sustainable Travel and Permit Schemes**

The Local Transport Plan (LTP) 2006-11 emphasises Council policy in promoting sustainable travel and its support for residents affected by parking from major attractors (see below).

Residential areas – these are the living spaces for City residents and, as far as possible, the Council will ensure that the adverse effects of transport in them are minimised and that accessibility is maximised. This implies the adoption of effective traffic management measures and the promotion of sustainable travel modes. (LTP 2006-11)

Parking policy in residential areas will continue to focus on ensuring that residents do not experience problems resulting from commuter parking, or from parking generated by major attractors (such as hospitals, education establishments, leisure venues, etc). (LTP 2006-11)

Thus around the University of Southampton the introduction of permit parking has helped to both, make on-street parking available for residents and their visitors, and to promote the use of Uni-Link bus service which has grown to over 3 million passengers annually. Together these approaches have helped to reduce congestion and carbon emissions.

7. **Officer's comments – Permit Charges**

The Council recognises the importance of on-street parking to residents and has therefore maintained the principle of first Resident Permits being free of charge. Given concerns of residents, the proposals also sought to reduce the extent of any prospective increase in charges for Visitor Permits by seeking to reduce the cost (£55K) of printing of (day) Visitor Permits by introducing an Annual Visitors Permit. It was intended that those households contributing to the cost of permit schemes through second Resident Permits should, where possible, not be asked to pay more. The proposal facilitates this by setting the cost of an Annual Visitors Permit at £30 per year and reducing the cost of second permits from £60 to £30. Therefore for resident such as Mrs Roux it is intended that the savings in the cost of the second Residents Permits should cover the cost of visitor parking.

It is also important to note that there is no proposed charge for Essential Visitor Permits. Therefore elderly or disabled residents dependent on carers or family members can make of use of this permit for visitors without cost. The Annual Visitor Permits would also allow more visits than the current entitlement to 60 (day) Visitor Permits would allow.

It should also be noted that during public consultations we also receive concerns from residents outside of the permit parking zones objecting to bearing the costs of these schemes.

8. **Officer's comments – Permit Misuse**

The issue of the misuse of Visitor Permits for resident or commuter parking is a concern which these proposals are intended to deter rather than encourage. The absence of any charge for the existing Visitor Permits allows them to be transferred at no cost to the original applicant with potential for financial gain. This increases the cost of printing to deter counterfeiting and limits the availability to 60 per household to reduce costs and limit the scope of misuse. Whilst introducing a charge for these permits may not reduce calculated misuse it should help deter casual misuse. The intention is also very much to deter the misuse of Annual Visitor Permits. The limit of 8 hours per day parking (including limited waiting) is thus intended to benefit day-time visitors rather than extended periods of stay that might be associated with resident parking. The restriction on parking within 250m has two aims:-

- To prevent permit being used to commute or park across a zone
- To limit use in areas where there is a shortage of parking.

Another key aspect of the proposal is that the issue/reissue of Annual Visitor Permits is subject to limits. Therefore in zones where there are issues with available parking the initial issue may be limited or where difficulties arise in zones, the reissue of permits may be reduced. Whilst this procedure would be outside of the Traffic Regulation Order, it is intended that this process is undertaken through discussion between SCC Parking Services and Ward Councillors.

Given the concerns raised, Cabinet may however wish to consider the imposition of a further condition applied in Norwich *that holders of Annual Visitors Permit should inform the Council if they wish to use a permit for the same vehicle for a period of more than 14 days*. Such a specific condition of

use need not be stipulated within the TRO and is therefore is at the discretion of the Council.

9. Officers comments – Overall

Otherwise it is the view of the Traffic Management team that whilst appreciating the concerns raised, that the TRO provides an appropriate framework to continue to promote sustainable transport through helping to address future funding for the design, administration and enforcement of permit parking schemes. The proposals also help to manage the allocation and conditions of use of permits to meet current and changing circumstances across the zones.

RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

Capital/Revenue

10. The cost and revenue analysis is shown below, the part year covering the period from 1/9/2011-31/3/11 and the full year for 2012/13 and following years. The costs and revenue are managed through SCC Parking Services budgets.

Description	Part Year £	Full Year £
Set-up costs	10,000	0
<u>Income</u>		
Daily Visitor Permits	28,331	48,568
Annual Visitors Permits	45,308	77,670
Second Permits (reduced price)	-9,748	-16,710
Income sub-total	63,891	109,528
Administration (net increased costs)	11,391	19,527
Net Increase	42,500	90,000

Property/Other

11. None

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Statutory power to undertake proposals in the report:

12. The Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 permits the introduction of the parking restrictions as set out in this report in accordance with a statutory consultation procedure set down in the Act and associated secondary legislation.

Other Legal Implications:

13. In preparing and determining the proposals set out in this report the Council is required to have regard to the provisions of Equalities legislation, the Human Rights Act 1988 and s.17 Crime and Disorder Act 1998 (the duty to have regard to the need to remove or reduce crime and disorder in the area). It is considered that the proposals set out in this report are proportionate having regard to the wider needs of the area

POLICY FRAMEWORK IMPLICATIONS

14. N/A

AUTHOR:	Name:	Graham Muir	Tel:	023 80388037
	E-mail:	graham.muir@bbisl.gov.uk		

KEY DECISION? Yes

WARDS/COMMUNITIES AFFECTED:	All
------------------------------------	-----

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Non-confidential appendices are in the Members' Rooms and can be accessed on-line

Appendices

1.	Copy of Public Notice and Statement of Reasons
2.	Objections and Concerns over the proposed changes to Permits and Permit Charges
3.	Other objections or concerns received after the closure of the public consultation (<i>none at present</i>)

Documents In Members' Rooms

1.	N/A
----	-----

Integrated Impact Assessment

Do the implications/subject of the report require an Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) to be carried out.	Yes/No
--	--------

Other Background Documents

Integrated Impact Assessment and Other Background documents available for inspection at: N/A

Title of Background Paper(s)	Relevant Paragraph of the Access to Information Procedure Rules / Schedule 12A allowing document to be Exempt/Confidential (if applicable)
------------------------------	--

1.	None
----	------

This page is intentionally left blank

Copy of Public Notice and Statement of Reasons

**NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL
proposes to make the following Order:**

THE CITY OF SOUTHAMPTON (RESIDENTS' PARKING SCHEMES) (AMENDMENT) ORDER 2011

1 The effects of the Order are as follows:-

Visitor Permits in Zones 1-12 & 16:

- (a) To introduce a charge of £6 for each booklet of (10) Visitor Parking Permits, with no change to the current allocation and conditions of use.
- (b) To introduce an Annual Visitor Parking Permit with a charge of £30 per annum, with the following additional conditions of use:-
 - A limit of one per postal address eligible for Visitor Permits, subject to possible limits on the total number issued or re-issued within any particular zone;
 - A maximum 8 hour stay (including any limited waiting period) during the period permit parking restrictions apply;
 - The permit may only be used for parking vehicles within a distance of 250m of permit holding household;

(There is no proposed change to Essential Visitor Permit for carers, as these would remain free of charge)

Business Permits in Zones 2-12 & 16

- (c) To remove the requirement for business permits to be registered to specific vehicles;
- (d) In exceptional circumstances to increase the maximum allocation of two business permits (subject to annual review) where this is considered to be in the public interest;

Resident's Permits in Zones 1-12 & 16

- (e) To reduce the charge for second residents' permits to £30 per annum (currently £60 per annum), subject to approval of the proposals above;

(No change is proposed to first Residents' Parking permits which would remain free of charge)

2 Copies of the Order and statement of reasons for proposing may be inspected during normal working hours at my Enquiry Office. Further information may also be obtained from the Traffic Management Section of the Southampton Highways Partnership on 023 8038 8037.

