

REPORT OF CABINET

(Meeting held on 5 June 2002)

1. **BEST VALUE PERFORMANCE PLAN 2002/03 (REPORT D – 5 JUNE) (MINUTE NO. 8)**

The Cabinet has considered the Best Value Performance Plan (BVPP) for 2002/2003. Each year the Council has a duty to publish its BVPP together with a summary. Last year's main and summary documents were commended by District Audit and the Audit Commission for their clear reflection of the Council's performance.

This year the publication date for the main document is 30 June to enable actual rather than forecasted performance information to be included.

The style and format of the BVPP is similar to last year although opportunities have been taken to reduce the introductory text and concentrate on providing performance results, improvement activities and planned challenges within the portfolio sections.

The final updated BVPP is attached as appendix 1 to this report.

RECOMMENDED:

That the Best Value Performance Plan for 2002/03 as attached at Appendix 1 to this report be approved.

**Cllr S A Hayes
CHAIRMAN**

BEST VALUE PERFORMANCE PLAN 2002/03

1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

- 5.1 This report seeks final approval of this year's Best Value Performance Plan (BVPP) and sets out details of costs and how the document will be used.
- 5.2 The report builds on some of the information contained in the Best Value progress report considered by Cabinet on 8 April.

5 BACKGROUND

- 5.1 Each year the Council has a duty to publish its BVPP together with a summary. In previous years both needed to be published by 31 March.
- 5.2 Last year's main and summary documents were commended by the District Audit and Audit Commission for their clear reflection of our performance.
- 5.3 This year the publication date for the main document has been set at 30 June to enable actual rather than forecasted performance information to be included.
- 2.4 A further change this year was that Councils should look to integrate Best Value performance information within the Council Tax leaflet. This was achieved. Further performance information was included in the spring edition of Forest News.

3. THIS YEAR'S BVPP

- # 3.1 Appendix 1 is a copy of the draft text for this year's plan.
- 3.2 The text is virtually complete. Some additional information will be added between Cabinet and the Council meeting including the actual performance figures for 2001/02 as these will not be available until shortly before the document's final approval by Council at a special meeting on 17 June 2002. A brief addendum to the document will be provided at the Council meeting where additions have been made.
- 3.3 The style and format of the BVPP is similar to last year although opportunities have been taken to reduce the introductory text and concentrate on providing performance results, improvement activities and planned challenges within the portfolio sections.
- 5.1 Efforts have been made to align portfolio/service achievements and targets more closely to the Heart of the Forest.
- 3.5 The document will be enhanced by the greater use of graphics and photographs and a copy will be displayed at the Council meeting.

- 3.6 It is suggested that the document is published in two colour (as per last year).
- 3.7 The Plan has been drafted to be a reference document for members, employees and stakeholder organisations. This should help Portfolio Holders, Scrutiny members and services to undertake their respective roles. It also strives to achieve clarity of joint roles with partners.
- 3.8 Good public access will be given to the document both in hard copy form (via libraries, recreation centres and information offices etc) and electronically via the Council's web site. Key Council partners and stakeholder organisations will also be sent a hard copy of the Plan.

4. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 Quotes have been obtained from the Council's approved list of printers and the lowest received against the specification (56 pages and cover, two colour throughout) was £1,955 for 500 with £216 for a 500 run on.
- 4.2 Additional costs will be:
- | | |
|----------------------|--------|
| Graphics | £1,500 |
| Distribution/postage | £500 |
- 4.3 The total estimated cost for this year's plan is therefore approximately £4,000. This represents a £2,000 saving over last year's actual cost of £6,000
- 4.4 Last year's total cost did not include any charge for Forest News as this cost was met from the Public Relations budget. The cost of using this year's spring edition of Forest News for Best Value was £2,400. These new charging arrangements are due to the changed status of Forest News, which now has a community paper focus.
- 4.5 There was no additional cost to the Council of incorporating performance information into the Council Tax leaflet.

5. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 The environmental implications relating to the publication of any document needs to be viewed from three perspectives.

The use of natural resources – the paper used will be produced from sustainable forests and the number printed will be as near to the requirements as reasonably possible.

The use of materials that damage the environment – The paper is recycled and recyclable and is chlorine free. The binding is minimal (2 staples).

The contribution the document makes to increase the awareness of the reader of good environmental practice – The structure of the plan helps both the organisation and its partners to understand what the Council is trying to achieve for the environment.

6. CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 There are no direct implications although the structure of the plan helps both the organisation and its partners to understand what the Council is seeking to achieve to help combat Crime and Disorder.

7. CONCLUSION

- 7.1 The BVPP provides a useful vehicle for bringing together key information relating to the Council's performance. Members and services are encouraged to make use of it in their work.
- 7.2 The principles of best value have been applied to the production of the document and each year the Council seeks to produce a document that meets the needs of those who use it whilst providing better value for money.
- 7.3 The revised deadline for publication should be welcomed as it enables a more meaningful document to be published with actual performance recorded.

8. CONSULTATION

- 8.1 During the production of this draft document services have been fully involved in the relevant information contained in the text.
- 8.2 The Cabinet was the initial stage in the consultation process with Portfolio Holders. Final draft Portfolio sections have been sent to each Portfolio Holder prior to submission of the document to Council.

9. RECOMMENDATION

- 9.1 That the Council's draft Best Value Performance Plan for 2002/03 be approved.

For further information contact the Best Value Performance Plan Team

Geoff Bettle
Dottie Dabrowska
Chris Malyon
Keith Smith

PERFORMANCE MATTERS

DRAFT BEST VALUE PERFORMANCE PLAN 2002/03

C O N T E N T S

- CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION TO THE PLAN**
By Cllr Simon Hayes, Leader of the Council and
Dave Yates, Chief Executive
- Chapter 2 **‘HEART OF THE FOREST’ - THE CORPORATE PLAN**
Summary of the Council’s Aims
- Chapter 3 **BEST VALUE DEVELOPMENTS**
- Key Changes in 2001/02
 - Response to District Audit Recommendations – 2000/01
- Chapter 4 **PORTFOLIO PERFORMANCE MATTERS**
- Introduction
 - Crime and Disorder Portfolio
 - Economy and Planning Portfolio
 - Environment Portfolio
 - Finance and Support Portfolio
 - Health and Social Exclusion Portfolio
 - Housing Portfolio
 - Leisure Portfolio
 - Policy and Strategy Portfolio
 - Themed Reviews
- Chapter 5 **APPENDICIES**
- Appendix 1: Financial Statement
 - Appendix 2: Service Index to Portfolio
 - Glossary of Terms

DRAFT BEST VALUE PERFORMANCE PLAN

APPENDIX 1

INTRODUCTION BY THE LEADER AND CHIEF EXECUTIVE

The production of the Best Value Performance Plan gives us an opportunity to reflect on the past 12 months and to set out our plans for the years to come. We have chosen to share this introduction as it represents a commitment at both member and officer level to ensure this Council continues to move forward in a way that achieves continuous improvement. Such improvement is not seen as a series of short term 'quick wins' through individual service reviews but an opportunity to integrate best value into performance management. The new political structures of Cabinet, Review Panels and Committees should ensure elected members play a full role in setting and monitoring long term objectives. Indeed, Improvement Plans coming out of the reviews are now forming an important part of the Review Panels work programmes.

This year has seen a reassessment of the Council's approach to Best Value as we have applied Best Value principles to the process itself. This has resulted in a much more streamlined approach whilst retaining the rigor that previously existed. Different levels of review now exist and the emphasis is now clearly on appropriateness. The new approach introduces 'Fast track' reviews that apply to those services that are relatively small and have low impact on the community or where overall performance results are good. Both members and senior officers have been the driving force behind streamlining the process.

April 2002 saw the third and final visit from the Peer Review Team set up as part of the Local Government Improvement Programme (LGIP) which the Council started back in June 2000. The results of that review have been very positive. The Team judged that the authority has continued to demonstrate its potential to be high performing and recognised a large number of areas which were good and moving in the right direction including:

- Plentiful evidence of high quality services
- High quality and committed employees
- Cabinet process working well
- Improved streamlined approach to Best Value
- Strong partnerships being further developed as part of the Local Strategic Partnership
- Corporate Management Team working together as a team
- An open attitude towards areas for improvement.

The Team agreed with the Council's own analysis that the key areas where improvement is necessary are:

- A need for greater priority setting in the budget and the Corporate Plan
- Further development of the Scrutiny role
- Continued focus on maintaining staff morale and avoiding any negative aspects of departmentalism.

Set against this positive report is the need to avoid complacency. The criteria for an 'ideal local authority' as set out in the LGIP has helped the Council set out its own Improvement Plan covering Leadership, Democratic and Community Engagement and Performance Management. This will help the Council develop in the lead up to the Comprehensive Performance Assessment which will take place in 2003.

DRAFT BEST VALUE PERFORMANCE PLAN

APPENDIX 1

Partnerships have been a key theme for achievement in the past year and time spent in building the foundations for the Local Strategic Partnership (LSP) has been a good investment. The New Forest LSP has a good reputation at County and Regional level for bringing agencies together to work towards a common purpose. This can only bring benefits to the District's communities and help provide Best Value in the years to come as the Community Strategy is developed for publication early next year

Our performance against the Best Value Performance Indicators (BVPI's) has been particularly pleasing with 67% of those measures being in the top quartile for district councils in the country and 85% being greater than average performance. The 15% that fell below average are viewed as opportunities where greatest improvements are possible and services will look at all reasonable means to make real progress in these areas.

If we had to choose one Performance Indicator that gave us the greatest sense of pride then it would be BVPI 3 – the percentage of citizens satisfied with the overall service provided by the Council. Our result of 92% proved to be the highest in the country and we take great heart from the fact that our efforts are endorsed at the local level as well as through national initiatives. We recognise this result sets a high standard to live up to.

To date there have been three service reviews inspected (recreation centres, tourism and development control). We are proud that the first two inspections have received a 2 star good service and rated as likely to improve. The final results of the third inspection are awaited.

The year has seen good progress made in the reviews of services as set out in the Council's programme. Details of reviews undertaken and planned for the coming year are set out in the Portfolio sections of the Plan together with a number of key targets and achievements. We are pleased to see that the review process is producing real improvements that have been generated through challenging conventional thinking to produce benefits in service delivery.

The dialogue we have with our communities is viewed as an essential part of best value. An important best value element of this dialogue is the publication of the Performance Plan summary, which this year was also incorporated into the Council Tax leaflet. As in previous years we included a summary in the Council's community newspaper Forest News and this year took the opportunity to obtain feedback on the information provided to the public. Forest News Performance Matters received a positive response, with 90% of respondents believing it gave sufficient information on the Council's performance. The Council Tax leaflet received more mixed results with almost half feeling the information was just right but with about a third not remembering seeing the information.

Ongoing communication by individual services and the Council itself has provided strong foundations on which to build. We aim to develop techniques to provide better opportunities to encourage two way communications. The link between this and democratic renewal is recognised and we hope that our efforts now and in the years to come will bring about a renewed interest in public services and the democratic process.

Councillor Simon Hayes
Leader of the Council

Dave Yates
Chief Executive

HEART OF THE FOREST – THE COUNCIL’S CORPORATE PLAN

A new Corporate Plan, ‘Heart of the Forest’, setting out the Council’s aims and objectives has been put together for consultation with our partners and key stakeholders. It has been developed at a time of change with new opportunities for local authorities. This is supported by new decision-making structures that provide for individual councillor responsibility and accountability together with a key role of scrutiny to develop policies and review decisions and performance.

The Plan sets out how we intend to work both internally and externally with the public and our partners to place the Council at the heart of community life in the Forest. It is our Local Agenda 21 strategy, which will help contribute towards a sustainable future.

A summary of the key headings from the plan are shown below, and detailed in each relevant portfolio section of this Plan. The full document can be viewed at all Council offices, on nfdc.gov.uk or by contacting Keith Smith on 023 8028 5551.

Summary of ‘Heart of the Forest’ – The Council’s Aims

Striving to be an Organisation of Excellence through:

- ◆ Developing our Employees
- ◆ Managing our Finances
- ◆ Securing Real Best Value
- ◆ Fostering Innovation in Service Delivery
- ◆ Promoting Equal Opportunity and Diversity
- ◆ Managing our Physical Assets
- ◆ Making Best Use of New Technology

Working with Public and Partners to:

- ◆ Involve the Public
- ◆ Develop a Community Strategy
- ◆ Improving Work with Partners
- ◆ Deliver Real Benefits
- ◆ Protect the Forest

Develop Economic Well-being through:

- ◆ An Economic Strategy
- ◆ Linking Economy and Planning
- ◆ Encouraging appropriate Tourism

Develop Social Well-being through:

- ◆ Community Safety
- ◆ Health
- ◆ Engaging Young People
- ◆ Meeting Needs of Older People
- ◆ Social Inclusion
- ◆ Housing
- ◆ Leisure, Arts and Culture

Develop Environmental Well-being through:

- ◆ Cleanliness
- ◆ Recycling Waste
- ◆ Emergency Response to Flooding

- ◆ Coastal Protection
- ◆ Linking Environment and Planning
- ◆ Transport

BEST VALUE DEVELOPMENTS

KEY CHANGES IN 2001/02

Over the last year we have continued to develop Best Value as a key tool for delivering improved services that meet the needs of the Community whilst driving the Council to become an organisation of excellence. As a learning organisation we do not claim to get everything right first time but we do aim to improve what we do.

Following feedback from the District Audit, the Inspection Service, the Local Government Improvement Programme, Members, officers and our partners we believe have improved how we manage our organisations performance as well as improving services.

We have spent time developing comprehensive Best Value guidance for Members and officers in a Best Value Guide. It is provided in both hard copy and on our internal web site and is viewed as far more than a process manual as it provides real practical guidance, workbooks and checklists on good business practice. The Best Value process has been streamlined further allowing services the flexibility to evaluate whether to undertake a fundamental, a light touch or even no review depending on their level of Best Value activity, performance results and the extent of issues to address.

A greater support network has been set up for review teams with an individual Best Value Mentor for each review team. A strengthened verification for reviews has also been established through Best Value Boards that now work closely with the review teams at early and later stages of the review, and include both Member and external specialist involvement to assure the rigor and challenge of the process.

We will continue to develop and adapt out Best Value processes and activity over the coming year to ensure the Council prepares for the Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA) in 2003. In particular a project team are now reviewing the corporate approach to performance management and planning to ensure there are clear links between the Corporate Plan, budgets, service plans, Best Value reviews and the Personal Development Interview process.

RESPONSE TO DISTRICT AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS – 2000/01

Following an independent audit of our 2001 Best Value Performance Plan it was applauded by the District Audit and was given an unqualified report in June 2001. Their full report is available on our web site nfdc.gov.uk in the Best Value section. Below we have summarised the key areas highlighted for action and detailed activity we have made against them.

Both statutory (**Stat**) and non-statutory (**Non-Stat**) recommendations are included to demonstrate overall developments and improvements and to highlight we are working towards all key areas of activity.

| DISTRICT AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS | | NFDC ACTIVITY |
|--------------------------------|--|---|
| INTEGRATING BEST VALUE | | |
| Stat | 1. Better Member guidance on performance management process. | BV Guide includes detailed reporting and performance management process to Members and officers. It clearly provides information on the responsibilities of Members and others. |

| | | |
|-------------------------------|--|--|
| Non Stat | 2. Consultation co-ordination | Services are encouraged to co-ordinate consultation activity with others through the Council's Corporate Consultation Officer. Development of a consultation database is underway. |
| Non Stat | 3. Process should be strengthened for consultation to influence BV Review Improvement Plans. | The BV Guide gives comprehensive guidance and practical workbooks that enable consultation results to feed into Improvement Plans. |
| Performance Management | | |
| Stat | 4. Corporate guidance needed on service planning. | Basic service planning guidance has been included as good practice activity in the BV Guide. A service planning network has been established to develop a corporate process for planning and resource allocation in time for the 2003/04 budget. |
| Stat | 5. Development of a process which links resource allocation to service planning. | See above. |
| Stat | 6. Incorporate SMART targets into service plans. | SMART targets form an integral part of BV Guidance and are incorporated into the pro-forma for service improvement plans. |
| Non Stat | 7. Strengthen role of Corporate Management Team (CMT). | A review of CMT has repositioned its strategic direction. |
| Non Stat | 8. Develop corporate Quality Assurance (QA) system including evidence for supporting calculations. | A QA system has been set up for performance management including forecasting and checks on performance |
| Non Stat | 9. Develop local Performance Indicators (PI's) across the Council. | As BV reviews and guidance has improved local PI's have been developing. Development of a database to co-ordinate all local PI's is underway. |
| PLAN 2001/02 | | |
| Non Stat | 10. Summary of objectives in main BV Performance Plan and summary. | Summary of the Council's Aims has been included in this plan and detailed in each key section in the summary plan. |
| BEST VALUE REVIEWS | | |
| Stat | 11. Greater support to verification to ensure BV methodology is consistently applied. | BV Board status acts as internal inspection and includes at least one officer experienced in BV. Clear guidance and checklists are also provided. |
| Stat | 12. Review teams should be encouraged to avoid deferring elements of review. | BV Guide highlights importance of dealing with issues during the review and provides workbooks to ensure priority issues are dealt with. |
| Non Stat | 13. Opportunities for shared working across reviews. | BV programme has been further streamlined to 35 packages and BV Guide emphasises a need to link with others internally and externally during the review. |
| Non Stat | 14. A revised BV review methodology should not stop delivering improvements. | The overall focus of the new BV Guide is a practical step towards continuous improvement rather than a fundamental change in the process |

INTRODUCTION

Best Value aims to provide the services stake holders want at a price they are willing to pay for through continuous improvement based on Challenge, Consultation, Comparison and Competitive assessment. Information relating to the performance and improvement activities of services, split across eight portfolios, is included in this section. A Councillor heads each portfolio and has overall responsibility for the services included. These councillors are known as portfolio holders and make up the Cabinet, the major decision-making part of the Council.

