

# A G E N D A

## Environment Scrutiny Committee

Date: **Friday, 17th September, 2004**

---

Time: **10.00 a.m.**

---

Place: **Brockington, 35 Hafod Road,  
Hereford**

---

Notes: Please note the **time, date** and **venue** of  
the meeting.

*For any further information please contact:*

*Paul James, Members' Services,  
Brockington, 35 Hafod Road, Hereford  
Tel:01432 260 460 Fax:01432 260286*

***e-mail [pjames@herefordshire.gov.uk](mailto:pjames@herefordshire.gov.uk)***

---

**County of Herefordshire  
District Council**



# AGENDA

## for the Meeting of the Environment Scrutiny Committee

To: Councillor J.H.R. Goodwin (Chairman)  
Councillor W.L.S. Bowen (Vice-Chairman)

Councillors B.F. Ashton, P.J. Dauncey, G.W. Davis, Mrs. A.E. Gray,  
K.G. Grumbley, T.W. Hunt, R. Mills and J.W. Newman

	Pages
<b>1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b>	
To receive apologies for absence.	
<b>2. NAMED SUBSTITUTES (IF ANY)</b>	
To receive details any details of Members nominated to attend the meeting in place of a Member of the Committee.	
<b>3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</b>	
To receive any declarations of interest by Members in respect of items on the Agenda.	
<b>4. MINUTES</b>	1 - 10
To approve and sign the Minutes of the meeting held on 18th June and 23rd June, 2004.	
<b>5. CAPITAL BUDGET MONITORING</b>	11 - 18
To advise Members on the progress of the 2004/05 Capital Programme for Environment Areas within the overall context of the Herefordshire Council Capital Programme.	
<b>6. ENVIRONMENT REVENUE BUDGET MONITORING</b>	19 - 26
To advise members of Budget Monitoring the position for the Environment Programme Area budgets for the period to 31st July 2004. The report lists the variations against budget at this stage in the year.	
<b>7. HEREFORDSHIRE'S SECOND LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN</b>	27 - 36
To consider the consultation draft Local Transport Plan Guidance (July 2004), prepared by the Department for Transport and its implications for the development of the second Herefordshire Local Transport Plan so that the Director of Environment can make a formal response on behalf of the Council.	
<b>8. PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY - PERFORMANCE AND STRATEGY UPDATE</b>	37 - 42
To update members on progress of the rights of way strategy and provide a progress report on the key work programmes for the Public Rights of Way	

Service.	
<b>9. MONITORING OF 2004/2005 PERFORMANCE INDICATORS - APRIL 2004 TO JULY 2004</b>	43 - 46
To update Members on progress made by the Environment Directorate for the four months April to July 2004 towards achieving all of the performance indicators / targets which appear in the Council's Corporate Plan.	
<b>10. BEST VALUE REVIEWS - IMPLEMENTATION OF IMPROVEMENT PLANS</b>	47 - 50
To report the remaining actions and the exceptions to the programmed progress in the improvement plans resulting from the reviews of Development Control, Public Conveniences, Public Rights of Way and Highway Maintenance.	
<b>11. UPDATE ON REVIEW OF PARKING STRATEGY</b>	
To receive an oral update on the Review of the Council's Parking Strategy.	

## **PUBLIC INFORMATION**

### **HEREFORDSHIRE COUNCIL'S SCRUTINY COMMITTEES**

The Council has established Scrutiny Committees for Education, Environment, Health, Social Care and Housing and Social and Economic Development. A Strategic Monitoring Committee scrutinises Policy and Finance matters and co-ordinates the work of these Committees.

The purpose of the Committees is to ensure the accountability and transparency of the Council's decision making process.

The principal roles of Scrutiny Committees are to

- Help in developing Council policy
- Probe, investigate, test the options and ask the difficult questions before and after decisions are taken
- Look in more detail at areas of concern which may have been raised by the Cabinet itself, by other Councillors or by members of the public
- "call in" decisions - this is a statutory power which gives Scrutiny Committees the right to place a decision on hold pending further scrutiny.
- Review performance of the Council
- Conduct Best Value reviews
- Undertake external scrutiny work engaging partners and the public

Formal meetings of the Committees are held in public and information on your rights to attend meetings and access to information are set out overleaf

# **The Public's Rights to Information and Attendance at Meetings**

## **YOU HAVE A RIGHT TO: -**

- Attend all Council, Cabinet, Committee and Sub-Committee meetings unless the business to be transacted would disclose 'confidential' or 'exempt' information.
- Inspect agenda and public reports at least five clear days before the date of the meeting.
- Inspect minutes of the Council and all Committees and Sub-Committees and written statements of decisions taken by the Cabinet or individual Cabinet Members for up to six years following a meeting.
- Inspect background papers used in the preparation of public reports for a period of up to four years from the date of the meeting. (A list of the background papers to a report is given at the end of each report). A background paper is a document on which the officer has relied in writing the report and which otherwise is not available to the public.
- Access to a public Register stating the names, addresses and wards of all Councillors with details of the membership of Cabinet and of all Committees and Sub-Committees.
- Have a reasonable number of copies of agenda and reports (relating to items to be considered in public) made available to the public attending meetings of the Council, Cabinet, Committees and Sub-Committees.
- Have access to a list specifying those powers on which the Council have delegated decision making to their officers identifying the officers concerned by title.
- Copy any of the documents mentioned above to which you have a right of access, subject to a reasonable charge (20p per sheet subject to a maximum of £5.00 per agenda plus a nominal fee of £1.50 for postage).
- Access to this summary of your rights as members of the public to attend meetings of the Council, Cabinet, Committees and Sub-Committees and to inspect and copy documents.

## **Please Note:**

Agenda and individual reports can be made available in large print. Please contact the officer named on the front cover of this agenda **in advance** of the meeting who will be pleased to deal with your request.

The meeting venue is accessible for visitors in wheelchairs.

A public telephone is available in the reception area.

## **Public Transport Links**

- Public transport access can be gained to Brockington via the service runs approximately every half hour from the 'Hopper' bus station at the Tesco store in Bewell Street (next to the roundabout junction of Blueschool Street / Victoria Street / Edgar Street).
- The nearest bus stop to Brockington is located in Old Eign Hill near to its junction with Hafod Road. The return journey can be made from the same bus stop.

If you have any questions about this agenda, how the Council works or would like more information or wish to exercise your rights to access the information described above, you may do so either by telephoning the officer named on the front cover of this agenda or by visiting in person during office hours (8.45 a.m. - 5.00 p.m. Monday - Thursday and 8.45 a.m. - 4.45 p.m. Friday) at the Council Offices, Brockington, 35 Hafod Road, Hereford.

**COUNTY OF HEREFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**BROCKINGTON, 35 HAFOD ROAD, HEREFORD.**

**FIRE AND EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE**

In the event of a fire or emergency the alarm bell will ring continuously.

You should vacate the building in an orderly manner through the nearest available fire exit.

You should then proceed to Assembly Point J which is located at the southern entrance to the car park. A check will be undertaken to ensure that those recorded as present have vacated the building following which further instructions will be given.

Please do not allow any items of clothing, etc. to obstruct any of the exits.

Do not delay your vacation of the building by stopping or returning to collect coats or other personal belongings.



COUNTY OF HEREFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

**MINUTES of the meeting of Environment Scrutiny Committee held at Brockington, 35 Hafod Road, Hereford on Friday, 18th June, 2004 at 10.00 a.m.**

**Present:** Councillor J.H.R. Goodwin (Chairman)  
Councillor W.L.S. Bowen (Vice Chairman)

Councillors: G.W. Davis, Mrs. A.E. Gray, K.G. Grumbley, T.W. Hunt, R. Mills and Miss F. Short

**In attendance:** Councillors: P. J. Edwards (Cabinet Member – Environment), J.G.S. Guthrie, D.B. Wilcox, R.M. Wilson (Cabinet Member – Highways and Transportation).

**1. CHAIRMAN AND VICE-CHAIRMAN**

The Committee noted the appointment at Council on 21st May, 2004, of Councillor J.H.R. Goodwin as Chairman and Councillor W.L.S. Bowen as Vice-Chairman.

**2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were received from Councillors P.J. Dauncey and J.W. Newman.

**3. NAMED SUBSTITUTES (IF ANY)**

There were no substitutes.

**4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

**5. MINUTES**

**RESOLVED:**

**That the minutes of the meeting held on the 2nd April, 2004 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.**

**6. GEM PERFORMANCE 2003/2004**

The Committee were invited to consider the Council's performance in respect of its environmental management/ ISO 14001 system to ensure that it continued to be suitable, adequate and effective in delivering improvement in environmental performance.

The Director of Environment reported that Good Environmental Management (GEM) helped the Council to deliver its corporate objective and environmental policy commitment across all Directorates.

The Environmental Sustainability Officer reported that during 2003/4 two surveillance visits had been made by external certifiers and only one corrective action had been raised. Internal audits had been undertaken and the small number of weaknesses

identified would be addressed over the coming year. She further reported that while there had been a number of difficulties, in general, good progress had been made on the objectives in the 2003/4 programme (detailed in Appendix 1 to the report). Appendix 2 to the report detailed the performance against each of the targets in 2003/4.

The Environmental Sustainability Officer further reported that the GEM programme for 2004/5 (Appendix 3 to the report) had been drawn up in conjunction with the GEM Group and relevant officers. The 2002/03 objectives had been consolidated and made more quantifiable and the nine objectives included: 1% energy reduction in Council operational buildings; 1% reduction in business miles per head; 5% rise in public transport/cycling and waste recycling to cover 90% of major Council Sites.

The report commented on the Council's partnership with Herefordshire Jarvis Services (HJS) and Owen Williams; communications, particularly in relation to the results of the Staff Opinion Survey 2003; concerns of relevant interested parties, notably relating to information security; GM crops and procurement.

