








EXECUTIVE SUMMARY - REPORT AND IMPROVEMENT PLAN FOR THE CIVIL ENGINEERING SERVICE BEST VALUE REVIEW

Summary of Purpose and Recommendations:

This report summarises the findings of the Civil Engineering Service Best Value Review and shows the Improvement Plan.

Cost to Council: £18,000 employee time. **Within existing budget?** Yes

Contribution to Corporate Plan (Minor/Moderate/Major/Neutral):

	+		-		+		-
	Major			Priorities			
	Moderate			Clean Streets and Public Space		Neutral	
		Neutral		Crime and Disorder	Moderate		
	Moderate			Housing		Neutral	
	Major			Managing our Finances		Neutral	

Comments on Impacts on Corporate Objectives and Priorities:

The best value improvement plan is intended to improve the effectiveness of the service, particularly in the areas of partnership working, sustainability, communications and strategic planning. Surveys undertaken as part of the review process show that the public and partners hold the service in high regard. The best value board assessed it as 'Good and likely to improve'. The service has a major impact on the built and natural environment, dealing as it does with coastal erosion, flooding, road and pedestrian safety, street lighting and green transport. Much of it is delivered in partnership with other organisations and by reducing risks and hazards it contributes to social well-being.



Organisation of excellence



Working with public and partners



Economic well being



Social well being



Environmental well being

BEST VALUE REVIEW OF THE CIVIL ENGINEERING SERVICE – SUMMARY REPORT AND IMPROVEMENT PLAN

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This report summarises the process used to undertake a Best Value Review of the Civil Engineering Service and the outcomes from that review. The report seeks approval to an action plan for continued improvement over the next four years.
- 1.2 Significant changes to the structure of the service and its key personnel have occurred during the course of the review and up to the present time. Details are shown in 4.2 below.

2 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF KEY OUTCOMES OF THE REVIEW

- 2.1 A Citizen's Panel survey demonstrated that the service and the way that it is provided enjoys general public support. However, the review also showed that there are viable alternatives to the current method of delivery, including increased out-sourcing of work to the private sector, though there is evidence that, at the moment, private sector engineering consultants are not interested in undertaking the routine, low-value elements of the work.
- 2.2 During the review period the service has faced uncertainties created by on-going changes in management, together with external pressures such as Hampshire County Council's highway network management review and the first phase of Defra's review of the funding and administration of coast protection and flood defence. Consequently, the review team has been cautious about recommending any major changes to service delivery, preferring instead to propose a three to four year programme of achievable improvements whilst structural changes take effect and Defra's second phase review takes place. However, the Best Value Board considered that a more in-depth review of service delivery options could have been undertaken so the review team have included it as an improvement activity for the next fundamental service review.
- 2.3 Currently, there are no national BVPIs relevant to the service but the review team discovered a number of sources of comparative data. Most notable was the performance framework system developed, by the Local Government Association's Technical Advisors Group (TAG). This was used successfully to compare performance of the coast protection and land drainage services, which both achieved highest scores, and the street lighting service which was placed eighth out of 22. Work on relevant BVPIs is being progressed by TAG, and others and may be available for future reviews.
- 2.4 The service has not been subject to compulsory competitive tendering but the review team was able to draw on cost information from work won in competition with the private sector by a NFDC Coastal Group/ Southampton University partnership, which demonstrates that employee costs are competitive with the private sector. Comparative

cost data generated by TAG also showed that the hourly rates of NFDC's engineers are generally lower than equivalent staff in similar authorities and selected consultancies. The Best Value Board, whilst acknowledging that there was evidence of market testing on cost considered that quality needed to be better addressed as part of the improvement plan.

- 2.5 Under the heading of Environmental well being, Heart of the Forest identifies the coast, flooding and transportation as major issues and commits the Council to work in partnership with other organisations to deal with them effectively. The review demonstrated that the service is generally successful in delivering corporate objectives but improvement is possible, as reflected in the improvement plan.
- 2.6 Key improvement areas were identified as: -
- (a) *Partnership Working* – Developing new and improving existing relationships with in-house clients, local councils, government agencies and private sector providers.
 - (b) *Environmental Awareness and Sustainability* – Raising awareness of environmental issues and legislation; developing a strategy for the sustainable use and disposal of construction materials; planning for the impacts of climate change.
 - (c) *Procedures and Processes* – Improving performance management; regularly reviewing cost and quality comparators and service delivery options; developing appropriate performance indicators; putting in place procedures to ensure that Government targets for flood and coastal defence are fully met.
 - (d) *Raising the Profile and Improving Communications* – Reviewing communications and consultation procedures, both internally and externally; providing appropriate information to the public via the Council's website.
 - (e) *Strategic Planning* – Regularly reviewing and updating strategic planning documents and procedures and implementing any necessary actions. (e.g. Land Drainage and Coast Protection Strategies, Shoreline Management Plans, Operational Flood Plan and Oil Spill Contingency Plan).
- 2.7 The overall cost of the service in 2002/03 was nearly £1.25 million. The cost of conducting this review is about £18,000 to date. Although there is the potential to achieve savings over the life of the improvement plan it was not possible to calculate their value during the review. The review team intends to assess savings as part of the annual review of the improvement plan. There is some potential for the engineering and coastal protection groups to generate additional income from partnership-working initiatives.