Each portfolio is supported and scrutinised by a corresponding Review Panel, which is made up of a cross section of councillors from a mix of political parties. The Review Panel Members are an important part of Best Value scrutiny, with representation on each review, and are an essential element to securing continuous improvement in service delivery.

Performance information outlined in each Portfolio sections relates to completed and current reviews and sets out Best Value improvements, activity in 2001/02 and planned reviews for 2002/03.

In addition, a section has been included to draw together our Themed Best Value reviews, of which we are required to undertake at least one each year. These themes have been separated from the individual Portfolio sections as they often relate across more than one if not all of them.

Best Value activity for all other services are shown at a glance in a Continuous Improvement Activity Chart at the end of each Portfolio section. Key Best Value activities are shown based on the 4C's (Challenge, Compare, Consult, Compete). It is aimed that as Best Value becomes more integrated into service delivery these sound management practices will increase.

All services are encouraged to follow Best Value principles as part of the annual performance management framework. Services programmed for a fundamental Best Value review will start on the 1st January of each year. A Review Plan will first be agreed, with an Improvement Report to be approved at Cabinet by no later than March in the following year.

CONTENT OF EACH PORTFOLIO

General portfolio information

- Key achievements 2001/02
- Key targets 2002/03
- The programme of reviews

Portfolio Best Value Activity in 2001/02 based on either:

- Improvement Plan Activity – 2000/01 Reviews
- Best Value activity and improvements identified – 2001/02 Reviews
- Key challenges and consultation – 2002/03 Reviews

Best Value and Local Performance indicators providing where possible:

- Actuals and Targets 2000/01 – 2002/03
- National and Local Benchmark comparisons
- Comments on significant actions or changes in performance

A Continuous Improvement Activity Chart

CRIME AND DISORDER PORTFOLIO**Portfolio Holder: Cllr Jeremy Heron**

The Council recognises the impact, or the fear, that levels of crime has on the quality of life of people and aims to minimise its effect throughout the District. It also is responsible for the Council's response to community safety, emergency planning and road safety. Its main focus is on improving the social well being of people through extensive partnership working on community safety issues.

KEY ACHIEVEMENTS IN 2001/02

- ✓ Implemented a multi agency approach and method for Anti Social Behaviour Orders (ASBO's).
- ✓ Utilised Information Technology to promote the sharing of data between partners for Community Safety purposes.
- ✓ Reviewed the Emergency Plan for the District.
- ✓ In liaison with our partners, prepared and implemented the year 3 Community Safety Action Plan, carried out a Crime Audit and developed a Community Safety Strategy.
- ✓ Secured the provision of Close Circuit Television (CCTV) in three towns in the District.
- ✗ The Council's CCTV programme not yet fully implemented but expected to be functioning in July 2002.
- ✓ Completed the cross cutting Best Value review of Community Safety and began work on improvement plan.
- ✓ Consulted with youth on community safety matters.
- ✓ Worked with Hampshire County Council to address road safety issues.

KEY TARGETS FOR 2002/03

- Ensure the effective implementation of Close Circuit Television (CCTV).
- Complete full review of Acceptable Behaviour Contracts (ABC's).
- Publish the Community Safety Strategy and Year 1 Action Plan.
- Work with the County Council to address road safety issues and to produce a co-ordinated approach to road safety in the New Forest.
- In conjunction with partners, devise programmes to tackle juvenile nuisance.

5-YEAR REVIEW PROGRAMME

| Review Year | Review Package | Value £000's |
|-------------|------------------|--------------|
| 2001/02 | Community Safety | 91 |

BEST VALUE ACTIVITY – 2001/02**COMMUNITY SAFETY (Reviewed 2000/01)****To reduce crime, disorder and the fear of crime in the New Forest****Officer Contact**

Siân Jenkins

Email: Sian Jenkins at NFDC

Tel: 023 8028 5148

Key Improvements 2001/02

- A Cross Agency training event was held for Acceptable Behaviour Contracts and other anti-social behaviour issues. As a result a more co-ordinated approach is now being achieved with better results for the community.
- A financial mechanism has been agreed by the **Community Safety Partnership (CSP)**, and therefore a pooled budget is now in place. The benefit is that the financial strategy will sit

- alongside the action plan for 2002/3 allowing more to be achieved by the Partnership.
- The post of Acceptable Behaviour Contract Officer has been created allowing a co-ordinated approach to dealing with anti social behaviour and the issuing and monitoring of Acceptable Behaviour Contracts.
- A communication strategy has been developed for the CSP resulting in a community safety page in each edition of Forest News and a public relations resource has been allocated to ensure messages and issues continue to be highlighted to the public.
- The CSP has successfully gained the views of the New Forest's Gay and Lesbian community, which is something that has not been achieved before. The Community Safety Strategy will now be based on a wider picture of the District's issues.

COMMUNITY SAFETY BENCHMARK

The following results show how New Forest District Council compares to 60 other similar authorities in England, where a higher ranking shows a better performance, over 2000/01 results . The best performing authorities in the group (Top Quarter) is shown by four stars with one star denoting performance in the bottom performing quarter within the group.

The District compares well with half of our indicators falling in the top quarter and only one in the bottom quarter. Overall, three quarters of the indicators are above average performance or better. Sexual offences only just fall in the worst category for the benchmarking group although these results are not high compared to national statistics.

| Performance Indicator | Rank in Family | Benchmarking Group Quarter results |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|---|
| All crime | 45 | ★★★★ |
| Autotheft | 37 | ★★☆☆ |
| Theft from Vehicle | 30 | ★★★☆☆ |
| Theft of Vehicle | 61 | ★★★★ |
| Burglary - Dwelling | 53 | ★★★★ |
| Robbery | 59 | ★★★★ |
| Sexual Offences | 38 | ★☆☆☆☆ |
| Violence against the Person | 41 | ★★★☆☆ |

KEY:

| | |
|-------|----------------------------|
| ★★★★ | Top quarter performance |
| ★★★☆☆ | Above average performance |
| ★★★☆☆ | Below average performance |
| ★☆☆☆☆ | Bottom quarter performance |

DRAFT BEST VALUE PERFORMANCE PLAN

APPENDIX 1

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

| Indicator Ref. and Brief description | 2000/01 actual | Target 2001/02 | 2001/02 Actual | 2002/03 Target | NATIONAL BENCHMARK * | | HAMPSHIRE BENCHMARK** | |
|--|----------------|--------------------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| | | | | | Top & Bottom QUARTERS | Performance at a glance | Top & Bottom QUARTERS | Performance at a glance |
| BVPI 126 Domestic burglaries per 1,000 households | 6.41 | 7.5 ! | 7.2 | 7.5! | 7 - 13 | ★★★☆☆ | 5.15 – 8.4 | ★★☆☆☆ |
| Performance for 2000/01 did not achieve the forecast of 4.84 published in 2001. | | | | | | | | |
| BVPI 127 Robberies per 1,000 population | 0.2 | No Target set | 0.2 | No Target set | No comparison figures | No comparison figures | No comparison figures | No comparison figures |
| The occurrence of robberies is negligible for the District, although previous indicators also included violent crimes in performance results, shown below. | | | | | | | | |
| BVPI 128 amended Vehicle crimes per 1,000 population | 10.85 | 9.8 ! | 8.99 | 9.75 ! | 8 - 15 | ★★★☆☆ | 7.95 – 11.88 | ★★★☆☆ |
| Performance for 2000/01 did not achieve the forecast of 8.48 published in 2000/01 | | | | | | | | |
| Local PI Violent Crimes per 1,000 population | 6.57 | 7.1! | 6.76 | 7.13 ! | 6 - 10 | ★★★☆☆ | 3.56 – 9.12 | ★★☆☆☆ |
| BVPI 173 Is there a Corporate strategy to reduce crime and disorder? | Not Applicable | Not Applicable | YES | YES | | | | |
| The strategy will be reviewed every 3 years | | | | | | | | |
| BVPI 174 Racial incidents recorded by the authority per 100,000 population | 0 | Nothing recorded in BVPP | 0 | 0 | 0 - 2 | | 0 – 0.25 | |
| A system is in place to record any racial incidents in the District | | | | | | | | |

KEY:

*Benchmark figures are obtained from all England national district performance results for 2000/01 published on dtr.gov.uk.

**The Hampshire average benchmarks are based on audited 2000/01 results

! Targets are based on Hampshire Police Target

| | | | | |
|------|-------------------------|--|-------|---------------------------|
| ★★★★ | Top quarter performance | | ★★★☆☆ | Below average performance |
|------|-------------------------|--|-------|---------------------------|

DRAFT BEST VALUE PERFORMANCE PLAN

APPENDIX 1

| | | | |
|-------|---------------------------|-------|----------------------------|
| ★★★☆☆ | Above average performance | ★★★★☆ | Bottom quarter performance |
|-------|---------------------------|-------|----------------------------|

| Ref. Brief description | 2000/01 actual | Target 2001/02 | 2001/02 Actual | 2002/03 Target | NATIONAL BENCHMARK * | | HAMPSHIRE BENCHMARK** | |
|---|-------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| | | | | | Top & Bottom QUARTERS | Performance at a glance | Top & Bottom QUARTERS | Performance at a glance |
| BVPI 175 The percentage of racial incidents that resulted in further action | 0 | Nothing recorded in BVPP | 0 | No Target set | 100 – 67 % | N/A | 50 – 0 % | N/A |
| BVPI 176 Domestic Violence Refuge places per 10,000 population, | 5 | 5 | ? | ? | | | 1.7 – 0.5 | |

CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITY CHART

Although key Best Value activity does not denote improvements in itself, these sound management practices will continuously encourage it.

| Review Packages | CHALLENGE | | | COMPARE | | | CONSULT | | | COMPETE | | |
|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|---------|--|--|
| | Business Plan available? | Business Plan involves stakeholders? | Performance measured & reviewed? | Benchmarks underway? | Consultation mechanisms in place? | Stakeholder shaping the service? | Targets aim for Top Quarter | Alternatives regularly reviewed? | | | | |
| Community Safety | | | | | | | | | | | | |

KEY:

*Benchmark figures are obtained from all England national district performance results for 2000/01 published on dtr.gov.uk.

**The Hampshire average benchmarks are based on audited 2000/01 results

! Targets are based on Hampshire Police Target

| | | | |
|-------|---------------------------|-------|----------------------------|
| ★★★★ | Top quarter performance | ★★★★☆ | Below average performance |
| ★★★☆☆ | Above average performance | ★★☆☆☆ | Bottom quarter performance |

& ENVIRONMENT**ECONOMY AND PLANNING PORTFOLIO PORTFOLIO HOLDER: CLLR TOM RUSSELL**

This portfolio aims to facilitate a sustainable and growing economy for the New Forest District that creates economic and employment opportunity whilst making use of the area's unique assets. There is also recognition of the importance of policies to restrain development, protect our unique environment and provide the appropriate capacity to meet local needs.

The main focus of the portfolio is to ensure a balance between economic and environmental objectives through:

Implementing the Economic Strategy
Linking Economy and Planning
Linking Environment and Planning
Transport

KEY ACHIEVEMENTS IN 2001/02

- ✓ A new economic strategy has been adopted for the District, following consultation with business and support agencies
- ✓ Helped the business community establish a Business Forum within the District.
- ✓ **Assessed Associated British Ports' applications for port development at Dibden Bay, in partnership with Hampshire County Council, and presented the New Forest District Council case at the public inquiry**
- ✓ The District Local Plan has been progressed through the first deposit stage and representation has been reported on.
- ✓ Responded to Countryside Agency consultations on New Forest National Park and publicised the Council's views
- ✓ **Improved transport links for young people were identified and implemented through the introduction of an enhanced scheme for concessionary travel, which has now been expanded into all rural areas.**
- ✓ **Undertook a review of the District's highways network management as part of Hampshire County Council's highway review.**

KEY TARGETS FOR 2002/03

Continue to work positively with the business community in supporting the development of the Business Forum

Pursue the District Council's case to the proposed port development at Dibden Bay throughout the public inquiry.

Implement the Fawley Square environmental improvement scheme.

Establish a revised initiative for supporting measures to ensure the vitality and viability of the District's town centres.

Respond to the Designation Order for a New Forest National Park and represent the District Council's stated views of a preference for a tailor-made National Park at the public enquiry.

Progress the District Local Plan through 2nd stage deposit to public inquiry during 2002/03. (This objective is included pending the Government's consultation on fundamental changes to the planning system)

| Review Year | Review Package | % Value | Value | Changes from BVPP 2001 or comments |
|--------------------|-----------------------|----------------|--------------|---|
| 2000/01 | Planning | 71% | 2,113 | Combines Development Control and the Policy section in one review. |
| 2001/02 | Building Control | 21% | 631 | |
| 2002/03 | Economic Development | 8% | 215 | Due to limited resources a Best Value review was not considered appropriate. Challenges for a review of alternative options for the service are reported. |

BEST VALUE ACTIVITY – 2001/02

PLANNING (Reviewed 2000/01)

This review included Development Control, Enforcement, Policy and Plans, Conservation and Urban Design, Landscape and Open Space Group and Trees. The main objective of the review was to assess the effectiveness of the overall planning services' performance and how it meets stakeholder needs. The service has been independently inspected by the Audit Commission.

Officer Contact

Chris Elliot
John Ward

E-mail: chris.elliott@nfdc.gov.uk
E-mail John Ward at NFDC

Tel: 023 8028 5310
Tel: 023 8028 5748

Key Improvements 2001/02

- Access to the service is being improved through a trial neighbourhood notification scheme to those directly effected by planning applications
- Information to the community has been improved through the introduction of a Planning page on the Council's web site where users can download parts of the Local Plan and view planning applications

Inspection

The planning service has been independently inspected and rated as a good 2 star service with uncertain prospects for improvement. A brief outline of the main outcomes are detailed below but the full report can be viewed on or use the contact details above.

There were many strengths highlighted in the service, with the following positive features noted:

- ◆ helpful and positive staff with easy access at the main Council offices;
- ◆ significantly increased opportunities to access the Service via the internet;
- ◆ consistently deciding 70 per cent of planning applications in under 8 weeks;
- ◆ modern local planning framework incorporating key local priorities;
- ◆ prioritisation within the Service on enforcement action;
- ◆ helpfulness in giving advice to customers before planning applications are submitted.
- ◆ the situation given to retaining and planting new trees
- ◆ high quality conservation, design , tree and landscape advice.

Key recommendations were made by the inspectors, which the service are committed to address and incorporate into their own improvement plan. The service is 'certain' it will improve and will demonstrate over the next year where it has acted upon the key recommendations in the report:

- Ensure that the service meets the needs of stakeholders and customers
- To deliver consistently high customer care and satisfaction
- To continue to make it easier to access and use the service

- To ensure the service operates efficiently

BUILDING CONTROL (Reviewed 2001/02)

The primary role of the Building Control Group (BCG) is the regulation of buildings and building works to protect and ensure public health and safety.

Officer Contact

Stuart Gange

Email Stuart Gange

Tel: 023 8028 5287

Member Scrutiny

Cllr Pat Wyeth and Cllr Ben Earwicker

Priority Challenges

- Seek to identify practical alternative methods of service provision
- Examine plan assessment principles and evaluate externalisation of the service.
- Review site inspection procedures and adopt improved performance standards.
- Consider options for Building Regulation fee levels and income generation.
- Examine whether the role of structural consultants is providing value.