During the course of discussion the following principal points were made:

- While not directly under the control of the Council, schools were being encouraged to reduce energy consumption.
- Work was still progressing on achieving a robust baseline concerning the consumption of energy in Council premises.
- Good progress had been made in meeting Objective 1 (2003/4) relating to waste reduction.
- As part of the property portfolio, officers were still investigating the possible relocation of salt barns.
- A draft revised procurement strategy was expected for consultation at the end of the month.
- Information gathering continued in relation to the evaluation of water monitoring.
- The pilot flexible working scheme in Revenues and Benefits had been delayed due to difficulties with ICT links for home working.
- It was suggested that a report on the Herefordshire Partnership Appraisal tool, which included environmental considerations, be made to a future meeting.
- Annual grant contributions were made to community transport providers who provided transport throughout the County. Monitoring of the schemes was undertaken by comparison with Performance Indicators set in service level agreements with the providers. Potential existed for closer co-ordination of the service with the hospital car service in relation to health related transport. Officers were also monitoring a pilot project currently underway in Worcester to evaluate whether such an approach could be adopted in Herefordshire.
- The Committee were pleased with the increase in the number of Eco-schools.
- The Committee noted that the Staff Travel Plan (car share scheme) had been positively received at the World Environment Day event, particularly by other large organisations who had shown an interest in joining the scheme.

The Committee congratulated the officers and noted that the Authority had been placed in the top quintile of local authority respondents in the West Midlands Environmental Index 2003, for the second year running, improving its score by nearly 10%.

**RESOLVED: That the GEM Performance 2003/4 report be noted.**

## 7. WASTE MANAGEMENT

The Committee received an update on the current performance of the Waste Collection Contract, Integrated Waste Management Contract and an outline of the implication of the Municipal Waste Management Strategy for Herefordshire.

The Head of Environmental Health and Trading Standards reported that the collection and disposal contracts were interrelated and the performance of one area may be dependent on the performance in another area. Comparative data on the Council's performance compared to other authorities was appended to the report.

In relation to Integrated Waste Management he highlighted that the Council had a number of statutory targets with regard to waste management. The two most immediate targets related to BVPI 82 (a) & (b) – the percentage of household waste recycled and composted. He commented that the 2003/04 target of 14% had been achieved (19.4%). While some investment had already been made in the expansion of kerbside collection, unless further investment in the Council's recycling and composting was made, the next target for 2005/04 of 21% was unlikely to be met. He referred to a number of options to tackle this point, as outlined in the report, which he felt the Council would have to consider at some stage to enable it to achieve the targets.

Concerning the Waste Management Contract he commented on the inter-relationship between the various management elements e.g. the proposed Autoclave process at Madley; the performance of the Household Waste Sites and possible changes to kerbside collection. He reported that failure to comply with the Landfill Allowance Trading Scheme targets for biodegradable municipal waste would lead to severe financial penalties.

The Director of Environment reported that following consultation on the Joint Municipal Waste Strategy for Herefordshire and Worcestershire "Managing Waste for a brighter Future" a number of minor changes had been made and a report on the strategy was due to be considered by Cabinet in July 2004.

During the course of discussion the following principal points were noted:

- The Director of Environment reported that the Enviability Recycling Scheme at Ross-on-Wye was due to be extended to a number of surrounding villages.
- Consideration was being given to varying the kerbside collection in a trial area whereby residual waste would be collected on a fortnightly basis and recyclables collected on alternate weeks to establish whether an increase in recyclables could be obtained without increasing costs while maintaining the collection of residuals.
- While no financial penalties, other than that imposed through the Landfill Allowance Trading Scheme, were expected to be imposed through not achieving the targets, it was noted that elements of waste management were contained in the Council's Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA).
- The pay back time for a 'box collection' scheme, similar to that currently at Ross-on-Wye, was difficult to predict.
- The collection cost per tonne of recycled waste was considerably more than that for collecting residual waste, particularly when collecting high volume low weight waste such as plastics.
- Use would be made of the recently launched DEFRA computer models to compare different methods of waste collection.
- It was anticipated that the next edition of Herefordshire Matters would contain

an article on waste and recycling.

- The proposed Household Waste site at Kington was awaiting the resolution of land ownership problems.

**RESOLVED: That the report on waste management be noted.**

#### **8. CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2004/05**

The Committee were informed of the latest position with regard to the Environment Capital Programme for 2004/05.

The Director of Environment reported that the Capital Programme for 2004/05, attached to the report at Appendix 1, detailed the individual schemes. He highlighted that a number of bids were being considered for approval for funding under the Prudential Borrowing Code. He reported that the programme had largely been based on the 2004/05 Local Transport Plan. The total amount available for the Capital Programme was expected to be £12,643,720 plus any sum approved under the Prudential Borrowing Code.

The Committee scrutinised the budget report and noted that funding for improving access to Council owned buildings was administered from the property budget.

**RESOLVED: That the Environment Capital Programme 2004/05 report be noted.**

#### **9. ENVIRONMENT REVENUE BUDGET 2004/05 AND OUTTURN 2003/4**

The Committee were informed of the latest position with regard to the Environment Budget for 2004/05 following the formal approval of the Council's budget.

The Director of Environment reported that while the outturn figures for 2003/4 had not been finalised, an underspend of approximately £371,000 was expected to be brought forward. This had mainly arisen due to problems with staff recruitment. Brief comments on the 2003/04 outturn including commentary on overspends and underspends within various budget headings, were detailed in the report.

He further reported that Council had approved a budget of £23,369,485 for the Environment Programme Area which included allocations of £1,154,000 for Central Support Services. This total had increased by £314,250 by a transfer from the Property Programme Area following the reallocation of staff costs arising out of the improving service exercise. The total budget therefore became £23,683,485. In addition to the effects of inflation, Council had made a number of adjustments to the 2004/5 Environment Budget, namely in the areas of property related insurance; the Waste Management PFI contract and the one-off use of reserves for highway maintenance.

**RESOLVED: That the report on the Environment Revenue budget 2003/4 and 2004/5 be noted.**

#### **10. BEST VALUE REVIEWS IMPLEMENTATION OF IMPROVEMENT PLANS**

The Committee received a report on the remaining actions and the exceptions to the programmed progress in the improvement plans resulting from the reviews of Development Control, Public Conveniences, Public Rights of Way and Highway Maintenance.

Programmed actions in the various improvement plans were detailed in Appendix 1 to the report.

During the course of discussion the Committee noted that improvements were being made to the website access for planning services and that a full scale review of the website would be undertaken by ICT Services. Good use had been made of the website during the Unitary Development Plan (UDP) consultation. The Committee discussed whether the 'By When' date in appendix 1, should be reviewed to improve the objectivity of the review particularly when it was known that the original date would not be met. The Director of Environment reported that it was important to indicate to Members when planned action targets had slipped.

**RESOLVED: That the report on the implementation of the Best Value Review Improvement Plans be noted.**

**11. MONITORING OF 2003/04 PERFORMANCE INDICATORS FULL YEAR APRIL 2003 TO MARCH 2004**

Members were updated on progress made by the Environment Directorate for the full year April 2003 to March 2004 towards achieving all of the performance indicators/targets which appeared in the Council's Performance Plan.

The report of the targeted performance was attached to the report at Appendix 1.

The Committee debated the performance figures and noted that over time a number of target criteria had changed. The Director of Environment highlighted that this now caused difficulties, particularly in relation to BV97a & b - Condition of non-principal roads – as this target formed part of the Council's Local Public Service Agreement (LPSA). Local targets were regularly revised to ensure that they were meaningful and attainable.

**RESOLVED: That the monitoring report in relation to the 2003/2004 local and national performance indicators be noted.**

**12. HEREFORDSHIRE PLAN AMBITIONS - CONTRIBUTION MADE BY THE ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE**

The Committee were advised of the Directorate's contribution to the ambitions contained within the Herefordshire Plan, in particular those relating to "protecting and improving Herefordshire's distinctive environment" and "developing an integrated transport system for Herefordshire".

The Director of Environment reported that the Herefordshire Plan was the Community Strategy for the County. The mechanism for implementing the Plan was through 10 Ambition Groups established to deliver each of the ambitions in the Plan. While the Directorate principally contributed to the Environment Ambition Group and the Transport Ambition Group, contributions had also been made to the work of a number of other Ambition Groups. The achievements and the work undertaken had been detailed in the report.

In the course of scrutinising the report the Committee noted the following principal points:

- The number of Countryside Stewardship Schemes continued to grow. By utilising external funding (50% match funding for 3 years) the Directorate had, through the appointment of a Countryside Advisor (Archaeology), been able to provide advice and guidance to the farming community on conservation

measures that may promote elements of the historic environment in stewardship.

- The Head of Planning Services reported that while bids for Parish Plan funding had closed, a new funding scheme by the Countryside Agency or its successor was anticipated. This would not affect the level of support given by the Council to Parish Councils in assisting them to complete their Parish Plans. He also reported that while the planning views of all parishes were fed into the planning process, this was made easier when there was a relevant Parish Plan. The Cabinet Member (Highways and Transportation) reported that Cabinet was due to receive a report on the Parish Plans Protocol, a document that outlined the relationship between Herefordshire Council and Parishes when working on their Parish Plans and the procedures that should be followed.
- The Lead Planner Transportation briefly reported upon the level of Rural Bus Grant and the level of budget support given to both rural and urban bus transportation.

**RESOLVED: That the report on the Herefordshire Plan Ambitions – Contribution made by the Environment Directorate be noted.**

The meeting ended at 12.02 p.m.

**CHAIRMAN**

The Chairman reported that Mr John Colyer, Transportation Manager, would be retiring at the end of July 2004. The Committee thanked him for his service to the Council and wished him a long and happy retirement..