3. BEST VALUE BOARD ASSESSMENT

- 3.1 In general the Board felt that the review had covered all aspects of the Best Value process and was supportive of the report overall. The Board recognised the amount of resource and effort that had gone into finalising the report and also that the Board's initial comments had for the most part been addressed.

3.2 The Board felt that in particular: -

- (a) There were clear objectives for the service and links to the Corporate Plan had been demonstrated. However there was no evidence to demonstrate that these links actually existed in practice.
- (b) In general the challenge element of the review had been addressed with reasonable rigour. The team had identified that, while many of the services under review were statutory, an evaluation of better ways of doing things was required.
- (c) A lot of work, some of it very innovative, had gone into establishing performance comparisons when none had previously existed and where like for like comparison was extremely difficult. What was now required was for the comparative information to be analysed and translated into action plan activity.
- (d) There was good evidence of consultation through the Citizens Panel Employee Questionnaire and with partners on project specific issues. It was felt that the review would benefit from examples where consultation has led to changes in service delivery.
- (e) Although there is a strong statutory element to the services under review there was evidence of market testing on cost but not on quality. This needs to be addressed as part of the Action Plan.
- (f) Although the service has identified clear objectives there needed to be more clarity within the review on how successful the service was in meeting those objectives and what action is required where they were not being met.
- (g) The Report gave the impression overall that three separate reviews had taken place and there needed to be an overview in order to determine better ways of working together to achieve successful outcomes.
- (h) A recurring theme throughout the Review was the lack of clarity on links between outcomes from the Review and the Improvement Plan and the need to translate these into SMART Targets.

3.3 Notwithstanding these comments the Board felt that there was sufficient evidence of good performance and capacity for improvement to score the service as Good (2*) with Good prospects for improvement (2*).

3.4 The review team's response to the BV Board comments is shown below.

3.2a	Evidence provided in sections 4.2 to 4.4 of the full report	-
3.2b	Need for evaluation included in the improvement plan.	G4
3.2c	Fuller analysis undertaken. Improvement points noted in improvement plan	G10, E16, C5, C7, T6

Board Comment	Review Team Response	Improvement Plan Ref.
3.2d	Examples of consultation leading to change in delivery are: - CDM regulations – scheme planning procedures revised. Engineering Works Group – new performance monitoring process agreed. Sewer Investigations – new commissioning and monitoring process agreed	G3 E11 E8
3.2e	Market testing of quality included in the improvement plan.	G5
3.2f	Monthly team/progress meetings are held but monitoring service performance against objectives is not consistently undertaken. Review of performance against service objectives included in the improvement plan.	G6
3.2g	The full report provides the overview. As the three service groups are now located in different directorates a more formal framework for working together to provide a coherent civil engineering service may be needed.	-
3.2h	Links clarified and improvement actions revised in full report.	-

4. THE SERVICE

- 4.1 Three groups in the Technical Services Section of the Resources Directorate deliver the Civil Engineering Service, mainly working from the Town Hall at Lymington. The Channel Coastal Observatory, a six strong regional coastal monitoring group, funded by Defra and managed by NFDC's Coastal Projects Manager, operates from Southampton University's Oceanography Centre.

Group	Key Activities
Engineering Group	Land drainage investigations Watercourse inspections and maintenance Land drainage aspects of development control Emergency response (flooding, oil & chemical spills) Design & construction of engineering schemes
Coastal Group	Specialist design of coastal projects. Monitoring coastal processes Hydrographic surveying Coastal research Coastal management & maintenance Emergency response (coastal flooding & oil spills)
Transportation Group	Transportation planning Street lighting Traffic management Developing and implementing transportation initiatives

- 4.2 Until 1997 Civil Engineering formed a stand-alone division of the Technical Services Directorate. In 1997 it was absorbed into the Consultancy Services Division of the newly created Environment Directorate. At the end of 2002 Consultancy Services was

expanded, renamed the Technical Services Section and transferred to the Resources Directorate. In April 2004 the Engineering Group was transferred to the Commercial Services Directorate and the Transportation Group to Community Services, the Coastal Group remaining in Resources.

