

Public Document Pack

Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee

Thursday, 22nd July, 2010
at 5.00 pm

Council Chamber - Civic Centre

This meeting is open to the public

Members

Councillor Barnes-Andrews (Chair)
Councillor Vinson (Vice-Chair)
Councillor Baillie
Councillor Dick
Councillor Fitzgerald
Councillor Jones
Councillor Kolker
Councillor Norris
Councillor Stevens
Councillor Dr R Williams

Appointed Members

Mr J Bettridge, (Parent Governor Representative)
Mr T Blackshaw, (Church of England)
Mrs U Topp, (Roman Catholic Church)
Mrs M Bishop, (Primary Parent Governors)

Contacts

Natalie Noke
Senior Democratic Support Officer
Tel. 023 8083 3950
Email: natalie.noke@southampton.gov.uk

Joy Wilmot-Palmer
Assistant Chief Executive (Strategy)
Tel. 023 8083 4428
Email: joy.wilmot-palmer@southampton.gov.uk

PUBLIC INFORMATION

Role of Overview and Scrutiny

Overview and Scrutiny includes the following three functions:

- Holding the Executive to account by questioning and evaluating the Executive's actions, both before and after decisions taken.
- Developing and reviewing Council policies, including the Policy Framework and Budget Strategy.
- Making reports and recommendations on any aspect of Council business and other matters that affect the City and its citizens.

Overview and Scrutiny can ask the Executive to reconsider a decision, but they do not have the power to change the decision themselves.

Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee

The Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee holds the Executive to account, exercises the call-in process, and sets and monitors standards for scrutiny. It formulates a programme of scrutiny inquiries and appoints Scrutiny Panels to undertake them. Members of the Executive cannot serve on this Committee.

Southampton City Council's Six Priorities

- Providing good value, high quality services
- Getting the City working
- Investing in education and training
- Keeping people safe
- Keeping the City clean and green
- Looking after people

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

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

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

Access – Access is available for disabled people. Please contact the Democratic Support Officer who will help to make any necessary arrangements.

Dates of Meetings: Municipal Year 2010/11

2010	2011
20 May	20 January
17 June	17 February
22 July	22 March
19 August	14 April
21 September	
21 October	
18 November	
16 December	

CONDUCT OF MEETING

Terms of Reference

The general role and terms of reference for the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee, together with those for all Scrutiny Panels, are set out in Part 2 (Article 6) of the Council's Constitution, and their particular roles are set out in Part 4 (Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules – paragraph 5) of the Constitution.

Rules of Procedure

The meeting is governed by the Council Procedure Rules and the Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules as set out in Part 4 of the Constitution.

Disclosure of Interests

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

Personal Interests

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

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

A Member must disclose a personal interest

Business to be discussed

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

Quorum

The minimum number of appointed Members required to be in attendance to hold the meeting is 4.

Prejudicial Interests

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

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

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

There are some limited exceptions.

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

Principles of Decision Making

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

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

In exercising discretion, the decision maker must:

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

AGENDA

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

1 APOLOGIES AND CHANGES IN PANEL MEMBERSHIP (IF ANY)

To note any changes in membership of the Panel made in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 4.3.

2 DISCLOSURE OF PERSONAL AND PREJUDICIAL INTERESTS

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

NOTE: Members are reminded that, where applicable, they must complete the appropriate form recording details of any such interests and hand it to the Cabinet Administrator prior to the commencement of this meeting.

3 DECLARATIONS OF SCRUTINY INTEREST

Members are invited to declare any prior participation in any decision taken by a Committee, Sub-Committee, or Panel of the Council on the agenda and being scrutinised at this meeting.

4 DECLARATION OF PARTY POLITICAL WHIP

Members are invited to declare the application of any party political whip on any matter on the agenda and being scrutinised at this meeting.

5 STATEMENT FROM THE CHAIR

6 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (INCLUDING MATTERS ARISING) (

To approve and sign as a correct record the Minutes of the meetings held on 17th June 2010 and to deal with any matters arising, attached.

7 MONITORING SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATIONS

Report of the Head of Policy and Improvement, detailing actions and monitoring progress of the recommendations of the Panel, attached.

8 FORWARD PLAN

Report of the Assistant to the Chief Executive (Strategy) detailing the Forward Plan for the period July to October 2010, attached.

9 UPDATE ON THE BUILDINGS SCHOOLS FOR THE FUTURE AND ACADEMIES PROGRAMME

Report of the Executive Director of Children's Services and Learning detailing updates in relation to the above programmes for the Committee's comments and consideration, attached.

10 LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN - CONSULTATION

Report of the Executive Director of Environment seeking comments and consideration from the Committee in relation to consultation on the Local Transport Plan, attached.

WEDNESDAY, 14 JULY 2010

SOLICITOR TO THE COUNCIL

Agenda Item 6

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 17 June 2010

Present: Councillors Barnes-Andrews (Chair), Vinson (Vice-Chair), Baillie, Dick, Kolker, Norris, Stevens, Osmond and Parnell
Mrs Bishop (Primary Parent Governor)

Apologies: Councillors Fitzgerald, Jones, R Williams, Mr Bettridge, Mr Blackshaw and Mrs Topp

In attendance: Councillor Moulton – Cabinet Member for Resources and Workforce Planning
Councillor Walker – Cabinet Member for Safeguarding Children and Youth Services
Councillor P Williams – Cabinet Member for Housing and Local Services

9. **APOLOGIES AND CHANGES IN PANEL MEMBERSHIP (IF ANY)**

Apologies were received from Councillors Fitzgerald, Jones and Dr R Williams. The Panel noted that in accordance with the provisions of Procedure Rules 4.3 and 4.4 Councillors Osmond, Parnell and Letts replaced them respectively, for the purposes of this meeting.

10. **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (INCLUDING MATTERS ARISING)**

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee held on 20 May 2010 be approved and signed as a correct record. (Copy of the minutes circulated with the agenda and appended to the signed minutes).

11. **DRAFT CORPORATE PLAN 2010-13**

The Committee consider the report of the Assistant Chief Executive (Strategy) relating to the contents of the draft Corporate Plan. (Copy of the report circulated with the agenda and appended to the signed minutes).

RESOLVED that the following points be included in the Plan prior to its approval at Full Council in July:-

- In light of the financial situation that the Plan be altered to show the Administration's priorities in a "traffic light" system, in order for it to be clear which would take precedence. This would then be up-dated and progress reported in 6 months time reflecting the Comprehensive Spending Review;
- The introduction from the Leader would include a reference about the highways improvements; and
- That the statistics from the residents feed back would include the figure of the number of people that had responded.

12. **KNOWLEDGE ECONOMY AND HEALTH SECTOR SCRUTINY INQUIRIES**

The Committee considered the report of the Assistant Chief Executive (Strategy) setting out the draft Terms of Reference and Inquiry Plan for the proposed inquiries into the Knowledge Economy and the proposed scope for an inquiry into the local health sector,

for comment and consideration. (Copy of the report circulated with the agenda and appended to the signed minutes).

RESOLVED

- (i) that the draft terms of reference and Inquiry Plan for an inquiry into the local Knowledge Economy be approved subject to authority being delegated to the Chair to finalise points in relation to the following:-
 - that the proposed meeting with the University be one of the first meetings of the Inquiry;
 - concerns raised in relation to the “Work Foundation” being used as an authoritative source of information; and
 - the inclusion of Solent Synergy, Business Southampton and Centre for Cities PUSH report
- (ii) that the proposed scope for the inquiry into the local Health Sector be approved subject to authority being delegated to the Chair to agree draft terms of reference with the Chair of the Inquiry Panel.

13. **MONITORING SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Committee considered the report of the Head of Policy and Improvement, detailing actions and monitoring progress of the recommendations of the Panel. (Copy of the report circulated with the agenda and appended to the signed minutes).

RESOLVED that the Chair would liaise with the Leader expressing concern that budget proposals were not being made available in advance to opposition group leaders and spokespeople.