3 Any person wishing to object to the Orders must write to me at the address given below, stating the grounds for objection, by 17th June 2011.

Dated: 27th May 2011

Mark R Heath, Solicitor to the Council, Southbrook Rise, 4-8 Millbrook Road East, SOUTHAMPTON SO15 1YG

The Resident Parking Schemes across the city have been introduced, where requested by communities, to improve the amenities of an area by reducing the level of non-resident on-street parking. In order to assist in funding the administration, maintenance and enforcement of these schemes, permit charges are applied and are subject to variation. New charges for permits are being proposed within this order to help maintain the operation of the schemes and their contribution to preserving the amenities within an area. In particular it is intended to reduce the cost of Visitor Permits by introducing charges and an option of an Annual Visitor Parking Permit. If these proposals are approved through due process, there will also be a reduction in the charge for second Resident's Permits, so that the most households currently contributing to the cost of these schemes can avoid any increase in their contribution. Otherwise the proposed charges for Visitor Permits are intended to extend the scope of households contributing to the overall cost of operating these schemes. Additional flexibility over the use and issue of Business Permits is also proposed, so that their operational work is not unduly affected by restrictions intended to assist resident parking.

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 3

Appendix 2

Appendix 2 Objections and Concerns over the proposed changes to Permits and Permit Charges

Residents' Parking Permits

MRS. E. P. ROUX.

Highfield.
Southampton

13-6-11

Re:- Residents Parking Permits +
Amendment, order 2011 Zone 1-12 + 16.

Mr. Heath,
Southbrook Rise,
H. B, Millbrook Road East,
Southampton, SO15 1YQ



Dear Mr. Heath,

I object to paying for visitors parking permits. I pay for my 2nd car, I pay road tax also council tax, therefore why should I pay for permits, so people can visit me.

In Highfield we have many Senior Citizens and very elderly people, who find things very hard with everything going up in price. Now they have to pay so people can visit them, also some people don't even own a car, but the council hope to make them pay.

Annual Visitors Parking Permits. this means a household can have three cars. One free, One £60 (£30) and one with Annual Permit, this I do object to.

Students already have a way of obtaining visitor Parking Permits plus they mark each day with a special pen so they use the same permit, is this Amendment going to make matters worse

Yours Sincerely
E. P. Roux

Appendix 2 Objections and Concerns over the proposed changes to Permits and Permit Charges (cont)

From: jacqui rayment [<mailto:councillor.j.rayment@hotmail.co.uk>]
Sent: 10 June 2011 17:35
To: Ivory, Richard
Subject: Objection to permits schemes

BL/ET03/03/0271

Mr Richard

Having read the proposal I wish to object for the following reasons;

I feel that while I understand the reason for this change and for other areas it makes sense, in the City Centre/ Bargate, Bevois we will be going back wards as this is where we where a number of years ago.

I can see abuse of the scheme and hope that there will be good enforcement.

In some parts of the Inner City , Residents cars have to park in other streets as there is no spaces in said Rd and that is not through choice, the 250m distance is not going to work in these instances.

I also have a number of concerns re the different temples who we already spend a lot of time helping with the parking problems/confusion.

Jacqui

Councillor Jacqui Rayment
Chair Hampshire Police Authority
Deputy Leader Southampton Labour Group
Bevois Ward Southampton City Council

Agenda Item 5

EXECUTIVE DECISION MAKING

RECORD OF THE DECISION MAKING HELD ON 4 JULY 2011

Present:

Councillor Moulton	-	Cabinet Member for Children's Services and Learning
Councillor Baillie	-	Cabinet Member for Housing
Councillor Fitzhenry	-	Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport
Councillor Hannides	-	Cabinet Member for Resources, Leisure and Culture

Apologies: Councillors Smith and White

10. PRIMARY SCHOOL EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT FOR CHILDREN WITH SPECIAL NEEDS INQUIRY

On consideration of the report of the Chair of Scrutiny Panel A detailing the Panel's inquiry into primary school educational attainment for children with special needs Cabinet agreed the following:

- (i) to receive the report of Scrutiny Panel A on Primary School Educational Attainment for Children with Special Needs, including ADHD.
- (ii) to develop a formal response to the recommendations contained within the report, including an action plan detailing how the Executive will take forward any accepted recommendations.

11. PATIENT SAFETY IN ACUTE CARE INQUIRY

On consideration of the report of the Chair of Scrutiny Panel B detailing the Panel's inquiry into patient safety in acute care inquiry Cabinet agreed the following:

- (i) to receive the report of Scrutiny Panel B on Patient Safety in Acute Care;
- (ii) to develop a formal response to the relevant recommendations contained within the report, including an action plan detailing how the Executive proposes to take forward any accepted recommendations

12. CRUISE INDUSTRY SCRUTINY INQUIRY - HOW CAN CRUISE SHIP PASSENGER SPEND BE INCREASED?

On consideration of the report of the Chair of Scrutiny Panel C detailing the Panel's inquiry into the Cruise Industry in Southampton Cabinet agreed the following:

- (i) to receive the attached Scrutiny Inquiry report on increasing cruise ship passenger spend in Southampton;
- (ii) to develop a formal response to the recommendations contained within it, including an action plan detailing how the Executive proposes to take forward any of the recommendations contained in the report

13. SCHOOLS DEFICIT BUDGETS 2011/12

DECISION NO: (CAB 11/12 6466)

On consideration of the Assistant Director for Children's Services and Learning seeking approval for the deficit budgets for various schools for the 2011- 2012 municipal year the Cabinet Member for Children's Services and Learning agreed the following:

- (i) that the deficit budgets for the following schools for 2011/12 be approved:

	Years in Deficit	Deficit
Ludlow Junior School	1	£19,000
Chamberlayne College of the Arts	3	£57,000
St George Catholic VA College	5	£37,000
Vermont School	9	£42,000
Total Requested		£155,000

- (ii) that unless the school can demonstrate at a meeting in September that their recovery plan is achievable, notice will be given that a deficit application in 2012/13 will not be supported.
- (iii) to note that the approval of the above deficits does not confirm the Council's acceptance of the management of the overall financial position in relation to the schools in question, or in any way limit or remove the Council's power to undertake intervention action in schools in accordance with the Scheme for Financing Schools or otherwise, as provided for under the Education Acts.
- (iv) to delegate Authority to the Director of Children's Services and Learning, following consultation with the Head of Finance and the Cabinet Member for Children's Services, to take any intervention action necessary under the Scheme for Financing Schools or otherwise as provided for in the Education Acts, to secure to good management and governance of Southampton schools or to otherwise address the financial or performance management of maintained schools in Southampton.