**MINUTES of the meeting of Environment Scrutiny Committee held at The Council Chamber, Brockington, 35 Hafod Road, Hereford on Wednesday, 23rd June, 2004 at 10.00 a.m.**

**Present:** Councillor J.H.R. Goodwin (Chairman)  
Councillor W.L.S. Bowen (Vice Chairman)

Councillors: G.W. Davis, K.G. Grumbley, P.E. Harling, T.W. Hunt, R. Mills and J.W. Newman

**In attendance:** Councillors J.W. Edwards, P.J. Edwards, D.J. Fleet, J.W. Hope, Mrs. R.F. Lincoln, Ms. G.A. Powell, J. Stone, W.J.S. Thomas and R.M. Wilson (Cabinet Member – Highways and Transportation)

**13. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were received from Councillors P. J. Dauncey, Mrs. A. Gray and Miss. F. Short.

**14. NAMED SUBSTITUTES**

Councillor G. Lucas substituted for Councillor Mrs. A. Gray.

**15. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

No declarations of interest were made.

**16. REVIEW OF THE VOLUNTARY CODE OF PRACTICE FOR THE USE OF POLYTUNNELS IN HEREFORDSHIRE**

The Committee considered the findings of the Polytunnel Review Working Group following the review of the Voluntary Code of Practice for the use of Poly tunnels in Herefordshire.

The Chairman reminded the Committee that Cabinet on 6th February, 2003, had adopted a Voluntary Code of Practice for the use of polytunnels and agreed that the Code be reviewed after 12 months. On 23rd January 2004, the Committee had established a Poly tunnel Review Working Group to look at the Code and agreed a scoping statement, which included the terms of reference for the review.

The Chairman of the Poly tunnel Review Working Group, Councillor T. W. Hunt, took the Committee through the report on a page by page basis and particularly highlighted the following:

- the methodology used in the review;
- the scope of concerns or questions raised and the range of evidence gathered.
- the advice received concerning the legal position, especially in relation to the 'temporary' nature of polytunnels, (section 5) and the planning position, (section 6) especially concerning the procedure for when a planning application would be required (section 6.1.7).

- that sufficiently robust statistical detail could not be established for the Working Group to draw any final conclusion on the effect on the economic and tourism sectors in the County (Sections 7.2.13 & 9.1.1);
- that despite claims by objectors, other local authorities did not seem to have the range of issues concerning polytunnels encountered in Herefordshire (Section 7.3).
- Information from DEFRA indicated that the use of polytunnels did not impact any more on soil health than soft fruit grown in open fields (Section 7.4).
- That the Working Group suggested the distance from the nearest elevation of any dwelling (currently 30 metres) be extended to 50 metres subject to the retention of the current stipulation that 'this be subject to variation of that distance by agreement with that neighbour'. He emphasised that the Review Group wished to see the encouragement of good neighbourliness and communication between grower and local resident and vice versa (Sections 7.8.1 & 9.1.4.4).
- It was proposed that in view of the constant advances in polythene technology and growing methods the Code be reviewed in 12 months (Section 7.15.6 & 9.1.5).

The Working Group Chairman thanked the public, growers and organisations who had contributed their views or comments to the review.

The principal conclusions from the review, detailed at Section 9, were that:

- A revised and strengthened Code should operate to regulate the temporary use of polytunnels
- The distance between polytunnels and the closest dwelling should be increased from 30 to 50 metres
- Farmers should, where possible, consider the use of less reflective, coloured, plastic
- Polytunnels can only be used on the same site for a maximum of two years – subject to the polythene covering being removed for at least six months in each 12-month period. Longer uses would require planning permission.
- Polythene sheeting removed from frames after use must either be stored away from public view or removed and recycled.
- Farmers proposing to use polytunnels on their land must submit a "landscape impact statement" which would inform the Council of measures taken to mitigate the impact.
- That the voluntary code be reviewed again in a year's time.

The Committee debated the report and noted that a comparison had been made with the wirescape in Hop yards, many of which had been in place for many years and had therefore weathered. It was anticipated that polytunnel hoops should over time blend in more as the metal aged. Comment was made that there should be adequate policing of the Code both in terms of enforcing the Code to ensure compliance and monitoring to ascertain statistics.

The Committee also noted that while information had been sought from other Authorities little had been received and therefore the Working Group had had to assume that those authorities had not encountered the issue of polytunnels in their areas.

The Committee further noted that the Working Group concluded that the 'siting of polytunnels be restricted to 2 years'. Reference was made to correspondence received following publication of the Group's report on the issue of the expected life of strawberry plants, (the growing period). In view of the correspondence the



Committee suggested that the Cabinet Member may wish to give further consideration to the claim that in some instances the growing period may be up to 3 years.

The Chairman referred to a letter dated 21st June from P. Keetch MP who proposed 'pressing government ministers to provide the guidance and powers which are lacking' in relation to polytunnels. The Chairman of the Working Group confirmed that little government guidance on the issue had been available (Section 6.1.3) and that the Council had made renewed efforts to bring the issue of 'temporary structures' to the government's attention (Section 7.3.9). The Cabinet Member (Environment) confirmed that he would be taking up this matter with government ministers.

The Director of Environment commented that as this was effectively the second year of operating the Code he anticipated there would be a reduction in visible plastic at certain sites as polytunnels should now start to be moved to new locations, as part of the rotation process.

The Cabinet Member (Environment) thanked the Polytunnel Review Working Group and the Committee for undertaking the review and commented that this had been an excellent example of the scrutiny review process.

**RESOLVED: That subject to the Cabinet Member (Environment) giving further consideration to the growing period the conclusions contained in the Polytunnel Review Working Group report be endorsed and the report submitted to the Cabinet Member (Environment) for consideration.**

The meeting ended at 11.09 a.m.

**CHAIRMAN**



**CAPITAL BUDGET MONITORING****Report By: DIRECTOR OF THE ENVIRONMENT****Purpose**

1. To advise Members on the progress of the 2004/05 Capital Programme for Environment Areas within the overall context of the Herefordshire Council Capital Programme.

**Financial Implications**

2. Capital Budgets for the Environment Programme Areas for 2004/05 are shown in Appendix 1, on an individual basis, with funding arrangements indicated in overall terms.
3. The total of the Capital Programme has been reduced from £12,643,720 notified to the previous meeting (see Appendix 1) to £12,009,519. The variations are as follows; -

- (a) Approval of four schemes as part of the Prudential Borrowing arrangement

	<b>£000</b>
Hereford Crematorium	100
Leominster Closed Landfil	45
Site Monitoring Infrastructure	
Extension to Hereford Cemetery	100
Improvements to Public	
Conveniences	<u>150</u>
	<u>395</u>

- (b) The Urban Bus challenge of £774,000 was incorrectly included as an expenditure item with funding. The Challenge finished in 2003/04.
- (c) Completing the Jigsaw capital grant £68,385 and Safety Camera installation are funding brought forward from 2003/04.
- (d) New contributions are anticipated for Legion Way Bus Stops (£6,000) and Cycle Network (£20,000).
- (e) The amount of Objective 2 funding available for addition to the Roman Road scheme in 2004/5 has been confirmed at £170,000. This represents a transfer of planned funding from the Rotherwas Access Road scheme.
- (f) The amount shown for the Friar Street scheme is now included as part of the traffic calming scheme budget.

## Considerations

4. The report has been largely based on the third round of capital monitoring, which involved an examination of all schemes at the end of July 2004. Care is being taken to ensure the forecast spend accurately reflects the expected spend in 2004/05. The overall spending position is being kept under careful review by the Environment General capital-working Group.
5. The actual spend against each scheme is shown as at 31st July 2004.
6. The total spent or committed to 31st July date is £4.812 million or 39% of the Revised Forecast.

## Notes on individual schemes.

7. It is anticipated that because of the need to obtain a compulsory purchase order spending on the Rotherwas Access Road will be significantly less than forecast in 2004/5. The spending forecasts will need to be reviewed to take account of this situation.

## RECOMMENDATION

**THAT the report be noted.**

## BACKGROUND PAPERS

- None identified.

ENVIRONMENT GENERAL CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2004/5

Appendix 1

	Original Budget 2004/5	Revised Forecast 2004/5	Change in Forecast	Total spent to 31/07/04	Total committed to 31/7/04	Total spent or committed at 31/7/04	% spent or committed
	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	%
<b>LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN</b>							
<b>Hereford Integrated Transport Strategy</b>							
<b>Walking and Access</b>							
Pedestrian Crossing Improvements	5	5		1	8	1	20.0
Pedestrian Route & Disabled Access Imps	35	35		3	8	11	31.4
<b>Cycling</b>							
Cycle Network Development	70	90	20	5	15	20	22.2
<b>Public Transport Minor Schemes</b>							
Bus Priority Measures	45	45		3	5	3	6.7
WyeS Moves	5	5			5	5	100.0
Passenger Waiting Facilities	30	30		5		5	16.7
Travel Centre	20	20					0.0
<b>Park and Ride</b>							
Christmas Park and Ride	22	22				0	0.0
Park and Ride Sites analysis	20	20				0	0.0

	Original Budget 2004/5	Revised Forecast 2004/5	Change in Forecast	Total spent to 31/07/04	Total committed to 31/7/04	Total spent or committed at 31/7/04	% spent or committed
	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	%
<b>Rotherwas Minor Schemes</b>							
Rotherwas Integrated Access	15	15	0	0	4	4	26.7
<b>Rotherwas Access Road</b>							
Rotherwas Access Road	915	425	-490	85	12	97	22.8
<b>Roman Road</b>							
Roman Road	3100	3270	170	619		619	18.9
<b>Rural Towns and Market Towns Transport Strategy Walking and Access</b>							
Pedestrian and Disabled Access Imps	15	15	0			0	0.0
Rural Footway Improvements	60	60	0	3		3	5.0
<b>Cycling</b>							
Network of Cycle Routes and Parking	80	80	0	10	3	13	16.3
<b>Public Transport Minor Schemes</b>							
Public Transport Information Access Points	35	35	0			0	0.0
Rural Bus Improvements	68	68	0			0	0.0
Passenger Waiting Facilities	40	40	0	4	4	8	20.0