- 4.3 Although the in-house groups possess wide ranging technical skills and experience, work is out-sourced quite regularly, particularly when specialist skills or additional resources are needed. Typically, specialist surveys, geotechnical investigations and structural design work are commissioned from private sector consultants. Subject to the availability of resources, the Engineering Works Group in the Commercial Services Directorate undertakes routine construction work. High value schemes and those requiring specialist skills are put out to competitive tender. Contractors are selected from the Exxor list with assistance from the Audit section.
- 4.4 Discretionary powers granted to district councils by the Coast Protection Act, 1949 and the Land Drainage Act, 1991, but the Government expects that councils will exercise their powers whenever necessary. Transportation is also discretionary but the government expects district councils to contribute to Local Transport Plans, liaise with the County Council and contribute towards road traffic reduction and road safety. NFDC's partnership agreement with Hampshire County Council is formal and subject to legal conditions. Strictly speaking, all elements of the civil engineering service are discretionary but the government expects the Council to provide them and in some circumstances can direct the Council to do so.

5. THE REVIEW PROCESS

5.1 Service review team

Name	Role
John Rainbow	Service Head/Review Leader
Carl Michalski*	Engineering Group Leader
Nick Hunt	Transport Group Leader
Andy Bradbury	Coastal Group Leader
Doug Wright	Review Co-ordinator
Tom Gibbons	Advisor
Derek Adams	Employee Representative
Chris Malyon	Best Value Mentor
Becky Drummond	Audit Representative

(* When Carl Michalski retired in 2002, Doug Wright became Engineering Group Leader, but also retained his co-ordination role.)

- 5.1.1 The service head and three group leaders formed a core review team within which each group leader was responsible for reviewing his part of the overall service, with input from group members. Each assessment was carried out to a common format and followed the principles of Best Value by considering the 4Cs, sustainability and partnership working together with any other matters relevant to the work of the particular group.

5.1.2 The views of front-line staff regarding the performance of the service and potential improvements were obtained from group meetings devoted wholly or partly to Best Value. The core team co-ordinated information and worked through the necessary programme of research and data analysis at bi-monthly meetings.

5.2 Scope of the review

5.2.1 The Engineering Works Group in the Commercial Services Directorate is also involved in delivering the civil engineering service and was included in the original Best Value package. However, acting on advice from the Best Value Review Board, the Engineering Works Group was taken out of the review because, as a contractor, its objectives, financing and management were very different than the other three service groups.

5.3 Key challenges

5.3.1 In the early stages the review team, in consultation with the Environment Review Panel, identified a number of key challenges that were included in the Review Plan. The table below lists these challenges and indicates how they were dealt with.

Challenge	BV review action
Obtaining a true stakeholder perception of the service in terms of access, quality, cost-effectiveness and delivery mechanisms.	Various methods of data acquisition were debated, with help from the BV co-ordinator, before a Citizen's Panel survey was chosen.
Comparing performance against other local authorities in the absence of nationally accepted BVPIs.	Data search was conducted via the LGA and a number of technical and professional bodies. (See Compare)
Developing effective working arrangements, with key partners.	Consultation with parish councils, HCC and other key partners to review existing arrangements and discuss new ones.
Communicating the work of the service more widely and effectively.	Benefits of using the Inter and Intranet debated and results of the Citizen's panel survey noted.
Responding to the potential impacts of climate change, despite the uncertainties inherent in prediction of change.	Reliable sources of information identified and contacts made with relevant organisations e.g. UKCIP, Hampshire Water Strategy Group.
Responding to new government performance targets, including Defra's High-Level Targets for flood and coastal defence.	Land drainage and coastal monitoring programmes reviewed, with assistance from the Environment Agency, and need for change and revised procedures noted.
Responding to Defra's funding review of flood and coastal defence arrangements.	Comprehensive response to Defra through LGA and individually. (Further review in 2006 may have a significant impact on the service.)
Dealing effectively with increasingly stringent environmental duties and requirements.	Contacts made with individuals and bodies able to provide useful information and guidance.
Developing post-CCT partnership working arrangements with the Engineering Works Group.	Preliminary review of procedures, working arrangements etc. that inhibit closer working. More comprehensive review required in future.

5.4 Review process and outcomes

- 5.4.1 The review was structured around the 4Cs of Best Value, (Challenge, Consult, Compare and Compete) including alternative service delivery options, which helped to focus the review team's activities. In addition the review team considered sustainability, partnerships, best practice and other issues specific to the three groups. The main outcome of the review is the improvement plan, which can be found in Appendix 1 to this report. (Note that the report references in column 3 of the improvement plan refer to the full report that was considered by the Best Value Board and CMT).
- 5.4.2 Cllr Michael Thierry, the Environment portfolio holder, and Cllr Brenda Smith the Liberal-Democrat environment spokesperson, read and commented upon a first draft of the full review report and on the group assessment reports. Both Members were satisfied that the review had been carried out in a satisfactory manner and in accordance with the corporate guidelines. They found the group assessments informative and suggested that they could be very useful documents for member training.
- 5.4.3 Advice and assistance in preparing the report were also sought from the LGA's Technical Advisors Group, the Hampshire Districts Land Drainage Working Group, the regional coastal group SCOPAC and the Hampshire District Engineers Group.