14. PARTNERSHIP FOR URBAN SOUTH HAMPSHIRE (PUSH): REVISION TO CONSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

DECISION NO: (CAB 11/12 6623)

On consideration of the report of the Director of Corporate Services Cabinet agreed the following:

- (i) That the revised constitutional arrangements relating to PUSH appended to this report, be approved.

- (ii) That the Director of Corporate Services be given delegated authority to take any other action necessary in terms of any other changes or amendments to the PUSH constitution to give effect to the content of this report.

15. HOUSING STRATEGY 2011-2015 AND THE HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT BUSINESS PLAN 2011 - 2041

DECISION NO: (CAB 11/12 6303)

On consideration of the report of the Cabinet Member for Housing Cabinet agreed the following:

- (i) To considered the draft Housing Strategy (incorporating the Private Housing Renewal Strategy) and HRA Business Plan
- (ii) Subject to the Council decision delegated authority to the Head of Housing Solutions to approve specific policies for the giving of assistance in accordance with the Private Housing Renewal Strategy, following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing, the Head of Legal and Democratic Services and the Senior Manager, Finance.

16. ESTATE REGENERATION PROGRAMME - NEXT PHASE

DECISION NO: (CAB 11/12 5478)

On consideration of the report of the Cabinet Member for Housing Cabinet agreed the following:

Weston

- (i) Approve in principle the redevelopment of a site at Weston, shown edged red at Appendix 1, comprising the three blocks listed below:
- 1-20 Kingsclere Close, 1-7 Wallace Road, 70-80 Weston Lane (evens only)
Comprising 20 flats and maisonettes, 10 commercial units including Weston Local Housing Office and Weston Library, garages, sheds, service yards and other open areas.
 - 1-32 Sombourne House, Weston Lane
Comprising 32 flats and maisonettes, garages, sheds, service yards and other open areas.
 - 1-14 Ashton House, Kingsclere Avenue
Comprising 14 flats and maisonettes, garages, sheds, service yards and other open areas.
- (ii) To approve the service of Initial Demolition Notices on secure tenants at the three estate regeneration sites listed in (i) above under the provisions of the Housing Act 1985
- (iii) To implement the adopted Decant Policy in relation to the sites listed in (i).
- (iv) To delegate authority to the Head of Property and Procurement to negotiate and acquire by agreement any legal interests or rights held in respect of the

properties listed in (i) above, not held by the Council, using such acquisition powers as the Head of Legal and Democratic Services advises. In each case subject to confirmation from Capita, acting as independent valuers, that the price represents the appropriate Market Value.

- (v) To amend the phasing of the expenditure in the HRA capital programme as set out below and to approve, for the purposes of Finance Procedure Rules, capital spending of £500,000 in 2011/12, £1,000,000 in 2012/13 and £454,000 in 2013/2014 on the Weston estate regeneration proposals in this report.
- (vi) To delegate authority to the Director for Economic Development in consultation with the Senior Manager for Finance to accept, in accordance with Finance Procedure Rules, any grant funding towards the costs of the redevelopment of the Weston estate regeneration site listed in (i) above
- (vii) Approve the establishment of a project group in relation to the possible redevelopment of the site at Weston, with a remit to:-
 - a. continue consultation and dialogue with local residents and other stakeholders including those living in affected properties and with other interested parties; and
 - b. work with the local community and other potential partners to prepare a development brief
- (viii) To delegate authority to the Director for Economic Development to finalise and approve the development brief following consultation with the Cabinet Member responsible, Head of Legal and Democratic Services, Senior Manager for Finance, Head of Planning and Sustainability, and Head of Property and Procurement.
- (ix) To delegate authority to the Director for Economic Development to approve the choice of procurement route which she considers to be most appropriate to seek a development partner following consultation with the Cabinet Member responsible, Head of Legal and Democratic Services, Senior Manager for Finance and Head of Property and Procurement, and to proceed with such procurement activity up to the stage of appointing a preferred bidder for which further authority from Cabinet will need to be obtained.

Townhill Park

- (x) To report back to Cabinet the outcome of the procurement activity referred to in (ix) above as appropriate and seek further authority from Cabinet to proceed and appoint a preferred bidder based upon the results of that procurement activity.
- (xi) To delegate authority to the Director for Economic Development, following consultation with the Cabinet Member responsible, to commence a programme of consultation and engagement with residents and stakeholders at Townhill Park and to appoint consultants to prepare a Regeneration Framework document
- (xii) To approve for the purposes of Finance Procedure Rules, capital spending of £200,000 in 2011/12, on the Regeneration Framework for Townhill Park and associated fees and costs, provision for which exists in the HRA capital programme.

Property Acquisition

- (xiii) To delegate authority to Head of Property and Procurement following receipt of advice from Capita, to negotiate and acquire by agreement any legal interests or rights in the properties listed at Confidential Appendix 3 and 4 and not held by the Council using such acquisition powers as the Head of Legal and Democratic Services advises.
- (xiv) To delegate authority to the Head of Legal and Democratic Services to enter into any legal documentation necessary in respect of the purchase or acquisition of rights and to undertake any ancillary action in connection therewith.
- (xv) To hold any acquired properties in accordance with the acquisition powers pending future regeneration.
- (xvi) To reduce the uncommitted provision in the 2011/12 HRA capital programme for "Other site assembly costs" by the sum specified in Confidential Appendix 3 and to add a scheme to the 2011/12 HRA capital programme for the "Acquisition of properties" for the same value.
- (xvii) To approve in accordance with Finance Procedure Rules, expenditure in 2011/2012 in the sum set out in the Confidential Appendix 3 for the acquisition of properties.

17. DELIVERY OF AN INTELLIGENT TRANSPORT SYSTEM AND COMMUNITY SAFETY CLOSED CIRCUIT TELEVISION SERVICES

DECISION NO: (CAB 11/12 6536)

On consideration of the report of the Leader of the Council Cabinet agreed the following:

- (i) To commence a competitive dialogue procurement process to select a private sector service provider to relocate the Council's Intelligent Transport Systems and Public Safety CCTV services and to maintain and operate the services for a period of up to 15 years as set out in this report and Appendix 1.
- (ii) To delegate authority to the Director of Environment, following consultation with the Leader of the Council, Head of Legal and Democratic Services, the Head of Finance and Director of Corporate Services, to take any necessary action to give effect to recommendation (i) above, including but not limited to undertaking any and all necessary procurement activities in compliance with Contract Procedure Rules, and consulting upon and implementing all necessary service, staffing and organisational structure changes necessary to implement the project

18. DISPOSAL OF 2-8 QUEENSWAY

DECISION NO: (CAB 11/12 6527)

On consideration of the report of the Cabinet Member for Resources, Leisure and Culture Cabinet agreed the following:

- (i) To approve the principle of the sale of the Council's freehold interest jointly with the long leasehold interest, and
- (ii) To delegate authority to the Head of Property and Procurement to approve the preferred tender, agree the terms of the sale and carry out all ancillary matters to dispose of the site
- (iii) To note that the capital receipt will be used to reduce the current funding deficit in the capital programme

19. EAST STREET CENTRE - RESTRUCTURE OF GROUND LEASE TO FACILITATE REDEVELOPMENT

DECISION NO: (CAB 11/12 6367)

On consideration of the report of the Cabinet Member for Resources, Leisure and Culture Cabinet agreed the following:

- (i) To approve the terms for the surrender and renewal of the East Street Centre Headlease as set out in the Confidential Appendix.
- (ii) That the Head of Legal and Democratic Services be authorised to enter into any legal documentation necessary in respect of the variations.