	Original Budget 2004/5	Revised Forecast 2004/5	Change in Forecast	Total spent to 31/07/04	Total committed to 31/7/04	% spent or committed
	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	%
<b>Low Floor Bus Project</b>						
Rural Low Floor Bus Project	500	500		126	1	25.4
<b>Pembridge By-Pass</b>						
Pembridge By -Pass	5	5		0	0	0
<b>Countywide Strategy Hearts and Minds</b>						
Travel Awareness	35	35			35	100
Green Travel Promotions	28	28			0	
School Travel Support	25	25		1	24	100
<b>Minor Safety Schemes</b>						
Minor Safety Improvements	250	250		11	138	59.6
<b>Traffic Calming</b>						
Traffic Calming	110	113	3	6	6	10.6
<b>Safer Routes to Schools</b>						
Safer Routes to Schools inc 20mph zones	300	300		49	116	55.0

	Original Budget 2004/5	Revised Forecast 2004/5	Change in Forecast	Total spent to 31/07/04	Total committed to 31/7/04	% spent or committed
	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	%
<b>Speed Control</b>						
Safety Cameras		5	5	2	3	100.0
Village Speed Restrictions	33	33		19	14	100.0
Vehicle Activated Signs	20	20				
<b>Monitoring</b>						
Monitoring	20	20		16	4	100.0
<b>Highways Maintenance</b>						
Capitalised Maintenance of Principal Roads	1,200	1,200		130	317	37.3
Capitalised Maintenance of Non Principal Roads	3,272	3,272		475	1,841	70.8
Footways	550	550		42	120	29.5
<b>Bridge Maintenance</b>						
Capitalised Assessment & Strength of Bridges	500	500		61	215	55.2
Transport Staff costs allocated over LTP	301	301			301	100



	Original Budget 2004/5 £000	Revised Forecast 2004/5 £000	Change in Forecast £000	Total spent to 31/07/04 £000	Total committed 31/7/04 £000	Total spent or committed £000	% spent or committed %
<b>Non LTP SCHEMES</b>							
Hereford Crematorium		100	100		0	0	0
Leominster Closed Landfill Monitoring Infrastructure		45	45		0	0	0
Extension to Hereford Cemetary		100	100		0	0	0
Public Convenience Improvements		150	150		0	0	0
Legion Way Bus stop		6	6		0	0	0
Completing the Jigsaw		68	68	9	9	13.2	13.2
Sect 106 Friar St	38		-38				
LPSA improving road safety	7	7	0		0	0	0
LPSA improving road safety	96	96	0		0	0	0
Urban Bus Challenge WyeSMoves	774		-774		0	0	0
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURE</b>	<b>12,644</b>	<b>12,009</b>	<b>-635</b>	<b>1,676</b>	<b>3,195</b>	<b>4,871</b>	<b>40.6</b>

<b>FUNDING</b>	<b>Original Budget 2004/5 £000</b>	<b>Revised Forecast 2004/5 £000</b>	<b>Change in Forecast £000</b>
Supported Capital Expenditure Revenue	11,072	11,072	0
Prudential Borrowing		395	395
Safety Cameras Installation		5	5
Objective 2 Rotherwas Integrated Access	15	15	0
Cycle Network Level		20	20
Objective 2 Rural Transport Strategy	62	62	0
Objective 2 Rotherwas Access Road	490	0	-490
Objective 2 Roman Road	0	170	170
Objective 2 - SRTS	35	35	0
LPSA	103	103	0
Private Developers	93	58	-35
Urban Bus Challenge	774	0	-774
Completing the jigsaw		68	68
Legion way		6	6
<b>TOTAL FUNDING AVAILABLE</b>	<b>12,644</b>	<b>12,009</b>	<b>-635</b>

**ENVIRONMENT REVENUE BUDGET MONITORING****Report By: DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENT****Purpose**

1. To advise members of Budget Monitoring the position for the Environment Programme Area budgets for the period to 31st July 2004. The report lists the variations against budget at this stage in the year.

**Financial Implications**

2. It is expected that all budget variances will be contained within the overall 2004/05 revenue budget for Environment. Some pressure areas have been identified below but where necessary, management action will be taken to contain these pressures.

**Considerations**

3. The report on Budget Monitoring is attached at Appendix 1 for Members' consideration.
4. The total Environment Budget for 2004/05 is the amount reported to the last meeting of the Committee which was £23,369,485 plus the carry forward of £371,000 from 2003/04 and a further transfer to the Property Programme Area of £39,880 following the reallocation of staff costs arising out of the improving the service exercise. The total Environment Budget is therefore £23,700,605.
5. The Budget carry forward from 2003/04 has been allocated as follows;-

	<b>£000</b>
Planning	
Development Grant	165
Document Management System	78
Scanning Back Histories to 1977	25
Scanning Equipment	15
Developing Website	10
UDP Enquiry Costs	60
Local Biological Records Centre	22
Hereford Urban Archaeological Database	18
Buildings at Risk Survey	18
Other Planning issues	26
Environment Regularity	31
Highways and Transportation	<u>-97</u>

371

6. At this very early stage in the year an underspending of £830,000 is predicted for 2004/05. The three main elements for this underspending are the Waste PFI contract and planning fee income and staff savings.

## Environment General

7. No particular budget issues have been identified so far, with the exception of Waste Disposal.
8. The Waste Disposal P.F.I contract budget is expected to be underspent by around £500,000 largely due to the sums included for additional costs following renegotiation not being required until 2005/06 and 2006/07. In addition the costs for the existing contract are anticipated as being lower than the budget assuming existing volumes are maintained. Any underspending will be transferred to the Council's General Reserves in line with current policy.

## Environment Regulatory

9. The spending on these services looks very much in line with the budget at present. It is expected that staff vacancies will generate underspendings of at least £30,000 during the year.

## Environment Planning

10. We continued during the first four months of the year to receive income in excess of the budget. Additional Building control income (£50,000) and Development Fee income (£110,000) was received in this period. The level of staff vacancies suggest significant staff savings during 2004/05.
11. Even if the fee income is not as buoyant in the remainder of the year, a net underspending of at least £300,000 is likely for 2004/05.
12. The amount carried forward from the 2003/04 Planning Delivery Grant of £164,000.

## RECOMMENDATION

**THAT the Revenue Budget Monitoring Report for 2004/05 be noted subject to the comments which members may wish to make.**

## BACKGROUND PAPERS

- None identified.

**ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME AREA BUDGETS Summary**

**APPENDIX 1**

	Budget 2004/5	Actual to	Projected	Variance
	£	31st July 2004	Outturn 2004/5	£
	£	£	£	
Environment Regulatory	2,518,680	718,261	2,488,680	-30,000
Environment General				
Highways	7,616,590	1,793,951	7,616,590	0
Transportation	2,079,570	279,387	2,079,570	0
Other Services	7,892,095	544,021	7,392,095	-500,000
Environment Planning	2,753,670	-94,804	2,453,670	-300,000
Central Support Costs	1,154,000	0	1,154,000	0
<b>TOTALS:</b>	<b>24,014,605</b>	<b>3,240,816</b>	<b>23,184,605</b>	<b>-830,000</b>

	Budget 04/05	Actual to	Projected	Variance
	£	31st July 2004	Outturn 2004/5	£
	£	£	£	£
<b>Environment Regulatory</b>				
<b>Operational Budgets:</b>				
Air Pollution	-32,410	-5,791	-32,410	0
Landfill/Contaminated land	143,050	53,347	143,050	0
Water Pollution	9,520	-585	9,520	0
Pest Control	-17,960	-26,919	-17,960	0
Dog Control	22,470	5,911	22,470	0
Animal Health and Welfare	1,990	-5,074	1,990	0
Licensing (inc. Taxis)	-134,950	-63,479	-134,950	0
Trading Standards	62,780	-650	62,780	0
Street Trading	-73,450	-30,957	-73,450	0
SMSS head of Env. Health & Trading Standards	75,220	14,440	75,220	0
SMSS Commercial Team	12,920	418	12,920	0
SMSS Pollution Control	17,430	9,419	17,430	0
<b>Total Operational Budgets</b>	<b>86,610</b>	<b>-49,920</b>	<b>86,610</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Staffing Budgets:</b>	<b>2,014,110</b>	<b>672,323</b>	<b>1,984,110</b>	<b>-30,000</b>
<b>Staff related Running Costs(Inc IT)</b>	<b>304,390</b>	<b>95,858</b>	<b>304,390</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Support Service Team Recharge</b>	<b>113,570</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>113,570</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Total Staff Related Budgets</b>	<b>2,432,070</b>	<b>768,181</b>	<b>2,402,070</b>	<b>-30,000</b>
<b>TOTALS ENVIRONMENT REGULATORY</b>	<b>2,518,680</b>	<b>718,261</b>	<b>2,488,680</b>	<b>-30,000</b>

	Budget 04/05 £	Actual to 31st July 2004 £	Projected Outturn 2004/5 £	Variance £
<b>Environment General</b>				
<b>Highways:</b>				
<b>Operational Budgets:</b>				
Highways - Prof. & Eng. (inc. Capitalisation)	122,100	76,687	122,100	0
Highways - Roads Mtce. (See attached)	3,422,220	676,533	3,422,220	0
Highways - NRSWA	-114,620	-35,209	-114,620	0
Highways- Winter Mtce.	451,230	145,329	451,230	0
Highways - Drainage/Flood Alleviation	135,440	68,080	135,440	0
Highways - Street lighting	758,370	20,064	758,370	0
Highways - Bridgeworks	65,300	6,927	65,300	0
Highways - Public Rights of Way	218,020	81,354	218,020	0
Highways - Shopmobility	15,910	2,232	15,910	0
Highways - Car Parking	-1,170,390	-318,614	-1,170,390	0
Highways - DeCrim. Parking	-483,010	-208,733	-483,010	0
Highways - Highways Cleansing	781,020	232,495	781,020	0
Highways - Public Conveniences	294,890	124,550	294,890	0
<b>Total Operational Budgets</b>	<b>4,496,480</b>	<b>871,695</b>	<b>4,496,480</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Staffing Budgets:</b>	<b>2,313,630</b>	<b>807,593</b>	<b>2,313,630</b>	<b>0</b>
Staffing-related Running Costs (Inc. IT)	522,550	114,663	522,550	0
Support Service Team Recharge ( to be apportioned between Transportation and other Environment Services)	283,930	0	283,930	0
<b>Total Staff Related Budgets</b>	<b>3,120,110</b>	<b>922,256</b>	<b>3,120,110</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Total Highways</b>	<b>7,616,590</b>	<b>1,793,951</b>	<b>7,616,590</b>	<b>0</b>