5.5 Overall performance assessment

- 5.5.1 An overall assessment of the service can be gained from the Citizen's Panel and employee surveys, consultations with internal and external stakeholders, the Best Value Board assessment, comparative data provided by the TAG framework analysis and from cost data provided by TAG and the NFDC/Southampton University coastal partnership.
- 5.5.2 In summary, it can be concluded that the service enjoys wide public support, with clear objectives linking to the corporate plan that are supported by land drainage, coast protection and transportation strategies and operational guidance documents. Employee morale is good with staff generally feeling involved in decision making and service improvement.
- 5.5.3 However, the review has highlighted the potential to improve performance in the following areas: -
- Partnership Working
 - Environmental Awareness and Sustainability
 - Procedures and Processes
 - Raising the Profile and Improving Communications
 - Strategic Planning

5.6 Efficiency improvements and targets

- 5.6.1 A number of potential areas for improvement were identified in each of the three group assessments and from other work associated with the service review. Some improvement areas were common to all three service groups. To reflect this the Improvement Plan has been drawn up in four parts as follows: -
- General Issues
 - Engineering Group Issues
 - Coastal Group Issues
 - Transportation Group Issues

- 5.6.2 As the future of the service may be substantially affected by the second review of coast protection and flood defence funding in 2006, the review team focused on improvements that can be obtained over the next three years, between 2003/04 and 2006/07. Further improvements in years four and five will be identified when the future direction of the service becomes clearer and incorporated in the improvement plan as part of the annual review process.

6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 Full implementation of the Action Plan as proposed should be achievable within existing revenue and project budgets. There is some potential for the engineering and coastal protection groups to generate additional income from partnership-working initiatives.
- 6.2 Key efficiency improvements are : -
- G1 & G6 – improve performance management
 - E1 – more efficient use of resources
 - E10 – improve efficiency of watercourse inspection
 - E11 – more effective joint service delivery
 - C3, 6 & 7 – more cost-effective coastal monitoring

7. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 The sustainability assessment undertaken by the service resulted in the identification of areas for improvement, many of which have a positive impact on the environment. Of particular note are the following: -
- E3 - promote Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems.
 - E4 – raise awareness of environmental issues.
 - E5 – undertake early consultations with environmental bodies.
 - C2 – increase use of recycled materials.
 - T2 – consult parish councils with significant traffic management concerns.

8. CRIME & DISORDER IMPLICATIONS

- 8.1 The sustainability assessment recognises the importance of safe and secure communities. This service has identified the following relevant areas of its activity, which have been taken into account when finalising the Action Plan: -
- G3 – consistent implementation of Construction, Design & Management regulations.
 - E17 – complete review of Oil Spill contingency Plan.
 - E18 – identify temporary storage sites for oily waste.
 - T9 – consult parish councils about additional street lighting.

9. CONCLUSIONS

- 9.1 The service team undertook a thorough assessment of the civil engineering service, based around the 4Cs of Best Value.

- 9.2 The Best Value Board, following its evaluation of service team's assessment report, concluded that there was sufficient evidence of good performance and the capacity for improvement to score the service as Good (2*) with Good prospects for improvement (2*), whilst noting a number of areas for improvement.
- 9.3 Based on the service team's assessment and the Board's evaluation, a plan was developed to provide a framework for service improvements between 2003/04 and 2006/07.
- 9.4 Phase 2 of the Government's review of the funding and administration of flood and coastal defence is due to be completed in 2006. As the outcome could have a major impact on service delivery mechanisms and responsibilities it would be sensible to arrange for the next civil engineering Best Value assessment to coincide with publication of Government's proposals arising from this review.

10. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 10.1 That the Action Plan for continuous improvement of the Civil Engineering Service as set out in Appendix 1 be approved.
- 10.2 That those actions not requiring additional resources be implemented in accordance with the timetable.
- 10.3 That those actions requiring additional resources either be met by efficiency savings, or not implemented until sufficient budgetary provision is provided.

For Further Information:

Doug Wright
Principal Engineer - Engineering Group
Town Hall, Lymington
Tel: (023) 8028 5908
Fax: (023) 8028 5943
E-mail: doug.wright@nfdc.gov.uk

Andy Bradbury
Coastal Projects Manager
Town Hall, Lymington
Tel: (023) 8028 5911
Fax: (023) 8028 5943
E-mail: andy.bradbury@nfdc.gov.uk

Nick Hunt
Principal Engineer - Transportation Group
Town Hall, Lymington
Tel: (023) 8028 5916
Fax: (023) 8028 5829
E-mail: nick.hunt@nfdc.gov.uk

Background Papers:

Review Plan
(January 2001)