20. SOLENT SKY MUSEUM - PROPOSALS FOR RE-LOCATION OF SERFCA AND USE OF VACATED SPACE.

DECISION NO: (CAB 11/12 6528)

On consideration of the report of the Cabinet Member for Resources, Leisure and Culture Cabinet agreed the following:

- (i) To approve the surrender of the SERFCA accommodation at Solent Sky on the terms set out in this report.
- (ii) To approve the changes in the proposed lease terms of the Museum as outlined in this report; and
 - To delete the existing scheme in the Leisure and Culture capital programme for repairs to the Museum,
 - To add to the Leisure and Culture capital programme a new scheme for £240,000 in 2011/12 for a capital grant to the Museum towards the costs of the repairs; and
 - To approve, in accordance with Finance Procedure Rules, spending of £240,000 in 2011/12.

- (iii) To approve the grant of a lease of the whole premises to the Trustees of the Solent Sky Museum on the terms set out in this report and to delegate to the Head of Property and Procurement authority to undertake all such ancillary acts to complete the lease.

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 9

DECISION-MAKER:	CABINET
SUBJECT:	SOUTHAMPTON BUS PARTNERSHIP
DATE OF DECISION:	1 AUGUST 2011
REPORT OF:	CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORT
STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY	
Not Applicable	

BRIEF SUMMARY

The key objective of Southampton Bus Partnership (SBP) is to create a governance framework within which Southampton City Council and local bus operators can work together. Fundamentally this is designed to increase bus patronage and modal shift as well as improve and promote local bus services and associated infrastructure within Southampton through various mechanisms including (but not exclusively) a voluntary quality bus partnership.

Accordingly, the SBP will provide a governance framework for improving and promoting local bus services within Southampton. Further to this, a venue will be provided where the Southampton Quality Bus Partnership (QBP), the Bus Punctuality Improvement Partnership (PIP) and any other similar or related plans may be discussed and agreed.

A mechanism needs to be in place to effectively deliver public transport solutions. A Statutory Quality Partnership cannot be entered into unless a voluntary agreement has been tested. Relationships with transport operators are at a level where a partnership approach has been developed and a draft agreement negotiated with bus companies.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Having had regard to the provisions of the Community Strategy and having satisfied itself that the proposals in this report will or are likely to improve the economic, social or environmental well being of the area:

- (i) To approve the Southampton Bus Partnership (Appendix 1)
- (ii) To appoint the Cabinet Member for Environment & Transport to represent the Council on the Southampton Quality Bus Partnership
- (iii) To delegate authority to the Director of Environment, following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment & Transport to agree elements of work pertaining to the SBP.
- (iv) To approve, in accordance with Financial Procedure Rules, the addition of £300,000 in 2012/13 to the Environment and Transport Portfolio Capital Programme for a Bus Partnership scheme funded from the confirmed LTP3 Integrated Transport allocation for that year.
- (v) To agree, in principle, to add similar schemes in 2013/14 and 2014/15, subject to confirmation of the LTP3 Integrated Transport allocations for those years and to future Council capital expenditure priorities.

REASONS FOR REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

1. To enable Cabinet to agree a mechanism to deliver bus based elements of the Local Transport Plan 3 agreed at Full Council in March 2011.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

2. It is not acceptable to do nothing as the economic building blocks using the bus as one of the main modes of transport for the city need to be laid. Statutory Quality Contracts cannot be entered into unless it can be demonstrated that alternative partnership based approaches have failed to deliver benefits. The terms of a Voluntary Partnership Arrangement can be met through using the mechanism outlined in this report without a binding commitment.

DETAIL (Including consultation carried out)

3. Bus operator investments tend to favour locations where such agreements are in place; particularly where they can have confidence that their investments will get a greater return because of complementary investments or policies of the local authority. Bus operators are already doing this in Southampton in response to the inclusion of longer term programmes of work that support bus service growth. Consequently Bluestar have committed to implement a smartcards scheme in the city for their bus operation and other operators have made informal commitments to match this investment by 2013. The regional Directors of our two largest bus operators and representative of the smaller operators have helped design this approach to joint working.

The SBP will be a voluntary agreement. Unlike previous voluntary agreements it is the intention of this new agreement to improve relationships between bus operators and the city council by backing the agreement up with actions and financial commitments over a medium term period. These are not subject to any binding contract or statutory process but by honest intention.
4. The Local Transport Plan aims to bring about the following outcomes:
 - Reduce dependence on the private car
 - Improve awareness of the different travel options
 - Improve journey time reliability for all modes
 - Improve road safety within the sub-region
 - Improve accessibility within and beyond the sub-region
 - Improve air quality and environment
 - Promote a higher quality of life.
5. Around 17% of peak period trips and 16% of off-peak trips to and from the city centre are made using buses. A quarter of journeys to work are less than 2km in length, three-quarters less than 10km. Thus there is considerable scope for public transport usage to increase, given that 30% of households do not have a car available and a further 45% only have one car.
6. Current levels of provision and usage will need to be supported and expanded to meet growth expectation. A key element of this is the Bus

Strategy which has the challenging goal of increasing bus patronage by 50% over the next 20 years.. Achieving the goals of the Bus Strategy involves:

- Roll out of new and innovative **smart ticketing technology**
 - A **modernised bus fleet** accompanied by effective **marketing and information to attract new passengers**;
 - A **coherent network and prioritised network** to allow buses to make faster and more reliable journey
7. The South Hampshire Bus Operators Agreement was signed between Transport for South Hampshire, First Hampshire & Dorset, Go South Coast (Bluestar, Unilink & Wilts & Dorset) and Black Velvet Travel in June 2010. This aims to promote modal shift in favour of the bus to support the growth agenda, with the objective of delivering 5% growth in passenger numbers across South Hampshire per annum. The agreement supports the use of partnership based delivery including the use of Punctuality Improvement.
 8. The Traffic Management Act 2004 encourages Local Authorities to work with relevant parties, such as the traffic commissioner and bus operators, in formulating and implementing plans for bus priority.
 9. As part of the development of LTP3 bus operators have been involved in the development of the Bus Strategy as well as the Intelligent Transport Systems & Bus Priority elements of the implementation plan. The agreement is now at a stage where it is acceptable as a delivery vehicle to all parties of the agreement.
 10. The Southampton Bus Partnership aims to put in place the delivery mechanism to deliver prioritised schemes to accommodate this growth through:
 - A *Strategic Board* to oversee the delivery of work programmes by the working group. This will develop proposals for future development of SBP and liaise and report to TfSH / PUSH / the LEP in delivering the key objectives;
 - A *Working Group* to deliver or monitor the delivery of work programmes (including but not limited to bus based schemes agreed for delivery from LTP funding). To implement the decisions of the Strategic Board. This is likely to take the form of Bus Punctuality Improvement Task Force or similar.

RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

Capital/Revenue

11. The approved Environment & Transport Capital Programme includes a total budget of £480,000 in 2011/12 for bus based capital projects. It is recommended that £300,000 is added for a Bus Partnership scheme in 2012/13, to provide for initiatives such as Bus Priority, which will be funded from the confirmed LTP3 Integrated Transport allocation for that year (£2.027M). This equates to an allocation of 15%, which is roughly equal to the current modal share of bus patronage in the city.
12. In principle, and subject to funds being available, it is proposed that a ring fenced allocation of the Local Transport Plan 3 funding period (2011-2015) be allocated to bus based capital projects such as Bus Priority to enable bus

groups to attract internal funding to complement Council investment. However, this level of investment will be subject to confirmation of LTP3 Integrated Transport allocations for those years and also to future Council capital expenditure priorities.

13. Approval to spend the budget on specific work programmes (for capital schemes less than £500,000) is with the appropriate Chief Officer, in consultation with the Chief Financial Officer and the Cabinet Member. The projects developed through this agreement will need to comply with the robust, but easy to use, LTP scheme prioritisation methodology, which complements internal project management processes. This will ensure that decision makers are well informed about what schemes offer greatest value for money.

Property/Other

14. Some LTP schemes will have land issues associated with them. These will be addressed on a case by case basis.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Statutory power to undertake proposals in the report:

15. Section 2 Local Government Act 2000 allows a Local Authority, having had regard to the provisions of the community strategy, to do anything it considers likely to improve the economic, social or environmental wellbeing of its area.

Other Legal Implications:

16. In delivering services in accordance with the proposals set out in this report the Council must have regard to its duties under the Equalities Act 2010 and section 17 Crime & Disorder Act 1998.

POLICY FRAMEWORK IMPLICATIONS

17. This delivery mechanism is wholly in accordance with the approved Local Transport Plan 3 .
18. The Proposals are supported by the aims and objectives of the Community Strategy, in particular towards the achievement of improved transport infrastructure and transport systems.

AUTHOR:	Name:	Paul Walker	Tel:	023 8083 2628
	E-mail:	paul.walker@southampton.gov.uk		

KEY DECISION? Yes/No Yes

WARDS/COMMUNITIES AFFECTED:	All
------------------------------------	-----

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Non-confidential appendices are in the Members' Rooms and can be accessed on-line

Appendices

1	Draft Southampton Bus Partnership
---	-----------------------------------

Documents In Members' Rooms

	None
--	------

Integrated Impact Assessment

Do the implications/subject of the report require an Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) to be carried out.	No
--	----

Other Background Documents

Integrated Impact Assessment and Other Background documents available for inspection at:

Title of Background Paper(s)	Relevant Paragraph of the Access to Information Procedure Rules / Schedule 12A allowing document to be Exempt/Confidential (if applicable)
------------------------------	--

1.	Local Transport Plan 3	
2.	LTP3 Bus Priority Compendium	
3.	Bus Priority Implementation Packages	

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 10

DECISION-MAKER:	CABINET
SUBJECT:	HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT (HRA) CAPITAL PROGRAMME PROJECT APPROVALS 2011/12 – PHASE 2
DATE OF DECISION:	1 AUGUST 2011
REPORT OF:	CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING
STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY	
Not Applicable	

BRIEF SUMMARY This report seeks formal approval in accordance with Financial Procedure Rules for expenditure on various housing projects provision for which exists in the Housing Revenue Account capital programme.

The project in Harefield will contribute to the Council’s strategic housing objectives through improving the appearance and facilities of our estates, the wellbeing and the satisfaction of our tenants in areas where they live.

The proposal will ensure that the Council continues to contribute to the creation of Decent Neighbourhoods where people want to live by delivering a programme of projects to improve the appearance of our estates that will develop, nurture and sustain a sense of pride and local identity through resident involvement.

The disabled adaptations will improve the quality of life for resident for residents and help them to continue to live independently.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- (i) To approve a virement of £700,000 from the “Future Decent Neighbourhoods Schemes” budget in 2012/13 to the “Decent Neighbourhoods Scheme – Harefield”, phased £100,000 in 2011/12 and £600,000 in 2012/13.
- (ii) To approve a virement of £475,000 from the “Decent Homes Future Years” budget in 2012/13 to the budget for “Adaptations for Disabled People” in 2011/12.
- (iii) To approve, in accordance with Financial Procedure Rules, spending on the following schemes

	2011/12 £000’s	2012/13 £000’s
<u>Decent Neighbourhoods</u>		
Harefield	100	600
<u>Total Decent Neighbourhoods</u>	100	600
<u>Decent Homes</u>		
Disabled Adaptations 11/12	475	
<u>Total Decent Homes</u>	475	
<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>575</u>	<u>600</u>

REASONS FOR REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Including sums in a Capital Programme does not give authority to spend the money. This is done by a separate scheme approval process. Financial Procedure Rules require that all schemes with a total estimated cost of more than £500,000 be approved by Cabinet before they can proceed.
2. Schemes with an estimated cost of up to £500,000 can be approved by an Executive Director following consultation with appropriate officers and Cabinet Members. Within this, schemes over £200,000 will usually require a formal report, decision making meeting and decision notice.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

3. There have been various consultation meetings with tenants' groups during the last two years with regard to the proposed programme of capital expenditure associated with the Housing Revenue Account (HRA). The 2011 HRA Business Plan also supports the types of programmes of work highlighted above as meeting our long term strategy and this has once again been supported by all parties who expressed support for schemes of work at this time.
4. The alternative option of not undertaking this work would leave the council's homes and surrounding areas in their present condition and would not accord with the views expressed during the consultation process or with the Council's policies of providing decent homes and places where people want to live.

DETAIL (Including consultation carried out)

Decent Neighbourhoods

5. This report seeks permission to proceed with the development, procurement and implementation of Capital Projects which form part of the Housing Revenue Account Capital expenditure plans for 2011/12. This report deals with the second phase of Decent Neighbourhoods investment that is ready for approval. The programme outlined in this report is consistent with the Housing strategy and HRA business plan 2011 – 2041 approved by Cabinet and Council in July 2011.
6. The proposals are intended to reverse the decline in these communities by implementing a range of measures that have worked on other projects. The significant anti social behaviour problems being experienced by residents and visitors will be tackled by adopting measures to improve the large neglected areas around the four walk up blocks in Chawton Close, Leckford Close, Wellow Close and Holmsley Close including new communal garden areas (adopting principles from Capital Growth's Edible Estates model which has successfully transformed over 1000 derelict and unloved areas into spaces that communities value and protect), improved lighting, signage, decoration, incidental play provision, access control and recycling facilities.
7. At Meon Court options will be explored to improve the access and parking for vulnerable and older residents. The construction of two new parking areas in Blendworth Lane and Fritham Road will increase the supply of parking spaces and help to reduce the pressure on parking in the area. The parking schemes will provide, subject to planning approval two new parking areas identical to spaces constructed in Thirlmere Road Millbrook that were described by one

Millbrook resident as “fabulous”. These measures will where possible be integrated and coordinated with the estate regeneration and Big Local programmes.