<b>Transportation:</b>	<b>Budget 04/05</b>	<b>Actual to 31st July 2004</b>	<b>Projected outturn 2004/5</b>	<b>Variance</b>
<b>Operational Budgets:</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>
Transport - Prof. & Admin. Staff (incl. Capital)	-315,520	36,993	-315,520	0
Transport - Public Transport (inc. Rural Bus)	805,710	-4,833	805,710	0
Transport - Design and Planning	28,270	-26,113	28,270	0
Transport - Traffic Management	80,300	-4,458	80,300	0
Transport - Road Safety	1,080	-1,405	1,080	0
Transport - School Crossing Patrols	2,190	1,000	2,190	0
Transport - Bus Stations	-13,420	-13,099	-13,420	0
Transport - Concessionary Travel	303,060	-16,934	303,060	0
Transport - Searches	-1,570	3,254	-1,570	0
Transport - Section 38 Fees	-41,550	-23,074	-41,550	0
<b>Total Operational Budgets</b>	<b>848,550</b>	<b>-48,669</b>	<b>848,550</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Staffing Budgets:</b>	<b>1,106,870</b>	<b>289,435</b>	<b>1,106,870</b>	<b>0</b>
Staffing-related Running Costs (Inc. IT)	124,150	38,621	124,150	0
<b>Total Staff Related Budgets</b>	<b>1,231,020</b>	<b>328,056</b>	<b>1,231,020</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Total Transportation</b>	<b>2,079,570</b>	<b>279,387</b>	<b>2,079,570</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Waste/Other:</b>				
<b>Operational Budgets:</b>				
Waste Collection (Domestic)	2,766,840	444,067	2,766,840	0
Waste Collection (Trade)	-93,300	-332,024	-93,300	0
Waste Management	51,890	6,536	51,890	0
Waste Disposal	4,750,730	381,626	4,250,730	-500,000
Recycling	140,360	-11,043	140,360	0
Travellers Sites	-65,290	-22,740	-65,290	0
Cemeteries	55,390	-22,275	55,390	0
Crematorium	-257,570	-77,099	-257,570	0
<b>Total Operational Budgets</b>	<b>7,349,050</b>	<b>367,048</b>	<b>6,849,050</b>	<b>-500,000</b>
<b>Staffing Budgets:</b>	<b>417,440</b>	<b>127,740</b>	<b>417,440</b>	<b>0</b>
Staffing-related Running Costs (Inc. IT)	125,605	49,233	125,605	0
<b>Total Staff Related Budgets</b>	<b>543,045</b>	<b>176,973</b>	<b>543,045</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Total Waste /Other</b>	<b>7,892,095</b>	<b>544,021</b>	<b>7,392,095</b>	<b>-500,000</b>
<b>TOTAL ENVIRONMENT General</b>	<b>17,588,255</b>	<b>2,617,359</b>	<b>17,088,255</b>	<b>-500,000</b>



	Budget 2004/5	Actual to	Projected	Variance
	£	31st July 2004	Outturn 2004/5	£
	£	£	£	£
<b>Environment Planning</b>				
<b>Operational Budgets:</b>				
<b>Building Control</b>				
Building Control Fees	-609,680	-259,642	-709,680	-100,000
Building Control costs	14,320	2,586	14,320	0
<b>Development Control</b>				
Development Control Fees	-850,940	-446,257	-1,050,940	-200,000
Development Control costs	19,660	15,185	19,660	0
<b>Forward Planning</b>				
	83,800	28,282	83,800	0
<b>Conservation</b>				
Conservation Grants	64,140	-24,839	64,140	0
Conservation Management	45,280	-79,817	45,280	0
<b>Management and Administration</b>				
	414,490	-370,410	414,490	0
<b>Total Operational Budgets</b>	<b>-818,930</b>	<b>-1,134,912</b>	<b>-1,118,930</b>	<b>-300,000</b>
<b>Staffing Budgets:</b>				
	2,950,720	959,512	2,950,720	0
<b>Staffing-related Running Costs (Inc. IT)</b>	<b>531,020</b>	<b>80,596</b>	<b>531,020</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Support Service Team recharge</b>	<b>90,860</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>90,860</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Total Staff Related Budgets</b>	<b>3,572,600</b>	<b>1,040,108</b>	<b>3,572,600</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>TOTAL ENVIRONMENT PLANNING</b>	<b>2,753,670</b>	<b>-94,804</b>	<b>2,453,670</b>	<b>-300,000</b>



# HEREFORDSHIRE'S SECOND LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN

**Report By: Director of Environment**

## Wards Affected

County-wide

## Purpose

1. To consider the consultation draft Local Transport Plan Guidance (July 2004), prepared by the Department for Transport and its implications for the development of the second Herefordshire Local Transport Plan so that the Director of Environment can make a formal response on behalf of the Council.

## Financial Implications

2. None as a result of this report. The quality of the next LTP will have an impact on the future capital funding for Highways and Transportation.

## Background

3. The Transport Act 2000 sets out the statutory requirement for local highway authorities to produce and review local transport plans. The Council's first Local Transport Plan (LTP) was published in July 2000 and covers the period 2001/2 – 2005/6. The second LTP must be submitted to Government by 29 July 2005 and will cover the period 2006/7 to 2010/11
4. The LTP sets out the Council's transport objectives over its period of coverage, set in the context of a longer term vision for transport. The LTP strategy identifies how it can meet these objectives and includes a 5 year implementation programme. Monitoring the performance of the LTP is achieved through a set of national and local targets and performance indicators and is reported on each year through the Annual Progress Report.
5. The current LTP has secured over £40M for investment in transport improvements for the County in its first 4 years (up to 2004/5). This has enabled the Council to deliver important highways and transport improvements including:
  - (Capital) Highway maintenance;
  - Bridge repairs and replacement such as the new bridge at Bridge Sollers;
  - 40 new low floor buses improving quality and accessibility for bus users;
  - re-furbished bus stations in Hereford and Leominster,
  - new cycle routes and cycle parking;
  - better access for pedestrians; and

---

Further information on the subject of this report is available from Steve Burgess, Team Leader (Transportation Planning) on 01432 260968

- road safety improvements that have significantly reduced the most serious accidents.

## Report

6. The Department for Transport issued consultation draft guidance on the preparation of the next LTP on 2 August 2004. Responses must be made by 8 October 2004. A copy of the guidance (as summarised by the DfT) is included at **Appendix 1**. The full guidance can be made available on request.
7. The key changes from the guidance provided for the current LTP are:
  - There will be a greater emphasis on the **Shared Priorities** for local government, particularly in respect of setting objectives and targets. The transport specific shared priorities are:
    - Tackling congestion;
    - Delivering accessibility;
    - Safer roads; and
    - Better air quality.
  - **LTP Funding and the 'Planning Guidelines'**. It is proposed to issue highway authorities with formula-derived spending guidelines indicating the approximate level of Integrated Transport Block funding that will be available for their LTP. Consultation is taking place separately on the criteria and weighting to be used in the formula. There will, however, remain an element of performance rated funding and this could result in an increase or reduction in funding (from the guideline) of up to 25%.
  - **Major Scheme Thresholds**. Currently, major schemes have to be at least £5M, however, it is acknowledged that smaller authorities that receive a smaller overall allocation often have difficulty funding individual schemes that cost from £2.5M -£5M. A list of eligible authorities and individual thresholds will be published alongside the planning guidelines (see above) in late 2004. The guidance goes on to state that 'only the smallest LTP areas – most of them unitary authorities developing their own plan – would be likely to gain support for schemes through this route.' Herefordshire Council may well fall into this category and be able to take advantage of this new opportunity for funding.
  - **Accessibility Strategies**. Accessibility can be defined as the extent to which someone living in a particular location is able to get to work, school, healthcare, food shops and other services. The Government has identified accessibility planning as a way of identifying how access to such services can be improved. The Council must develop an 'accessibility strategy' which will identify priorities for improving access and help inform the development of the LTP. In developing the accessibility strategy the Council will need to work closely with key partners and service providers to look at the issue of accessibility as widely as possible. DfT recognises that this leaves a short timescale for a significant area of work and has indicated that there will be a further opportunity to refine the accessibility strategy by the end of 2005 (after the LTP submission in July 2005).

- **Transport Asset Management Plans (TAMPs).** The guidance indicates that authorities should draw up Transport Asset Management Plans (TAMPs), which will help plan the maintenance of, and improvements to the highway network. The assessment of the LTP will take this into account.
- **Air Quality Action Plans and Rights of Way Improvement Plans.** These will be incorporated into the LTP process. The Council has designated an Air Quality Management Area based on the A49 in Hereford and is also developing the Rights of Way Improvement Plan for the County. Both will need to be properly integrated with the LTP.
- **Strategic Environmental Assessment.** The LTP will also need to include an Environmental Report that identifies its environmental impacts. There is a requirement for this Report to be included as part of the consultation carried out with local stakeholders.