14. **INTERAGENCY RESPONSE TO THE SOUTHAMPTON REVIEW OF SAFEGUARDING**

The Committee considered the report of the Executive Director of Children’s Services and Learning in relation to the independent review that was carried out into inter-agency safeguarding arrangements across Southampton. (Copy of the report circulated with the agenda and appended to the signed minutes).

RESOLVED

- (i) that the finalised action plan as set out in Appendix 1 to the report be noted; and
- (ii) that an update on progress as part of the annual report from the independent chair of Southampton’s Local Safeguarding Children’s Board, be received at a future meeting.

15. **LOCAL SAFEGUARDING CHILDREN'S BOARD**

The Committee noted the report of the Chair of the Local Safeguarding Children’s Board detailing the work of the Safeguarding Children’s Board, highlighting the the impact of the increased demand for safeguarding services on all agencies and concerns about overall capacity to meet these needs if demand continues to grow. (Copy of the report circulated with the agenda and appended to the signed minutes).

Donald Mc Phail, Chair of LSCB, Linda Dawson, Hampshire Police, Andy Timms, Hampshire Police, Judy Gillow, SUHT, Stephanie Ramsey (Associate Director NHS

Southampton City), Alison Alexander and Annie McIver, Southampton City Council were in attendance and with consent of the Chair addressed the meeting.

16. **FORWARD PLAN AND PERFORMANCE MONITORING**

The Committee considered the report of the Head of Policy and Improvement detailing the Forward Plan for the period June to September 2010. (Copy of the report circulated with the agenda and appended to the signed minutes).

Members of the public were in attendance, in relation to the forward plan item that related to Grants for Voluntary Organisations 2010/11 and with the consent of the Chair the following addressed the meeting:-

Ian Loynes – Shopmobility
Geoff Wilkinson – User of Shopmobility
Roz Park – Community Play Link
Gary Edwards – SARC
Jo Ash – SVS
Steve Hall – City Reach Project
Ali Beg – Awaaz FM
Anne-Marie McCarthy – Rainbow Project

THE FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATIONS WERE PROPOSED:-

That following concerns raised about information not yet being available it was recommended that Cabinet be requested to consider the additional information due to be verbally given at their meeting on Monday 21st June and that in order to give them enough time to fully consider this information they should defer making their decision until their next meeting on 5th July.

ON BEING PUT TO THE VOTE THIS RECOMMENDATION WAS LOST.

It was recommended that the panel that considers Community Chest application should also include outside representatives and not just Council officers.

ON BEING PUT TO THE VOTE THIS RECOMMENDATION WAS LOST.

RESOLVED that the report of the Cabinet Member for Housing and Local Services set out in Appendix 1 to the report: 2010/11 Grants to Voluntary Organisation be noted and that the following points be agreed:-

- that the previous and current grants priorities be circulated to members; and
- that the Executive Member contact Southampton Advice and Representation Centre directly to give details of the proposed criteria used to cut Southampton Voluntary Services and their grant compared with the position with the Citizens Advice Bureau.

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 7

DECISION-MAKER:	OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE		
SUBJECT:	MONITORING SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE EXECUTIVE		
DATE OF DECISION:	22 JULY 2010		
REPORT OF:	HEAD OF POLICY AND IMPROVEMENT		
AUTHOR:	Name:	Suki Sitaram	Tel: 023 8083 2060
	E-mail:	Suki.sitaram@southampton.gov.uk	

STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY

None.

SUMMARY

This item enables the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee to monitor and track progress on recommendations made to the Executive at previous meetings.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- (i) That the Committee considers the responses from Cabinet Members to recommendations from previous meetings and provides feedback.

REASONS FOR REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

1. To assist the Committee in assessing the impact and consequence of recommendations made at previous meetings.

CONSULTATION

2. None.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

3. None.

DETAIL

4. Appendix 1 of the report sets out the recommendations made to Cabinet Members at previous meetings of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee. It also contains summaries of any action taken by Cabinet Members in response to the recommendations.
5. The progress status for each recommendation is indicated and if the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee confirms acceptance of the items marked as completed they will be removed from the list. In cases where action on the recommendation is outstanding or the Committee does not accept the matter has been adequately completed, it will be kept on the list and reported back to the next meeting. It will remain on the list until such time as the Committee accepts the recommendation as completed. Rejected recommendations will only be removed from the list after being reported to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee.

FINANCIAL/RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

Capital

6. None.

Revenue

7. None.

Property

8. None.

Other

9. None.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Statutory power to undertake proposals in the report:

10. The duty to undertake overview and scrutiny is set out in the Local Government Act 2000.

Other Legal Implications:

11. None.

POLICY FRAMEWORK IMPLICATIONS

12. None.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Appendices

1.	Monitoring Scrutiny Recommendations – July 2010
----	---

Documents In Members’ Rooms

	None.
--	-------

Background Documents

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

	None.	
--	-------	--

Background documents available for inspection at: N/A

FORWARD PLAN No: N/A **KEY DECISION?** No

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

Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee: Holding the Executive to Account

Scrutiny Monitoring – July 2010

Date	Portfolio	Title	Action proposed	Action Taken	Progress Status
17.06.10	Leaders	Draft Corporate Plan 2010-13	That the Corporate Plan be amended to include the number of people surveyed in the Place Survey, and highways improvements in the Leaders introduction.	The Executive has formally responded to the Committee's recommendations within the Appendix to the Corporate Plan report to Full Council in July. The statistics relating to the number of People responding to the Place Survey is now shown on page 7 of Part 1 of the Plan and a reference to highway improvements has been added to the Leader's Foreword which refers to the Environment, Transport and Infrastructure challenges in the city.	Completed
17.06.10	Leaders	Draft Corporate Plan 2010-13	That the Corporate Plan clearly identifies the priorities of the Administration in a traffic light system. (Essential / Important / Desirable)	The Executive has formally responded to the Committee's recommendations within the Appendix to the Corporate Plan report to Full Council in July. This proposal was rejected by the executive. The plan already reflects the executive's priorities which will be progressed by the end of March 2011 - unless there is a specific change in the regulations/legislation or finances associated with a particular proposal which will prevent it from proceeding.	Completed
17.06.10	Leaders	Draft Corporate Plan 2010-13	That the Corporate Plan, and the Administrations priorities be reviewed in 6 months time following the Comprehensive Spending Review.	The Executive has formally responded to the Committee's recommendations within the Appendix to the Corporate Plan report to Full Council in July. Progress against the actions and targets contained within the Corporate Plan will be reviewed and reported to members on a quarterly basis as an integral part of the Council's overall performance management arrangements. Outcomes from the CSR in the Autumn will also be more appropriately reflected in next year's (2011/12) Corporate Plan.	Completed

Date	Portfolio	Title	Action proposed	Action Taken	Progress Status
17.06.10	Housing and Local Services	2010/11 Grants to Voluntary Organisations	That the 2009/10 and 2010/11 grants criteria be circulated to members of the Committee	Criteria e-mailed to members of the OSMC on 18 th June 2010	Completed
22.04.10	Adult Social Care and Health	NI 132	That the Cabinet Member provides an update on progress relating to NI 132, or the equivalent indicator, at the April 2011 meeting of OSMC		Update in April 2011
18.02.10	Economic Development	Safe City Partnership Plan	Recommendation : Police/ SCP to identify hotspots where assaults have fallen and provide analysis of the actions that contributed to this.	The Police and Partnership Analyst has been commissioned to undertake a detailed assessment and problem profile of violent crime that will include the OSMC recommendation. There will be an assessment for each district in the City, the assessment results will be ready late August.	Update at OSMC meeting on 21 st September 2010
21.01.10	Children's Services & Learning	Improvement of Key Stage 2 Performance	That the Committee review the Government's response to the School Improvement Strategy at an appropriate meeting.		To be programmed for a future OSMC meeting as appropriate
19.11.09	Housing and Local Services	The Review of Grants to Voluntary Organisations	That the Cabinet Member investigates the possibility of devolving the management of the small grants programme to the voluntary sector is investigated.	This suggestion has also been raised as part of the formal consultation and is being investigated. Meetings were held in May with SVS & Hampshire / IOW Community Foundation to discuss possible options. SVS wanted to consider this suggestion and wait until the outcome of the grants awards before having further discussions, Hampshire/ IOW Community Foundation is interested and a follow up meeting will be arranged in the autumn to look at further detail.	Update in January 2011
19.11.09	Housing and Local Services	The Review of Grants to Voluntary Organisations	That the Cabinet Member investigate the possibilities of a 3 year rolling programme particularly for large grants.	Reference to three year funding was included in the report on grants considered by Cabinet at its Special Meeting on 21 st June. Cabinet approved a recommendation for further work to be carried out under delegated powers in time for the next grants funding round.	Completed.