Decent Homes

8. The original budget for 2011/12 for Adaptations for Disabled People has already been fully committed and the maximum virement that is possible under delegated powers has already been agreed (£200,000). Approval is now being sought for further investment of £475,000 including fees for adaptation works in 2011/12. This investment level will ensure that SCC continues to provide both minor and major adaptations to Council properties where residents have a specific medical need to enable them to live independently.
9. Referrals from Social services Occupational Therapist can be either Critical or substantial under both major and minor headings. Critical and minor referrals have a target period for delivery within eight weeks, while Decent Homes have a target period of nine months to deliver the major works. This will bring the total budget for adaptation for disabled people up to £1.35M in 2011/12
10. A key role in the development of the Capital Programme has been the involvement of Tenant Focus Groups, Block Wardens, Tenant Representatives, Leaseholders and staff. Tenants and Leaseholders have been closely involved in the production of our long term business plans for future investment.

RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

Capital/Revenue

11. The estimated capital expenditure arising from the approvals recommended in this report is £575,000 in 2011/12 and £600,000 in 2012/13. There is no specific provision for this spending in the latest approved HRA capital programme However there is provision of £1,185,000 for “Future Decent Neighbourhoods schemes” in 2012/13. This report therefore recommends that £700,000 of this sum is allocated to the scheme at Harefield, leaving £485,000 remaining for other schemes. There is also a budget of £9,981,000 in 2012/13 for future decent homes work. This report proposes utilising £475,000 of this for adaptation for disabled people in 2011/12, leaving £9,506,000 for decent homes work in 2012/13.
12. The capital financing cost associated with this capital spending was allowed for in the revenue estimates that were approved by Council on 16th February 2011.

Property/Other

13. The HRA capital programme is fully reflected in the Corporate Property Strategy.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Statutory power to undertake proposals in the report:

14. There are no specific legal implications in connection with this report. The power to carry out the proposals is contained within Part 2 of the Housing Act 1985.

Other Legal Implications:

15. None.

POLICY FRAMEWORK IMPLICATIONS

16. The proposed schemes in this report will contribute positively to the Council's objectives set out in the Housing Strategy and HRA Business Plan to maintain and improve the condition of the city's housing stock.

AUTHOR:	Name:	Aidan Cooper	Tel:	023 80915108
	E-mail:	Aidan.cooper@southampton.gov.uk		

KEY DECISION? Yes/No YES

WARDS/COMMUNITIES AFFECTED:	Bitterne
------------------------------------	----------

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Non-confidential appendices are in the Members' Rooms and can be accessed on-line

Appendices

1.	None
----	------

Documents In Members' Rooms

1.	Outline Project Proposal
2.	Project Category Evaluation

Integrated Impact Assessment

Do the implications/subject of the report require an Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) to be carried out.	Yes
--	-----

Other Background Documents

Integrated Impact Assessment and Other Background documents available for inspection at: Lordshill Local Housing Office, Lordshill Centre East Lordshill S016 8PB

Title of Background Paper(s)

Relevant Paragraph of the Access to Information Procedure Rules / Schedule 12A allowing document to be Exempt/Confidential (if applicable)

1.	Car park plans for Fritham and Blendworth	
----	---	--

DECISION-MAKER:	CABINET
SUBJECT:	DISPOSAL OF HRA PROPERTIES
DATE OF DECISION:	1 AUGUST 2011
REPORT OF:	CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING
STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY	
Not Applicable	

BRIEF SUMMARY

This report seeks formal approval for the disposal of up to 50 HRA properties per year that are either, structurally unsafe, require substantial major capital investment, or that are not suitable for housing requirements.

The intention is to utilise the Capital receipt to help bridge the current funding gap and generate additional funding to support the estate regeneration programme.

The report shall also seek permission to dispose of Freeholds where all of the properties within a block have over the years been sold, but the Council still has responsibilities for communal areas.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- (i) To approve a policy for the sale of up to 50 HRA dwellings per annum where:
 - The sale is in accordance with the General Housing Consents 2005; and
 - The council can keep 100% of the sale proceeds
- (ii) To delegate authority to the Environment Director to determine which dwellings should be disposed of having regard to the criteria set out in this report.

REASONS FOR REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The voluntary sale of up to 50 HRA properties is not currently possible under delegated powers as it is a new policy. This has to be approved by Cabinet.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

2. The proposal in this report is one of the options for helping to close the resources gap in the HRA capital programme.

DETAIL (Including consultation carried out)

3. The HRA budget report to Council in February 2011 noted that the HRA capital programme was £3.079M short of resources in the period to the end of 2012/13.
4. The HRA capital and revenue outturn report submitted to Council in July noted that this overall resource position has not materially changed.
5. One of the options is to generate capital receipts from asset sales. In addition to considering which assets to dispose of, there are two specific legal and financial issues that need to be addressed. These relate to the legal powers for such disposals and the ability of the Council to retain 100% of the receipts from such sales.

6. The only way it is possible to keep 100% of the sale proceeds would be to sell a vacant dwelling to somebody who did not occupy the dwelling “as his only or principal home”. The main market would therefore be other landlords. It would be essential that the Council obtained some form of “guarantee” from the purchaser that this requirement would be met. If this was not the case the council would be required to pay 75% of the receipt to Government.
7. With this constraint on sales, the General Housing Consents 2005 contain the following provision which could be utilised:

“A local authority may, subject to the provisions of this consent, dispose of one vacant house or vacant flat or vacant converted house to any individual for a consideration equal to its market value, provided that the purchaser (alone or with others) has not, under the consent in this paragraph A5.1.1, acquired another dwelling-house from the authority previously in the same financial year.”
8. This would provide a limited market for voluntary sales but it would still be possible to undertake such sales.
9. It is understood that the Government intends to relax the legal and financial frameworks as part of the self-financing proposals for the HRA but detailed proposals have not yet been published. It should also be noted that any such amendments are independent from the provisions in the Localism Bill (which makes provision for the self-financing proposals). It is possible for the Government to make the changes at any time by the issue of amended regulations. So whilst it is the Government’s stated intention to make the changes at the same time as self-financing starts this may not be the case. Should the current legal and financial frameworks be amended, the policy proposed in this report can, of course, be reconsidered.
10. In terms of the assets to be disposed of, Asset Management will work closely with other departments to identify properties within the HRA portfolio and prioritise those for disposal. These will include:-
 - a) Properties which are surplus to requirement i.e. Hostels which have been recently been returned to the Authority, but are not suitable for conversion into standard dwellings.
 - b) Properties where the structural integrity of the building has been severely compromised.
 - c) Properties where the amount of Capital investment required to ensure the Decent Homes’ standard is met, is substantially higher than the average cost.
 - d) Other dwellings from the HRA general stock that are no longer needed to meet priority housing needs.