## Matters for Consideration

8. **Implications of the Proposed Changes to Funding.** It is unclear at present what impact the introduction of a formula based allocation for the integrated transport block funding will have on the level of funding for Herefordshire. However, there are concerns that the formula may favour urban authorities with more densely populated settlements. The Transport Planning Team is carrying out further assessment of the proposal as additional details emerge from DfT, however, it is important that concerns regarding the proposal are included in any response the Council makes to the consultation on the draft Guidance if the formula is not clarified in the meantime. The proposed changes to the Major Scheme thresholds presents a good opportunity for the Council to secure additional transport funding and should be welcomed. It will be important for the Council to seek to ensure that it will be amongst the highway authorities which would be eligible for the reduced threshold Major Scheme funding.
9. **Emphasis on Urban Issues.** There is a general emphasis throughout the draft Guidance on urban issues and solutions, such as road pricing, which might be more appropriate in densely populated urban settlements. This is also reflected in possible changes to the integrated transport block allocation referred to above. In responding to the draft Guidance it will be important to highlight this concern and ensure that the Government gives full consideration to rural issues.
10. **Significantly Increased Workload.** The draft Guidance has arrived at a relatively late stage in terms of the production of the next LTP, which must be completed by July 2005. It introduces a number of new requirements, outlined above, which will themselves generate new work. There are legitimate concerns that the timescale for completing the LTP and the additional supporting work, including the preparation of an accessibility strategy, strategic environmental assessment and transport asset management plan, may not be sufficient to enable thorough consideration of all matters. The Council's response to this consultation should clearly highlight this key area of concern.

## PROGRESS REPORT ON LTP2

### 11. Work so far includes:

- Considering Draft guidance on LTP and a range of related matters including Accessibility Planning and Strategic Environmental Assessment.

- Initial consultations have taken place including a Members Seminar, presentations to the Transport Wider Reference Group and other transport forums. Preparation of a consultation leaflet for wider based consultation is underway.
- LTP2 work is also being publicised through the Council's website which is also being used to help with consultation.
- Presentations to the Local Forums have been scheduled for September.
- The work programme for delivery of LTP2 is currently being refined in light of the guidance requirements.

## RECOMMENDATION

**THAT;**

- (a) **Members note the content of this report and the draft LTP Guidance summary included at Appendix 1, and**
- (b) **the Committee consider whether it wishes to comment on the implications of the consultation draft Local Transport Plan Guidance prior to consideration and submission of a formal response by the Cabinet Member (Highways and Transport) and the Director of Environment.**

## BACKGROUND PAPERS

- None identified.

## ENVIRONMENT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 17 SEPTEMBER 2004

### APPENDIX 1: SHORTER GUIDANCE FOR SECOND LOCAL TRANSPORT PLANS (AS SUMMARISED BY DEPARTMENT FOR TRANSPORT)

#### DRAFT FOR CONSULTATION, JULY 2004

1. *Note: This short form of the LTP guidance is aimed at a wide audience, including local authority members and senior officers, and their key partners and stakeholders. The Department is also preparing separate full guidance aimed at those directly responsible for compiling new LTPs. This version of the LTP Guidance is a draft for consultation.*

#### The central / local government context

2. The Government wants to deliver sustainable improvements in economic performance, social inclusion, and a better quality of life. Achieving these aims requires
  - co-ordinated planning and action across many agendas, including education and skills, housing, regeneration and other infrastructure
  - funding to match the desired outcomes
  - transformation of the way services are delivered to the public – putting the emphasis on the customer's and user's experience.
3. This is the context in which the Government approaches transport. In particular, it means
  - being clear that transport is, ultimately, one of a combination of factors contributing to sustainable economic growth and social inclusion: it is not an end in itself
  - recognising the responsibility of central government to decide on levels of public spending, national priorities and to set national strategic objectives.
  - providing structures for regional and local determination of issues best dealt with at that level, and the freedom to tailor solutions to reflect local circumstances.
4. The Government published its **overall transport strategy** 'The Future of Transport' in July, taking forward the strategy originally set out in 2000 (The Ten Year Plan for Transport). This recognises the vital role that improving mobility plays in meeting the wider objectives for the economy and an inclusive society. The Government wants to ensure that we can benefit from greater mobility and access, while minimising the impact on other people and the environment, now and in the future. The strategy is built around three central themes:
  - **sustained investment** over the long term whilst ensuring that each pound of investment works harder for the British taxpayer;
  - **improvements in transport management**, to achieve better value for money from both existing and new infrastructure. The Government will encourage local authorities to procure bus services through Quality Contracts, where this

is linked to a wider strategy including bold measures to reduce congestion, or modification of rail services.

- **planning ahead** of transport policies and programmes. Britain cannot build its way out of the problems it faces on its road networks, and doing nothing is not an option. So the Government will lead the debate on road pricing. The Government is also committed to sharing decision-making with regional and local stakeholders, ensuring that planning at regional and local levels is based on a shared view of priorities, deliverability and affordability.
5. Delivering better transport depends in large part on the planning and delivery of transport by local authorities in England, in support of authorities' wider agendas. The shared priority which the Government has agreed with the Local Government Association captures the continuing aims: **Improving access to jobs and services, particularly for those most in need, in ways which are sustainable: improved public transport; reduced problems of congestion, pollution and safety.**
  6. Alongside the Government's strategies in 'The Future of Transport' for aviation, railways and strategic roads, the key strategies to help local government deliver these outcomes are:
    - freer flowing local roads delivered through measures such as congestion charging;
    - more, and more reliable, buses - enjoying more road space;
    - demand responsive bus services that provide accessibility in areas that cannot support conventional services;
    - looking at ways to make services more accessible, so that people have a real choice about when and how they travel;
    - promoting the use of school travel plans, workplace travel plans and personalised journey planning to encourage people to consider alternatives to using their cars; and
    - creating a culture and improved quality of local environment so that cycling and walking are seen as an attractive alternative to car travel for short journeys, particularly for children.
  6. The Transport Act 2000 gave local authorities a statutory requirement to produce Local Transport Plans, in the light of guidance issued by the Government. This paper provides guidance for the second round of LTPs, covering the years 2006-07 to 2010-11. It reflects the principles of the Government's transport strategy, and, together with the accompanying full guidance for LTP practitioners, replaces the guidance issued in March 2000 for the first round of LTPs, covering the five years up to 2005-06.
  8. As part of delivering its transport strategy, the Government will expect high-quality LTPs from all authorities required to prepare one, and will aim to help authorities develop their LTPs through direct engagement.

### **What makes a good LTP**

9. The LTP system aims to encourage high quality planning and delivery of local transport, and also to provide a basis for tracking performance locally. This new guidance accordingly puts emphasis on 4 key themes:
  - **setting transport in a wider context**
  - **locally relevant targets**



- **identifying the best value for money solutions**
- **indicators and trajectories**

#### ***A) Setting transport in a wider context***

10. This is necessary both to inform the transport agenda, but also to ensure that plans for regeneration and housing development are informed by realistic expectations about transport improvements. Many of the first round of LTPs were weak in this respect. This guidance places more emphasis on the need to:

- **set the LTP in the context of the regional economic and spatial strategies, and the local vision for the area;**
- **provide a longer term strategy**, within which the 5 year implementation plan is set;
- **take a realistic view of transport investment.** To facilitate this, this guidance explains the Government's intention to issue guideline budget allocations this autumn, to inform the construction of plans. LTPs should identify what can be delivered within these budgets;
- **work across authority boundaries**, reflecting the need to address some transport issues over a wider geographical area, such as travel to work areas. In some cases it will be sensible for local authorities to produce joint plans. Metropolitan districts need to ensure that their input to the plans reflects the contribution they can make as highway authorities, for example to PTE bus priority schemes;
- **develop the LTP in partnership with stakeholders and partners.**

#### ***B) Locally relevant targets***

11. First round LTPs often appeared to set targets on the back of predetermined transport investment plans, rather than addressing the harder question of what transport targets needed to be set in order to support economic growth and social inclusion. Targets in the second round should:

- **visibly support local targets for sustainable economic growth, housing, and social inclusion;**
- **relate to outcomes, rather the inputs or outputs;**
- **focus on the shared priorities - congestion, accessibility, safety and air quality** - as well as other locally important **quality of life outcomes** such as health and liveability;
- **take account of national targets for road safety, public transport patronage and air quality, but should be tailored to local circumstances;**
- **be challenging but realistic.**

#### ***C) Identifying the best value for money solutions***

12. The plan should demonstrate how an authority will deliver its targets. The plan should :

- **make full use of the growing evidence base on what works**, in particular on programmes which change behaviour;
- **make best use of existing infrastructure**, including through efficient maintenance and management of the local road network ;
- **avoid focussing on capital investment at the expense of other innovative solutions**. Packages of complementary measures, with measures to address both demand and supply, should be considered, including the new opportunities for supporting strategies to tackle congestion in towns and cities contained in 'The Future of Transport';
- **be underpinned with analysis of local problems and opportunities**, both now and in the future. There is a new requirement to include **accessibility analysis** and an **accessibility strategy**, on which separate detailed advice is being provided.

#### ***D) Indicators and trajectories***

13. The Plan should set trajectories for the key targets, as a platform for tracking progress locally, and securing additional funding for delivering against the plan, including:

- **outcome targets and trajectories for a number of mandatory and locally relevant indicators**. Mandatory targets and indicators will provide greater consistency and robustness in assessing performance. Views on which indicators should be mandatory are being sought as part of the consultation on this draft guidance. The mandatory indicators will be confirmed in the final guidance;
- **targets for intermediate outcomes and outcomes for contributory measures**.

#### **LTP funding**

14. The Plan also serves other purposes - in particular, it influences the allocation of LTP funding to local authorities. There are three elements of LTP funding: capital maintenance; the integrated transport block; and major schemes.