Agenda Item 8

DECISION-MAKER:	OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE		
SUBJECT:	FORWARD PLAN AND PERFORMANCE MONITORING		
DATE OF DECISION:	22 JULY 2010		
REPORT OF:	HEAD OF POLICY AND IMPROVEMENT		
AUTHOR:	Name:	Suki Sitaram	Tel: 023 8083 2060
	E-mail:	Suki.sitaram@southampton.gov.uk	

STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY

None

SUMMARY

This item enables the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee to examine the content of the Forward Plan and to discuss issues of interest or concern with the Executive to ensure that forthcoming decisions made by the Executive benefit local residents.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- (i) That the Committee discusses the Forward Plan item listed in paragraph 4 of the report to highlight any matters which Members feel should be taken into account by the Executive when reaching a decision.

REASONS FOR REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

1. To enable Members to identify any matters which they feel the Cabinet should take into account when reaching a decision.

CONSULTATION

2. The Forward Plan is considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee as a key part of the Council's decision-making consultation process.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

3. None.

DETAIL

4. The Forward Plan for the period July –October 2010 has been circulated to members of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee. The following issue was identified for discussion with the Executive:

Portfolio	Decision	Requested By
Leisure, Culture and Heritage	Sea City Museum Scheme Approval	Cllr Barnes-Andrews

5. A briefing paper responding to the Forward Plan item identified by members of the Committee is attached as an appendix. Members are invited to use the paper to explore issues with the Cabinet Member.

FINANCIAL/RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

Capital

6. The detail for the item on the Forward Plan will be set out in the Executive decision making report issues prior to the decision being taken.

Revenue

7. The detail for the item on the Forward Plan will be set out in the Executive decision making report issues prior to the decision being taken.

Property

8. The detail for the item on the Forward Plan will be set out in the Executive decision making report issues prior to the decision being taken.

Other

9. The detail for the item on the Forward Plan will be set out in the Executive decision making report issues prior to the decision being taken.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Statutory power to undertake proposals in the report:

10. The duty to undertake overview and scrutiny is set out in Section 21 of the Local Government Act 2000.

Other Legal Implications:

11. None.

POLICY FRAMEWORK IMPLICATIONS

12. None.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Appendices

1.	Sea City Museum Scheme Approval
----	---------------------------------

Documents In Members' Rooms

	None
--	------

Background Documents

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

	None	
--	------	--

FORWARD PLAN No: N/A

WARDS/COMMUNITIES AFFECTED: All

This page is intentionally left blank

Report of: CABINET MEMBER FOR LEISURE, CULTURE AND HERITAGE

Briefing to: OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Date of Decision: 22 JULY 2010

Subject: SEA CITY MUSEUM – SCHEME APPROVAL

SUMMARY

1. The purpose of the Sea City Museum report going to the 2nd August 2010 Cabinet Meeting is to seek the approvals needed to take the Museum project through to completion. The report will also seek approval to enter into any agreements necessary for the implementation of the project and to carryout a procurement procedure to identify an operator to run the museum.

BACKGROUND

1. In April 2009, Cabinet approved expenditure of £992,000 to take the development of the project from early feasibility to the stage when it would be ready to make a Round 2 application to the HLF. This application was submitted in October 2009. On the 23rd November 2009, Cabinet gave approval to spend a further £375,000 to undertake further development work at risk whilst the Round Two bid was being considered by the HLF. Prior to this £48,000 had been approved for the feasibility stage of the project bringing the total approved spend to £1,415m. On the 17th February 2010 Council added £13,585m in to the Leisure and Culture Capital Programme to demonstrate their commitment to the project to the HLF. £1.223m was made available to carry out repairs to the building fabric, including asbestos removal in the areas of the building not being used as part of the first phase of the project. In March 2010 the HLF advised that the bid had been successful in being awarded a further £4.6m towards the project on top of the funding already awarded after the round 1 application.
2. The project will create a nationally important visitor attraction that will showcase the City's archaeology and heritage collections. Extensive use will be made of personal objects, documents, photographs and oral history testimony from the collections.
3. Phase 1 of Sea City Museum will include two permanent exhibitions plus a special exhibitions gallery. The Gateway exhibition will tell the story of Southampton as Gateway to the World, and will chart the movement of people through the port since pre-history. The Titanic crew's story exhibition will tell the so far untold story of impact the Titanic had upon Southampton and particularly the crew and their families. The first temporary exhibition will be about "Titanic the Legend" covering the fascination in the Titanic since 1912, which has

revealed itself through the production of films, publications and the search for the wreck. During the first year of opening there will be a particular emphasis on the Titanic to tie in with the 100 year commemoration of the sinking of RMS Titanic.

RESOURCES/POLICY/FINANCIAL/LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

4. This report will seek scheme approval for the funding added into the Councils capital programme in respect of this project in February 2010.

OPTIONS AND TIMESCALES

5. Alternative options and locations have been explored in the past for a museum for the city. Officers have been working on the proposals to develop the museum in the magistrates court building since 2008. The project has been awarded two rounds of HLF grants to help develop the project and take it forward. There is always the option to return the grants and not take the project forward, however the plan is currently to proceed with starting on site in October 2010 with a completion date of April 2012.

Agenda Item 9

DECISION-MAKER:	OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANGEMENT COMMITTEE		
SUBJECT:	UPDATE ON THE BUILDING SCHOOLS FOR THE FUTURE AND ACADEMIES PROGRAMMES		
DATE OF DECISION:	22 JULY 2010		
REPORT OF:	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF CHILDREN'S SERVICES AND LEARNING		
AUTHOR:	Name:	Beky Mepham	Tel: 023 8083 2269
	E-mail:	Beky.mepham@southampton.gov.uk	

STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY

None

SUMMARY

Southampton City Council entered into Wave 6a of the Building Schools for the Future (BSF) programme in July 2008. Since then the programme had accelerated through pre-procurement. It commenced the procurement phase on 28 April 2010 with the issue of an advert for the programme in Southampton in the Official Journal of the European Union and, had secured two bidding consortia (Wates and Skanska RM). These were issued with an invitation to participate in Dialogue on 2 July 2010.

The announcement given by the Secretary of State for Education, Michael Gove, attached as Appendix 2, "stopped" the current Southampton BSF programme, and put the Academies programme "under review".

The Academies programme consists of two proposed Academies, Oasis Mayfield and Oasis Lord's Hill, both sponsored by Oasis Community Learning. Following a call off procedure under the National Framework established by Partnership for Schools, Carillion was appointed as the preferred bidder in March 2010. A contract has not yet been entered into.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- (i) To note the impact of the statement on education funding given by the Secretary of State for Education on 5th July 2010, on the BSF and Academies programmes within Southampton.

REASONS FOR REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

1. This report is in response to a request from the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee.

CONSULTATION

2. N/A

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

3. N/A

DETAIL

4. ACCOUNTABILITY, IMPLEMENTATION AND OVERSIGHT

- Strategic accountability for the Building Schools for the Future and Academies programmes is with the Executive Director, Children's Services & Learning.
- Responsibility for implementation of any education capital programmes lies with Director: Infrastructure, Academies and BSF.