CIVIL ENGINEERING SERVICE BEST VALUE IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GENERAL ISSUES PLAN: 2003/04 to 2006/07

Key areas for improvement are:

- PROCEDURES AND PROCESSES
- ENVIRONMENTAL AWARENESS AND SUSTAINABILITY
- RAISING THE PROFILE AND IMPROVING COMMUNICATIONS

PROCEDURES AND PROCESSES

Plan ref	Proposed Activities	Report ref	Performance measures/targets	Milestone dates & priority levels	NF officer or partner	Resources
G1	Use targets and objectives identified during PDIs to monitor on-going employee performance.	6.3.10 (c)	Increased focus on service priorities Improved productivity.	PDI process beginning March 2004 (H)	Group leaders	Staff time
G2	Use PDIs to identify key strengths in employees and, as far as possible, exploit these strengths to improve service delivery.	6.3.10 (d)	Improved productivity, job satisfaction and service delivery.	New PDI process beginning March 2004 (M)	Group leaders	Staff time
G3	Ensure that CDM regulations are applied in a consistent manner to all relevant engineering projects. Include procedures in the New Works team's quality manual.	3.3 (d) 6.6.12 (c)	Minimise risk of construction related accidents and injuries. Refresher training	In progress (H) June '04 (M)	All relevant staff Helen Woodvine	Staff time Training budgets
G4	Conduct a more detailed assessment of alternative service delivery options.	3.2 (b) 6.2.12 (a)	Identify optimum service delivery mechanism and implement necessary changes.	Next service review in 2006/07 (M)	Service team	Staff time
G5	Evaluate quality of service by means of second Citizen's Panel survey and formal consultation with internal and external stakeholders.	3.2 (e)	Identify appropriate level of service and implement necessary changes.	Next service review in 2006/07 (M)	Service team	Staff time

Plan ref	Proposed Activities	Report ref	Performance measures/targets	Milestone dates & priority levels	NF officer or partner	Resources
G6	Review day to day performance management.	3.2 (f)	Full delivery of service objectives ad targets.	Monthly progress meetings (H)	Service team	Staff time

ENVIRONMENTAL AWARENESS AND SUSTAINABILITY

Plan ref	Proposed Activities	Report ref	Performance measures/targets	Milestone dates & priority levels	NF officer or partner	Resources
G7	Research all aspects of sustainable construction and develop a strategy for the increased use of recycled materials and re-use of construction waste.	6.6.12 (b)	Reduce the environmental impact of the Council's civil engineering service.	Strategy in place by April 2006 (M)	Group leaders and team members	Staff time Possible increased cost of construction

RAISING THE PROFILE AND IMPROVING COMMUNICATIONS

Plan ref	Proposed Activities	Report ref	Performance measures/targets	Milestone dates & priority levels	NF officer or partner	Resources
G8	Arrange ad-hoc and informal inter-group meetings.	6.3.10 (e)	Clearer understanding of each other's work and priorities Better communications.	2003 – 2004 (M)	Group leaders	Staff time
G9	Arrange regular employee briefings by the head of service.	6.3.10 (f)	Opportunity to discuss forthcoming corporate issues at an early stage with the service head.	Quarterly briefings (M)	Head of service	Staff time
G10	Adopt a more structured approach to consultation with external clients and stakeholders during future reviews.	6.3.10 (g)	More robust evidence available for use in service assessment.	Next service review in 2006/07 (L)	Service team Debbie Holmes	Staff time
G11	Determine Members' perceptions of service performance and priorities for action.	6.3.10 (h)	More robust evidence available for use in service assessment.	Awareness training starting March 2004 (H)	Service team	Staff time

Plan ref	Proposed Activities	Report ref	Performance measures/targets	Milestone dates & priority levels	NF officer or partner	Resources
G12	Undertake in-depth review of the impact of the service on other Council services and all corporate objectives.	6.11.7 (g)	Understand the role played by the service in delivering all of the Council's objectives	Next service review in 2006/07 (L)	Service team	Staff time

ENGINEERING GROUP PLAN: 2003/04 TO 2006/07

Key areas for improvement are:

- PARTNERSHIP WORKING
- ENVIRONMENTAL AWARENESS AND SUSTAINABILITY
- PROCEDURES AND PROCESSES
- STRATEGIC PLANNING

PARTNERSHIP WORKING

Plan ref	Proposed Activities	Report ref	Performance measures/targets	Milestone dates & priority levels	NF officer or partner	Resources
E1	Develop partnership-working agreements with relevant town and parish councils to achieve a more efficient use of resources during flooding events.	6.10.3 (a)	Determine which councils are relevant and agree procedures.	June 2003 to March 2005 (M)	Doug Wright Stuart Beaton	Staff time
			Implement, monitor and review arrangements	Implement as and when agreements reached. (M)	Doug Wright Stuart Beaton	Staff time
E2	Reach agreement with the Environment Agency to monitor, on their behalf, defined lengths of main river within the district, and explore the possibility of undertaking monitoring elsewhere.	6.10.3 (b)	Define and agree extent of work with Environment Agency and agree terms and conditions.	July/Sept '04 (H)	Doug Wright John Mascall Grainne O'Rourke	Staff time
			Implement agreement	April '05 to March '08	Doug Wright Stuart Beaton	Staff time
			Monitor and review programme.	Annual review	Doug Wright Stuart Beaton	Staff time