15. As was the case in the first LTP period, the allocations for **maintenance** in the second LTP period will generally be made by formula. The Government also proposes to make 75% of the **integrated transport block indicative** allocations on a formula basis. We are working with the Local Government Association and local authorities to develop a proposal for the formula, and transitional arrangements, over the coming months. The proposed formula will provide the basis for guideline budgets to be issued to local authorities in the autumn, to inform the LTP development process - at which point we will also start a formal consultation on the formula. The Government also wants to incentivise good LTPs, and so 25% of the final block allocations will be allocated on the basis of the quality of submitted plans, and an assessment of the deliverability of those plans in the light of past performance.

16. The Government's assessment of authorities' LTPs will focus on the **quality of planning** against the 4 key themes and each of the best practice points highlighted above. Account will be taken of **the degree of challenge in the locally determined targets**. The Government will be discussing the methodology for its assessment with the Audit Commission. More detailed advice on how planners might tackle these issues is included in the more detailed guidance published in parallel with this document.
17. Decisions on funding for **major schemes** will continue to be taken during the LTP period. The targets that authorities set in their plans should be on the basis of no new major schemes beyond those currently provisionally or fully approved. LTPs should nevertheless provide details of any major schemes an authority expects to submit over the LTP period, how they contribute to meeting the authority's longer term strategy, and how they would impact on the targets. If a new major is subsequently approved, some adjustment of the targets and trajectories may be required, though in most cases the impacts may not be significant within the plan period. Where more than one new major scheme is anticipated in an LTP area, the LTP should indicate priorities, with reasons.

### **Performance Assessment**

19. The Audit Commission will assess the quality of the Plan as part of its **corporate assessment**, under the sustainable communities and transport heading. The Audit Commission will therefore also be looking for LTPs to be set in the wider context of an authority's policy for sustainable communities. The Audit Commission will also take account of Department's assessment of annual progress against the plan, as one element of its own assessment of the environmental services block, alongside progress on national Best Value Performance Indicators and Commission inspections.
20. The Department's annual assessment in 2005 and 2006 will be on the basis of delivery of the first LTP, with an increasing emphasis on delivery of outcomes against LTP targets. The first assessment under new LTPs will be in late 2007. Our aim will be to further simplify the assessment process, with a focus on tracking performance against the targets and trajectories set out in the new LTP.

### **CPA Excellent authorities**

21. Local transport authorities categorised as 'excellent' under the Comprehensive Performance Assessment are not required to submit a local transport plan in accordance with the Department's LTP guidance. Our minimum requirement from all 'excellent' authorities is submission of a set of targets relating to the mandatory indicators for the shared priority areas, with milestones for each year from 2006 to 2011, informed by the funding levels set out by the guideline budget. They should also include any other local targets that they wish to be taken into account in the Department's annual performance assessment.
22. The Government is minded to provide to 'excellent' authorities meeting the minimum requirement indicative allocations determined entirely by formula (i.e. it would not adjust allocations, either upwards or downwards, based on an assessment of the quality of transport planning). If an 'excellent' authority chooses to submit a full LTP, rather than just the minimum requirement, its LTP will be assessed according to the criteria described above for all other LTPs, and that authority will then have the opportunity to gain additional funding for a good plan.

## **Working with LAs**

23. The Government wishes to help share and promote best practice, and to offer constructive challenge, as the plans are developed. Over the past nine months the Department has had a detailed dialogue with 11 sets of local authorities, predominantly in urban areas, to inform the Spending Review process and the development of the second round of LTPs. Working with the Government Offices we propose to continue this activity throughout the production of new LTPs, and extend it to all other authorities (often in groups rather than one-to-one). This will help us understand the local issues, and will also ensure that there is a consistent approach, especially to the degree of challenge in the targets and trajectories that will subsequently be used in performance assessment.

## **Submission of plans**

24. Final plans should be submitted by the 29<sup>th</sup> July 2005 to the Department for Transport and the relevant regional Government Office. Final allocations for 2006-07, and indicative allocations for later years (to be not less than 75% of the guideline budgets) will be issued in December 2005.

## **Consultation on this draft**

25. *This consultation is open to all who wish to take part. The Department for Transport will aim to take account of comments in preparing a final version of this document for publication in the Autumn of 2004. All comments on this draft should be sent to [ltp@dft.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:ltp@dft.gsi.gov.uk) or posted to: LTP1a, Department for Transport, 3/18 Great Minster House, 76 Marsham Street, London, SW1P 4DR, by 8<sup>th</sup> October 2004<sup>1</sup>. Please include, with any comments, clear references to relevant paragraphs, and full contact details. The Department for Transport anticipates that this consultation will be particularly relevant to:*

- *local authorities;*
- *all other organisations and individuals with an interest in local transport issues;*
- *all organisations and individuals with an interest in the impact of local transport on the delivery of other services;*
- *organisations and individuals with an interest in spatial planning and local economic development;*
- *organisations and individuals with an interest in the implications of local transport for the environment.*

**Department for Transport  
July 2004**

---

<sup>1</sup> Responses from local transport authorities should be copied to their regional Government Office.

## **PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY – PERFORMANCE AND STRATEGY UPDATE**

**Report By: Director of Environment**

### **Wards Affected**

Countywide

### **Purpose**

1. To update members on progress of the rights of way strategy and provide a progress report on the key work programmes for the Public Rights of Way Service.

### **Financial Implications**

2. The public rights of way strategy will need to be delivered within the financial resources available for the service, but the strategy and this report highlight the severe pressures on service development and delivery imposed by current funding levels.

### **Considerations**

3. A report entitled “A Strategy for the Public Rights of Way Service in Herefordshire – Consultation” by the Director of Environment was presented to the committee on the 21<sup>st</sup> November 2003. An outcome following the consideration of the report was that members receive an up-date on the strategy and an indication on the way backlogs were being dealt with.

### **PERFORMANCE (ALL YEARS ARE FINANCIAL)**

#### **NATIONAL BVPI 178**

4. Herefordshire Council are required to carry out a 5% survey of the network in two, 2.5 percent surveys per year. The results of this survey makes up the National Best Value Performance Indicator No. 178, which indicates the percentage of paths easy to use and signposted from the road. Last year’s (2003-2004) performance indicator result was 43.5%. The first 2.5% survey of this years performance indicator, carried out in May, was 41%. Overall the BVPI results have been rising by approximately 2% per year. The target for this year is 46%. Nationally, Herefordshire are near the bottom of the table with other unitary authorities. A note of caution needs to be raised, as most other unitary authorities are urban based.

#### **DEFINITIVE MAP MODIFICATION ORDERS**

5. There are two full time officers dealing with an increasing number of Definitive map modification applications. A recent seminar to elected members highlighted the extent of work involved in each application to modify the definitive map received. Currently there is a backlog of 109 outstanding applications, 62 of which are in the

---

Further information on the subject of this report is available from Rob Hemblade,  
Public Rights of Way Manager, on (01432) 261981

south of the county and 47 in the north of the county. The numbers of new applications we are receiving is increasing with 7 new applications being received in 2003, and 9 new applications being received so far this financial year. This number is likely to increase rapidly as applications are submitted in anticipation of the closure of the definitive map and as the Countryside Agency's Discovering Lost Ways project is implemented.

6. 2 applications have been determined this financial year so far and 1 public inquiry has been held. Since 1998 the number of applications determined is low with only 8 applications being made up to April 2004. There are a number of factors involved, the primary ones being problems with staffing in other areas, which has meant the modification officers have needed to cover vacancies, and the acceptance of poor applications which has required excessive amounts of time being spent on individual cases. -It is intended that the backlog will be addressed in part by reviewing current procedures and statement of priorities and seeking rejection of a number of poor or non beneficial applications. The emphasis will be shifted to put more onus on the applicant to supply higher quality applications at the outset and an incentive to carry out detailed historical / user research. The target for modification order determinations this year is 8.

### **TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT DIVERSIONS**

7. As part the planning process, the Council has the power to divert paths under the Town and Country Planning Act. So far this year we have received 4 applications. All TCPA applications are turned around within 6 months; therefore there is no backlog.

### **HIGHWAYS ACT DIVERSIONS**

8. There are 87 outstanding Highways Act diversion applications some of which are a number of years old. The diversion officer post was vacant for nearly 2 years. A new member of staff was appointed to the post in August 2003. However this same officer deals with temporary closure orders of which there have been 17 since April 2003, 7 of which have been in this financial year. In 2003, 3 applications to divert footpaths were received; so far this year we have received 9 new applications. Legislation will shortly be brought into force to extend the scope of diversion applications, which is likely to increase the number of applications being received.
9. Although no applications have been determined this year there are 4 orders are decision making stage. As set out in the strategy, the intention is to reduce the backlog of applications by revising the current policies and requiring applicants to carry out more initial preparation work. It is also proposed to seek rejection of a number of old applications which have become 'stuck' for one reason or another. The target for determinations this year is 10.

### **MAINTENANCE**

10. Since 1998, the rights of way service has received over 16,700 defect reports on public rights of way. In 2003 alone 5173 defect reports were received, of which 63.2% were cleared that year (defect remedied). So far this year, 2100 defect reports have been received of which 37% have been cleared to date. Although defect reports are carried over at the end of the year, figures are presented on an annual basis. As a guide of the 16,700 reported defects since 1<sup>st</sup> April 1998, 70% have been remedied.

---

Further information on the subject of this report is available from Rob Hemblade,  
Public Rights of Way Manager, on (01432) 261981

11. Some of the main causes of defects are obstructions caused by farming practises and waymarking. A new enforcement strategy is currently under consultation, which should address the farming issue, and a closer working relationship with parishes is being forged to increase the number of volunteers carrying out waymarking duties.

A good working relationship has been established with the new partnership, Herefordshire Jarvis Services, and there is a commitment on both sides to resolve issues. A new maintenance regime, involving greater use of programmed work, is being jointly developed to improve cost-effectiveness whilst maintaining a good level of service. The results of this regime will be monitored, in common with other maintenance services delivered through the partnership, and may result in a need for some minor reallocation of budgets in the future to take account of overall costs and the apportionment of any efficiency improvements.