Consultation

| Stakeholder Groups | Consultation Aim | Key Outcome |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| Professional users | To obtain feedback on effectiveness of the service | 92% have a good or very good impression of the service |
| Householder users | To gauge levels of satisfaction from end users of the Building Regulation process | 79% have a good or very good overall impression of the service |
| Development Control (NFDC internal) | To determine the effectiveness of the liaison process internally between a key partner service | Improvements to the site monitoring process are required |

Alternative Delivery

| Key Options | The Way Forward |
|--|---|
| Use of private consultants | External consultants will share the plan examination workload |
| Joint working with other local authorities | The scale, area and location of the District makes joint working arrangements for the service impractical. Possibilities will be examined if they arise in the future |
| Discontinue or limit the size of inspections | There was extensive support from stakeholders to maintain and improve the current level of service |
| Existing employees under consultant arrangements | The benefits and operating costs of setting up this arrangements did not justify pursuit of this option |
| Realigning in-house arrangements | Gaps at supervision level were identified and as a result a new post has been filled. |

Key Review Outcomes

- Site inspections will be improved through the introduction of a quality system
- Difficulties in recruiting experienced staff will be overcome through the use of external consultants to share the workload of examining deposited plans
- 90% of completion certificates will be issued within 5 working days from the current performance of 52%
- A customer charter is to be introduced and included in a new welcome pack giving clear advice and contact information is to be provided to all new owner/occupiers at the commencement of building work

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (Options Review 2002/03)

The service aims to

Officer Contact

Neil Miller

E-mail neil.miller@nfdc.gov.uk

Tel: 023 8028 5353

Member Scrutiny

Cllr Bill Catt and Cllr (Lib Dem)

Key Challenges

- Should a service be provided; and what scale, objectives and focus would be appropriate for this District
- Establishing and resourcing measures to ensure that the commercial health of the town centres is maintained and enhanced
- Ensuring that the service (and the Council's wider corporate involvement) meets the needs and expectations of business
- Ensuring that arrangements within the Council are appropriate for achieving the economic strategy and service objectives

Consultation Plans

Members, local businesses and business support agencies will be involved in developing the way forward.

DRAFT BEST VALUE PERFORMANCE PLAN
PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

APPENDIX 1

| Indicator Ref. and Brief description | 2000/01 actual | Target 2001/02 | 2001/02 Actual | 2002/03 Target | NATIONAL BENCHMARK * | | HAMPSHIRE BENCHMARK** | |
|---|----------------|----------------|-------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|
| | | | | | Top and bottom quarters | NFDC Performance at a glance | Top and Bottom Quarters | NFDC Performance at a glance |
| PLANNING | | | | | | | | |
| BVPI 176 Standard searches carried out in 10 working days | 100% | 99% | 99% | 99% | 100% - 87% | ★★★☆☆ | 100 – ?? % | ★★★☆☆ |
| BVPI 106 New homes built on previously developed land | 59% | 70% | Awaiting results | 60% | 84 – 41 % 62% | | 79.5 – 49.5 % | |
| The target was set high for 2001/02 because the forecast for 2000/01 results had been overestimated at 70% | | | | | | | | |
| BVPI 107 Expenditure per head of population | £13.17 # | No Target set | £14.90 # | £15.59 | £7.36 - £13.22 | ★☆☆☆☆ | £11.32 – £16.92 | ★★☆☆☆ |
| Overall costs are high for this service due to a high number of applications in a specially protected area. A one off additional cost has been included for 2001/02 and 2002/03 for work on the Dibden Bay inquiry. Costs of the service compare more favourably locally. # The increase shown between 2000/01 and 2001/02 are due to a change in calculations from net to gross expenditure and should therefore not be used for comparison | | | | | | | | |

DRAFT BEST VALUE PERFORMANCE PLAN

APPENDIX 1

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|------|------|-------------|-----|--------------------|-------|---------------|-------|
| BVPI 108 Departures from the statutory plan from the total number granted | 0.8% | 0.1% | 0.5% | 1% | 0.3% - ?? 0.71% | ★★★★☆ | 0.11 – 1.46 % | ★★★★☆ |
| The target is low as it reflected an incorrect calculation in the forecast figure for 2000/01. | | | | | | | | |
| BVPI 109 Applications decided with 8 weeks | 71% | 70% | 70% | 70% | 70% - 63% | ★★★★★ | 72.33 – 59 % | ★★★★☆ |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|---------------|-------------------|---------------|---------------|-------|-------------------|-------|
| BVPI 110 Average time taken to determine all applications | ? | 9.3 weeks | 9.67 weeks | ? | ? | ? | 9.6 – 12.14 weeks | ★★★★★ |
| BVPI 112 Planning best practice checklist The best practice areas not achieved are: a) Delegating 70% or more of decisions to officers due to a local agreement to maintain parish veto b) There is no publicised charter but c) There is no overall equal access policy although the service is looking at ways to improve access for disadvantaged groups. | 70% | 70% | 70% | ? | Not available | N/A | 74 – 57.25% | ★★★★☆ |
| Local PI The percentage of successful planning appeals | 38% | No target set | 29% | No target set | Top - 50% | ★★★★★ | Not available | N/A |

KEY:

*Benchmark figures are obtained from all England national district performance results for 2000/01 published on dtr.gov.uk.

**The Hampshire average benchmarks are based on audited 2000/01 results

! Targets are based on Hampshire Police Target

| | | | | |
|------|-------------------------|--|------|---------------------------|
| ★★★★ | Top quarter performance | | ★★★☆ | Below average performance |
|------|-------------------------|--|------|---------------------------|

| | | | |
|------|---------------------------|------|----------------------------|
| ★★★☆ | Above average performance | ★☆☆☆ | Bottom quarter performance |
|------|---------------------------|------|----------------------------|

| Indicator Ref. and Brief Description | NFDC 2000/01 | Average benchmark*** | Top quarter benchmark *** | NFDC At a glance | NFDC Improvement Target |
|--|--------------|----------------------|---------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|
| BUILDING CONTROL | | | | | |
| LOCAL PI Unit cost per Building Regulation application | £239 | £308 | £239 | ★★★★ | |
| LOCAL PI Applications checked within 15 days of submission | 87% | 82% | 100% | ★★★☆☆ | 90% within 10 working days |
| LOCAL PI Site inspection on active site every 90 days | 68% | 65% | 88% | ★★★☆☆ | 90% by 2003 |
| Local PI Same day inspections undertaken when requests received by 10.30am | 100% | 97% | 100% | ★★★★ | |

| | | | | | |
|---|------------|-----|------|------|------|
| LOCAL PI Dangerous structure call outs in 2 hours | 90% | 90% | 100% | ★★☆☆ | 100% |
|---|------------|-----|------|------|------|

Key:

*** Benchmark comparisons are based on 2000/01 results of a joint Hampshire and Dorset benchmarking group

CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITY CHART

Although key Best Value activity does not denote improvements in itself, these sound management practices will continuously encourage it.

| Review Packages | CHALLENGE | | | | COMPARE | | | | CONSULT | | | | COMPETE | | | | | | | |
|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|---|----------------------------------|---|----------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|---|----------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Business Plan available? | Business Plan involves stakeholders? | | | Performance measured & reviewed? | | Benchmarks underway? | | Consultation mechanisms in place? | | Stakeholder shaping the service? | | Targets aim for Top Quarter | | Alternatives regularly reviewed? | | | | | |
| Planning | █ | █ | █ | █ | | | | | █ | █ | | | █ | █ | | | █ | █ | | |
| Building Control | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ |

ENVIRONMENTAL

WELLBEING &

PEOPLE AND PARTNERSHIP

ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO PORTFOLIO HOLDER: CLLR MELVILLE KENDAL

The Council strives to preserve and enhance a high quality, clean and sustainable environment for the people who live and work in or visit the District.

This will be achieved through environmental well-being and partnership working focussing on:

Cleanliness
Waste
Flooding
Coast

KEY ACHIEVEMENTS IN 2001/02

- ✓ A review of alternative fuel technology during 2001/02 has resulted in approval of a scheme for more environmentally and economically viable fuel for refuse collection vehicles
- ✓ Grounds Maintenance arrangements have been reviewed in 2001/02 putting forward the option of locality based service delivery
- ✓ A formal management structure has now been agreed for Project Integra, a joint waste initiative with all Hampshire Districts and the County Council
- ✓ A review of the Council's policies on land drainage and coastal defences during 2001/02 has resulted in new policies being adopted in line with Government national High Level Targets
- ✓ Coastal strategies have started for Christchurch Bay during 2001/02. Approval for Western Solent coastal strategy awaited from DEFRA. A planned Saltmarsh study did not secure European Union funding
- ✓ Prepared a 5 year Contaminated Land Strategy
- ✓ Adopted a Food Safety Plan in accordance with the Food Standards Agency's requirements
- ✗ **The Council was due to implement its Air Quality Management Strategy. Following installation of a sulphur dioxide monitor at Fawley the air quality review did not identify a need to declare an air quality management area. The strategy is being reviewed to enable it to maintain standards and provide a link to the planning process**

KEY TARGETS FOR 2002/03

The benefits of locality based service delivery towards providing cleaner streets will be investigated and up to three pilot schemes will be implemented for evaluation

Options for increasing recycling to 40% by 2005 will be examined with Project Integra

The Management of the Regional Coastal Monitoring programme for the South East of England will begin

Assessments for noise, air quality and contaminated land from the port development at Dibden Bay will continue. The New Forest District Council case will be presented at the public inquiry.

Integrate the Air Quality review and assessment and the Contaminated Land Strategy into the Local Plan as supplementary guidance

Develop a Food and Health and Safety training partnership with a private provider

5-YEAR REVIEW PROGRAMME

| Review Year | Review Package | % Value | Value £000's | Changes from BVPP 2001 or comments |
|-------------|---------------------------------|---------|--------------|---|
| 2000/01 | Refuse and Street Cleansing | 37% | 4,224 | |
| 2001/02 | Public Services | 19% | 2,207 | Combined review of Grounds Maintenance, Car Parks, Cemeteries, Street Naming and numbering, Customer Services and Public Conveniences |
| | Environment Commercial Services | 8.8% | 1,006 | Includes Food and Health & Safety inspections and Licensing Services |
| 2002/03 | Civil Engineering | 28% | 3,111 | Combines Coastal Protection, Land Drainage and general civil engineering works. |
| | Sustainability/Quality of Life | 0.2% | 20 | For information on this see the section on themed reviews (pg xx |
| 2004/05 | Environmental Protection | 7% | 758 | The review has now combined Dog Wardening, Pest Control and Pollution Control |

BEST VALUE ACTIVITY – 2001/02**REFUSE AND STREET CLEANSING (Reviewed 2000/01)**

A review was completed in 2000/01 of the Council's Customer Services and Waste Management Services. This includes the refuse collection, clinical waste, disposal and recycling, special collections. Technological advances, customer satisfaction and overall potential areas for improvements were the prime focus of the review.

Officer Contact

Graham Tombs

E-mal: Graham Tombs at NFDC

Tel: 023 8028 5956

Key Improvements 2001/02

- Ways of increasing recycling have been investigated through the introduction of a garden waste collection trial.
- New recycling sites are due to be introduced
- A programme for improving standards at existing recycling sites is underway
- Information about recycling and refuse collection rounds are now available on the Council's website for the public to view on nfdc.gov.uk
- Links have been improved with Dorcas and other charities involved in the recycling or re-use of waste materials. NFDC and other authorities in Hampshire supported the Worn it? Recycle it! Campaign in January 2002.

PUBLIC SERVICES (Reviewed 2001/02)

This review combined seven service areas of Cemeteries, Grounds Maintenance, Public Conveniences, Car Parking, Abandoned Vehicles, Street Naming and Numbering and Customer Services. The aim was to combine opportunities for public consultation and enable an overall assessment of policy integration and service development. Each

APPENDIX 1

service area directly involved customers and other stake-holders external to the District Council directly within the review.

Officer Contact

Graham Tombs

E-mail: Graham Tombs at NFDC

Tel: 023 8028 5956

Member Scrutiny

Cllr Pat Wyeth and Cllr Bill Dow

Priority Challenges

▪

Consultation

| Stakeholder Groups | Consultation Aim |
|---|--|
| Residents via the Citizens' Panel and Street Interviews | To determine overall satisfaction in the service quality and effectiveness of the service. |
| Town and Parish Councils | Obtain views on alternative proposals for delivery of services |
| Customer surveys | |
| Partner questionnaire | |
| Southern Tourist Board survey | Views on quality standards |

Alternative Delivery

| Key Options | The Way Forward |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Renegotiate contacts | Some contracts have been returned in- as this has been found to be more efficient pending further competitive assessment |
| Develop partnerships or joint working | Partnership arrangements are in progress with some Town and Parish Councils for elements of work including grounds maintenance. Other areas were not as viable at this stage |
| Cease services | There was support for continuing with all key services |
| Externalise service | A majority of the current external contracts are returning in-house |
| Internal restructure | A key change of direction to locality based service delivery is currently under consideration |

Key Review Outcomes (Provisional)

The following are interim recommendations as the Review Report is not yet fully approved:

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| Abandoned Vehicles | The speed of service delivery will be improved through streamlining duplication of the dual role of housing and public services in this area |
| Car Parking | A coherent car parking strategy must be established at NFDC in support of Government objectives and Hampshire County Council transport policies, whilst recognising the needs of the locality |
| Cemeteries | <p>Display boards are to be introduced at cemeteries with contacts and services available to improve signage and access to information</p> <p>Cemetery users with Ealing Tide Mill permits will be issued credit card sized permits following user feedback</p> <p>Memorials will be required to meet minimal fixing requirements to improve health and safety standards for future users</p> |

APPENDIX 1

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Customer Services | <p>An extension of opening hours of the service is being considered to improve access to the service during out of office hours</p> <p>The service will aim to become a centre of excellence through an e-governance programme making better use of technology and systems to deal with a greater volume of calls, have a better response and provide improved information</p> |
| Grounds Maintenance | <p>Partnership opportunities will be looked at to enable town and parish councils such as Ringwood and New Milton to get more involved or take over grounds maintenance in their area</p> <p>To improve the quality of grounds maintenance service smaller multi-purpose locality teams will be set up and employed on annual contracts to enable greater ownership of areas.</p> |
| Public Conveniences | <p>Major refurbishment and rebuilding of 7 public conveniences are underway</p> <p>A saving in the overall cleaning contract will be achieved through the closure of 3 facilities. Further savings will be sought in consultation with local town and parish councils.</p> |
| Street Naming/Numbering | <p>Procedures for notification of damaged nameplates will be improved to enable quicker response and replacements</p> |

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH - COMMERCIAL DIVISION (Reviewed 2001/02)

The Commercial Services Group carries out food and health and safety enforcement, environmental health licensing and other general licensing for areas such as public entertainment and taxis. The service is largely mandatory and prescriptive and the review primarily aimed to improve the method of delivery and to challenge the delivery of the non-statutory elements such as education and promotional events. The viability of contracting all or part of the service was also being considered.

Officer Contact

Derek Roe

E-mail: Derek Roe at NFDC

Tel: 023 8028 5685

Member Scrutiny

Cllr John Hoy and Cllr Geoff Spikins

Key Challenges

- Should NFDC or another provide the service?
- What level of service should be provided?
- What are the implications of externalising the service?
- Is the service meeting stakeholder needs?
- Are there joint working opportunities with other local authorities?
- How can technology and processes improve service delivery?

Consultation

| Stakeholder Group | Consultation Results |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| Business customers | Established high levels of consumer and business satisfaction with the overall provision. |
| Residents through the Citizens' Panel | |
| Business customer questionnaires | |
| Police Authority | |

| | |
|----------------|--|
| Fire authority | |
|----------------|--|

Alternative Service Delivery

| Key Options | Way forward |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Internal restructuring | Roles of employees are being revised to tie in better with needs of the service |
| Transfer to external provider | Other providers only found for parts of the food service. External providers will now carry out a number of inspections. The information on costs and quality will be used for comparison information to be assessed in the future |
| Public/Private Partnership | Food education courses will be provided in partnership resulting in a saving of £13,450. This is also aimed for Health and Safety training. Aiming to introduce a Healthy Workplace Award scheme in partnership with other Local authorities in Hampshire |
| Joint commissioning | Possibilities for joint ventures for a food newsletter and provision of advice/guidance for local leisure/holiday organisations. A county-wide environmental health officer pool is being considered for Hampshire. |

Key Review Outcomes

- Improved information and access to the service will be achieved through development of a website, a newsletter for businesses and availability of a translation service for ethnic minority businesses
- Service quality will aim to improve through project-based working and individual inspection targets. Businesses will be encouraged to improve their own quality standards through the Hampshire Healthy Workplace Scheme awards
- Efficiency and effectiveness will look to improve opportunities for county-wide inspection staff and streamlining with other Hampshire authorities
- Alternative delivery options to be investigated further will be to monitor the possibility of externalising inspections if cost effective and a joint venture for education courses with other Hampshire authorities

CIVIL ENGINEERING (Review 2002/03)

Provision of Coastal Protection, Land Drainage and civil engineering support to other projects and services.

