

## Land Charges VFM Review

# Executive Summary

## Cherwell District Council

<b>Timetable</b>	<b>Papers Finalised</b>	<b>Meeting Date</b>
Use of Resources Steering Group	8 January 2009	12 January 2009
CMT (final version)	20 February 2009	25 February 2008
Circulate to UoR Steering Group		26 February 2009
Executive	4 March 2009	16 March 2009

<b>Revision History</b>		
<b>Revision Date</b>	<b>Previous Revision Date</b>	<b>Summary of Changes</b>
5 February 2009		1 <sup>st</sup> draft of Executive Summary
20 February 2009	5 February 2009	Amendments and additional information from circulated draft. Includes revised search totals for 2007/08 and amendments to benchmarking information arising from this.
23 February 2009	20 February 2009	Amendments following the final project team meeting with Project Sponsor.
25 February 2009	23 February 2009	Further amendments from Project Sponsor. Addition of benchmarking Annex.
5 March 2009	25 February 2009	Amendment to para 1.26

## 1. Value for Money Review of Land Charges - Executive Summary

---

### Introduction

#### Purpose of this report

- 1.1. This report details the findings of the VFM review of Land Charges and makes recommendations for improving value for money in the service.

#### Land Charges; background

- 1.2. Each local authority has a duty to maintain an accurate Local Land Charges Register for its own administrative area. A principal purpose of the Register is to protect buyers of land and property and help ensure that they are not caught unawares by obligations that are enforceable against successive owners.
- 1.3. A Local Land Charge is a restriction/prohibition or a financial charge on the land or property that is binding on successive owners or occupiers. Local Land Charges would not normally be disclosed by an examination of the title deeds or by inspection of the land or property itself, hence the need for a register maintained by local authorities.
- 1.4. There are two types of local search commonly made of local authorities in connection with land and property transactions: Search of the Local Land Charges Register and Enquiries of Local Authorities (known collectively as the official search).
- 1.5. Charges may be made for staff carrying out official searches on behalf of others (i.e. for solicitors involved in conveyancing) or by members of the public by what are known as personal searches. The introduction of personal searches has led to personal search companies effectively undercutting local authority search charges.

#### Cherwell in context

- 1.6. Cherwell saw its volume of searches fall by 18% in 2007/08, with a further 18% fall estimated for 2008/09 – a cumulative reduction of 32% over 2 years. The proportion of personal searches undertaken has increased from 26.6% in 2006/07 to 62.4%, although the diminishing base level of searches means these have actually reduced in number by 15%.
- 1.7. The reduction in overall search volumes along with the statutory fee of £11 for personal searches (compared to £80 for an official search) can be shown to have directly contributed to the reduction in income identified in 1.14 below.
- 1.8. Benchmarking work has shown that a fall in overall search volumes and a rise in the proportion of personal searches are typical amongst local authorities. This has been attributed to the introduction of Home Information Packs, the increase in popularity of personal search companies and, more recently, the economic downturn.
- 1.9. The environment in which Land Charges operates has shifted significantly. Once seen as a lucrative income generator for local authorities the balance has shifted to a presumption of cost recovery only and, more lately, a net cost to the authority. As the economic situation in the district continues to decline the level of housing activity, and so the demand for land charge searches, will inevitably be adversely affected.

### Land Charges Function

- 1.10. The Land Charges team is located within Legal and Democratic Services, having transferred there from Business Services as part of the restructuring in 2008. The workload of the team can be broken down as follows;

Functions	% Time
Official searches, Registrations and maintenance	61%
Personal Searches	26%
Miscellaneous and Management	13%

### Staffing

- 1.11. The service has a budgeted allowance of five staff (3.72 full time equivalents) comprising the Land Charges Manager (full time) and four Land Charge Assistants (one full time and 3 part time). There is a mix of temporary and permanent staff, with a vacancy in the team at present

Post Title	Full or Part-Time	Hrs PW	FTE	Contract type
Land Charges Manager	Full	37.00	1.00	Permanent
Land Charges Assistant	Part	23.75	0.64	Permanent
Land Charges Assistant	Full	37.00	1.00	Temporary
Land Charges Assistant	Part	25.00	0.68	Temporary
Land Charges Assistant	Part	15.00	0.41	(Vacant)
		<b>137.75</b>	<b>3.72</b>	

- 1.12. The Land Charges Manager is the only permanent member of staff with significant experience, the other permanent member of staff having joined in August 2008.