### **NEW LEGISLATION AFFECTING PROW / BEING DEALT WITH PROW**

13. The Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 is a significant piece of legislation which is having a major impact on the service. Listed below are the main sections which are either currently being dealt with by PROW, or are expected to be.

#### *CROW Act Pt 1*

- Access Land Maps
- Owner / Occupier Liabilities
- Exclusion / restriction of Access
- Means of Access
- 

#### *Part II*

- Restricted Byways
- Extinguishment of Unrecorded rights of way
- Special diversions, creations etc
- Rights of Way Improvement Plan
- Obstructions
- Local Access Forums

14. Meeting these requirements will place additional workloads on the team. An additional member of staff has been recruited to assist with this, although further resources will be needed to fully implement the act.

### **SIGNIFICANT ACHIEVEMENTS**

15. There are a number of notable achievements, which the service has completed over the last year
- Production of draft PROW strategy
  - Production of draft enforcement Strategy
  - Extensive Rights of Way Improvement Plan consultation

---

Further information on the subject of this report is available from Rob Hemblade,  
Public Rights of Way Manager, on (01432) 261981

- First year of Herefordshire Local Access Forum
- Local member presentation on Modification orders
- Running of 3<sup>rd</sup> Walking Festival

### Budget

16.	<b>2003- 2004</b>	<b>2004 - 2005</b>
<b>Maintenance</b>	212,700	218,020
<b>Staff</b>	256,950	264,640 (To be revised)
<b>Other (bridges)</b>	30,000	30,000

### BENCHMARKING

17. Below are some key benchmarking statistics with other authorities. Herefordshire has an extensive rights of way network but commits significantly less resources than many other authorities. As a result of this the network is of a lower standard which in turn affects tourism, health and income.

	Herefordshire	Shropshire	Staffordshire	Warwickshire	Worcestershire
Length of Rights of Way	3358	5450	4000	2810	4391
No. of Staff (2003)(FTE)	12	13.2 (Has now been increased)	23.8	16	22.25
Budget inc Capital (C), Maintenance (M)	£212,000 (M)	£400,000 (M+C)	£197,000 (M+C)	£183,000 (M+C)	£320,000 (M)
BVPI 2002/03	41%	36%	49%	55%	59%
Modification order applications backlog (2002/3)	83 0 applications determined orders in 2003	71 41 applications determined in 2003	256	75	75 Not currently processing Modification order applications
Diversion Orders backlog (2002/03)	80 2 applications determined in 2003	60 31 applications determined in 2003	11	27	75 20 applications determined in 2003

---

Further information on the subject of this report is available from Rob Hemblade,  
Public Rights of Way Manager, on (01432) 261981



It should be noted that the benchmarking statistics were collated by the West Midlands Benchmarking club and have not been verified. Different authorities will have different ways of producing figures.

### **RIGHTS OF WAY STRATEGY - CONSULTATION UPDATE**

18. Extensive consultation has now been completed with many comments being received. As a result of those comments, one of the key findings is that many of the dates set against the objectives are too ambitious given current resource levels. One of the main changes in the strategy will therefore be to change the dates so they more accurately reflect resources. Generally the strategy has been well received by both landowners, general public and user groups alike.

### **CHALLENGES**

19. The main challenge is to integrate the Rights of Way Improvement Plan into the Local Transport Plan to ensure proper consideration of the strategic value of the network. This may enable access to capital funding through the LTP. A second challenge is to raise awareness of the economic and social benefits that can be derived for having a high quality public rights of way network. The recent restructuring should play a major role in moving towards achieving these two ambitions.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT the report is noted**

#### **BACKGROUND PAPERS :**

- **None identified.**



**MONITORING OF 200/2005 PERFORMANCE  
INDICATORS – APRIL 2004 TO JULY 2004****Report By: Director of Environment****Wards Affected**

County-wide

**Purpose**

1. To update Members on progress made by the Environment Directorate for the four months April to July 2004 towards achieving all of the performance indicators / targets which appear in the Council's Corporate Plan.

**Financial Implications**

2. All expenditure in respect of performance indicators / targets is from approved budgets.

**Content**

3. The report of exceptions to the targeted performance is attached at Appendix 1 for Members' consideration.
4. Also included, for comparative purposes, are the targets and out-turns for 2003/4 and the targets for 2004/5.

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT the exceptions monitoring report in relation to the 2004/2005 local and national performance indicators be noted, subject to any comments which Members may wish to raise.**

**BACKGROUND PAPERS**

- None identified.



**ENVIRONMENT****National:**

Ref	Target/Indicator	Target 2003/2004	Actual Out-turn 2003/4	Target 2004/5	Performance Apr-Jul	Comments
	<b>Strategic objective</b>					
BV82a	Percentage of the total tonnage of household waste arisings which has been recycled	13.62%	13.45%	14.4%	11.67%	Seasonal variation
BV82b	Percentage of the total tonnage of household waste arisings which has been composted	5.74%	5.95%	6.6%	9.30%	Seasonal variation
BV82d	Percentage of the total tonnage of household waste arisings which has been landfilled	80.64%	80.6%	79.0%	79.02%	Combined on target

**Local:**

Ref	Target/Indicator	Target 2003/2004	Actual Out-turn 2003/4	Target 2004/5	Performance Apr-Jul	Comments
	Number of missed bins – all rounds (not including trade) based on 2 per round per week	46	32.1	44	30.57	Performance better than target

**HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION (including Street Scene)****National:**

Ref	Target/Indicator	Target 2003/2004	Actual Out-turn 2003/4	Target 2004/5	Performance Apr-Jul	Comments
BV199	Local Street and Environment Cleanliness	36%	34%	33%	Figures not available	First period inspections rescheduled and in progress

**Local:**

Ref	Target/Indicator	Target 2003/2004	Actual Out-turn 2003/4	Target 2004/5	Performance Apr-Jul	Comments
	Number of Penalty Charge notice appeals cases "lost" at appeal as a percentage of those taken to adjudication	<50%	30% (17 out of 56)	<50%	20%	8 outstanding; 7 new 3 determinations rec'd in favour of HCC
	<b>Street Lighting</b>					
	The average length of time in repairing street light faults compared with the authorities policies and objectives	4.5 Days	3.9 Days	4.5 Days	2.1 Days	Summer lower nos. of faults reported
	<b>Bridges</b>					
	Number of bridges inspected to safeguard structural integrity (two year rota).	463	463	395	90	Not uniform program of inspection more done later in year

## **BEST VALUE REVIEWS – IMPLEMENTATION OF IMPROVEMENT PLANS**

**Report By: Performance Officer**

### **Wards Affected**

County-wide

### **Purpose**

- 1 To report the remaining actions and the exceptions to the programmed progress in the improvement plans resulting from the reviews of Development Control, Public Conveniences, Public Rights of Way and Highway Maintenance.

### **Financial Implications**

- 2 There has been no variation to the financial implications identified in the individual Improvement Plans.

### **Background**

- 3 In response to comments from Members and Officers, the reporting arrangements have been developed by consolidating the reports and only reporting on exceptions to the programmed actions. That is, where actions have been completed earlier than programmed or where the timetable has not been met.
- 4 Appendix 1 of this report covers the following improvement plans:
  - Development Control
  - Public Conveniences
  - Public Rights of Way
  - Highway Maintenance

### **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT members note and comment on, where appropriate, the implementation of the improvement plans.**

### **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

- None identified.





**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL**

Priority	Outcome	Action	Officer(s)	By When	Progress	Indicator for Improvement
High	Improved speed of applications and responsiveness of service	Review and update Highway Design Guide	Team Leader Transportation Planning / Consultant	December 2003 Date revised to March 2005	Being prepared by Owen Williams.	BV109 – Determine applications within 8/13 weeks

**PUBLIC CONVENIENCES**

Priority	Outcome	Action	Officer(s)	By When	Progress	Indicator for Improvement
High Priority – 2003/5	Improved provision of facilities	Refurbishment programme in progress	HOS Property	To be completed 2004/5	£150k in 2004/5 capital programme approved. Tenbury Road, Bromyard and minor works in East Street. Additional unit in Union Street. Mill Street, Kington deferred until 2005/6.	Public perception indicator

**PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY**

Priority	Outcome	Action	Comment	Officer(s)	By when	Progress	Indicator for Improvement
High	Improved focus of resources	Write policy and strategy for future delivery of the service to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Where resources should be focussed</li> <li>How to meet the requirements of the Disability Discrimination Act</li> <li>Business plan with targets</li> </ul>	Resource Implications - Identify funding to pay for consultancy work, DDA cost implications, promotion of network, creation of asset register.	SO/MJ / and others	Revised Dates December 2002  Date revised to December 2004	Draft Enforcement Strategy now completed and out for consultation. Responses are now being analysed,	BV178 Ease of use of Rights of Way

Priority	Outcome	Action	Comment	Officer(s)	By when Revised Dates	Progress	Indicator for Improvement
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An enforcement policy and strategy</li> <li>The creation of an Asset Register</li> <li>How to promote PROW</li> </ul>					
High	Increase throughput of Diversion Orders	Research, devise and write a fast-track method for determining applications for Diversion Orders	Staff time – possible offset through income generation. Now part of strategy.	RH/MM	1/7/02 – Date revised to November 2004	Not achieved, enforcement strategy took priority.	

## HIGHWAY MAINTENANCE

Priority	Improvement Area	Action	Targets and Outcomes	Officer(s)	Start Date	Programmed completion date	Progress	Indicator for Improvement
High	Best Practice procedures	Develop integrated IT systems including reporting via the "web". - in liaison with IT section (contribution to e-government). Links to "Info in Herefordshire". <b>[Best Value Inspection Recommendation]</b>	Target - all service areas covered in compliance with e-government targets. Outcome - Improved customer responsiveness. Efficiency improvements in responding to defects to achieve higher maintenance standards.	BH/IT/FM/RH /DJP	Apr-02	April 2004	Web pages relating to street scene management operational from 8 June 2004.	Improved public perception PI