Officer Contact

John Rainbow

E-mail: John Rainbow at NFDC

Tel: 023 8028 5901

Member Scrutiny

Cllr Steve Shepherd and Cllr Richard Frampton

Priority Challenges

- Review the standards and delivery of the service
- Identify improvements for a high quality and value for money service
- Provide a service which is responsive to the needs of the community and other customers

Consultation

| Stakeholder Groups | Consultation Aim |
|----------------------|--|
| DEFRA | Establish views on Councils performance |
| Public Organisations | Determine perceptions of the need and quality of service |
| Stakeholders | |
| The community | |
| Internal customers | Obtain views on the quality and |

APPENDIX 1

| | |
|-----------|--|
| | responsiveness of the service |
| Employees | Assess views on service delivery and management arrangements |

APPENDIX 1

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

| Indicator Ref. and Brief description | 2000/01 actual | Target 2001/02 | 2001/02 Actual | 2002/03 Target | NATIONAL BENCHMARK * | | HAMPSHIRE BENCHMARK ** | |
|---|----------------|------------------------|----------------|----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|
| | | | | | Top and Bottom QUARTER | NFDC Performance at a glance | Top and Bottom QUARTER | NFDC Performance at a glance |
| REFUSE COLLECTION | | | | | | | | |
| BVPI 90b Satisfaction with Household Waste Collection | 88% of 1101 | Next Survey in 2003/04 | | | 72 – 59 % | ★★★★ | | |
| BVPI 84 Household waste collected per head | 274 kg | 278 kg | 276 kg | ? | 46 – 545 kg | ★★★★☆ | 334 – 393 kg | ★★★★ |
| BVPI 88 The number of collections missed per 100,000 | 118 | 100 | 100.2 | 90 | 24 – 123 | ★★☆☆ | 103 - 2169 | ★★★★ |
| Majority of missed bins are put right by the next working day (xx%). The forecast performance published for 2000/01 was overstated at 224. | | | | | | | | |
| BVPI 86 Net cost per household of refuse collection | £35.92 | £36.00 | £35.36 | ? | £25.66 - 32.26 | ★★☆☆ | £32.40 - £37.84 | ★★★★☆ |
| High levels of recycling achieved locally and through Project Integra result in relatively high national comparisons although within the Project Integra (Hampshire) authorities' performance is above average. | | | | | | | | |
| RECYCLING | | | | | | | | |
| BVPI 90a Satisfaction with recycling facilities | 97% of 1125 | Next survey in 2003/04 | | | | | | |

APPENDIX 1

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------------------------|----------------------|--|----------------|--------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|--------------|
| <p>BVPI 82a Household waste recycled a) percentage b) tonnage The target for 2001/02 was not reached due to Initiatives to reach the 2002/03 target include</p> | <p>a)23.4% b) 14,366</p> | <p>a) 27%</p> | <p>a)23.83% b) ?</p> | <p>a) ?</p> | <p>14.4 – 7.1%</p> | <p>★★★★★</p> | <p>17.91 – 10.65 %</p> | <p>★★★★★</p> |
| <p>BVPI 82b Household waste composted a) percentage b) tonnage Several areas in the District are currently piloting a composting scheme. An assessment will be made of whether to extend the scheme by</p> | <p>a) 0</p> | <p>a) 0.22%</p> | <p>a)0.22% b) ?</p> | <p>a) ?</p> | <p>4.2 – 1.1%</p> | <p>★☆☆☆☆</p> | <p>3.49 – 0 %</p> | <p>★★☆☆☆</p> |
| <p>BVPI 82c Waste arising used to recover heat, power and other energy</p> | <p>0.24 %</p> | <p>No Target set</p> | <p>0.26 %</p> | <p>?</p> | | | | |
| <p>BVPI 82d Waste arising which has been landfilled</p> | <p>76.33%</p> | <p>No Target set</p> | <p>75.71%</p> | <p>?</p> | | | | |
| <p>BVPI 91 Population with kerbside collection of recyclables or within 1km of recycle centre # Target for 2002/03 are for kerbside collections only therefore cannot be used for comparison for 2001/02 A forecast of 75% published in 2001 did not reflect those parts of the population served by a recycle centre.</p> | <p>85%</p> | <p>85%</p> | <p>?</p> | <p>? #</p> | | | | |
| <p>BVPI 85 Cost per km of keeping relevant land clear of litter and refuse</p> | <p>£25,735</p> | <p>£28,000</p> | <p>£27,425</p> | <p>£27,300</p> | <p>£52,717 – 164,593</p> | <p>★★★★★</p> | <p>£13,180 – 69,658</p> | <p>★★☆☆☆</p> |
| PUBLIC CONVENIENCES | | | | | | | | |

APPENDIX 1

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------|----------------------------|-----------------|----|-----------|-------------|-----|-----|
| LOCAL PI (AC E3) Public conveniences provided normally through out the year The reduced target reflects the planned closure of 3 toilets in following consultation with the local town and parish councils | 30 | 30 | 30 | 27 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Local PI Annual spend per public convenience Increased expenditure reflects the current investment being made in local conveniences | £15,826 | No Target set | £16,477 | ? | | | | |
| Local PI Public conveniences with baby change facilities | 18% | No Target set | 24% | ? | | | | |
| Local PI Public conveniences with disabled facilities | 85% | No Target set | 85% | ? | | | | |
| CLEANLINESS | | | | | | | | |
| BVPI 89 Satisfaction with cleanliness standards | 85 % of 1180 | Next Survey 2003/04 | | | 64 – 51 % | ★★★★ | | |
| LOCAL PI (ACE2) Average time taken to remove fly tips The fluctuating performance reflects Despite anticipated appropriate resource allocation in 2000/01 | 5.3 days | 2.5 days | 7.4 days | | | | | |

APPENDIX 1

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|------------|-------|---------------|------|---------------|-------|----------------|-------|
| LOCAL PI (AC E1) Highways of an acceptable or high standard | 97% | 99% | 98% | ? | 97 – 87 % | ★★★★ | 98.6 – 82.25% | ★★★★☆ |
| ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH | | | | | | | | |
| BVPI 81 Completed an Air Quality Assessment? | YES | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| BVPI 166 Environmental Health Best Practice checklist | n/a | 100 % | 87.9 % | ? | Not Available | N/A | Not Available | N/A |
| The areas of best practice not currently undertaken include The new target aims to achieve | | | | | | | | |
| LOCAL PI High risk food premises inspections | 100% | 100% | 94 % # | 100% | 100 – 91 % | ★★★★☆ | 98.85 – 85.4 % | ★★★☆☆ |
| LOCAL PI All other food premises inspections | 95% | 100% | 86 % # | 100% | 100 – 79% | ★★★☆☆ | 99 – 73.33 % | ★★★☆☆ |
| # A reduction in the percentage for 2001/02 has been experienced while employees have been involved in the Best Value review of the service. Results are forecast to return back to 100% during 2002/03. | | | | | | | | |

CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITY CHART

Although key Best Value activity does not denote improvements in itself, these sound management practices will continuously encourage it.

| Review Packages | CHALLENGE | | COMPARE | | CONSULT | | COMPETE | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|
| | Business Plan available? | Business Plan involves stakeholders? | Performance measured & reviewed? | Benchmarks underway? | Consultation mechanisms in place? | Stakeholder shaping the service? | Targets aim for Top Quarter | Alternatives regularly reviewed? |
| Refuse & Street Cleaning | | | | | | | | |

APPENDIX 1

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Public Services | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ |
| Food & Health & Safety & Licensing | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ |
| Civil Engineering | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ |
| Environmental Protection | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ |

**DRAFT BEST VALUE PERFORMANCE PLAN
SOCIAL WELL-BEING AND
ORGANISATION OF EXCELLENCE
FINANCE AND SUPPORT PORTFOLIO
PORTFOLIO HOLDER: CLLR COLIN WISE**

APPENDIX 1

This portfolio ensures the provision of a range of financially based services internally and externally to the Council. It also provides corporate resource and information, technology and communication services to the Council.

The portfolio aims primarily to promote social well-being and develop an organisation of excellence focussing on:

- Managing our Finances**
- Managing our Physical Assets**
- Making Best Use of Technology**

KEY ACHIEVEMENTS IN 2001/02

- ✓ Developed and implemented a new corporate charging policy
- ✓ **Implemented a new corporate telephone system as planned, connecting to the Hampshire Public Services Network**
- ✓ **Implemented further stages of the e-Governance programme including a pilot study of the home-working project**
- ✓ **Reviewed and implemented changes to the decision making structure to ensure they are operating efficiently and effectively**
- ✓ **Effectively introduced the Electoral Rolling Register**

KEY TARGETS FOR 2002/03

To further develop the provision of access to services via electronic means. Specifically to enable the receipt of payments, the purchase of goods and services and consultation with the District through the Councils web site.

Work in partnership with the County and Town and Parish Councils to provide a seamless quality service from all Information Offices.

To agree with all political groups the level and breadth of management information required by Members and establish suitable financial and other reports accordingly.

5-YEAR REVIEW PROGRAMME

| Review Year | Review Package | % Value | Value £000's | Change from BVPP 2001 |
|--------------------|-----------------------|----------------|---------------------|--|
| 2000/01 | Cashiering Services | 2% | 236 | |
| | Fraud Investigation | 1% | 109 | |
| 2001/02 | Directorate Support | 8% | 971 | |
| | Financial Management | 5% | 635 | |
| | Information Services | 4% | 526 | |
| | Catering | 9% | 1,136 | |
| 2002/03 | ICT Services | 8% | 1,018 | |
| | Internal Audit | 1.5% | 201 | |
| 2003/04 | Democratic Services | 5% | 528 | |
| | Property Services | 25% | 3,202 | |
| | Legal | 3% | 369 | Due to resource issues the Legal review was moved from 2002/03 |

DRAFT BEST VALUE PERFORMANCE PLAN**APPENDIX 1**

| | | | | |
|----------------|-------------------------------|------|-------|--|
| | Exchequer Services | 3% | 402 | This review combined And was moved from 2002/03 due to structural re-organisation and the introduction of a new computer system. |
| 2004/05 | Central Purchasing and Stores | 3% | 349 | |
| | Fleet Management | 3.5% | 441 | |
| | Revenues and Benefits | 19% | 2,364 | |

CASHIERING SERVICES (Reviewed 2000/01)

The service provides a range of personal cash handling and payment services for internal and external customers.

Officer Contact

Helena Renwick

Email: Helena Renwick at NFDC

Tel: 023 8028 5560

Key Improvements 2001/02

- Merger of cashiering and information service has resulted in cost savings and improved effectiveness in customer service
- Public consultations on ease of access of service have been undertaken via the Web
- Process benchmarking now underway with other local authorities
- Improvements to employee consultation and participation have been made

FRAUD INVESTIGATION (Reviewed 2000/01)

Ensures the prevention and detection of Benefit fraud, including the investigation of suspected cases and the prosecution of offenders.

Officer Contact

Steve Cranston

Email: Steve Cranston at NFDC

Tel: 023 8028 5786

Member Scrutiny

Cllr B Dash

Key Improvements 2001/02

- Fraud Policy has been collated and circulated to all employees
- Fraud Training to all relevant employees was introduced
- Case management data base providers are being sourced
- Pro-active publicity of successful investigations are being reported internally and externally
- Internal and official documentation now standardised

INFORMATION SERVICES (Reviewed 2001/02)

This service includes the provision of customer information facilities at eight public locations across the District, either run by the Council or in partnership with the local town and parish council.

Officer Contact

Helena Renwick

Email: Helena Renwick at NFDC

Tel: 023 8028 5560

Member Scrutiny

Cllr M Kidman and Cllr L Snashall

Priority Challenges

- Development of consistent service delivery for all customers from all locations
- Development of a harmonised service identity
- Consider linkages with the cashiering service
- Identification of clear performance indicators
- Review location, accommodation facilities and layout of each information office
- Develop effective and efficient working practices and relationships with partners and customers

Consultation

| Stakeholder Groups | Consultation Aim |
|--------------------|------------------|
| | |

Alternative Delivery

| Key Options considered | The Way Forward |
|--|---|
| Enhancement of partnerships with other organisations | Identified need for closer working arrangements with existing and new partners to provide a more integrated approach to information dissemination |

Key Review Outcomes

- Merger with cashiering service
- Closer partnership working to include seamless service provision to the public
- Proactive working with internal services
- Improved ‘fit for purpose’ accommodation and equipment
- Comprehensive performance measurement system to be developed
- Harmonisation of service standards required

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT (Reviewed 2001/02)

This service consists of a range of financial services primarily delivered by Accountancy Services, including;

- Financial planning and advice
- Budgeting and reporting
- Financial accounts
- Corporate financial information system

Officer Contact

Patricia Higgins

Email: Pat Higgins at NFDC

Tel: 023 8028 5821

Member Scrutiny Cllr M Robinson and Cllr J Heron

Priority Challenges

- Improvement of service delivery and optimising costs
- Fundamental review of the budget process
- Centralised versus devolved service delivery
- Improved final account procedures
- To establish a clear service focus

Consultation

| Stakeholder | Feedback |
|------------------------|---|
| Internal service users | Complexity of budget process / Clarity of user guidance notes |
| Members | Feedback received inconclusive |

Alternative Delivery

| Key Options Considered | The Way Forward |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Outsourcing to private sector company | Potential suppliers indicated they would only be interested in a larger package including Exchequer, Benefits and Council Tax administration and in some cases central support functions such as ICT and Personnel. This will be reviewed again in 2004/05 when the Tax and Benefits service is reviewed. |

Key Review Outcomes

- Ensuring the provision of more meaningful and detailed financial information to services and Members essential
- Better financial performance data enabling improved performance monitoring and benchmarking
- Improved timeliness and accuracy of reporting
- More face to face contact with budget holders
- Clearer, simpler guidelines for year end procedures, expenditure plans and budget preparation
- Improved use of financial applications

DIRECTORATE SUPPORT (Reviewed 2001/02)

The review cuts across all clerical and secretarial services of the Council and is focussing on the following key areas:

- ◆ Secretarial and Typing Support
- ◆ Finance and Administrative Support
- ◆ Recruitment and Personnel Admin Support

Officer Contact

Sharon Plumridge

Email: Sharon Plumridge Tel: 023 8028 5454

Member Scrutiny

Cllr M Robinson and Cllr D Tipp

Priority Challenges

- Is there a need to provide services / undertake activities at all?
- Are any mandatory / discretionary services not being provided?
- Can services be provided differently through different processes or methods?
- Investigate opportunities for economies of scale or best practice in high cost areas
- Assess opportunities to improve service through better use of technology
- What partnership / joint working opportunities exist both internally and externally?

Consultation

| Stakeholder Group | Consultation Aim |
|-------------------|---|
| Council Officers | Written survey and 1 –1 interviews to obtain feedback on quality and ease of access to service. High level of satisfaction in the service |
| Members | Written survey to assess satisfaction and contact experience with the service. Examples of difficulty of access identified. |

Alternative Delivery

| Key Option Considered | The Way Forward |
|--|--|
| Use of external agencies for recruitment and | No current plan to outsource service. More measurement and assessment needed before informed decision can be made. To be |

| | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| secretarial functions | included in improvement plan for future investigation |
| Review existing internal arrangements | The possibilities for improved cross-directorate working and support are to be examined further |

Key Review Outcomes (Provisional)

The following are interim recommendations as the Review Report is not yet approved

- Best practice being shared across the Council
- Commitment to pooling of resources where possible
- Duplication of effort being identified and addressed
- Support services adding value to front line services being supported
- Improved efficiencies being achieved with similar or lower costs
- Development of a set of performance measures and results against which to set future targets and standards

CATERING (Reviewed 2001/02)

The catering service provides refreshment facilities at the Council's 5 recreation centres, the golf course at Dibden, Meals on Wheels are also provided for some of the district and employee / Member catering at Appletree Court and the Town Hall.

Officer Contact

Bob Millard

Email: Bob Millard at NFDC

Tel: 02380 285469

Member Scrutiny

Cllr S Wade and Cllr M Kidman

Priority Challenges

- Identification of why the service is delivered, and establishing need?
- Exploring options for alternative methods of delivery and / or service providers
- Critical look at the level of service provision at each of the recreation centres
- Assessment of the way in which employee and Member catering needs are met

Consultation

| Stakeholder Groups | Consultation Aim & outcome |
|--------------------|----------------------------|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

Alternative Delivery

| Key Options | The Way Forward |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| Continue with In house delivery | Strategic decision taken to close bars at recreation centres, due to falling demand and unprofitability |
| Ceasing all or parts of the service | Extended use of vending machines will be used to compliment catering facilities at recreation centres |

Key Review Outcomes (Provisional)

The following are interim recommendations as the Review Report is not yet approved

- The rationalisation of service provision at some of the recreation centres. Some bar facilities to close, more emphasis on vended service provision
- Options review for employee / Member catering completed. Further work now needed to agree favoured option. This will require Member and employee consultation.