### Expenditure and Income

- 1.13. Income for service has reduced dramatically since 2006/07, as has its expenditure.

	2006/07		2007/08		2008/09	2009/10
	Budget	Outturn	Budget	Outturn	Revised budget	Draft budget
<b>Expenditure</b>	£318,000	£372,592	£334,000	£419,433	£312,173	£238,000
<b>Income</b>	(£411,000)	(£478,208)	(£397,000)	(£363,457)	(£201,570)	(£166,000)
<b>Net</b>	(£93,000)	(£105,618)	(£63,000)	£55,976	£110,603	£72,000

- 1.14. The level of income peaked in 2006/07 where actual income was 16% above the level budgeted. Since then it has declined dramatically, falling by 24% in 2007/08 and predicted to fall a further 44% in 2008/09. The budgeted income for 2009/10 is 65% lower than that received in 2006/07.
- 1.15. Whereas the service represented a net income for the authority in 2006/07 it now represents a net cost. The degree of this turnaround is significant – in 2007/08 the service cost the authority £161,500 more than it did in 2006/07. Despite a 25.5% reduction in expenditure in 2008/09 predictions are that the service will represent a net cost of £110,000.

## Findings from the Review

- 1.16. 2007/08 has been used as a base year for comparison in benchmarking work. Extensive data cleansing has been carried out on the 2007/08 RO return to make it as comparable as possible. Where misleading data has been provided in these returns by other authorities (i.e. no employee expenses despite having staff) these have been excluded from key calculations.
- 1.17. Findings from the review are presented below in terms of comparison to average performance, and also to top quartile performance (i.e. the best performing, whether this is high or low values). Figures in brackets present the costed implications of this difference in performance.

## VFM Conclusion

- 1.18. The overall conclusion of the review is that the service is **high cost** and has **low performance** in terms of its productivity, but is **high quality** in terms of its search turnaround times

## Expenditure

- 1.19. Cherwell had a mixed picture for the costs of its service in 2007/08 when compared to benchmark authorities, but is generally more expensive;
- Employee costs per head of population were 18.5% above average (£21,900 total), or 111% per head more than top quartile (£73,700 total). Employee costs per hour were 3.7% below average (-£5,300 total), or 23% more than top quartile (£26,400 total)
  - Running expenses per head of population were 12.4% below average ( -£25,260 total), or 18.7% more than top quartile (+£28,190 total)
  - Expenditure per search was 6% higher than average (£18,600 total) or 19.7% more than top quartile (£52,500 total)
- 1.20. The review has found that the main drivers of this performance in 2007/08 were as follows;
- Employee costs were higher than normal in 2007/08 as additional help was given to the team on a temporary basis. This was partly due to a long term sickness in the service, and also as a result of a request for more resources to help deal with the increases in personal searches. This created greater capacity within the service at a time when the volume of searches was decreasing, resulting in lower productivity but high quality in terms of search turnaround times
  - Support service recharges made to the service were not in line with its direct operating costs. This reflects the historic income generating environment of Land Charges, where loading it with some additional overhead costs was prudent to reduce the net costs of other frontline services. In addition an error was made in 2007/08 with the service being recharged an additional £56,000, or 13% of its overall expenditure.
  - An anomaly was identified in how recharges are made for search work carried out by other services. An allocation of £108,600 was added to the costs of the service by other cost centres in Planning and Environmental Services; a long-standing arrangement which was a prudent way of supporting staff costs in other services when Land Charges generated significant income. As a flat rate this historic arrangement does not relate to the level of work undertaken by these other services, effectively subsidising them when search volumes are below those forecast. The recharge itself does not appear in the operating

budget for the Land Charges team and so was not apparent to the Land Charges Manager until this review.