5. CURRENT PROGRESS

- The Department for Education is launching a comprehensive review to shape design of all capital investment in schools, early years, colleges and sixth forms – to guide future spending decisions over the next Spending Review period (2011-12 to 2014-15), and with the 'intention that future investment will be focused on ensuring sufficient school places in buildings which are conducive to teaching and learning'.
- The Secretary of State stressed in his letter to Local Authorities, dated 5 July 2010 and attached as Appendix 3, that "the cancellation of BSF, does not represent the end of capital investment in schools".
- We await the outcome of this review to determine the level of capital investment and then to assess it against local priorities.
- The results of the Comprehensive Spending Review are due to be announced on the 20th October 2010.
- The Academies programme is at an advanced stage, with a completed design for Mayfield Academy, final planning panel scheduled for 20th July and construction due to commence in November 2010. This is now subject to further discussion with the Department for Education.
- The impact on BSF Schools by selected local authorities is attached as Appendix 1.

FINANCIAL/RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

Capital

6. The capital impact will be known once the review has been completed, future investment is clarified and local priorities for investment have been reviewed.

Revenue

7. Once the investment review is complete, potential funding confirmed and capital priorities have been assessed, the required revenue can be determined.

Property

8. Once the investment review is complete, potential funding confirmed and capital priorities have been assessed, the impact on property can be determined.

Other

9. None

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Statutory power to undertake proposals in the report:

10. N/A

Other Legal Implications:

11. None

POLICY FRAMEWORK IMPLICATIONS

12. Action aligns with statutory Children and Young People’s Plan, particularly its ‘Stay Safe’ component.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Appendices

1.	Impact on BSF Schools by selected local authorities
2.	Statement given by Michael Gove
3.	Letter to the Local Authority from Michael Gove

Documents In Members’ Rooms

	None
--	------

Background Documents

Title of Background Paper(s)

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

Background documents available for inspection at: N/A

FORWARD PLAN No: N/A

KEY DECISION?

N/A

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

This page is intentionally left blank

Impact on BSF Schools by selected local authorities**Southampton**

Oasis Academy Lord's Hill	Academy - for discussion	
Oasis Academy Mayfield	Academy - for discussion	
Bitterne Park School	Stopped	
Cantell Maths & Computing College (ICT only)	Stopped	
Chamberlayne College for the Arts	Stopped	PFI
Redbridge Community School (ICT only)	Stopped	
St George RC Boys School	Stopped	
The Sholing Technology College	Stopped	PFI
Upper Shirley High	Stopped	PFI
Woodlands Community College (ICT Only)	Stopped	

Hampshire

Havant Academy	Academy - for discussion	
Cowplain Community	Stopped	
Glenwood	Stopped	
Horndean Technology College	Stopped	
Park Community School	Stopped	
Prospect	Stopped	
Rachel Madocks	Stopped	
The Hayling College	Stopped	
Warblington School	Stopped	
Woodlands Education Centre	Stopped	

Portsmouth

Charter Academy	Academy - for discussion	
Admiral Lord Nelson	Stopped	
City of Portsmouth Boys	Stopped	PFI
City of Portsmouth Girls	Stopped	PFI
Harbour (formerly Waterside and LA PRU provision)	Stopped	
King Richard	Stopped	PFI
Mayfield - Portsmouth	Stopped	
Miltoncross	Stopped	
Priory	Stopped	
Redwood Park	Stopped	
Springfield	Stopped	
St Edmund's	Stopped	PFI

Isle of Wight

Cowes High School - Isle of Wight	Unaffected	
-----------------------------------	------------	--

This page is intentionally left blank

Oral statement by the Secretary of State for Education– 5th July 2010

Mr Speaker, with your permission, I would like to make a statement on education funding.

This coalition Government is determined to make opportunity more equal and to reverse the decline in the performance of our education system relative to our international competitors.

Over the last ten years we have declined from 4th in the world for the quality of science education to 14th, 7th in the world for literacy to 17th and from 8th in the world for mathematics to 24th. At the same time the gulf between rich and poor has got wider, with the attainment gap between students in fee-paying schools and those in state schools doubling.

But the action necessary to improve our schools is made more difficult by the truly appalling state of the public finances left by the last Government.

This coalition has inherited

A National Debt approaching one trillion pounds

A Budget Deficit of One Hundred and Fifty Five Billion Pounds

And debt interest costs every year which are more than the entire schools budget

It is no surprise then that the last Labour Chancellor of the Exchequer felt he had to pledge a 50% cut in all capital spending, the last Labour Education Secretary could not make any firm promises to protect schools capital spending and the last Labour Chief Secretary to the Treasury left a letter saying simply – there is no money left...

Faced with the desperate mess left by the last administration this Government has had to prioritise.

And our first priority is raising the attainment of the poorest by investing in great teaching.

We know that the world's best education systems have the most highly qualified teachers.

We are fortunate the current generation of teachers are the best ever. But we must do better if we are to keep pace with the best.

No organisation has done more to attract brilliant new recruits into the classroom, than the charity Teach First. Since its launch, Teach First has placed hundreds of highly accomplished graduates in our most challenging schools, and has helped drive up attainment in those schools for the very poorest.

We believe that every child should have access to excellence, especially the poorest, which is why we will more than double the size of the programme – from 560 new teachers a year to one thousand one hundred and forty

We will help recruit hundreds more teachers into areas of poverty – so there will be Teach First teachers in one third of all challenging schools

And, breaking new ground, we will fund the permanent expansion of Teach First into Primary Schools so that more than 300 superb new teachers will be working in some of the country's most challenging primaries.

Therefore, in order to clear up the economic mess we have been left,

We have to bear down on the waste and bureaucracy which has characterised Labour's years in office and rein back projects which have not been properly funded.

Even before we formed this coalition Government, and had the opportunity to look properly at the scandalous mess we inherited we knew that Labour ministers had no proper respect for the public's money.

The whole process by which the Government procured new school buildings was a case in point.

The Building Schools for the Future scheme has been responsible for about one third of all this department's capital spending.

But throughout its life it has been characterised by massive overspends, tragic delays, botched construction projects and needless bureaucracy.

The BSF process has had nine meta-stages

- Preparation for BSF

- Project Initiation
- Strategic Planning
- Business Case Development
- Procurement Planning
- Procurement
- Contractual Close
- Construction
- And then Operation

Each of these meta stages has a series of sub-stages

Meta Stage 3 – Strategic Planning – for example has had another 9 sub stages

Step 1 – Local Authorities produce a strategic overview of the education strategy

Step 2- Local Authorities produce a school and FE Estate summary

Step 3 - Local Authorities submit their plans to both the non-departmental public body Partnership for Schools - and the Department for Education – for approval

Step 4 – Once Ministers have approved Steps 2 and 3, Part 1 of the “Strategy for Change” is considered complete.

Step 5 – Local authorities produce another strategic overview – this time with “detail and delivery”.

Step 6 – Local authorities use the “school and FE estate summary” to develop an “estates strategy”

Step 7 – Local Authorities then seek executive approval on steps 5 and 6

Step 8 – Once they get executive approval, Local Authorities submit the same documents to the Department for Education.

Step 9 – Once the Department for Education approves, Part 2 of the “Strategy for Change” is complete.

I have here just the first three of the more than 60 official documents which anyone negotiating the BSF process needed to navigate

This whole process has been presided over by the Department for Education, the quango Partnership for Schools, and at various times has involved another body 4ps and Partnership UK.

Local authorities involved in this process have employed a Partnership for Schools Director, a Department for Education Project Adviser, a 4ps adviser and an enabler from CABE – the Council for Architecture and the Built Environment – another non-departmental public body.

Local authorities have also had to set up a Project Governance and Delivery structure normally including a project board of ten people, a separate project team of another ten people and a further, separate, stakeholder board of 20 people.