ENVIRONMENTAL AWARENESS AND SUSTAINABILITY

Plan ref	Proposed Activities	Report ref	Performance measures/targets	Milestone dates & priority levels	NF officer or partner	Resources
E3	Promote the use of Sustainable Urban, Drainage Systems particularly through the Hampshire Water Strategy steering group. Develop SUDS implementation strategy.	6.6.12 (d)	Secure membership of HWS steering group. Strategy in place and being implemented	2003 then ongoing input into group (M) Guidelines in July 2004. Strategy by April 2005.	Doug Wright Doug Wright Stuart Beaton Chris Elliott	Staff time Staff time
E4	Use English Nature and other relevant bodies to raise awareness of environmental issues relating to land drainage.	6.6.12 (a)	EN attendance at Hampshire Land Drainage Working group. Regular contact with Environment Agency.	November 2003 (M) When environmental issues identified	Doug Wright Stuart Beaton	Staff time Staff time
E5	Undertake early consultation with English Nature and Environment Agency about potential environmental impacts of engineering works.	6.4.5 (c)	Procedure for consulting at appropriate stage in project planning. Implement, monitor and review procedure.	Complete by Autumn 2005 (M)	Doug Wright Roger Hand Doug Wright Roger Hand	Staff time Staff time
E6	Investigate all sources of information about the potential impacts of climate change on flood defence and coast protection and the range of responses available to local authorities.	6.11.7 (d)	Balanced view of impacts and responses for use in service planning and dissemination to others.	Winter 2004 to Spring 2005 (L)	Doug Wright Andy Bradbury	Staff time Publications from existing budgets

PROCEDURES AND PROCESSES

Plan ref	Proposed Activities	Report ref	Performance measures/targets	Milestone dates & priority levels	NF officer or partner	Resources
E7	Improve feedback to in-house clients and partners about project progress and expenditure.	6.3.10 (a)	Consult to determine needs and agree feedback mechanism(s).	Completed by January '05 (M)	Doug Wright Roger Hand	Staff time
			Implement, monitor and review procedure.	Review after 12 months	Roger Hand	Staff time
E8	Change the way in which sewer investigations are commissioned by Environmental Health.	3.2d 6.3.10 (b)	Consult Environmental Health to determine needs and agree new procedure(s) to ensure a more integrated approach.	Completed by December '03 (M)	Geoff Bettle Annie Righton Doug Wright	Staff time
			Implement, monitor and review procedure(s).	Quarterly reviews	Carole Gallagher Tom Gibbons	Staff time
E9	Engineering Group to take responsibility for delivering the planned car park maintenance programme.	6.3.10 (i)	Consult Car Parks Manager. Agree procedure(s) to deliver a more cost-effective programme.	Agreement by March '05 (L)	Doug Wright Roger Hand	Staff time
			Implement, monitor and review procedure(s).	Start: April '05 Annual review.	Roger Hand John Bull	Staff time
E10	Improve delivery of the critical ordinary watercourse inspection programme to meet Defra's high level targets.	6.4.5 (a)	Undertake risk assessment and develop risk-based inspection programme.	November '04 to February '05 (L/M)	Doug Wright Stuart Beaton	Staff time
			Implement, monitor and review inspection programme.	Start: April '05 or to coincide with new EA agreement.	Stuart Beaton	Staff time