In addition there are also some blocks of flats that have been sold in their entirety but where SCC still remains the freeholder and is therefore responsible for communal services. It is the intention to dispose of these freeholds, reducing the cyclical testing requirements to the blocks and the ongoing repairs cost.

11. At the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee held on 28th June 2011 it was agreed that the criteria to be applied when deciding to sell void properties would be circulated to OSMC members. This has now happened.

RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

Capital/Revenue

12. The expected sales would generate additional capital receipts for the HRA. This will help bridge the funding shortfall and, depending on the overall level of sales, generate additional resources to fund further spending on estate regeneration.
13. In economic terms it is essential that sales are only undertaken where:
- It is possible for the council to retain 100% of the capital receipt or
 - Where an assessment of income and expenditure shows that there is a net benefit from the sale, taking into account the sales income and savings on capital expenditure.
14. Sales that are completed before 31 March 2012 can be excluded from the self-financing debt calculations. After this, the economic assessment will need to allow for repayment of the outstanding debt on the property.
15. The capital receipts generated will depend on the dwellings that are finally sold and their condition. As a guide, the gross average value of a dwelling sold under the Right-To-Buy scheme is approximately £90,000. Total sales proceeds could therefore reach £4.5M in a full year (less costs of disposal). In practice, total sales proceeds are likely to be less than this but there will also be lower demands on the capital programme if properties sold are those needing a comparatively high level of capital investment.

Property/Other

16. The HRA Capital programme is fully reflected in the Corporate Property Strategy.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Statutory power to undertake proposals in the report:

17. The Council has power to make these disposals under the General Housing Consents 2005, or by specific application to the Secretary of State.

Other Legal Implications:

18. None

POLICY FRAMEWORK IMPLICATIONS

19. None

AUTHOR:	Name:	Geoff Miller	Tel:	023 8083 4987
	E-mail:	geoffrey.miller@southampton.gov.uk		

KEY DECISION? Yes/No YES

WARDS/COMMUNITIES AFFECTED:	All wards in the city
------------------------------------	-----------------------

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Non-confidential appendices are in the Members' Rooms and can be accessed on-line

Appendices

1.	None
----	------

Documents In Members' Rooms

1.	None
----	------

Integrated Impact Assessment

Do the implications/subject of the report require an Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) to be carried out.	Yes
--	-----

Other Background Documents

Integrated Impact Assessment and Other Background --- documents will be available for inspection in the Members Room (these will be supplied in paper format)

Title of Background Paper(s)	Relevant Paragraph of the Access to Information Procedure Rules / Schedule 12A allowing document to be Exempt/Confidential (if applicable)
------------------------------	--

1.	Integrated Impact Assessment	
----	------------------------------	--

DECISION-MAKER:	CABINET
SUBJECT:	2012/13 GRANTS TO VOLUNTARY ORGANISATIONS
DATE OF DECISION:	1 AUGUST 2011
REPORT OF:	CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING
STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY	
Not applicable	

BRIEF SUMMARY

Southampton City Council has a long history of supporting the contribution of the voluntary and community sector in the city with grants, contracts and other help in kind. Corporate grant aid alone amounts to almost £1.9M per annum. Nevertheless applications from voluntary organisations for city council grants far exceed the available budget and it is difficult to support new grant applications.

Despite significant financial pressures on the Council in order to provide some stability to the voluntary sector in Southampton this report seeks approval for the grants to voluntary organisations budget to remain the same in 2012/13 as 2011/12. It also recommends consulting on suspending the current open competitive grant application process for awarding grants in 2012/13 and renewing 2011/12 grants at current levels, excluding any paid notice, for a further year until 31st March 2013 and continuing to work with voluntary organisations in the city to identify potential efficiency savings and ways of streamlining the grant application process in future years.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Having complied with paragraph 15 of the Council's Access to Information Procedure Rules:

- (i) To approve in principle that the 2012/13 grants to voluntary organisations budget will be £1,907,300
- (ii) To authorise the Interim Director of Environment to carry out consultation on the following proposals:
 - suspending the current grant application process for awarding grants from the corporate grants budget for 2012/13
 - renewing 2011/12 grants at current levels, excluding any paid notice, for a further year until 31st March 2013 subject to satisfactory monitoring
 - reviewing and potentially bringing forward the timing of the grant application process in future years
- (iii) To delegate authority to the Interim Director of Environment following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing to determine whether or not to proceed with the proposals set out in recommendation (ii) and, within approved budgets, to take any other decisions necessary or expedient to determine the award of all grants for the 2012/13 financial year.

REASONS FOR REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The current open competitive grant application process for awarding grants from the corporate grants budget has been in place for many years. Any changes to the process require Cabinet approval and consultation with stakeholders. The recommendations in this report also respond to feedback received from voluntary organisations in the city and will help to provide a greater degree of certainty about potential funding levels in 2012/13, thereby giving these organisations more time to explore other potential funding opportunities and to participate in the two reviews approved by Cabinet in March.
2. This report is submitted for consideration as a General Exception under paragraph 15 of the Access to Information Procedure Rules in Part 4 of the City Council's Constitution, notice having been given to the Chair of Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee and the Public. In order to accommodate consultation and application process timescales a decision is required as soon as possible and before the publication of the next forward plan.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

3. The alternative option is to continue the current open competitive grant application process for awarding grants in 2012/13. It is proposed to suspend this process in 2012/13 to provide a year of stability to existing grant recipients, to clarify the situation for new grant applicants and to allow more time to complete the reviews detailed in paragraph 12 below.

DETAIL (Including consultation carried out)

2012/13 Grants Budget

4. Applications from voluntary organisations for City Council grants always far exceed the available budget. However, the need to make unprecedented budget savings in 2011/12 exacerbated this situation with applications totalling £3,535,443 over double the available budget of £1,691,600.
5. A reduction in the 2011/12 savings target as a result of a one-off draw from contingencies and the inclusion of Homelessness Prevention grants increased the budget to £1,907,300. Nonetheless, following impact assessments, some grants were discontinued or significantly reduced and no new grants were awarded.
6. Nationally funding for voluntary and community groups remains uncertain. Information provided by voluntary organisations on The Voluntary Sector Cuts website (supported by most of the national and regional voluntary sector infrastructure organisations) currently reports average "cuts" to statutory funding of around £340,000 per organisation in the South East region (excluding London).
7. Most of the organisations whose city council grants were reduced in 2011/12 emphasised during their impact assessment discussions that they should be able to cope this year but that they would not be able to cope with any further reductions.

8. Despite the continuing significant financial pressures on the council in order to provide some stability it is recommended that the 2012/13 grants to voluntary organisations budget remains at £1,907,300.