- As a result of the above, the Land Charges Manager had negotiated separate arrangements with Heads of Service to reimburse them for search work carried out on behalf of Land Charges using a cost-per-search rate. This arrangement resulted in costs of £93,224 in 2007/08 - effectively paying other services twice for the same work – accounting for 22% of its overall expenditure.
- There is a £12,000 payment per year made to the County Council of which £10,000 relates to information provision for highway records and £2,000 for common land and village green registration. Negotiations are in hand to make this payment part of a formal agreement, as per procurement best practice.

### **Staffing structure and productivity**

1.21. Cherwell had a higher level of staffing for its service in 2007/08 than benchmark authorities;

- Cherwell has the third highest number of person hours available per thousand of population of the benchmark authorities, 27.5% higher than average or 77% higher than top quartile
- Productivity (in terms of searches per hour) was 30% lower than average or 103% lower than top quartile; the third lowest of the benchmark authorities.

1.22. The review has found that the main drivers for this performance were as follows;

- Cherwell's level of staffing has not reduced in line with the reductions in demand for searches, leaving it with extra capacity. This has been addressed in part by retaining staff on a temporary basis, or leaving vacant posts unfilled. The service is currently operating on 122 hours per week (compared to the 138 hours used for comparisons in 2007/08) through operating with an unfilled vacancy of 15 hours. The 2009/10 budget for the service includes a 37 hours per week reduction.
- Cherwell has a labour-intensive search process which requires a high degree of checking to ensure that accurate search results are achieved. A process mapping exercise carried out with the team on the personal search process identified that the incomplete digitisation of records requires manual checking to ensure all land charges are correctly identified on search returns. As with other authorities, errors made by personal search companies when booking appointments also account for additional checking to locate the correct search location.
- The current ICT system used by the team is not efficient and is due to be de-supported by the software company in 2009/10. A more efficient system which is in use in seven of the benchmark authorities (TLC), is to be installed as part of the agreed capital programme. However, this is no guarantee of productivity; Oxford City is the only benchmark authority to have a completely automated search process but has a marginally higher productivity than Cherwell.
- The effectiveness of any new ICT system is highly dependent on the quality and amount of digitised records. Although all 35,000 planning files have been scanned back to 1974 there are estimated to be 41,000 relevant records yet to be digitised back to 1948, with an estimated 10,000 digitised records that require labour-intensive error checking. There is a high volume of other records that are not scheduled for scanning/digitisation which has not been fully evaluated. Limited resources in the GIS team to address these issues prevent the council from realising the full benefits of the TLC system when installed.
- Discussions with land charges teams in other authorities have confirmed that a similar scope of work is carried out in the benchmark authorities. However, direct comparisons

are difficult because of the varying degrees of automation across authorities, and the level to which they use other services to assist in search activity.

- Cherwell has been using staff time to take payments and deal with personal search visits to Bodicote House for morning appointments, whereas reception staff deal with this work in the afternoons.

### **Income**

1.23. Cherwell had a low level of income in 2007/08 in comparison to benchmark authorities.

- Cherwell has the 5<sup>th</sup> lowest level of income for standard searches; 9.1% below average and 40.1% below top quartile
- Cherwell has 6<sup>th</sup> lowest level of income for all searches (6.9% below average, 47.7% below top quartile)
- Total income per head of population was 8.1% below average (-£31,850 total) or 45.7% below top quartile (-£306,000 total)
- Income per search was £5.30 below average (-£26,900 total) or £65.12 below top quartile (-£330,900 total)

1.24. The review has found that the main drivers for this performance were as follows;

- Cherwell's standard search fee is set at £80; the lowest of all benchmark authorities. The highest fee set was by Ashford at £140.
- There is an apparent inelasticity of demand in fees for official searches. Cherwell's fee was reduced from £102 to £99 in 2006/07 in an attempt to stimulate demand and prevent a loss of business to personal search companies. It was reduced again to its current level in 2007/08 in light of cost recovery guidance. However, the service does not currently recover its costs in full.