E11	Review the structure and working procedures of the Engineering Group and Engineering Works Group with the aim of improving the effectiveness of joint service delivery. (Commercial Services Directorate Service Plan, section 6.11)	3.2d 6.10.3 (e)	Undertake review, report findings and Implement agreed actions to secure more effective joint service delivery.	March to October 2004 (H)	Geoff Bettle Doug Wright Tom Gibbons	Staff time
E12	Use the Hampshire Districts Land Drainage Working Group to review and refine Defra's high level targets and the work programmes required to achieve them.	6.4.5 (e)	Undertake review, report findings to Defra. And Implement agreed actions.	Working group programmes for 2005/06. (L) Input into 2006 Defra review of flood & coastal defence.	Doug Wright Andy Bradbury	Staff time
E13	Reach agreement with Hampshire County Council to undertake the planning and design of specified local highway improvement schemes within the district resulting from the latest County Local Transport Plan.	6.11.7 (c)	Agree terms and conditions. Review agreement	May/June '04 (H) March '05	Doug Wright John Mascall Grainne O'Rourke Doug Wright	Staff time Staff time
E14	Review the arrangements for inspecting and maintaining watercourses passing through publicly owned and maintained land to meet Defra's high level targets.	6.4.5 (a)	Undertake review with relevant Council services, identify and implement changes to improve watercourse maintenance.	2005/06 (L)	Stuart Beaton Graham Snape	Staff time
E15	Change the recording of flood and coastal defence data to meet the requirements of the Environment agency's forthcoming National Flood and Coastal Defence Database (Defra high level target).	6.4.5 (a)	Secure membership of NFCDD steering group and ensure that local authority needs for data access and transfer are met. Use NFCDD as the basis for the recording of flood and coastal defence data to a consistent national standard.	2003 then ongoing input into group. NFCDD due to launched by E.A. in late 2004	Stuart Beaton Steve Cooke Stuart Beaton Steve Cooke	Staff time Staff time
E16	Support the development of performance indicators through HDLDWG and TAG.	6.4.5 (e)	Development of realistic and usable performance indicators.	2005/06 (M)	Doug Wright Stuart Beaton	Staff time

STRATEGIC PLANNING

Plan Ref	Proposed Activities	Report ref	Performance measures/targets	Milestone dates & priority levels	NF officer or partner	Resources
E17	Review the Council's Oil Spill Contingency Plan and oil spill response training programme to ensure that the Council can respond adequately to a major oil spill.	6.11.7 (e)	Update plan with latest national guidance and improved local information and, if necessary, arrange exercise to trial the plan. Arrange suitable oil spill response training for staff on the emergency call-out list.	April 2003 to July 2004 (M) Autumn 2004 (H)	Doug Wright Tom Gibbons John Mascall Helen Woodvine Doug Wright Tom Gibbons	Staff time Training budgets
E18	Identify temporary oil storage sites and develop an action plan for bringing them into use in the event of an oil spill.	6.11.7 (f)	Identify sites in consultation with Environment Agency, Maritime and Coastguard Agency and Oil Spill Response Centre. Draw up action plan and secure approval of the Environment Agency. Arrange exercise to trial the plan.	March 2004 to July 2004 (M) July 2005 to March 2005 (M)	Doug Wright Tom Gibbons Doug Wright Tom Gibbons Helen Woodvine	Staff time Staff time

COASTAL GROUP IMPROVEMENT PLAN: 2003/04 TO 2006/07

Key areas for improvement are:

- PARTNERSHIP WORKING
- ENVIRONMENTAL AWARENESS AND SUSTAINABILITY
- PROCEDURES AND PROCESSES
- RAISING THE PROFILE AND IMPROVING COMMUNICATIONS
- STRATEGIC PLANNING

PARTNERSHIP WORKING

Plan ref	Proposed Activities	Report ref	Performance measures/targets	Milestone dates & priority levels	NF officer or partner	Resources
C1	Develop partnership working within the Channel Coastal Observatory.	6.10.3 (c)	Integrate English Nature into programme	2005 (H)	Andy Bradbury	Staff time
			Integrate south west local authorities into regional programme	April 2006 (M)	Andy Bradbury	Staff time

ENVIRONMENTAL AWARENESS AND SUSTAINABILITY

Plan ref	Proposed Activities	Report ref	Performance measures/targets	Milestone dates & priority levels	NF officer or partner	Resources
C2	Develop a strategy for the increased use of recycled materials and development of innovative management methods for coastal maintenance programme.	6.6.12 (b)	Better maintenance methods. Continued efficiency savings.	New programme beginning April 2004 (M)	Steve Cook	Staff time

PROCEDURES AND PROCESSES

Plan ref	Proposed Activities	Report ref	Performance measures/targets	Milestone dates & priority levels	NF officer or partner	Resources
C3	Improve delivery of the coastal inspection and maintenance programme for all of the publicly and privately owned coast protection works, to achieve Defra high level targets	6.4.5 (a)	Revise reporting methodology	2004-2005 (H)	Pete Ferguson	Staff time
C4	Develop Defra high level targets for coastal defence in partnership with operating authorities within SCOPAC	6.11.7 (a)	Complete inspection programme	2005 – 2006 (H)	Pete Ferguson	Staff time
C5	Support the development of performance indicators through SCOPAC and TAG	6.5.4 (a)	Introduction of realistic and usable performance indicators to all service areas.	In place by April 2005 (M)	Andy Bradbury	Staff time
C6	Improve efficiency and implementation of the Hurst Spit Beach Management Plan.	6.11.7 (b)	Review benefit cost analysis	August 2004 (H)	Andy Bradbury Steve cook	Staff time
C7	Review cost effectiveness of in-house coastal monitoring team by comparison with external contractors, through regional monitoring programme.	6.5.4 (b)	Cost of coastal monitoring remains competitive with private sector costs.	April 2006 (L)	Andy Bradbury Steve Cook	Staff time
C8	Implement all Defra High Level Targets relating to coast protection, in accordance with agreed Council policy.	6.4.5 (a)	Achieve Defra inspection and reporting targets	September 2004 (H)	Pete Ferguson	Staff time