They formed the Core Group supervising the project.

Beyond them local authorities were expected to engage a Design Champion, a Client Design Adviser and the 4ps Gateway Review Team, a group of people who produce six separate Gateway Reviews over the course of the whole project.

It is perhaps no surprise that it can take almost three years to negotiate the bureaucratic process of BSF before a single builder is engaged or brick is laid.

There are some councils which entered the process six years ago which have only just started building new schools. Another project starting this year is three years behind schedule.

By contrast, Hong Kong International Airport, which was built on a barren rock in the South China Sea and can process fifty million passenger movements every year took just six years to build – from start to finish.

Given the massively flawed way in which it was designed, and led, BSF failed to meet any of its targets.

BSF schools cost three times what it costs to procure buildings in the commercial world and twice what it costs to build a school in Ireland.

The last Government was supposed to have built 200 wholly new schools by the end of 2008. It had only rebuilt 35 and refurbished 13.

The cost to each school for just participating in the early stages of the programme was equivalent to the cost of a whole newly qualified teacher.

The cost of setting up the procurement bureaucracy before building could commence – the so-called local education partnership or LEP – has been up to ten million pounds for each local area.

And this expenditure did not guarantee quality. One BSF school was built with corridors so narrow the whole building had to be reconstructed, another had to be closed because the doors could not cope with high winds, one was so badly ventilated additional mobile air conditioners had to be brought in during the summer and pupils were sent home.

And after thirteen years in power only 96 new schools out of a total secondary school estate of 3,500 schools have ever been built under BSF – the dilapidated school estate we have today is, alongside our broken public finances, Labour's real legacy. Far from using the boom years to build a new Jerusalem the last Government only managed to fix just under three per cent of roofs while the sun was shining.

The whole way we build schools needs radical reform – to ensure more money is not wasted on pointless bureaucracy, to ensure buildings are built on budget and on time, and to ensure a higher proportion of the capital investment we have gets rapidly to the frontline – to individual local authorities and schools which need it most.

Which is why I can announce today that a capital review team, led by John Hood, the former Vice-Chancellor of Oxford University, Sir John Egan, the former chief executive of BAA and Jaguar, Sebastian James, the Group Operations Director of Dixons Store Group, Kevin Grace, Tesco's Director of Property Services and Barry Quirk, Chief Executive of Lewisham Council, will look at every area of departmental capital spending to ensure we can drive down costs, get buildings more quickly and have a higher proportion of money going direct to the frontline.

In order to ensure we do not waste any more money on a dysfunctional process I am today taking action to get the best possible value for the taxpayer.

I will take account of the contractual commitments already entered into. But I cannot allow more money to be spent until we have ensured a more efficient use of resources.

Where financial close has been reached in a local education partnership the projects agreed under that LEP will go ahead. I will continue to look at the scope for savings in all these projects.

Where financial close has not been reached future projects procured under BSF will not go ahead. This decision will not affect the other capital funding in those areas. Schools will still receive their devolved capital allowance for necessary repairs. And the efficiencies we make now will ensure better targeting of future commitments on areas of greatest need.

However, there are some areas where although financial close has not been reached, very significant work has been undertaken to the point of appointing a preferred bidder at 'close of dialogue'. There are 14 such cases. In these cases 2 (or occasionally 3) projects have been prioritised locally as 'sample' projects, to be the first taken forward in the area. I will be looking in more detail over coming weeks at these 'sample projects' to see whether any should be allowed to proceed.

And because we believe in supporting those in greatest need my department will be talking to the sponsors of the 100 or so academy projects in the pipeline, with Funding Agreements, or which are due to open in the coming academic year, which are designed to serve students in challenging schools in our most deprived areas.

Where academies are meeting a demand for significant new places and building work is essential to meet that demand, where there is a merger and use of existing buildings would cause educational problems and where there is other pressing need I will look sympathetically on the need for building work to go ahead.

But where projects are some way from opening or academy sponsors can use existing buildings to continue their work of educational transformation any future capital commitments will have to wait until the conclusion of our review.

And that review is made all the more necessary because as pupil numbers rise in years to come we have to ensure our first duty is guaranteeing an expansion in capacity to meet that demographic growth.

Fortunately, in this coalition Government, we have a proper relationship between the Department for Education and the Treasury. Which is why we have deliberately reduced our forecast reliance on underspends elsewhere and brought our spending into line.

In the process we have kept capital spending within the envelope outlined by the last Government so there are no reductions beyond those the Treasury had budgeted for.

By bearing down on costs now we can ensure money will be available in the future to help secure additional places, to help the most disadvantaged pupils and to refurbish those schools in greatest need.

We have safeguarded frontline schools spending, frontline spending on surestart and frontline spending on school and college places for 16 to 19 year olds this year.

We have cut spending on wasteful quangos

We have cut the unnecessary bureaucracy which has swallowed up so much money

And we have reduced the amount spent on regional government, on field forces and on unnecessary Government inspection regimes

But we have prioritised funding for better teachers

We have invested more in the education of the poorest

And we are giving schools greater control of the money which has previously been spent on their behalf

For everyone who believes in reforming education that has to be the right choice and I commend this statement to the House.

This page is intentionally left blank



Rt Hon Michael Gove MP
Secretary of State

Sanctuary Buildings Great Smith Street Westminster London SW1P 3BT
tel: 0870 0012345 ministers@education.gsi.gov.uk

5 July 2010

Dear Colleague,

This afternoon, I made a statement in the House of Commons about the Building Schools for the Future (BSF) programme and the future of capital spending in schools more broadly.

As I set out in my statement, the BSF programme has become far too complex, bureaucratic and inefficient. Too much of the money allocated to it has been spent on expensive consultants and advisers and the complexity of the procurement process has compounded this.

I made clear that the BSF model of investment in school buildings could not continue, except for those projects so far advanced in the process that it would make no sense to call a halt.

I have therefore concluded that where financial close has been reached on a particular Local Education Partnership (LEP), then the agreed set of projects under that LEP should go ahead. This reflects the financial negotiations and contracts that have been signed. This means that even where financial close has not been reached on particular school projects within that LEP, they should nonetheless go ahead where formally agreed as part of the creation of the LEP.

Where financial close has not been reached, I am clear that projects should stop as part of the ending of the BSF programme. In particular, I do not wish to allow the creation of new area-wide exclusivity agreements over many years with a single contractor.

However, there are some areas where although financial close has not been reached, very significant work has been undertaken to the point of appointing a preferred bidder at 'close of dialogue'. There are 14 such cases. In these cases 2 (or occasionally 3) school projects have been prioritised locally as 'sample' projects, to be the first taken forward in the area. I will be looking in more detail over coming weeks at these 'sample projects' to see whether any can be allowed to proceed.

In addition, drawing the line in this way in relation to academy building projects affect some 100 academy projects which involve academies which are either open in the predecessor school buildings, or due to open in the next school year or else due to open further into the future, but which already have a signed funding agreement with the sponsor. These academy projects are a

particular concern, because these are the schools which face a history of low attainment and serious deprivation, and are most in need of transformation.

I will therefore speak individually to each affected academy sponsor, to discuss the case of each affected academy. In many cases, it will be possible for the academy to continue its work of educational transformation without urgent injection of new capital expenditure. This will be the case where the existing building provides suitable accommodation for the pupils on roll and for the education provided by the academy. In these cases, I will expect that any building work at the academy will have to await the implementation of an improved approach to our capital programme - as will be the case with other proposals previously being considered as part of BSF.

However, there are also some cases where as well as meeting exceptional educational need, an academy project also meets a demand for a significant number of new places, and so the building work is essential to the functioning of the academy. Likewise, there are some cases where an academy was created from a merger of pre-existing schools, and where continued use of existing buildings would cause very significant educational problems. And there may be other exceptional cases where the implementation of an academy relies heavily on a building programme which cannot wait. In these cases, I will look sympathetically on the need for building work to go ahead, looking to make savings where possible.