### **Service Quality**

1.25. Cherwell had a high level of performance in 2007/08 in comparison to benchmark authorities.

- The percentage of searches returned within 5 days (96%) was the 2<sup>nd</sup> highest of the benchmark authorities
- The time taken to turn around searches was the 4<sup>th</sup> highest (4 days) of the benchmark authorities

1.26. As identified in 1.20 above, extra capacity in the team during 2007/08 enabled this high level of performance to be maintained. It is acknowledged that quality embraces more than turnaround times but with there being no other comparative data available this is the best measure available.

### **Best Practice**

1.27. A range of best practice examples were looked into as part of identifying improvements for the service.

- Shared Services were not in operation for any Land Charges team contacted through the LLCI, although Harborough were looking into this option with other Leicestershire authorities. Other authorities felt that a shared service option may be pursued in future, but only as part of a wider shared service initiative.

- Three authorities used their contact centres to take search appointment bookings. This option was explored with Customer Services & Information Systems staff as a follow-up to process mapping work. Such a transfer could be achieved quickly and easily, although there is no clear process gain from the move, and that the current manual system operates effectively. Benefits from such an introduction would be around the consistency of customer service across the council.
- A large number of authorities accept payment for search appointments over the telephone. Currently payment is made in person on the day of the search in Cherwell.
- An online booking and payment system for personal searches was also explored. An online form and appointments system could be introduced as part of current ICT plans. A major improvement in productivity would only be realised if the responsibility for accurately identifying the search location rested entirely with the applicant at the time of application through using an online map. Currently there is no way to capture the relevant search area online unless an expensive bespoke solution is developed.

### **Recommendations for Improvement**

- 1.28. Improvements identified from the review will combine to reduce its cost base, improve productivity and customer service, and maximise the use of ICT in delivering the service;

#### **Reduce Costs**

- Reduce staffing levels by 37hrs per week to eliminate surplus capacity and generate savings of £22,650. This will bring employee hours per thousand population more into line with the average authority. These savings have already been identified and accommodated in the 2009/10 budget.
- Further reduce the capacity within the service by 15hrs per week in recognition of the continuing fall in demand due to the economic slowdown, but re-invest these hours in improving the council's digital records to improve future productivity by allocating them to the council's GIS team. Monitor work volumes and review this arrangement after 6 months in order to maximise possible savings (should search volumes continue to fall) end ensure continuity of the service (should search volumes increase).
- Recalculate the contributions paid to other services through internal recharges so that these are based on a cost per search rather than a fixed overhead. This would produce savings of £24,865 for the service in 2009/10, although these costs would be transferred elsewhere in the council.
- Ascertain the true costs of the service (in anticipation of likely legislative changes allowing cost recovery charging) by carry out a zero based budget analysis of support costs to remove any overhead cost loading on the service. This is to take place in autumn 2009 as part of the routine budget revision process.

#### **Increase income**

- Raise the standard search fee from £80 to £120 (around the average for other Oxfordshire authorities) to raise additional income of £55,000 per annum. This may carry a risk of further reducing demand for searches, although reduced fees have not been shown to have any demonstrable influence on demand.
- If legislation is introduced to allow it, raise the fee for personal searches to at least £25. This would raise additional income of around £30,000 per annum.

#### **Improve productivity**

- Implement the TLC ICT system to improve the automation of electronically held information for searches



- Move appointments bookings and advance payments for searches to the Customer Contact centre to provide a common standard of customer service to callers and to remove unproductive administrative work from the land charges team
- Develop and introduce an online booking and payments system for appointments to complement the telephone service and further reduce administrative work
- Discontinue using Land Charges staff team to deal with personal search appointments in the mornings, transferring this work to reception staff (this has already been agreed and is being undertaken as an early outcome of this review).