The section provides an independent appraisal function for the review of internal control mechanisms, processes and systems adopted by the Council

Officer Contact

Steve Cranston

Email: Steve Cranston at NFDC

Tel: 023 8028 5786

Member Scrutiny Cllr Brian Dash

Priority Challenges

- Ensure compliance with all professional and legislative standards set for internal audit
- Review procedures and processes against other authorities Internal Audit services
- Seek to improve service delivery by improved communication with clients
- Review and compare costs with other service providers

Consultation

| Stakeholder Group | Consultation Aim |
|----------------------------|---|
| Clients | Obtain feedback on quality and appropriateness of audit reviews |
| Chief Officers | Review current methods of communicating performance |
| Members / Portfolio holder | Review current methods of communicating performance |

ICT SERVICES (Review planned 2002/03)

The role of ICT Services is divided into three broad areas:

- Strategic development and implementation of ICT to meet corporate and business objectives
- The provision of technical support and advice to users across the Council
- Helping business units and departments evaluate new ICT systems

Officer Contact

Ken Connolly

Email: ken.connolly@nfdc.gov.uk

Tel: 02380 285712

Member Scrutiny Cllr M Shand, Cllr N Smith and Cllr S Wade

Priority Challenges

- Evaluation of centralised versus decentralised ICT service provision
- Identification of areas for improvement through technology innovation or re-focussing the service
- Ensuring that strategic development continues in line with the local and national agenda
- Identification and evaluation of opportunities for outsourcing some aspects of the service
- Meeting growing customer/stakeholder expectations without significant increases in costs
- Development of improved partnership working

Consultation

| Stakeholder Group | Consultation Aim |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| | |

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

| Ref. BRIEF DESCRIPTION | 2000/01 actual | 2001/02 Target | 2001/02 Actual | 2002/03 Targets | NATIONAL DISTRICT BENCHMARKS* | | HAMPSHIRE DISTRICT BENCHMARKS** | |
|--|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| | | | | | Top and Bottom Quarter | NFDC Performance at a glance | Top and Bottom Quarter | NFDC Performance at a glance |
| FINANCE | | | | | | | | |
| BVPI 8 % Invoices paid within 30 days of receipt Government Target is set at 100% by 2002/03. A new system is to be introduced which will enable better control of invoices awaiting payment over the next few years. Delays in project implementation have slowed down anticipated improvements in 2001/02. | 87.52% | 91% | 86% | 90% | 89 – 79 % | ★★☆☆ | 91 – 86% | ★☆☆☆ |
| Local PI (AC A4) Net expenditure per head of population | £93.55 | £100.68 | £101.14 | £107.22 | £110 - £88 | ★★★☆☆ | £87.62 – 108.12 | ★★☆☆ |
| ELECTIONS | | | | | | | | |
| BVPI 6 Percentage turnout for local elections # Performance shown from last elections held in 1999. The high result for 2000/01 was influenced by the fact that a Parliamentary election was combined with local (Hampshire County Council) election in June 2001. The figure is unlikely to be sustained for May 2003 elections. | 35.48% # | 40% | 64.55% | | | | 36 – 28% | ★★★★ |
| Local PI (BVPI 7) Electoral registration form A's returned Electoral registration now follows a rolling registration system and therefore this performance indicator is no longer relevant after 2000/01. | | No Target | N/A | N/A | | | 98.95 – 97% | |
| ACCESS TO BUILDINGS | | | | | | | | |
| BVPI 156 % of buildings accessible to disabled people The remaining building without access is the Which requires a to make the area accessible. There is currently no customer need for this access and therefore the cost of the project is not considered feasible. This performance equates to 17/18 of our buildings (AC A1a & b) | 89 % | 94% | 94% | 94% | Not available | N/A | Not available | N/A |
| COUNCIL TAX COLLECTION | | | | | | | | |
| BVPI 9 % Council Tax Collected Performance is very close to Government Top Quartile Target of 98.2 % | 97.7% | 98% | 97.92% | 98% | 98.2 – 96.4 % | ★★★☆☆ | 98.15 – 95.95 % | ★★★☆☆ |
| BVPI 10 Business Rates collected | 98.7% | 98.5% | 99.65% | 98.7% | 98.7 – 97.2 % | ★★★★ | 98.65 – 96.9 % | ★★★★ |

DRAFT BEST VALUE PERFORMANCE PLAN

APPENDIX 1

Performance is above the Government Top Quartile Target of 98.7%

BENEFITS ADMINISTRATION

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------|---------------------|------------------|---------|---------------------|-------|----------------|-------|
| BVPI 77 Cost of administration per claim The significant increase in benefit administration costs is due to | ? | £124.41 | | | £73 - £49 £63.55 | | £64.70 – 79.02 | |
| BVPI 78a Average time to process new claims ##We have achieved and improved on both our own and the Government Top target of 36 days. This has been achieved through | 48 days | 42 days ## | 35 days | 35 days | 33 – 61 48 days | ★★★★☆ | 42 – 51 days | ★★★★★ |
| BVPI 78b Average time to process change of circumstances Performance is better than the Government Top Quartile Target of 9 days | 7.5 days | 7 days | 8.45 days | 8 days | 8 – 13 days | ★★★★☆ | 10 – 15 days | ★★★★★ |
| BVPI 78c Renewal claims for rent allowances paid on time Govt Target of 83% exceeded | 84% | 90% | 92.67% | 93% | 50 - 85% | ★★★★★ | 63 – 52 % | ★★★★★ |
| BVPI 79a % Housing Benefit claims processed correctly | 97% | 98% | 97.6% | 98% | 98 – 94 % | ★★★★☆ | 97.9 – 94.2 % | ★★★★☆ |
| BVPI 79b Recoverable of overpaid benefit Performance has dropped significantly in 2001/02 due toThe increased target for 2002/03 will be achieved through | ? | 50% | 57.35% | 65% | 72 – 49 % | ★★★☆☆ | 61 – 45% | ★★★☆☆ |
| BVPI 80 – Benefits User Satisfaction Survey 2000/01 – Overall satisfaction given of all respondents. Responses of successful and non-successful claimants can be obtained on request. | | | | | | | | |
| BVPI 80i Contact and access facilities at benefit office | 86% | Next survey 2003/04 | | | 85 – 79 % | ★★★★★ | 86 – 81% | ★★★★★ |
| BVPI 80 ii Service in benefit office | 88% | Next survey 2003/04 | | | 88 – 79% | ★★★★★ | 88 – 82 % | ★★★★★ |
| BVPI 80 iii Telephone service | 80% | Next survey 2003/04 | | | 82 – 70 % | ★★★★☆ | 79 – 70 % | ★★★★★ |

DRAFT BEST VALUE PERFORMANCE PLAN

APPENDIX 1

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------|---------------------|---------------|--------|---------------|-------|-----------|-------|
| BVPI 80 iv Staff in benefit office | 87% | Next survey 2003/04 | | | 87 – 81 % | ★★★★ | 87 – 83 % | ★★★★ |
| BVPI 80 v Clarity etc of forms and leaflets | 64% | Next survey 2003/04 | | | 67 – 58% | ★★★★☆ | 66 – 60 % | ★★★★☆ |
| BVPI 80 vi Time taken for a decision | 76% | Next survey 2003/04 | | | 77 – 65 % | ★★★★☆ | 76 – 71 % | ★★★★ |
| FRAUD | | | | | | | | |
| BVPI 76 Fraud scheme in place? | YES | YES | YES | YES | 81% Yes | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Local PI Weekly Benefit Savings (WBS) National fraud target | £520K | £208K | £248K | £56K * | Not Available | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| * WBS terminated, new scheme introduced (SAFE) which means | | | | | | | | |
| Local PI Number of prosecutions and other sanctions | 24 | No Target set | 38 | 50 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| A high increase in the target will be achieved through future emphasis based on prosecuting all offenders. | | | | | | | | |
| Local PI Sanction Rewards | N/A | £50K | £60K | £80K | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| An increase in the sanctions received is linked to the number of sanctions achieved | | | | | | | | |
| Local PI Prosecution success rate | 100% | 100% | 92% | 100% | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| ICT SERVICES – E-GOVERNANCE | | | | | | | | |
| BVPI 157 Interactions capable of electronic delivery which are adopted | 20% | 55% | 63.45% | 70% | | | | |
| Activities underway and proposed will ensure that we reach our e-governance target by March 2003 | | | | | | | | |
| LEGAL | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|--|--|--|--|--|
| <i>BVPI 177</i> Is the authority part of a Community Legal Service Partnership | N/A | N/A | YES | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|--|--|--|--|--|

CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITY CHART

Although key Best Value activity does not denote improvements in itself, these sound management practices will continuously encourage it.

| Review Packages | CHALLENGE | | | | COMPARE | | | | CONSULT | | | | COMPETE | | | |
|----------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|--|----------------------|--|-----------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|--|----------------------------------|--|
| | Business Plan available? | | Business Plan involves stakeholders? | | Performance measured & reviewed? | | Benchmarks underway? | | Consultation mechanisms in place? | | Stakeholder shaping the service? | | Targets aim for Top Quarter | | Alternatives regularly reviewed? | |
| Cashiering Services | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Fraud Investigation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Information Services | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Financial Management | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Catering | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Directorate Support | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ICT | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

SOCIAL**WELL-BEING**

People and Partnership

**HOUSING PORTFOLIO
GREENFIELD****PORTFOLIO HOLDER: CLLR P****The Housing service objectives are to:**

- Provide a customer orientated and high quality service within the principles of best value
- Providing new homes for those with greatest need through the tenants compact
- Maintain the housing stock in good condition
- Provide a caring warden and lifeline service
- Consult and involve tenants and leaseholders

The service contributes to the Council's aim of improving the social well-being of the community in partnership with key agencies through striving to maintain a high quality housing stock, providing housing to those in greatest need and involving tenants when housing decisions are made.

KEY ACHIEVEMENTS IN 2001/02

- ✗ Secured finance for 140 new homes in the district, which fell short of our target of 200.
- ✓ We have invested in excess of £3million in improvements to Council houses.
- ✓ A housing needs survey for the district has been completed which has resulted in revised local plan policies being proposed to secure future affordable housing and new dwellings.
- ✓ 61 empty properties brought back into use. This exceeded the target of 50
- ✗ We did not complete a Best Value review for Housing Development and Needs as all housing services are combining into a more effective overall housing review in 2003/04.
- ✓ We have revised the Council's housing allocation policy and moved to a choice based lettings system.
- ✓ Surveyed all New Forest District Council tenants to see if current arrangements for participation are acceptable.

KEY TARGETS FOR 2002/03

Ensure full expenditure of a Major Repairs Allowance. Invest additional resources to reduce the repairs backlog

Secure finance for partner housing associations to provide 140 new homes in the district.

Bring at least 10 private sector empty properties that have been empty more than 6 months back into use.

Bring 50 empty properties back into use.

Progress arrangements for developing the reactive maintenance partnership between the Council and its suppliers

Agree an approach to meeting the housing needs of key workers in the district.

Introduce new ways of involving tenants in the management of their homes and ensure fair and appropriate levels of representation.

5-YEAR REVIEW PROGRAMME

| Review Year | Review Package | % Value | Value £000's | Changes from BVPP 2001 or comments |
|--------------------|-----------------------|----------------|---------------------|---|
| 2002/03 | Central Control | 8% | 369 | Central Control and lifeline services remain separate due to a primarily different stakeholder focus. |
| 2003/04 | Housing Services | 92% | 3,975 | Combined all remaining elements of housing needs, development, strategy, agency and landlord role for a more efficient review across the service. |

CENTRAL CONTROL (Review Planned 2002/03)

This service includes the provision of a 24 hr monitoring service to Council run sheltered housing schemes and other vulnerable householders in both the public and private housing sectors. The control centre also provides an out of hours response service for NFDC services as a whole and some other external organisations.

Officer Contact

Dave Brown

Email Dave Brown at NFDC

Tel: 023 8028 5141

Member Scrutiny

Cllr McLean and Cllr xxxxxxxxx

Priority Challenges

- Why is the Council involved in this service at all?
- Is this the most efficient & effective way of providing this service?
- What opportunities exist for partnership working?
- Development of a business plan that includes a strategy for developing business outside of the District

Consultation Plans

- User satisfaction survey
- Consultations with corporate out of hours clients

Performance Indicator

| Brief description | 2001/02 Actual | 2002/03 Targets | Comments and Actions |
|--|----------------|-----------------|--|
| Local PI Annual growth of 50 lifeline units | 108 | 100 | Growth dependant on resources available. 2001/02 additional member of staff temporarily allocated to this function CONTEXT? |

HOUSING (Review Planned 2003/04)

The review will be wide ranging and will include the:

- Housing Strategy and Development Unit
- Housing Needs Service
- Housing Management
- Housing Maintenance (planned & reactive maintenance)

Officer Contact

Dave Brown

Email: Dave Brown at NFDC

Tel: 023 8028 5141

Nick Cross

Email: Nick Cross at NFDC

Tel: 023 8028 5125

Best Value Activity

- Member of a benchmarking group called 'The Southern 10'
- Undertaken process reviews within estate management (arrears & void properties)
- Warden services have consulted with residents within their sheltered housing schemes through focus groups
- Implementation of new Government supported tenant strategy

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

| Ref. Brief description | Actual 2000/01 | Target 2001/02 | 2001/02 Actual | 2002/03 Target | NATIONAL BENCHMARK * | | HAMPSHIRE BENCHMARK ** | |
|--|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------------|
| | | | | | Top and Bottom Quarters | NFDC Performance at a glance | Top and Bottom Quarters | NFDC Performance at a glance |
| HOUSING MAINTENANCE | | | | | | | | |
| BVPI 73 The average time taken to complete non-urgent responsive repairs. | 23 days | 28 days | 21 days | 28 days | 12 – 27 days | ★★★☆☆ | 16.6 – 25.5 days | ★★☆☆☆ |
| BVPI 71a Dwellings renovated = £5000 | 5.35% | 17.24% # | 23 % # | 40% | 52 – 18 % | ★★☆☆☆ | 54.25 – 8.84% | ★★☆☆☆ |
| BVPI 71b Dwellings renovated >£5000 | 0% | 0% | 25 % # | 40% | 8.8 – 0.2 % | ★★★★★ | 0.68 – 0 % | ★★★★★ |
| # Significant improvements in performance have been achieved through grant aid and Council investment which is programmed to continue into 2002/03 | | | | | | | | |
| BVPI 72 Relevant repairs completed within government time limits | 95% | 96% | 96 % | 96 % | 97 – 85 % | ★★★★☆ | 95.3 – 87.07 % | ★★★★★ |
| LOCAL PI (AC D2) Repair jobs for which an appointment was both made and kept by the authority | 6% | No Target set | 12 % | 10 % | 23 – 0 % | ★★☆☆☆ | 34.19 – 5.85 % | ★★☆☆☆ |
| Significant increase in performance has occurred in 2001/02 due to | | | | | | | | |

| HOUSING MANAGEMENT | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|---------|-------------------------|---------|--------------------------|------|--------------------|------|
| BVPI 66a Rent collected as a percentage of rent due | 98.30% | 97.50% | 98.7 % | 98 % | 98.4 – 96.6 % | ★★★★ | 98.54 – 97.31% | ★★★★ |
| BVPI 66b Rent arrears of current tenants as a proportion of the authority's rent roll | 1.27% | 1.5% | 1.1 % | 1.5 % | 1.9 - 3.1% | ★★★★ | 1.25 – 1.64 % | ★★★★ |
| BVPI 66c Rent written off as not collectable as a proportion total rent | 0.20% | 0.40% | 0.40 % | 0.3% | 0.2 - 0.56% | | 0.18 – 0.38 % | ★★★★ |
| BVPI 65a The average weekly management cost per dwelling | £12.80 | £14.04 | Awaiting figures | | £8.06 – 11.64 £10.08 | | £12.02 – 14.05 | |
| BVPI 65b The average weekly repairs cost per dwelling | £17.75 | £25.65 | Awaiting figures | | £10.33 – 13.23 £12.17 | | £12.20 – 17.85 | |
| BVPI 68 The average time taken to relet dwellings available for letting or awaiting minor repairs | 17.5 days | 20 days | 17 days | 18 days | 26 - 46 days | ★★★★ | 19.29 – 45.08 days | ★★★★ |
| Reached Government target of 25 days. 9th highest performance in England for 2000/01 | | | | | | | | |

DRAFT BEST VALUE PERFORMANCE PLAN

APPENDIX 1

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------|------|---------------|------|-------------|------|---------------|------|
| BVPI 69 The percentage of rent lost through properties being empty | 1 % | 1 % | 0.80 % | 1 % | 0.9 - 2.2% | ★★★★ | 1.18 – 1.71 % | ★★★★ |
| LOCAL PI (AC D3) Tenants owing over 13 weeks' rent at 31 March 2000, excluding where less than £250 | 1.76% | 1.8% | 1.1% | 1.8% | 1.8 - 4.4 % | ★★★★ | 1.51 – 2.53 % | ★★★★ |