The attached information from Partnerships for Schools (PfS), sets out in detail the impact of my announcement on local authorities.

I must stress that the cancellation of BSF does not represent the end of capital investment in schools. I announced today a review of how the Department for Education invests capital money. This review's recommendations will help to shape the design of future capital investment in schools. My intention is that future investment will be focused on ensuring sufficient school places in buildings which are conducive to teaching and learning.

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Michael Gove". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, sweeping initial 'M' and a long, horizontal tail.

MICHAEL GOVE

Agenda Item 10

DECISION-MAKER:	OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE		
SUBJECT:	LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN - CONSULTATION		
DATE OF DECISION:	22 JULY 2010		
REPORT OF:	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR - ENVIRONMENT		
AUTHOR:	Name:	Frank Baxter	Tel: 023 8083 2079
	E-mail:	Frank.baxter@southampton.gov.uk	

STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY

None.

SUMMARY

In order to fulfil a statutory duty the Council is developing a new Local Transport Plan (LTP) in partnership with Hampshire County Council and Portsmouth City Council. Formal public consultation is currently taking place on a joint strategy. This report notifies the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee of that consultation and seeks their engagement in the consultation process and development of the Local Implementation Plan.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- (i) The Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee is requested to consider the draft Local Transport Plan 3 Consultation Paper, attached as Appendix 1, and provide feedback on its content.

REASONS FOR REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

1. To ensure that feedback from Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee can be taken into consideration and fed into the overall consultation process for the development of the Local Transport Plan.

CONSULTATION

2. The Consultation on the joint LTP strategy runs for 12 weeks from the 8 July and can be found at:
<http://www.southampton.gov.uk/s-environment/transportplanning/ltp3publicconsultation/>

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

3. None

DETAIL

4. It is a statutory requirement that an LTP be produced and agreed by full Council before April 2011. It is also a requirement of the LTP guidance that the LTP have two sections, including a strategy section which sets the long term transport strategy and an implementation plan which includes a list of programmes and schemes for implementation over a three to five year period.

5. The Strategy Section is written in partnership with Transport For South Hampshire. This is for the simple reason that transport issues do not respect boundaries or the travel to work area. Consultation on the Joint Strategy was launched on 8th July 2010 and will run for twelve weeks. A copy of the strategy is attached as Appendix 1.
6. The implementation plan will apply to Southampton only and is being drafted ready for consultation towards the end of the year. The current policy and funding climate is not conducive to writing a definitive implementation plan at this time. It is expected that in October the results of the Coalition Governments spending review will allow for a definitive list of initiatives to be consulted upon. Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee will be engaged in this process.

FINANCIAL/RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

Capital

7. The LTP will set the future strategy by which available transport funding will be targeted at improving the existing transport network. It is anticipated that funding will be significantly reduced when compared to previous years.

Revenue

8. The LTP will set the future strategy by which available transport funding will be targeted at maintaining the transport network, structures and undertaking other revenue funded programmes.

Property

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

Other

10. None

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Statutory power to undertake proposals in the report:

11. The duty to undertake overview and scrutiny is set out in Section 21 of the Local Government Act 2000. The duty to produce a Local Transport Plan is set out in the Local Transport Act 2000.

Other Legal Implications:

12. None

POLICY FRAMEWORK IMPLICATIONS

13. The Local Transport Plan is a policy framework document which Full Council will be invited to approve on 16th March 2011.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Appendices

1.	Local Transport Plan 3 – Consultation on a draft joint strategy for South Hampshire
----	---

Documents In Members' Rooms

	None
--	------

Background Documents

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

	None.	
--	-------	--

KEY DECISION No

WARDS/COMMUNITIES AFFECTED: All

This page is intentionally left blank

Local Transport Plan 3

Consultation on a draft Strategy for South Hampshire



South Hampshire Local Transport Plan 3 Proposed Joint Strategy

This document sets out the proposed approach to transport for the South Hampshire sub-region to 2031. A transport strategy is being developed jointly by the three Local Transport Authorities of Hampshire County Council, Portsmouth City Council and Southampton City Council, working together as [Transport for South Hampshire \(TfSH\)](#) (opens in a new window). The content of the shared strategy will be included within the final Local Transport Plan 3 documents being developed by the three Local Transport Authorities, which will be published by April 2011. To help keep this joint strategy concise, it includes a number of hyperlinks, to a range of web pages where further explanation and detail is available.

Characteristics of South Hampshire

- South Hampshire encompasses the cities of Portsmouth and Southampton, and the urban centres of Eastleigh, Fareham, Gosport, Havant and Romsey as well as Totton and the Waterside;
- It is the largest urbanised area in the south of England outside London, home to almost 1 million people;
- South Hampshire boasts excellent transport links by air, road, rail and sea to the rest of the UK and beyond;
- It contains three international gateways. The [Port of Southampton](#) is the second biggest container port in the UK by throughput and the busiest passenger cruise ship port in the UK. The [Port of Portsmouth](#) is a busy freight and ferry port for cross-channel services, and the adjacent Naval Base is of great importance to the economy. [Southampton Airport](#) is a regional airport, serving a range of destinations across continental Europe and the Channel Islands;
- The sub-region has 275km of coastline designated, either nationally or internationally, for its nature conservation value;
- The South Hampshire economy is strong in the sectors of business services, advanced manufacturing, logistics, marine, aviation and creative industries; and
- Its economic performance has historically lagged behind the South East average. The [Partnership for Urban South Hampshire \(PUSH\)](#) is working to address this through creation of new jobs, improving workforce skills and productivity, reducing levels of economic inactivity and regeneration of urban centres.

Policy Background

The proposed transport strategy for South Hampshire is being formulated in accordance with existing and emerging national legislation, policy and guidance and a number of key sub-regional and local level plans and strategies:

Level	Legislation, plan, strategy or guidance
National legislation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Local Transport Act 2008; • The Climate Change Act 2008;
National policy and guidance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Coalition: Our programme for government (May 2010); • Guidance on Local Transport Plans (July 2009); • Delivering a Sustainable Transport System, (November 2008); • Delivering a Sustainable Transport System: the logistics perspective (December 2008); • Low Carbon Transport: A Greener Future (July 2009); • A Safer Way: Consultation on Making Britain's Roads the safest in the world (April 2009); • The Eddington Transport Study (December 2006);

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Stern review on the Economics of Climate Change (October 2006);
Sub-regional policies and strategies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The South Hampshire Agreement - Multi-Area Agreement (MAA); (March 2010) • Towards Delivery: The Transport for South Hampshire statement (April 2008) • The Urban South Hampshire 2014-19 Delivery Strategy • TfSH Reduce Strategy
Local plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current and emerging Local Development Frameworks of local planning authorities; • The Sustainable Community Strategies of Hampshire, Portsmouth and Southampton; • Corporate strategy of Hampshire, and Corporate Plans of Portsmouth and Southampton; • Children and Young Peoples Plans of Hampshire, Portsmouth and Southampton.

The South East Plan (May 2009) is not included in the list above in light of the Government's stated intention to abolish Regional Spatial Strategies, replacing them with locally set targets for housing and employment growth. Further detail will appear in the autumn within a [Decentralisation and Localism Bill](#).

Transport Vision for South Hampshire

The vision of the TfSH authorities is to create:

"A resilient, cost effective, fully-integrated sub-regional transport network, enabling economic growth whilst protecting and enhancing quality of life and environment"

It is intended that this vision would be delivered through the set of thirteen transport policies detailed within this document.

Challenges facing South Hampshire

Building on consultations carried out between November 2009 and February 2010, the TfSH authorities have identified six key challenges that the proposed transport strategy must address:

1. Securing funding to deliver transport improvements during what is expected to be a prolonged period of public-sector spending restraint;
2. Ensuring the timely delivery of transport infrastructure;
3. Ensuring continued reliable transport access to the sub-region's three international gateway ports and airport, (and the hinterland they serve);
4. Maintaining the existing highway network and improving its resilience to the effects of climate change;
5. Widening travel choice to offer people reasonable alternatives to the private car for everyday journeys and reducing the need to travel, moving towards a low-carbon economy;
6. Managing the existing transport network to ensure that journey time reliability is improved.