Value for Money Review of Land Charges

5 March 2009

Annex 1

	Ashford	Aylesbury Vale	Basingstoke & Deane	Chalmersford	Cherwell	Colchester	Eastleigh	Hunts	Oxford City	South Oxfordshire	Test Valley	Tonbridge & Malling	Vale of White Horse	West Wiltshire	Average	Top quartile	Cherwell Difference to average	Percentage difference	Implication	Cherwell difference to top quartile	Percentage difference	Implication
<b>Values per head</b>																						
Employees	£1.46	£0.48	£0.00	£0.37	£1.02	£0.60	£0.64	£0.00	£0.48	£0.99	£0.81	£1.80	£0.43	£1.23	£0.86	£0.48	£0.16	18.5%	£21,876.22	£0.54	111.2%	£73,708.84
Running Exp	£0.84	£2.21	£1.99	£1.87	£1.30	£2.51	£1.36	£1.75	£1.02	£1.27	£1.04	£1.65	£0.62	£1.36	£1.48	£1.10	£-0.18	-12.4%	£-25,261.34	£0.20	18.7%	£28,189.54
<b>Total Exp</b>	<b>£2.30</b>	<b>£2.68</b>	<b>£1.99</b>	<b>£2.24</b>	<b>£2.32</b>	<b>£3.12</b>	<b>£2.00</b>	<b>£1.75</b>	<b>£1.50</b>	<b>£2.26</b>	<b>£1.85</b>	<b>£3.45</b>	<b>£1.04</b>	<b>£2.59</b>	<b>£2.22</b>	<b>£1.88</b>	<b>£0.10</b>	<b>4.4%</b>	<b>£13,489.71</b>	<b>£0.43</b>	<b>23.0%</b>	<b>£59,713.29</b>
Sales/Fees	£4.34	£3.44	£2.25	£2.53	£2.13	£2.64	£2.72	£2.27	£1.70	£2.57	£1.99	£3.60	£2.09	£3.57	£2.70	£4.34	£-0.57	-21.2%	£-78,985.65	£-2.21	-50.9%	£-303,878.22
Other income	£0.52	£0.00	£0.00	£0.06	£0.51	£0.76	£0.02	£0.00	£0.00	£0.05	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.41	£0.17	£0.76	£0.34	206.1%	£47,132.86	£-0.25	-33.4%	£-35,062.11
<b>Total income</b>	<b>£4.86</b>	<b>£3.44</b>	<b>£2.25</b>	<b>£2.59</b>	<b>£2.64</b>	<b>£3.41</b>	<b>£2.74</b>	<b>£2.27</b>	<b>£1.70</b>	<b>£2.62</b>	<b>£1.99</b>	<b>£3.60</b>	<b>£2.09</b>	<b>£3.98</b>	<b>£2.87</b>	<b>£4.86</b>	<b>£-0.23</b>	<b>-8.1%</b>	<b>£-31,852.78</b>	<b>£-2.22</b>	<b>-45.7%</b>	<b>£-306,041.78</b>
Net Current	£-2.56	£-0.76	£-0.26	£-0.35	£-0.32	£-0.29	£-0.74	£-0.52	£-0.19	£-0.36	£-0.14	£-0.16	£-1.05	£-1.39	£-0.65	£-0.75	£0.33	-50.8%	£45,342.49	£0.43	-57.6%	£59,736.78
Capital Charges	£0.08	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.36	£0.21	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.19	£0.14	£0.00	£0.07	£0.00	£-0.07	-100.0%	£-9,569.49	£0.00		£0.00
<b>Net total cost</b>	<b>£-2.48</b>	<b>£-0.76</b>	<b>£-0.26</b>	<b>£-0.35</b>	<b>£-0.32</b>	<b>£-0.29</b>	<b>£-0.38</b>	<b>£-0.31</b>	<b>£-0.19</b>	<b>£-0.36</b>	<b>£-0.14</b>	<b>£0.03</b>	<b>£-0.91</b>	<b>£-1.39</b>	<b>£-0.58</b>	<b>£-0.66</b>	<b>£0.26</b>	<b>-44.8%</b>	<b>£35,773.00</b>	<b>£0.34</b>	<b>-51.9%</b>	<b>£47,420.37</b>