HOUSING NEEDS

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|---------------|-------------------|---------|---------------|-------|-------------------|-------|
| BVPI 67 Homelessness written notification to the applicant within 33 working days | 95% | 95% | 93.13 % | 96 % | 97 – 79 % | ★★★☆☆ | 90.5 – 80.95 % | ★★★★ |
| LOCAL PI Average time to decide whether to accept people as homeless | 14 days | No Target Set | 15 days | 15 days | Not Available | N/A | Not Available | N/A |
| LOCAL PI (AC D5) Average number of homeless households in bed and breakfast | 24 | No Target Set | 26 | 20 | 0 - 6.9 | ★☆☆☆☆ | 7.5 – 19.5 | ★☆☆☆☆ |
| LOCAL PI (AC D6) Average length of stay in bed & breakfast | 6.2 weeks | 6.5 weeks | 8.43 weeks | 7 weeks | 2 - 7 weeks | ★☆☆☆☆ | 5.25 – 9.17 weeks | ★★☆☆☆ |

HOUSING STRATEGY AND DEVELOPMENT

DRAFT BEST VALUE PERFORMANCE PLAN

APPENDIX 1

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------|--------------------------|---------------|--------------------------|------------|------|---------------|-------|
| BVPI 164 (AC D1) Commission for Racial Equality's Code of Practice | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES = 82 % | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| BVPI 62 Private unfit dwellings made fit or demolished as a result of action by the local authority | 4.90% | 3.50% | 6% | 3.6% | 3.6 – 1 % | ★★★★ | 3.43 – 1.05 % | ★★★★ |
| Achieved a higher performance than expected for both 2000/01 and 2001/02 due to | | | | | | | | |
| BVPI 63 Average SAP rating of local authority owned dwellings | 54.08 | 54.11 + | 59 # | 56 | 59 – 49 | ★★★★ | 60.7 – 55.52 | ★★★★☆ |
| LOCAL PI (BVPI 70) Average SAP change | | Maintain existing levels | 0.03 # | Maintain existing levels | 3.3 – 1.1 | | 1.25 – 0.14 | |
| # The higher the SAP rating the greater energy efficient a dwelling. | | | | | | | | |
| BVPI 64 Private dwellings, 6 months empty and returned to use | 1.26% | 0.60% | 0.82% | 0.61 % | 2.6 – 0 % | ★★☆☆ | 4.81 – 0.01 % | ★★★☆☆ |

CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITY CHART

Although key Best Value activity does not denote improvement in itself, these sound management practices will continuously encourage it.

| | CHALLENGE | | | | COMPARE | | | | CONSULT | | | | COMPETE | | | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|---------|---|---|---|---------|---|---|--|
| Review Packages | Business Plan available? | Business Plan involves stakeholders? | Performance measured & reviewed? | Benchmarks underway? | Consultation mechanisms in place? | Stakeholder shaping the service? | Targets aim for Top quarter | Alternatives regularly reviewed? | | | | | | | | |
| Central Control | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | |

**SOCIAL WELL-BEING AND
PEOPLE AND PARTNERSHIPS
HEALTH AND SOCIAL EXCLUSION PORTFOLIO
PORTFOLIO HOLDER: CLLR MAUREEN HOLDING**

The development of a Health Strategy throughout the District and the implementation of a health improvement programme are key objectives for this portfolio. Closely allied to this is the need to promote health and social exclusion issues throughout the community.

The portfolio is also responsible for the provision of support for meals on Wheels, Luncheon Clubs and voluntary organisations which affect the health and welfare of residents within the District.

All of these functions have strong linkages with the Council’s priorities to improve the social well-being of all residents within the district achieved through close working with partners, with particular emphasis on:

- Health**
- Young People**
- Older People**
- Social Inclusion**

KEY ACHIEVEMENTS IN 2001/02

- ✓ Established new scrutiny arrangements for the NHS with partners.
- ✓ Established joint working mechanisms for the new New Forest Primary Care Trust.
- ✓ Implement the 2001/02 action plan for the Council’s Health Strategy.
- ✗ We have not completed the Best Value review for Health Policy and Development. A revised completion date has been set for Autumn 2002.
- ✗ A draft social exclusion issues paper prepared but the consultation process was inconclusive and implementation has not commenced

KEY TARGETS FOR 2002/03

- Commence work on producing an integrated health strategy with the New Forest Primary Care Trust and others.
- Work with Hampshire County Council and other partners to introduce new scrutiny arrangements for the NHS.
- Complete the Best Value review for Health and begin implementation of the Improvement Plan.
- Produce and implement the 2002/03 action plan for the Council’s Health Strategy.
- Work with the Local Strategic Partnership to develop Participatory Needs Assessments as a local tool.
- Work with the Local Strategic Partnership to prepare a social inclusion strategy and commence implementation.

5-Year Review Programme

| Review Year | Review Package | Value £000’s | Changes from BVPP 2001 or comments |
|--------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|---|
| 2001/02 | Health Strategy | 87 | The Health review has been included in the newly formed Portfolio |

PERFORMANCE MATTERS

HEALTH POLICY AND DEVELOPMENT (Reviewed 2001/02)

The review will assess the daily work that the Council carries out across all Directorates to improve the health of local people. The role of the Health Development unit in co-ordinating this activity will also be subject to review. The main issues to be examined will be the strategic work with Partners and project work that takes place to support corporate and partnership priorities.

Officer Contact

Neil Frost

Email Neil Frost at NFDC

Tel: 023 8028 5217

Member Scrutiny

Cllr B Smith

Priority Challenges

- Is the strategic framework in place correct?
- Are the policies that are in place correct?
- What is the strength of the partnerships?
- Are the key projects that the Council is involved in the right ones?
- Is there the right level of participation for stakeholders on the projects that are undertaken?

Consultation

Whilst a range of consultation is underway, no conclusive results are available yet.

| Stakeholder Group | Issues |
|---|--|
| Citizens Panel Survey July 2000 (Promoting the right to health and well being) | 97% respondents thought that local people should be involved in health issues affecting the New Forest area. This indicates that the public take health issues very seriously and wish to have their views considered in shaping activity undertaken by the Council. |
| Citizens Panel Survey (Community Involvement Health Forum) undertaken in March 2002 | Results being analysed. |

Key Review Outcomes (Provisional)

The following are interim recommendations as the Review Report is not yet approved

- The development and implementation of a co-ordinated policy and strategy
- More effective partnership working
- Better co-ordination of actions across the Council
- Allocation of resources to be
- Development of an agreed set of performance indicators

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

The service currently has no meaningful or effective performance indicators. One of the key activities and outcomes expected from the review is the development of an agreed set of performance measures for the service to report against in the future.

CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITY CHART

Although key best value activity does not denote improvement in itself, these sound management practices will continuously encourage it.

| Review Packages | CHALLENGE | | | | COMPARE | | | | CONSULT | | | | COMPETE | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|---|----------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|---|----------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Business Plan available? | | Business Plan involves stakeholders | | Performance measured & reviewed? | | Benchmarks underway? | | Consultation mechanisms in place? | | Stakeholder shaping the service? | | Targets aim for Top Quarter | | Alternatives regularly reviewed? | | | | | |
| Health Policy and Development | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ |

SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC WELLBEING

LEISURE PORTFOLIO PORTFOLIO HOLDER: CLLR BARRY RICKMAN

THIS PORTFOLIO AIMS TO ENSURE THAT ALL LEISURE SERVICES ARE DELIVERED TO MEET THE NEEDS OF THE COMMUNITY; INDUSTRY; VISITOR AND ENVIRONMENT IN A WAY WHICH PROVIDES EXCELLENT, SUSTAINABLE, QUALITY OF LIFE.

The portfolio has a broad impact on all areas of well being but particularly focuses on the achievement of Social and Economic targets and makes a significant impact on partnership working through:

Tourism

Leisure

Arts and Culture

KEY ACHIEVEMENTS IN 2001/02

- ✓ ASSISTED IN THE EFFECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COUNCIL'S CHILD PROTECTION POLICY WITH KEY PARTNERS.
- ✓ FURTHER SUPPORTED THE VIABILITY OF THE TOURISM INDUSTRY THROUGH THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE COUNCIL'S TOURISM WEB SITE.
- ✗ RECRUITED A FURTHER 11 BUSINESSES TO THE LA21 TOURISM KIT AGAINST A TARGET OF 30. FOOT AND MOUTH DISEASE AND THE EVENTS OF 11 SEPTEMBER HAVE MEANT LIMITED DEVELOPMENT TIME TO ADD NUMBERS.
- ✓ SUSTAINED THE WORK OF THE COMMUNITY TOURISM GROUPS IN RINGWOOD; LYNDHURST; FORDINGBRIDGE; HYTHE; MILFORD ON SEA AND BEAULIEU.
- ✗ CONTINUED TO BUILD FACILITIES IN PARTNERSHIP WITH A RANGE OF AGENCIES, BUT DID NOT ACHIEVE THE TARGET TO CONSTRUCT PHASE 2 AT LYMINGTON RECREATION CENTRE AS A RESULT OF LOTTERY APPLICATION STILL AWAITED.
- ✓ SUPPORT THE SECURING OF A YOUTH CENTRE FOR MARCHWOOD.
- ✓ CONCLUDED THE APPRAISAL OF SERVICE DELIVERY OPTIONS FOR THE RECREATION CENTRES.
- ✓ REVIEWED THE LEISURE AND TOURISM STRATEGIES AND ENSURED THE EFFECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE TOURISM SERVICE IMPROVEMENT PLAN.

KEY TARGETS FOR 2002/03

Publish a Strategy to cover the work of the Council across all its services in recreation, tourism and the arts by the end of the calendar year.

Implement the chosen service delivery option for the Recreation Centres.

Complete the Review of "Our Future Together" after the involvement of key partners and publish by the 31st March 2003

Implement the programme of Cardiac Rehabilitation Schemes at the Recreation Centres

Implement changes to all agreements with partner agencies to include the improvement points arising out of Best Value reviews in Tourism and Recreation Development.

Sustain the youth project at Ringwood Recreation Centre and implement similar initiatives at Lyminster and Applemore

Ensure the integration of the outreach work in the service with the development of locality working in the Local Strategic Partnership

Assist in the completion of the Phase 2 extension at Lyminster Recreation Centre

Establish a clear benchmarking arrangement to judge the effectiveness of the Local Agenda 21 Tourism Kit

Agree the best ways for the service to communicate better with its partner agencies, service users and the public at large and implement them.

Ensure that the national Active Sports initiative is effectively implemented in the District with a new netball club established in Lyminster and initiatives started in two other sports.

5-YEAR REVIEW PROGRAMME

| Review Year | Review Package | % Value | Value | Changes from BVPP 2001 or comments |
|--------------------|---------------------------------|----------------|--------------|---|
| 2000/01 | Recreation Centres | 75% | 6,294 | |
| | Tourism | 7% | 592 | |
| 2001/02 | Recreation Development | 9% | 746 | |
| 2002/03 | Keyhaven and Coastal Management | 3% | 291 | The package has now been combined due to the synergy of the issues. |
| 2003/04 | Dibden Golf Centre | 6% | 508 | The review was moved from 2002/03 for management reasons. |

TOURISM (Reviewed 2000/01)

The provision of Destination Tourism management ; information and marketing services. The service was independently inspected by the Audit Commission and was rated as a good 2 star service and likely to improve.

Officer Contact

Anthony Climpson

Email: anthony.climpson@nfdc.gov.uk

Tel: 023 8028 5464

Key Improvements 2001/02

- JOINT WORKING GROUP ESTABLISHED WITH NEW FOREST TOURISM ASSOCIATION TO DEVISE A PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT.
- Agreed a brief for the creation of a Tourism “e” strategy.
- Achieved a three fold increase in the usage of the Tourism Destination web site.
- Recovery plan agreed and implemented with NFTA to address the implications of Foot and Mouth Disease.
- Large print copy of the “Where to Stay Guide” and magnifier made available at all Visitor Information Centres.

RECREATION CENTRES (Reviewed 2000/01)

The provision and management of the Council’s five Recreation Centres. The service was independently inspected by the Audit Commission and was rated as a good 2 star service and likely to improve.

Officer Contact

Bob Millard

Email: Bob Millard at NFDC

Tel: 023 8028 5469

Key Improvements 2001/02

- Review of service objectives completed
- Benchmarking information completed
- Service delivery option agreed
- Extended the youth project from Ringwood to two further Recreation Centres
- Programme of customer focus groups in place
- On-line booking service commissioned and implementation plan agreed

- Produced and distributed centre newsletter

RECREATION DEVELOPMENT (Reviewed 2001/02)

The service encourages and develops a wide range of cultural and leisure activities for the District including sports; play; youth; community recreation; arts and heritage development; open space projects and countryside recreation.

Officer Contact

Martin Devine

Email: martin.devine@nfdc.gov.uk

Tel: 023 8028 5474

Member Scrutiny

Cllr Richard Frampton and Cllr John Coles

Priority Challenges

- Why are these services provided and if they are to be provided what level is appropriate?
- Establishing good benchmarking arrangements and securing a clear improvement agenda
- Is working effective within a diverse and extensive District with the resources available.
- Understanding the effectiveness of the way services are delivered. Could generic development workers be a better means of working?
- Increasing the understanding of the value of the work undertaken

Consultation

| Stakeholder Group | Issues |
|--|---|
| Key partners | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strong support of NFDC role. ▪ More consultation on plans and projects using a number of means |
| Town and Parish Councils | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Relationships need building through closer liaison |
| Grant aid applicants from the last two years | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ High levels of satisfaction with support given – personal contact to be maintained ▪ Form design and length of process need addressing ▪ Council needs to be consistent in policy and practice. |
| Internal partners | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ More awareness of policy needed. ▪ Involvement in policy review requested using a number of means |
| Artists stakeholder meetings | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Council to facilitate the joining up of artists into a network ▪ Assist with technical issues ie marketing; sales, event promotion ▪ Sector is under-funded |
| Citizen’s Panel | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All aspects of the service valued, some particularly highly ▪ Substantial support for NFDC as community leader in these fields ▪ Strong support for current model of delivery ▪ Support to concentrate on community activity rather than events. |

Alternative Delivery

| Key Options | The Way Forward |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Transfer to external provider | Consultation revealed there was no support or mechanism for either of these options |
| Transfer to HCC | |
| Transfer to independent trust | No overall Trust in existence but Trusts are widely used in the delivery chain. Further research needed into this option. |
| Cease the service | Research showed a need for service and the outcomes it achieves |
| Retain within NFDC | Support for the Council retaining central development focus with strong partnership working and delivery |

Key Review Outcomes (Provisional)

The following are interim recommendations as the Review Report is not yet approved:

- Increasing awareness of the teams work
- Creating a set of workable performance indicators
- Further development of the partnership role but with a clear leadership input from NFDC
- Expression of a clear role for service leaders and a programme of training to assist this

KEYHAVEN AND COAST (Review 2002/03)

The review covers the provision and operation of moorings at Keyhaven and Beach Huts at Barton, Hordle Cliff, Milford and Calshot.

Officer Contact

Keyhaven

Martin Devine

Email: martin.devine@nfdc.gov

Tel: 023 8028 5456

Beach Huts

Sharon Plumridge

Email: Sharon Plumridge at NFDC

Tel: 023 8028 5454

Member Scrutiny

Cllr B Catt and Cllr J Hutchins

Priority Challenges

- Why is the Council involved at all?
- What other means of delivery and management are there?
- Are environmental factors sufficiently considered?
- What is the role of site staff and are they effectively used?
- Is the level of performance management sufficient?