RAISING THE PROFILE AND IMPROVING COMMUNICATIONS

Plan ref	Proposed Activities	Report ref	Performance measures/targets	Milestone dates & priority levels	NF officer or partner	Resources
C9	Web enabled delivery of the District Councils Coastal Management Plan.	6.9.2	Wide availability of coastal information to the public, schools and colleges.	June 2004 (H)	Catherine Eastick Andrew Colenutt Coastal Management Group	Staff time
C10	Development of coastal website in conjunction with regional monitoring partnership.	6.9.2	Improve delivery of coastal information to the public.	April 2005 (m)	Andy Bradbury Tanja Cooper	Staff time
C11	Improved communication within the coastal regional partnership.	6.10.3 (c)	Publish communication strategy document. Implement strategy.	September 2004 (m)	Andy Bradbury Travis Mason	Staff time

STRATEGIC PLANNING

Plan ref	Proposed Activities	Report ref	Performance measures/targets	Milestone dates & priority levels	NF officer or partner	Resources
C12	Develop the Channel Coastal Observatory strategic regional monitoring programme.	6.10.3 (c)	Achieve targets on regional high level report	Annual October (H)	Andy Bradbury Travis Mason	DEFRA funding
C13	Complete the Western Solent Coastal Strategy.	6.4.5 (b)	Agree plan through democratic process	April 2006 (H)	Andy Bradbury Andrew Colenutt	DEFRA funding Staff time
C14	Review the shoreline management plan in accordance with new Defra guidance.	6.4.5 (b)	Complete plan in partnership with partner local authorities	2007 – 2008 (m)	Andy Bradbury	Staff time

Plan ref	Proposed Activities	Report ref	Performance measures/targets	Milestone dates & priority levels	NF officer or partner	Resources
C15	Formulate a consultation document for the Christchurch Bay strategy study.	6.4.5 (b)	Publish consultation document. Implement consultation strategy.	September 2004 (H)	Andy Bradbury	Staff time
C16	Publish a revision to the District Council's Coastal Management Plan.	6.4.5 (b)	Publish revised document. Implement revised action plan.	July 2004 (H)	Andy Bradbury	Staff time

TRANSPORTATION GROUP IMPROVEMENT PLAN: 2003/04 TO 2006/07

Key areas for improvement are:

- PARTNERSHIP WORKING
- PROCEDURES AND PROCESSES
- RAISING THE PROFILE AND IMPROVING COMMUNICATIONS

PARTNERSHIP WORKING

Plan ref	Proposed Activities	Report ref	Performance measures/targets	Milestone dates & priority levels	NF officer or partner	Resources
T1	Take a leading role in transportation elements of the Community Action Plan.	6.10.3 (d)	Produce Action Plan	August 2003 to March 2004	Nick Hunt.	Staff time
T2	Organise meetings with town and parish councils having significant traffic management concerns.	6.10.3 (a)	Arrange regular meetings with Totton & Eling TC	August 2003 to March 2004	Nick Hunt.	Staff time
T3	Explore, with the Planning Policy and Development Control sections, the possibility of obtaining developers contributions for community transport.	6.3.10 (j)	Defer until Government produce long overdue regulations/guidance.	September 2004 to March 2005	Nick Hunt.	Staff time

PROCEDURES AND PROCESSES

Plan ref	Proposed Activities	Report ref	Performance measures/targets	Milestone dates & priority levels	NF officer or partner	Resources
T4	Develop procedures to fast-track appropriate planning applications.	None	Introduced but function now transferred to HCC	October 2003	Nick Hunt	None
T5	Review, in consultation with Accountancy, the allocation of service costs to DG codes.	None	Completed Nov 2003	Complete by November 2003	Nick Hunt Jane Alexander	None
T6	Support the development of performance indicators through the Hampshire District Engineer's Group.	None	Revised agency arrangements mean this is no longer required	-	Nick Hunt	None
T7	Develop and implement safety and security policy for street lighting.	6.4.5 (d)	Minimise risk of accidents and injuries	Complete by April 2005	Nick Hunt Alan Ellis	Staff time

RAISING THE PROFILE AND IMPROVING COMMUNICATIONS

Plan ref	Proposed Activities	Report ref	Performance measures/targets	Milestone dates & priority levels	NF officer or partner	Resources
T8	Raise the priority of road adoption work and monitor progress.	None	Introduced but function now transferred to HCC	-	Nick Hunt.	-
T9	Consult town and parish councils about additional street lighting	6.2.12 (c)	Agreed annual programme to reflect the views of Town & Parish Councils	None	Nick Hunt T & P clerks	Staff time