2012/13 Grants Process

9. A great deal of time and effort goes into completing and appraising applications and new applicants to both the Running Costs and New Projects Funds were particularly disappointed to learn that one of the allocation principles used to award grants in 2011/12 was to give “priority to existing applicants already in receipt of Running Costs Fund grants, which, regrettably means that no new applications to either fund can be considered”. (Paragraph 10 of the 2011/12 Grants to Voluntary Organisations Report to Cabinet 14th March 2011)
10. A number criticised the council for publicising the potential availability of new grants at a time of reduced local authority budgets. However, the scale of reductions only became apparent when the central government settlement was announced in December 2010 after the application process had closed.
11. Even if recommendation (i) is approved and the 2012/13 budget remains at £1,907,300 the only way that any new grants can be made is by reductions to existing grants. However impact assessments undertaken during the 2011/12 grants round indicated that the impact of reducing grants outweighed the impact of not awarding new grants.
12. On 14th March 2011 Cabinet also delegated authority to
- conduct a review of whether it would be more appropriate to move towards commissioning and purchasing some of the services that are currently grant aided and
 - conduct a cross service review of advices services in the city.
13. A long standing criticism of the grants process is that decisions are made in March each year for the following financial year (after budget setting in February) leaving organisations very little time to plan and budget for the new financial year. It also means that where grants are discontinued or reduced the cost of any required notice period comes from the new year grants budget. It is therefore proposed that the timing is reviewed and consideration is given to bringing forward the corporate grant application process in future years.
14. In the current stringent national economic circumstances in which all local authorities must make significant financial savings to achieve a balanced budget, it is unlikely that the Council will be able to maintain the corporate grants budget at current levels beyond 2012/13. Subject to consultation and the assessment of impact, consideration will therefore have to be given to reducing some grants over the medium term. The reviews agreed by Cabinet in March are underway and this work with voluntary organisations in the city will therefore need to continue to explore the potential for these organisations to also reduce their operating costs, to generate future efficiency savings through for example shared “back office” services or relocation and to help them to secure alternative funding sources.

15. In order to avoid wasting voluntary sector and council resources on an open competitive application process that is likely to result in disappointment for, and criticism from, new applicants; to allow sufficient time to complete the above reviews and to give consideration to bringing forward the application timetable it is proposed that the current open competitive grant application process is suspended for 2012/13. This will mean that no new grants are made and existing grants are renewed at current levels, excluding any paid notice, for a further year until 31st March 2013, subject to satisfactory monitoring, appropriate targets being set for 2012/13 and confirmation of the Council' overall budget position in February 2012.
16. If this recommendation is approved organisations in receipt of grants from the corporate grants budget in 2011/12 will be asked to complete a short assessment form (updating targets and financial information for 2012/13), submit their latest annual accounts and ensure they have met all 2011/12 monitoring requirements. Exceptions will be those organisations which have already been notified that they will not receive funding beyond 31st March 2012.
17. It should be noted that these recommendations do not apply to one-off Community Chest grants from the £50,000 Community Chest budget which will continue to be allocated in two rounds during the year.

Consultation

18. As this proposal constitutes a significant change to an established procedure it is necessary to undertake a consultation process with stakeholders. The new National Compact between the Coalition Government and civil society organisations recommends "Where it is appropriate, and enables meaningful engagement, conduct 12 week written consultation, with clear explanations and rationale for shorter time-frames or a more informal approach". Southampton's Compact between the Public Sector and the Voluntary and Community states that "The recommended response time is a minimum of 12 weeks. Where less than 12 weeks is allowed the document should specify the reason why a shorter time has been set."
19. However, if the Council allows 12 weeks consultation and the final decision is to continue with the current open competitive grant application process there would be insufficient time to assess applications properly, leading to rushed recommendations. Therefore, on balance, it is preferable to have a shorter 8 week consultation timeframe (from 11th August to 5th October 2011) and be able to run an open competitive application process properly.
20. Regardless of the process followed the need to consult will also mean it is necessary to shorten to 8 weeks the usual 12 weeks allowed for completion of application forms.
21. The time constraints detailed above also mean that it is not possible to meet the deadlines for Cabinet to determine, post consultation, whether or not to proceed with the proposals set out in recommendation (ii). It is therefore recommended that authority to determine this and, within approved budgets, to take any other decisions necessary or expedient to determine the award of all grants for the 2012/13 financial year is delegated to the Interim Director of Environment following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing.

22. Whichever process is followed final Cabinet approval will be sought for the 2012/13 grants to voluntary organisations. The date will depend upon which process is followed.

RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

Capital/Revenue

23. The grants to voluntary organisations budget is made up of the following elements and in making the recommendations it is assumed that all three elements will remain at the same level in 2012/13

2011/12 Budget	£
Corporate Grants Budget	1,786,700
Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Budget	19,600
Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) Budget	55,900
Homelessness Prevention Grants	45,100
Total	1,907,300

Property/Other

24. A number of organisations are accommodated in council premises and pay rent from the grant they receive from the council. A reduction in grant may result in them struggling to meet this commitment.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Statutory power to undertake proposals in the report:

25. The legal powers under which grants are made will be included in the report to Cabinet seeking approval for grants.

Other Legal Implications:

26. The council is mindful of the case law established through the judicial reviews of Haringey Council in 2000, Leicester City Council in 2004, Ealing Borough Council in 2008, London Councils in February 2011 and Birmingham City Council in 2011. Accordingly, the council follows four main principles during the annual grants process, namely timely and meaningful consultation with voluntary organisations with a clear explanation of proposals and an open, transparent, corporate, co-ordinated approach. Decision makers must be satisfied that consultation with affected organisations has been adequately carried out and that where appropriate any notice period given before the implementation of any reduction in grant is adequate and reasonable.
27. The Council recognises its equalities duties and in making its decision will pay due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination and promote equality and to the outcome of impact assessments.

POLICY FRAMEWORK IMPLICATIONS

28. Grant recommendations relate to the relevant policy framework plans and the services provided by the grant aided organisations will assist the Council in meeting the overall aims of its policy framework including the objectives set out in the City of Southampton Strategy (Community Strategy).

AUTHOR:	Name:	Roma Andrews, Development Officer (Grants and Voluntary Sector Support)	Tel:	023 8083 3198
	E-mail:	roma.andrews@southampton.gov.uk		

KEY DECISION? Yes

WARDS/COMMUNITIES AFFECTED:	ALL
------------------------------------	-----

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Non-confidential appendices are in the Members' Rooms and can be accessed on-line

Appendices

1.	None
----	------

Documents In Members' Rooms

1.	None
----	------

Integrated Impact Assessment

Do the implications/subject of the report require an Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) to be carried out.	Yes
--	-----

Other Background Documents

Integrated Impact Assessment and Other Background documents available for inspection at: Communities, 3rd Floor, One Guildhall Square

Title of Background Paper(s)	Relevant Paragraph of the Access to Information Procedure Rules / Schedule 12A allowing document to be Exempt/Confidential (if applicable)
------------------------------	--

1.	2011/12 Grants to Voluntary Organisations Report to Cabinet on 14 th March 2011	
----	--	--