Consultation Plans

| |
|--|
| Use of the Keyhaven Focus Group and Beach Hut Owners Association |
| Citizen’s Panel survey |
| Stakeholder seminars with key external partners |
| Survey of key internal partners |
| Survey of users |
| Stakeholder seminar with the three key Town and Parish Councils, with an open invitation to others to attend |

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

| Indicator Ref. and Brief description | 2000/01 actual | Target 2001/02 | 2001/02 Actual | 2002/03 Target | NATIONAL BENCHMARK * | | HAMPSHIRE BENCHMARK** | |
|--|----------------|---------------------|------------------|----------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| | | | | | Top & Bottom QUARTERS | Performance at a glance | Top & Bottom QUARTERS | Performance at a glance |
| LEISURE - OVERALL | | | | | | | | |
| BVPI 116 Total net spending per head on recreational facilities and activities | £9.45 | £10.78 | £10.58 ?? | | £38.96 - £61.49 | ★★★★★ | £14.53 – 26.39 | ★★★★★ |
| BVPI 3 & BVPI 119 | | | | | | | | |
| Satisfaction survey sent to 1120 residents on NFDC cultural and recreational services (satisfaction denoted by fairly/very satisfied) | | | | | | | | |
| See also 119b (museums) & 119c (sports and leisure facilities) | | | | | | | | |
| BVPI 3 cultural i Overall satisfaction | 86% | Next survey 2003/04 | | | 60 – 52 % | ★★★★★ | 65 – 50 % | ★★★★★ |
| BVPI 3 cultural ii Satisfaction of Non-Ethnic minority people | 86% | Next survey 2003/04 | | | 59 – 53 % | ★★★★★ | 72 – 47 % | ★★★★★ |
| BVPI 3 cultural iii Satisfaction of Ethnic minority people overall | 80% | Next survey 2003/04 | | | 67 – 34% | ★★★★★ | 79 – 41 % | ★★★★★ |
| BVPI 3 cultural iv Satisfaction of women overall | 86% | Next survey 2003/04 | | | 63 – 55 % | ★★★★★ | 66 – 48 % | ★★★★★ |
| BVPI 3 cultural v Satisfaction of men overall | 86% | Next survey 2003/04 | | | 56 – 50 % | ★★★★★ | 73 – 47 % | ★★★★★ |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|------|---------------------|---------------|------|------------|-------|-------------|-------|
| BVPI 119a Satisfaction for theatres and concert halls | 84% | Next survey 2003/04 | | | 57 – 51 % | ★★★★★ | 66 – 37 % | ★★★★★ |
| CULTURAL STRATEGY | | | | | | | | |
| BVPI 114 Does the local authority have a local cultural strategy? | NO | YES | NO | YES | 21% = YES | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| The target to achieve the strategy was not achieved but is allocated within the Leisure Review Panel work programme for 2002/03. The strategy will be developed with the Local Strategic Partnership. | | | | | | | | |
| MUSEUMS | | | | | | | | |
| BVPI 113 Pupils visiting museums and galleries in organised school groups | 347 | 450 | 1071 | 1000 | | | 1314 - 318 | ★★★★☆ |
| A project focusing on outreach/ direct education has proved overwhelmingly successful in increasing visits | | | | | | | | |
| BVPI 119b Satisfaction for museums/ galleries | 90% | Next survey 2003/04 | | | 55 – 44 % | | | |
| BVPI 169a (AC I3a) Museums operated or supported | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | N/K | N/A | 1.75 - 1 | N/A |
| BVPI 169b (AC I3b) Museums registered under the Museum & Galleries Commission | 1 # | 100% | 100% | 100% | N/K | N/A | 100% - 100% | N/A |
| # Indicator basis has changed from number registered to percentage registered. | | | | | | | | |
| BVPI 170a (AC I4a) Visits to/usages of museums per 1,000 population. | 10.8 | 30.3 | 52.8 # | 53.8 | 284 - 1337 | ★☆☆☆☆ | 238 - 79 | ★☆☆☆☆ |

DRAFT BEST VALUE PERFORMANCE PLAN

APPENDIX 1

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------|------------------------|---------------|-------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------|
| BVPI 170b (AC I4b) Visits/usage that were in person per 1,000 population. | 10.8 | 26.3 | 45.9 # | 47.8 | 250 - 890 | ★☆☆☆☆ | 188 - 66 | ★☆☆☆☆ |
| # Figures appear low compared to national statistics due to method of calculation which only allows a proportion of the visits to be shown where the authority does not run the museum | | | | | | | | |
| LOCAL PI (AC I5) The net cost per visit/usage | £0.00 | £0.00 | £0.00 | £0.00 | | | £1.98 – 5.68 | ★★★★★ |
| SPORTS AND LEISURE FACILITIES | | | | | | | | |
| BVPI 119c Satisfaction overall of residents with Sports and Leisure facilities | 86% | Next survey in 2003/04 | | | 61 – 45 % | ★★★★★ | 65 – 50 % | ★★★★★ |
| LOCAL PI (AC I1a) Number of swims and other visits per 1000 population | 7,193 | 7,354 | 7,784 | 8,080 | 7406 – 4596 | ★★★★★ | 8080 - 5046 | ★★★★☆ |

CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITY CHART

Although key Best Value activity does not denote improvements in itself, these sound management practices will continuously encourage it.

| Review Packages | CHALLENGE | | | | COMPARE | | | | CONSULT | | | | COMPETE | | | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|---|----------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|---|----------------------------------|---|
| | Business Plan available? | | Business Plan involves stakeholders? | | Performance measured & reviewed? | | Benchmarks underway? | | Consultation mechanisms in place? | | Stakeholder shaping the service? | | Targets aim for Top Quarter | | Alternatives regularly reviewed? | |
| Recreation Centres | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ |
| Tourism | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ |
| Recreation Development | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Keyhaven & Coastal Management | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ |
| Dibden Golf Centre | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ | █ |

ORGANISATION OF EXCELLENCE PEOPLE AND

PARTNERSHIP

POLICY AND STRATEGY PORTFOLIO PORTFOLIO HOLDER: CLLR SIMON HAYES

This portfolio sets the direction and vision for the Council. With competing demands and limited resources it is important that the Council operates within a strategic framework. This portfolio therefore provides that strategic overview which ensures that there is co-ordinated approach to the delivery of the Council's priorities.

It also looks externally to seek the best solutions for the District as a whole. It therefore seeks to ensure the Council is an organisation of excellence and that the best interests of communities are preserved through working with public and partners by:

- **Developing a Community Strategy**
- **Involving the public**
- **Working with partners**
- **Delivering real benefits**
- **Developing our employees**
- **Managing our finance**
- **Securing real best value**
- **Fostering innovation in service delivery**
- **Providing equal opportunities and diversity**

KEY ACHIEVEMENTS IN 2001/02

- ✓ First meeting of Local Strategic Partnership held in November 2001 which brought together senior representatives from the public, private and voluntary sector who agreed to work towards a common purpose.
- ✗ The district's first community strategy not yet published. Revised timetable agreed with Local Strategic Partnership providing for issue based approach and enhanced consultation programme.
- ✓ Promoted a diversity strategy as part of the Council's commitment to Equal Opportunities.

KEY TARGETS FOR 2002/03

Successfully complete re-assessment under the Investors in People (IIP) standard.

Continue to develop family friendly and work life balance policies including "right to ask" for flexible working hours.

Complete the review of the Council's Pay and Reward Strategy.

All NFDC services to reach level 1 of the overall Equality Standard encompassing race, disability and sex discrimination.

Undertake all preparatory work, including the drafting of a publication scheme, to ensure that the Council complies with the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

Work as part of the Local Strategic Partnership to produce a Community Strategy that reflects the needs of the District.

Work in partnership with the County Council and Town/Parish Councils to offer the public a seamless service to the standards of the Countywide protocol to ensure customers receive the same high service from all Information Offices.

Produce a Guide to Council Services and Disability Helpline specifically for residents with disabilities in conjunction with partner organisations.

5 YEAR REVIEW PROGRAMME

| Review Year | Review Package | Value £000's | Changes from BVPP 2001 or comments |
|-------------|---|--------------|---|
| 2000/01 | Public Relations and Graphic Design | 164 (23%) | Graphic Design section has been incorporated into the service with work to include key issues of the service into the Improvement Plan |
| 2002/03 | Corporate Strategy | | Following feedback from the Best Value Inspectorate this package was not felt suitable for a Best Value review and has consequently been removed from the programme. |
| 2003/04 | Communications (cross-cutting) | | It has been agreed to review the proposed cross cutting reviews for both 2003/04 and 2004/05 by involving the Local Strategic Partnership (LSP) in helping to determine what cross cutting issues should be reviewed. |
| 2004/05 | Community Planning (cross-cutting) | | |
| | Personnel, Recruitment, Health and Safety and Welfare, Central Training and Payroll | 556 (67%) | This package now incorporates payroll due to the synergy that exists between the two services. |

*BEST VALUE ACTIVITY – 2001/02**PUBLIC RELATIONS***Brief description – aim of service****OFFICER CONTACT**

David Atwill

Email: David Atwill at NFDC

Tel: 023 8028 5142

KEY IMPROVEMENTS 2001/02

- ***The Community Newspaper has now been published and reflects all the agencies working together for the District, for example Hampshire County Council, Health, Fire and Police now input.***
- ***Internal communications are now being served by an Intranet magazine and employee policy newspaper, which has released resources for more community-based work.***
- The seamless merging of public relations and graphic design has raised levels of efficiency, productivity and quality.
- Regular strategy meetings are encouraging innovation and successful project outcomes for example the Planhunters Sale at Appletree Court, Lyndhurst where over 1000 members of the public raised £2,750 for charity.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

| Ref. Brief description | 2000/01 actual | Target 2001/02 | 2001/02 Actual | 2002/03 Target | NATIONAL BENCHMARK * | | HAMPSHIRE BENCHMARK** | |
|---|-------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| | | | | | Top & Bottom QUARTERS | Performance at a glance | Top & Bottom QUARTERS | Performance at a glance |
| CORPORATE HEALTH – OVERALL SATISFACTION | | | | | | | | |
| BVPI 3 Satisfaction with the local authority | 92% | Next survey 2003/04 | | | 72 – 62% | ★★★★ | 78 – 70 % | ★★★★ |
| The results are based on 1163 respondents from the authorities Citizens' Panel | | | | | | | | |
| CORPORATE HEALTH - EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES & DIVERSITY | | | | | | | | |
| BVPI 2 Which level of the Commission for Racial Equality's 'Standard for Local Government'? | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | | | | |
| BVPI 11a The percentage of senior women in senior management | 21.05% | 20% | 21% | 22% | 27 – 13 % | ★★★★☆ | 27 – 17 % | ★★★★☆ |
| BVPI 11b The percentage of ethnic minority staff in senior management | 0 % | No target set | 0 % | No target set | Not available | | Not available | |
| BVPI 16 a) Staff with disabilities b) working age population with disabilities | a) 2.05% | a) 2.5% b) 11% | a) 1.6% b) 11% | a) 2% | 3 – 1 % | Not applicable | 3 – 1 % | Not applicable |
| BVPI 17 a) Staff from ethnic minorities b) Working age pop from ethnic minorities | a) 0.62% | a) 1% b) 1.6% | a) 0.7% b) 0.7% | 1% | 0.4 – 1.7% | Not applicable | 1.15 – 2.3 % | Not applicable |
| Our performance matches well against the profile of the District. It is not felt appropriate to judge against performance outside of the District. Awareness training and support is given to managers employing disabled people | | | | | | | | |
| CORPORATE HEALTH - PERSONNEL | | | | | | | | |

DRAFT BEST VALUE PERFORMANCE PLAN

APPENDIX 1

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------|---------------------|---------------------|-----------|--------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| BVPI 12 Day's sick per employee | 8.4 days fte | 7 days/fte | 8.5 days/fte | 8days/fte | 8.2 – 11.3 | ★★★★☆ | 7.9 – 9.6 | ★★★★☆ |
| Government top quartile has been set at 6.8 days by 2005 although performance is very close to the national and local top quartile results Sickness levels are monitored at corporate and business level and action taken. | | | | | | | | |
| BVPI 13 Voluntary leavers as a percentage of employees | 14.3% | 19% | 8.3% | 10% | 7.6 – 13% | ★★★★☆ | 10.8 – 14.23 % | ★★★★★ |
| The Target for 2001/02 appears high due to a higher performance forecast published last year. The performance has significantly decreased in 2001/02 due to | | | | | | | | |
| BVPI 14 Early retirements (excl ill health) as a percentage of the employees | 0.41% | 0.45% | 0.33% | 0.45% | 0.19 – 0.99% | ★★★★☆ | 0.04 – 0.66 % | ★★★★☆ |
| Government target of 0.45% is already achieved | | | | | | | | |
| BVPI 15 Ill health retirements as a percentage of employees | 0.27% | 0.35% | 0.33% | 0.35% | 0.22 – 0.78% | ★★★★☆ | 0.03 – 0.51 % | ★★★☆☆ |
| Government target of 0.35% is already achieved | | | | | | | | |
| COMPLAINTS | | | | | | | | |
| BVPI 4 Satisfaction of complainants | 43 % of 177 | Next survey 2003/04 | | | 45 – 38 % | ★★★★☆ | 47 – 38 % | ★★★★☆ |
| BVPI 5a Maladministration Ombudsman complaints | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 – 1 | ★★★★★ |
| LOCAL PI (BVPI 5b) Ombudsmen local settlement complaints | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 – 1.5 | ★★★★★ |
| LOCAL PI Report on complaints available to members of the public? | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES = | Not applicable | Not applicable | Not applicable |

CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITY CHART

Although key best value activity does not denote improvement in itself, these sound management practices will continuously encourage it.

| | CHALLENGE | | | | COMPARE | | | | CONSULT | | | | COMPETE | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|---|--|--|------------------------------------|---|----------------------|--|-----------------------------------|---|---|--|-------------------------------------|---|--|--|---|---|
| Review Year and Packages | Business Plan available? | | Business Plan involves stakeholder review? | | Performance measured and reviewed? | | Benchmarks underway? | | Consultation mechanisms in place? | | Stakeholder involved in developing service? | | Targets set by top quarter results? | | Alternative delivery regularly reviewed? | | | |
| Public Relations and Graphic Design ? DA To check | ■ | ■ | ■ | | | | | | ■ | ■ | | | ■ | | | | | ■ |
| Personnel and related services | ■ | ■ | ■ | | ■ | ■ | | | ■ | ■ | | | ■ | ■ | | | ■ | |

THEMED REVIEWS

We are required to undertake at least one themed or cross-cutting review each year. Essentially these two are the same and are reviews that focus on a particular issue or concern in the community or the Council. The scope of any such review is likely to cut across a number of Council services and other agencies and will often require a strong element of partnership working, both internally and externally. These reviews are often called cross-cutting reviews because they do not fall within one service or Portfolio to deliver but cut across many different areas of work, often reaching beyond the Council's work, to achieve improvements to the community.

All Best Value services are encouraged to link with others better during their day to day work and Best Value reviews. Themed review, however, signify those areas highlighted as of key concern to the authority and aim to identify clear improvements to an area not usually dealt with by any one individual service. By involving the whole range of services and agencies a themed review can identify and deliver improvements that are supported by those who can make a difference.

5-YEAR THEMED REVIEW PROGRAMME

| Review Year | Review Package | Value £000's | Changes from BVPP 2001 or comments |
|-------------|---------------------------------|--------------|--|
| 2000/01 | Community Safety | | For progress on improvements in this theme see the Crime and Disorder Portfolio on page xx of this plan. |
| 2001/02 | Health | | Due to the extensive cross agency working this review is not due to be completed until September 2002. For information on the key issues being addressed see the Health and Social Inclusion Portfolio (pg xx) . |
| 2002/03 | Sustainability/ Quality of Life | | The issues being addressed in this review are detailed below. |
| 2003/04 | Communication | | It has been agreed to review the proposed cross cutting reviews for both 2003/04 and 2004/05 by involving the Local Strategic Partnership (LSP) in helping to determine what cross cutting issues should be reviewed |
| 2004/05 | Community Strategy | | |

BEST VALUE ACTIVITY - 2001/02

SUSTAINABILITY/QUALITY OF LIFE (Review planned 2002/03)

Sustainability aims to improve or at least maintain the quality of life for both present and future generations. This is achieved through the integration and appropriate balance of the social, economic and environmental needs of the community in decision making and activities across the District. This issue is not only given high national importance but is also the focus for

the Councils corporate Plan, Heart of the Forest, which is in part based on the delivery of the 3 areas of economic, environmental and social well-being. The review will look internally at the Council at the support mechanisms to achieve sustainability and externally at the impact sustainable activity is having on the community.

Officer Contact Liz Malcolm e-mail: Liz Malcolm at NFDC Telephone: 023 8028 5303

Member Scrutiny Cllr Brenda Smith and Cllr Nick Smith

Priority Challenges

- Secure a more corporate and consistent approach to the integration of environmental, economic and social objectives along with raised Member, employee and public awareness of the issues.
- Identify gaps between policy and practice and improve efficiency by identifying those activities which most effectively meet sustainable objectives
- Put in place a process for monitoring and reporting on sustainability performance across the Council
- Understand and highlight areas of community concern and enable the Council, it partners and communities to make informed decisions
- Identify and integrate best practice and identify which top quarter results are appropriate for the Council to target

Consultation Plans

| | |
|---|--|
| Members | To obtain views on internal mechanisms and how these help achievements of sustainable activity for the community |
| Employees | |
| Senior Management | |
| The Community | To obtain a view on the Council's sustainability focus and direction for the future |
| Citizens' Panel questionnaire | |
| Local Strategic Partnership meetings and stakeholder conference | |
| Heart of the Forest consultation feedback | |

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

No formal indicators have been agreed to measure the sustainable development performance of the Council. The overall aim of the review will be to propose a set of appropriate indicators to reflect the needs of the community and the work of the Council.