Transport Outcomes

TfSH have developed seven outcomes, which are complementary to the corporate priorities of Hampshire, Portsmouth and Southampton. These outcomes define the policy framework for delivery. The table overleaf details how the policies contribute to the outcomes:

Outcome	Policies that contribute
1. Increased modal share for public transport and active travel	B, C, E, F, G, H, I, J, K, L
2. Reduced need to travel and reduced dependence on the private car	E, F, G, H, I, J, K
3. Improved journey time reliability for all modes	A, B, C, E, G, H, I, J, M
4. Improved road safety within the sub-region	C, F, G, L
5. Improved accessibility within and beyond the sub-region	A, B, H, I, J, K
6. Improved air quality and environment	A, B, D, E, F, G, H, I, J, K, L, M
7. Promoting a higher quality of life	C, F, G, H, K, L, M

Emerging transport policies

The thirteen emerging policies that follow (Policies A to M) set out the policy framework through which the TfSH authorities will seek to address the challenges. The philosophy of [Reduce-Manage-Invest](#) is central for each proposed policy. This means the TfSH authorities will work to reduce the need to travel, maximise the use of existing transport infrastructure and deliver targeted improvements. A combined approach to delivering the policies will enable us to deliver the proposed transport vision, address the challenges and achieve the outcomes set out above. The policies constitute a package, with each policy contributing to and complementing the others. For each policy there is a toolkit of delivery options, from which the Local Transport Authorities will select the most appropriate for inclusion within their Implementation Plans. Many of these delivery options will be common to each authority. Implementation Plans are three year programmes setting out which schemes will be delivered.

Policy A: Work with the Highways Agency, Network Rail, ports and airports to ensure reliable access to and from South Hampshire's three international gateways for people and freight.	
<i>Why?</i>	The three international gateways serve a large hinterland. Making sure that people and goods can flow easily and reliably to and from these gateways will maximise their contribution to the wealth and health of the wider UK economy. The economic success of all businesses within South Hampshire depends on maintaining or improving levels of journey time reliability on strategic road and rail corridors.
<i>How?</i>	The TfSH authorities will seek to influence investment decisions at national level to ensure timely investment to enable the best use to be made of existing transport infrastructure and deliver new infrastructure or capacity where most needed to improve journey time reliability . The TfSH authorities will work to encourage a greater share of onward movement of container freight traffic is catered for by rail.
<i>Delivery options</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Investigate the potential for hard shoulder running and variable speed limits on the busiest sections of motorway; Traffic lights at busiest motorway onslips to improve traffic flow; Work towards a joint traffic control centre; Improvements to quality and availability of travel information; Port Traffic Management Plans; Investigate the potential for provision of passing loops at suitable locations where limited capacity is a problem, to enable more freight to be moved by rail.

Policy B: To optimise the capacity of the highway network and improve journey time reliability for all modes	
<i>Why?</i>	Increasing levels of congestion affect both the operation of strategic linkages which are often already at-capacity, and journey time reliability , impacting on economic productivity across the sub-region.

<i>How?</i>	The TfSH authorities will work to better manage the existing highway network to ensure that existing capacity is optimised and used efficiently. This will entail using traffic signal and other highway technologies, helping to improve network management, bus priority, journey time reliability for all forms of travel and contribute to modal shift. Real-time traffic and travel information will be gathered and disseminated through a variety of sources and systems in a timely, efficient manner to enable people to make informed decisions about their travel choices.
<i>Delivery options</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upgrading and enhancing Urban Traffic Control systems enabling bus priority and Real Time Passenger Information; • Improved road network operation; • Pre- and in-journey travel Information (using static and mobile media); • Improvements to Information Systems on the local highway network; • Car Park Guidance Systems; • High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Lanes; • Investigation into the removal of traffic lights at specific locations.

Policy C: To achieve and sustain a high-quality, resilient and well-maintained highway network for all

<i>Why?</i>	Physical highway infrastructure deteriorates with age and use, and as a result requires regular maintenance to ensure that it meets the needs of users and provide for the safe movement of people and goods. The economy and well-being of the sub-region depends on having a well-maintained highway network that can cater for the movement of people and goods. The effects of climate change will necessitate a highway network that is more resilient to more extreme weather conditions.
<i>How?</i>	Each Local Transport Authority will tailor the delivery of highway maintenance to the particular needs of their own areas. Each authority has its own arrangements with highway maintenance contractors. However, as a general rule, highway maintenance investment will be targeted where it is needed to ensure value for money whilst protecting and enhancing the condition of the existing network, factoring in the 'whole life costs' of assets.
<i>Delivery options</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transport Asset Management Plans; • Maintenance contracts; • Improved maintenance and energy efficiency of street lighting; • Improvements to highway drainage; • Delivery of maintenance programmes.

Policy D: To deliver improvements in air quality

<i>Why?</i>	Congestion creates higher levels of air pollution as queuing traffic, especially in more restricted or confined spaces, generates higher concentrations of vehicle emissions and therefore poor air quality. Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) are places where pollutant levels exceed government thresholds. Twenty Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) have been identified within urban areas across the sub-region.
<i>How?</i>	The TfSH authorities will work with key partners, environmental health professionals and transport operators to mitigate the impacts of traffic on air quality. The principal causes of poor air quality will be addressed by implementing a strategic area-wide approach within each urban centre to minimise the cumulative effect of road transport emissions. This can be achieved through measures promoting modal shift towards public transport modes, walking and cycling, reducing single occupancy car journeys and tackling congestion.
<i>Delivery options</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air Quality Management Areas and Air Quality Action Plans; • Promotion of cleaner, greener vehicle technologies e.g. alternative fuels;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Car Share Schemes; • Support for private car-hire schemes.
--	---

Policy E: To develop strategic sub-regional approaches to management of parking to support sustainable travel and promote economic development

<i>Why?</i>	The cost and availability of parking has considerable influence on travel choices and if not managed in a co-ordinated manner can act as a barrier to efforts to widen travel choice. If insufficient parking is provided or if prices are considered high, then parking can be displaced into residential areas further out from town centres. Provision of free staff workplace parking may make it less likely for people to choose to use alternative travel methods.
<i>How?</i>	The TfSH authorities will encourage better co-ordination between local authorities with responsibilities for car parking to improve the way existing parking is used and priced. Discounts can be offered to encourage car sharing and low-emission vehicles. Park and ride sites offering lower cost parking than in urban centres can help reduce congestion and address poor air quality in the centres. It is important that parking management measures are implemented alongside improvements to sustainable travel modes to help increase the attractiveness and viability of these alternatives over private car trips, to support widening travel choice.
<i>Delivery options</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop complementary policy approaches to parking; • Controlled Parking Zones; • Improved management and supply of residential parking; • Park and ride network (e.g. bus and rail based systems); • Improved parking at some railway stations; • Car park guidance systems; • Workplace travel planning; • Car clubs; • Provision of electric vehicle charging points within car parks.

Policy F: To improve road safety across the sub-region

<i>Why?</i>	Road traffic collisions, as well as causing distress to those involved, also result in wider costs to society in terms of cost of providing healthcare treatment to those injured, and loss of productivity. Accidents create tailbacks and delays that adversely affect journey time reliability within the sub-region.
<i>How?</i>	Work to date has been effective at reducing incidences of speeding and unsafe road-user behaviour through education, engineering and enforcement. Reductions in speed limits and crossing improvements within built up areas have further improved the safety of vulnerable road users.
<i>Delivery options</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Speed Management measures; • Traffic Management measures; • Safer Routes to schools schemes; • Road Safety education and training to improve road user behaviour.

Policy G: To promote active travel modes and develop supporting infrastructure

<i>Why?</i>	Encouraging and making it easier for people to choose to walk or cycle for everyday journeys helps people to build physical activity into their routines, improving health and general wellbeing. Increasing the number of journeys undertaken by Active Travel modes will help to tackle the obesity epidemic, improve air quality and reduce congestion.
<i>How?</i>	The TfSH authorities will work with key health and activity partners (e.g. Sport England) to develop a network of high quality, direct, safe routes targeted at pedestrians and cyclists. Well-designed routes and secure cycle parking can be partly delivered through the planning system. Pro-active marketing and

	participative events will radically increase the profile and understanding of the benefits of active travel.
<i>Delivery options</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Legible South Hampshire project to provide integrated, high-quality information for public transport, walking and cycling; • Delivery of comprehensive walking and cycling networks (e.g. Green Grid); • Crossing improvements for pedestrians and cyclists; • Cycle hire scheme for urban centres; • Delivery of improved secure cycle parking facilities at key destinations.

Policy H: To deliver high-quality road-based public transport networks that are accessible, easy to use and are supported by appropriate priority measures

<i>Why?</i>	Improving the quality of public transport will widen travel choice giving a viable alternative to the private car for certain everyday journeys. For those without access to a car, buses and taxis are often the only realistic travel option for journeys to access goods and services. As new jobs are created, more people will wish to access the city centres of Southampton and Portsmouth and it is essential that a good quality bus service is provided along main corridors. This will accommodate growth whilst reducing the overall carbon footprint of transport and prevent deterioration of journey time reliability on main routes into urban centres.
<i>How?</i>	The TfSH authorities will work closely with bus operators to plan and deliver service improvements and develop Bus Rapid Transit corridors to ensure that the bus is a reliable and attractive alternative to the private car, with accurate and up-to-date information on how services are running. Measures to take advantage of advances in ticketing technology such as smartcards will improve the affordability, convenience and attractiveness of buses.
<i>Delivery options</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of a Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) network and other innovative public transport solutions between main centres; • Bus Priority measures; • Development of a comprehensive premium urban bus network offering high frequency services using high-quality vehicles; • Improved strategic interchanges and high quality bus stop Infrastructure; • Improved travel information in user-friendly formats; • Measures to support taxi services; • Improved ticketing (e.g. smartcards, ticket purchase via mobile phones); • Support for Community Transport services.

Policy I: To further develop the role of water-borne transport within the sub-region and across the Solent

<i>Why?</i>	The sub-region already has a good network of ferry services, connecting coastal settlements. Enhancing the integration between waterborne transport and other sustainable travel modes through improved interchanges, will help widen travel choice and reduce peak hour congestion.
<i>How?</i>	The TfSH authorities will work to improve the quality of bus, taxi and cycle interchange facilities at ferry terminals, particularly Town Quay in Southampton, The Hard in Portsmouth and Gosport.
<i>Delivery options</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of improved transport interchange facilities for buses and taxis at ferry terminals; • Improved ticketing (e.g. smartcards, ticket purchase via mobile phones); • Provision of secure cycle parking in the vicinity of ferry terminals.

Policy J: To deliver targeted investment in rail infrastructure and service improvements	
<i>Why?</i>	The rail network in South Hampshire is of strategic importance for both passengers and freight. There is potential to grow the modal share of rail for passenger and freight movements both within and beyond the sub-region. This policy will seek to facilitate a greater role for rail for local journeys within the sub-region. Targeted improvements to rail can help this mode provide an attractive alternative to the car for peak hour commuter journeys to key employment areas.
<i>How?</i>	The TfSH authorities will encourage investment in rail infrastructure such as track capacity, improved station facilities, and enhanced interchange facilities at main rail stations to make rail a more attractive option. Further investment in train services is also needed. The TfSH Rail Communications Protocol will be used to take forward improvements to the South Hampshire rail network ensuring more passengers and freight are carried by rail and improve rail service frequencies.
<i>Delivery options</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Investigate the potential for provision of passing loops at suitable locations where limited capacity is a problem, to enable more freight to be moved by rail; • Re-opening freight only lines for passenger use (e.g. Waterside line); • Improving rail access to Southampton Airport from the east and west; • Increasing capacity on the rail route between Eastleigh and Fareham; • Improved station and key city centre interchange facilities; • Working with train operators to deliver station travel plans; • Further development of Community Rail Partnerships (CRPs); • Improved capacity for cycles, wheelchairs and pushchairs on trains; • Use of rolling stock suitable for the type of route across the network.

Policy K: To work with Local Planning Authorities to integrate planning and transport	
<i>Why?</i>	The location, scale, density and design of new development and the mix of land uses has a significant influence on the demand for travel. Encouraging development on brownfield sites close to existing shops and services, and supporting higher density, mixed use development helps reduce the need to travel and the length of journeys, and makes it easier for people to walk, cycle or use public transport.
<i>How?</i>	The TfSH authorities will work with local planning authorities across the sub-region to encourage higher density and mixed-use developments to be located within main urban centres, in locations that are easily accessible by a range of travel methods. Planning authorities will be encouraged to locate new housing and employment development within close proximity, to help reduce the need to travel and encourage the use of sustainable travel modes. Good design of residential developments will ensure that key services are provided locally and that neighbourhoods are walkable, with good cycle and public transport links to nearby urban centres. Residential and workplace travel planning will be used to effectively manage the journeys created with development.
<i>Delivery options</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current and emerging local planning authorities' Local Development Frameworks (LDF) infrastructure delivery plans will be developed alongside the Implementation Plan sections of the Hampshire, Portsmouth and Southampton Local Transport Plans; • Seeking developer contributions from new development to mitigate the impact of new development on existing transport networks; • Residential and workplace travel planning.

Policy L: To develop and deliver high quality public realm improvements	
<i>Why?</i>	The quality of streetscape can have a big influence on the vibrancy of a place and the way people use streets. Place-making initiatives and the development of 'Naked Streets' will provide a better setting for people friendly activity, providing a more user-friendly public realm for pedestrians, vulnerable road users and cyclists. Public Realm improvements, utilising high quality materials, with careful detailing and public art will add to the character, feel and ownership of local places.
<i>How?</i>	Within cities, town and district centres, the TfSH authorities will reduce street clutter and make streetscape improvements using high-quality materials and street furniture to enhance the public realm and its accessibility.
<i>Delivery options</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reducing street clutter (e.g. pedestrian guard railing); • Streetscape enhancements (e.g. lighting, paving, planting, and street furniture); • Delivering improvements that follow the design principles set out in current design guidance and informed by examples of best practice.

Policy M: To safeguard and enable the future delivery of highway improvements within the sub-region	
<i>Why?</i>	A limited number of targeted highway improvements have been identified which would serve to address problems of localised congestion, unlock development sites with highway access problems and tackle adverse impacts of traffic on quality of life in communities.
<i>How?</i>	Delivery of major schemes for highway improvements is dependent on funding decisions by government and external contributors. The TfSH authorities will safeguard the routes of proposed highway improvements and continue to work with these agencies to secure funding for these schemes.
<i>Delivery options</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safeguarding routes of proposed bypasses for communities where heavy traffic causes problems of severance, noise and poor air quality (e.g. Botley, Stubbington); • Delivering highway access solutions to unlock Eastleigh River Side for new employment uses; • Enabling developer-led road improvements to facilitate access to planned major development areas (e.g. North Whiteley); • Developing a new motorway junction on the M275 serving Tipner, Portsmouth; • Providing a bridge link from Tipner to Horsea Island.

To respond to this consultation, please visit the consultation web portal at:

<http://southampton.limehouse.co.uk/portal>

This site is hosted by Southampton City Council on behalf of the three Local Transport Authorities and Transport for South Hampshire.

For a copy of this publication in another language or format (e.g. large print, easy-read or in an audio format) please contact

01962 846 778 or **tfsh@hants.gov.uk**

This page is intentionally left blank