A sample list of performance indicators and trend results are shown below to begin to show the Council's efforts in this area. It is anticipated that these results will be compared with other benchmarks in the 2003 Best Value Performance Plan.

| EXAMPLE PERFORMANCE INDICATOR | QUALITY OF LIFE ISSUE ADDRESSED |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| Recycling of Household Waste | Improving Management of the Environment |
| Cleanliness of streets | Improving the local environment |
| No of Days of Air Pollution | Reducing Pollution |
| Mortality by Cause | Improving People's Health |
| Qualification at Age 19 | Developing People's Skills |
| Homes judged unfit to live in | Improving Housing opportunities |

| | |
|--|---------------------------------------|
| Affordable Housing | Improving Housing opportunities |
| Community satisfaction with the local area | Strengthening Community Involvement |
| Local area getting worse/better/staying the same | Strengthening Community Involvement |
| Traffic volumes on major roads | Improving Transport |
| Fear of crime | Tackling Community Safety |
| Recorded crime for theft/burglary/violence | Tackling Community Safety |
| Proportion of working population in employment | Combatting Unemployment |
| Households receiving Council Tax Benefit | Tackling Poverty and Social Exclusion |
| Change in Local jobs | Encouraging Economic Regeneration |

FINANCIAL STATEMENT

This section reviews how we spent our money in 2001/2002 and summarises the Councils' spending plans for the current financial year. It also looks at how the Council has set a strategic framework for the utilisation of its major assets and how this links to the capital programme.

WHAT DID WE SPEND IN 2001/2002

(These figures are based on the original estimates for 2001/02. At the time of production of this document final outturn information was not available, however it is known that there are no material differences from the original estimates for the year).

| REVENUE EXPENDITURE | 2001/02 Original Budget | | |
|--|-------------------------|---------|-------------------|
| | | Income | Net Total Cost |
| | £000 | £000 | £000 |
| | £000 | | |
| Corporate & Democratic Core | 2,867 | -114 | 2,753 |
| Unapportionable Central Overheads | 613 | -22 | 591 |
| Other Operating Income & Expenditure (Including Town & parish Precepts) | 4,368 | -6,277 | -1,909 |
| Other Central Services | 7,154 | -5,711 | 1,443 |
| Cultural & Related Services | 7,504 | -4,521 | 2,983 |
| Environmental Services | 8,940 | -800 | 8,140 |
| Planning & Development Services | 3,395 | -1,087 | 2,308 |
| Highways, Roads and Transport Services | 2,177 | -557 | 1,620 |
| Housing Services – General Fund | 12,495 | -10,040 | 2,455 |
| Housing Services – Housing Rev. Account | 24,452 | -24,155 | 297 |
| Housing Services – HRA – Deficit met from Bal. | 0 | -297 | -297 |
| Social Services – Meals on Wheels | 59 | 0 | 59 |
| Sub Totals | 74,024 | 53,581 | |
| TOTAL NET COST | | | 20,443 |

WHAT DO WE PLAN TO SPEND IN 2002/2003

The Council's revenue budget for 2002/03 as approved by full Council, is set out below. The estimated gross spending on the day to day running of services is £78.833.m. This has gone up by £4.809m compared to 2001/02. This figure is before taking account of income such as charges for services and specific Government grants. The figure also includes spending on housing services which are paid for by rents charged to tenants

| REVENUE EXPENDITURE | 2002/03 Original Budget | | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------------|
| | Gross Total Cost £000 | Income £000 | Net Total Cost £000 |
| Corporate & Democratic Core | 2,808 | -106 | 2,702 |
| Unapportionable Central Overheads | 407 | -19 | 388 |

| | | | |
|--|--------|---------|---------------|
| Other Operating Income & Expenditure (Including Town & parish Precepts) | 4,386 | -6,029 | -1,643 |
| Other Central Services | 7,698 | -6,319 | 1,379 |
| Cultural & Related Services | 8,300 | -4,935 | 3,365 |
| Environmental Services | 9,557 | -1,002 | 8,555 |
| Planning & Development Services | 3,542 | -1,174 | 2,368 |
| Highways, Roads and Transport Services | 2,703 | -1,038 | 1,665 |
| Housing Services – General Fund | 14,555 | -11,763 | 2,792 |
| Housing Services – Housing Rev. Account | 24,824 | -23,947 | 877 |
| Housing Services – HRA – Deficit met from Bal. | 0 | -877 | -877 |
| Social Services – Meals on Wheels | 53 | 0 | 53 |
| Sub Totals | 78,833 | -57,209 | |
| TOTAL NET COST | | | 21,624 |

Financial Strategy

The Council takes a medium term approach to the setting of a financial framework. Whilst there is still to develop further the Council has attempted to improve the links between the direction and objectives that it sets out in the Corporate Plan and the way in which resources are allocated. Key factors in the strategy are:

- Ensure validity of saving proposals
- Review level of discretionary expenditure
- Maximising income and consider new area's for charging
- Consider new funding only if essential
- Consider environmental and sustainability issues
- All proposals to be prioritised
- Make full revenue provision for maintenance of assets
- New capital expenditure bids to be aligned to the capital strategy

Council Tax Calculation

The table below shows how the above spending decisions are funded and what level of Council Tax had to be set to raise the income required. The estimated net expenditure, to be funded from Council Tax (including Town / Parish Precepts), is £11.092m, an increase of £0.915m (8.99%) on 2001/02.

| | 2001/02 | 2002/03 |
|-------------------------------------|---------|---------|
| Net cost of services | 20,443 | 21,624 |
| Deduct – Net Transfer from Reserves | -622 | -283 |
| - Revenue Support Grant | -3,252 | -2,757 |
| - Non Domestic Rate Redistribution | -6,459 | -7,243 |
| - Collection Fund Surplus | -136 | -249 |
| Add - Non Operational Asset Rentals | 203 | 0 |
| To be funded by Council Tax | 10,177 | 11,092 |
| Tax base number of properties | 68,224 | 68,577 |
| Council Tax Per Band D Dwelling | £149.17 | £161.74 |

As this table shows the level of Council Tax has increased from £149.17 to £161.74, an increase of 8.42%

Capital Expenditure

As well as the day to day running costs, the Council also intends to invest for the future in its buildings and the infrastructure of the area (capital expenditure). The capital budget for 2002/03 is £8.754m and this will be spent on building works and equipment. Some of this is financed by borrowing. Total borrowing as at 31 March 2002 is estimated to be £13.1m.

The Council's Capital Strategy and Asset Management Plan give a strategic framework in which the capital programme is developed. It gives links between the capital programme and the corporate strategy. The strategy for 2001/02 focussed the need for investment in :-

Community Safety - secure car parking and CCTV
 Housing and Social Inclusion - target of 200 new homes partnership with RSL's and renovation grants
 Transport - various transport schemes
 Managing our Physical Assets - combined heat and power feasibility study

The principal areas where capital expenditure is proposed are shown as follows:

| CAPITAL EXPENDITURE | 2002/03 £'000 |
|---|--------------------------|
| Housing - Renovation Work (Public Sector) | 500 |
| - Improvement Grants (Private Sector) | 1,095 |
| - Enabling Activities (Housing Associations) | 2,446 |
| Appletree Court – Refurbishment of Heating System | 270 |
| New Milton Offices – Provision of new facility | 432 |
| Highways Agency | 398 |
| Catering Facilities | 111 |
| Public Conveniences | 287 |
| Car Parks | 130 |
| Recreational Facilities & Provision of Open Space | 1,019 |
| Land Drainage | 264 |
| Environmental Initiatives | 197 |
| Coast Protection | 962 |
| CCTV programme | 358 |
| Other Schemes | 285 |
| TOTAL | 8,754 |

APPENDIX 2 – Service Index by Portfolio

| SERVICE | PACKAGE DESCRIPTION | PORTFOLIO | PAGE |
|-------------------------|---|--------------------|------|
| Abandoned Vehicles | Public Services | Environment | |
| Accountancy | Financial Management | Finance & Support | |
| Administration | Directorate Support Services | Finance & Support | |
| Arts | Recreation Development | Leisure | |
| Building Control | Building Control | Economy & Planning | |
| Building Services | Property Services | Finance & Support | |
| Business Rates | Revenues and Benefits | Finance & Support | |
| Car Parks | Public Services | Environment | |
| Caretaking and Security | Property Services | Finance & Support | |
| Cashiering | Cash Collection and Reconciliation | Finance & Support | |
| Catering | Catering | Finance & Support | |
| Cemeteries | Public Services | Environment | |
| Central Control | Central Control | Housing | |
| Central Purchasing | Central Purchasing and Stores | Finance & Support | |
| Coastal Management | Keyhaven and Coastal Management | Leisure | |
| Coastal Protection | Civil Engineering | Environment | |
| Committee Services | Democratic Services | Finance & Support | |
| Community Safety | Community Safety (Cross cutting) | Crime & Disorder | |
| Complaints | Information Services | Finance & Support | |
| Concessionary Travel | Exchequer Services | Finance & Support | |
| Council Tax | Revenues and Benefits | Finance & Support | |
| Countryside | Recreation Development | Leisure | |
| Customer Services | Public Services | Environment | |
| Debtors | Exchequer Services | Finance & Support | |
| Development Control | Planning | Economy & Planning | |
| Dibden Golf Centre | Dibden Golf Centre | Leisure | |
| Dog Wardening | Environmental Protection | Environment | |

| | | |
|------------------------------|---|--------------------|
| Drainage | Civil Engineering | Environment |
| Economic Development | Economic Development | Economy & Planning |
| Electoral Registration | Democratic Services | Finance & Support |
| Employee Welfare | Personnel, Recruitment, Health and Safety and Welfare, Central Training and Payroll | Policy & Strategy |
| Environment Enhancements | Civil Engineering | Environment |
| Estates and Valuation | Property Services | Finance & Support |
| Fleet Management | Fleet Management | Finance & Support |
| Fraud Investigation | Fraud Investigation | Finance & Support |
| Food and Health and Safety | Environment Commercial Services | Environment |
| Fraud Investigation | Fraud Investigation | Finance & Support |
| Grounds Maintenance | Public Services | Environment |
| Health | Health Strategy | Housing |
| Health and Safety | Personnel, Recruitment, Health and Safety and Welfare | Policy & Strategy |
| Highways | Civil Engineering | Environment |
| Housing Benefit | Revenues and Benefits | Finance & Support |
| Housing Development | Housing Services | Housing |
| Housing Landlord Role | Housing Services | Housing |
| Housing Needs | Housing Services | Housing |
| Improvement Grants (Housing) | Housing Services | Housing |
| Information Technology | ICT Services | Finance & Support |
| Information | Information Services | Finance & Support |
| Insurance | Exchequer Services | Finance & Support |
| Internal Audit | Internal Audit | Finance & Support |
| Keyhaven | Keyhaven and Coastal Management | Leisure |
| Leased Cars | Exchequer Services | Finance & Support |
| Legal | Legal | Finance & Support |
| Licensing | Environment Commercial Services | Environment |
| Local Agenda 21 | Sustainability / LA21 (Cross cutting) | Environment |

| | | |
|-------------------------------|---|--------------------|
| Open Space | Recreation Development | Leisure |
| Payments | Exchequer Services | Finance & Support |
| Payroll | Personnel, Recruitment, Health and Safety and Welfare, Central Training and Payroll | Finance & Support |
| Personnel | Personnel, Recruitment, Health and Safety and Welfare, Central Training and Payroll | Policy & Strategy |
| Pest Control | Environmental Protection | Environment |
| Play | Recreation Development | Leisure |
| Policy Design and Information | Planning | Economy & Planning |
| Pollution Control | Environment Protection | Environment |
| Public Conveniences | Public Services | Environment |
| Public Relations | Public Relations | Policy & Strategy |
| Recreation Centres | Recreation Centres | Leisure |
| Recreation Development | Recreation Development | Leisure |
| Reception | Information Services | Finance & Support |
| Recruitment | Personnel, Recruitment, Health and Safety and Welfare, Central Training and Payroll | Policy & Strategy |
| Refuse and Street Cleansing | Refuse and Street Cleansing | Environment |
| Risk Management | Exchequer Services | Finance & Support |
| Administration | Directorate Support Services | Finance & Support |
| Secretarial Support | Directorate Support Services | Finance & Support |
| Sport | Recreation Development | Leisure |
| Stores | Central Purchasing and Stores | Finance & Support |
| Street Naming and Numbering | Public Services | Environment |
| Sustainability | Sustainability / LA21 (cross cutting) | Environment |
| Tourism | Tourism | Leisure |
| Transport Policy | Planning | Economy & Planning |
| Youth | Leisure Development | Leisure |

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

| | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| 4C's | Framework set by the government for local authorities to assess and improve their services through Challenging what they do, Comparing with others, Consulting stakeholders and demonstrate competitiveness with other providers. |
| Review Programme | Requirement for all local authorities to review their services starting 1.4.00. |
| Asset management | Optimising the utilisation of assets in terms of service benefits and financial return. |
| Beacon Council Status | A government award demonstrating best practice in a particular service area and good general performance across the board. |
| Benchmarking | The analysis of selected activities and processes, and their comparison with other organisations to obtain a better understanding of how we perform and learn best practice. |
| Best Value | The duty that Local Authorities owe to their stakeholders to provide relevant cost-effective services. |
| Best Value Guide | Document that provides guidance to managers on approaches to securing continuous improvement in the delivery of services. |
| BVPI | Best Value Performance Indicator. Measures set by the Government to compare performance of local authorities |
| CCTV | Close Circuit Television |
| Citizens Panel | A panel of 2000 residents, matching the District profile, who are involved in surveys to establish their satisfaction and views. |
| CMT | Corporate Management Team, comprising of 4 directors of the Council who consider policy and strategic issues for the Council |
| Community Planning | The process that enables the views of better partnership working and stakeholders and the public to influence the future shape of their communities of the District |
| Community Strategy | A plan for promoting or improving the economic, social and environmental well being of an area contributing to the achievement of sustainable development in the U.K. |
| CPA | Comprehensive Performance Assessment – Government assessment of a Council's overall performance |
| CSP | Community Safety Partnership of Hampshire authorities to ensure a uniform and co-ordinated approach to safety issues across the County |
| Cross Cutting Issues | An activity or provision of a service which involves more than one service, authority, voluntary organisation or private sector business. |
| DDA | Disability Discrimination Act 1995. |
| DTLR | Department of Transport, Local Government and the Regions |
| DISTRICT AUDIT | Independent body established with statutory responsibility for the external audit of public sector organisations. |
| ELECTRONIC GOVERNANCE | (E-Governance) Government initiative to promote electronic access to local authority services by users. |
| Fundamental Performance Review | Periodic formal review of selected services, focusing on the 4C's, Challenge, Compare, Consult and Compete, to lead to a 5 year Improvement Plan for continuous improvement. |
| ICT | Information and Communications Technology |
| Improvement Plan | Action plan created following a service review that identifies future areas of activity designed to realise improvements in service delivery. |
| Local Agenda 21 | A strategy to protect the local environment, communities and its people |

| | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| | developed from the Rio Earth Summit. |
| LGIP | LOCAL GOVERNMENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMME – A GOVERNMENT SCHEME WHICH ASSESSES A LOCAL AUTHORITY'S CURRENT ACHIEVEMENTS, ANALYSES ITS STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES AND FORMULATES AN IMPROVEMENT PLAN. |
| Local Strategic Partnership | High level partnership of key agencies representing economic, social and environmental interests working towards the common aim of improving the quality of life of people. |
| McPherson Report | Report commissioned by the Government to look at discrimination against ethnic minorities. |
| New Forest District Alliance | Multi-agency steering group set up to assist in the development of a community strategy. |
| Ombudsman | Independent body that deals with the investigation of complaints against local authorities. |
| PCG/T | Primary Care Group/Trust |
| Performance Indicators | Any numerical data or ratios collected and used for the purpose of making initial comparisons of the performance of groups of similar bodies. |
| Portfolio | Collection of services and functions grouped together under one area of responsibility. |
| Portfolio Holder | Council Member with specific responsibility for key service areas and member of the Advisory Cabinet. |
| PPPR | Portfolio Performance Review Panel. Panel made up of a cross section of Members to scrutinise and support the portfolio. |
| Quartile Range | The top 25% or bottom 25% of performance results when compared to a specific group of service providers i.e. local or national. |
| SAP | The Standard Assessment Procedure (SAP) is an index of annual cost of heating a dwelling to achieve a standard heating regime. It runs from 1 (highly inefficient) to 100 (highly efficient) |
| Service Delivery Options | 8 alternative service delivery options identified by DTLR which have to be considered by all services when undertaking a fundamental service review. |
| Stakeholders | Everybody with a legitimate interest in the service under consideration. |
| Sustainability | Meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. |
| Top Quartile | The top 25% of performance results within a specific group of service providers i.e. local or national. |