<b>Employee Costs per hour</b>	<b>£21.68</b>	<b>£17.93</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£13.72</b>	<b>£19.54</b>	<b>£15.30</b>	<b>£20.01</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£12.65</b>	<b>£16.05</b>	<b>£18.07</b>	<b>£44.94</b>	<b>£16.87</b>	<b>£26.68</b>	<b>£20.29</b>	<b>£15.86</b>	<b>£-0.74</b>	<b>-3.7%</b>	<b>£-5,314.67</b>	<b>£3.68</b>	<b>23.2%</b>	<b>£26,387.90</b>
Employee Costs as % total exp	63.3%	17.8%	0.0%	16.6%	43.9%	19.4%	32.1%	0.0%	32.2%	43.8%	43.9%	52.1%	41.0%	47.4%	32.38%	18.17%	11.51%			25.71%		
Employee hours per 000 pop	67.3	26.6	42.5	27.0	52.1	39.5	32.0	28.5	38.2	61.6	44.9	40.0	25.3	45.9	40.82	29.41	11.24	27.5%		22.65	77.0%	
<b>Expenditure per search (all)</b>	<b>£64.65</b>	<b>£72.85</b>	<b>£47.81</b>	<b>£60.16</b>	<b>£62.77</b>	<b>£75.56</b>	<b>£52.12</b>	<b>£35.20</b>	<b>£53.39</b>	<b>£58.64</b>	<b>£55.44</b>	<b>£89.68</b>	<b>£32.90</b>	<b>£66.22</b>	<b>£59.10</b>	<b>£52.43</b>	<b>£3.67</b>	<b>6.2%</b>	<b>£18,652.49</b>	<b>£10.34</b>	<b>19.7%</b>	<b>£52,527.32</b>
Employee exp per search (all)	£40.94	£12.95	£0.00	£9.97	£27.55	£14.64	£16.72	£0.00	£17.17	£25.66	£24.32	£46.75	£13.48	£31.38	£20.11	£13.08	£7.44	37.0%	£37,804.53	£14.47	110.6%	£73,514.85
All searches per 000 pop	35.6	36.8	41.7	37.2	36.9	41.2	38.3	49.6	28.2	38.6	33.3	38.5	31.7	39.0	37.62	35.91	-0.7	-1.8%	-94.5	1.02	2.8%	140.6
Personal searches per 000 pop	15.3	17.1	22.2	17.3	15.6	18.6	17.0	17.6	13.0	17.5	16.6	16.1	15.2	13.2	16.58	15.36	-1.0	-5.9%	-133.8	0.25	1.6%	34.3
Searches per 000 households	82.2	91.5	97.7	86.9	90.8	98.5	89.5	118.7	73.9	88.4	79.7	91.4	74.2	87.9	89.38	83.38	1.4	1.5%	189.2	7.37	8.8%	1,014.0
Searches per total hours available	0.53	1.39	0.98	1.38	0.71	1.05	1.20	1.74	0.74	0.63	0.74	0.96	1.25	0.85	1.01	1.74		-30.0%			-103.03%	
<b>Income per search (all)</b>	<b>£136.55</b>	<b>£93.45</b>	<b>£54.11</b>	<b>£69.64</b>	<b>£71.43</b>	<b>£82.61</b>	<b>£71.44</b>	<b>£45.66</b>	<b>£60.21</b>	<b>£67.88</b>	<b>£59.62</b>	<b>£93.73</b>	<b>£66.07</b>	<b>£101.87</b>	<b>£76.73</b>	<b>£136.55</b>	<b>£-5.30</b>	<b>-6.9%</b>	<b>£-26,958.17</b>	<b>£-65.12</b>	<b>-47.7%</b>	<b>£-330,922.62</b>
Income for standard searches	£528,311	£566,693	£322,324	£394,969	£339,405	£563,064	£306,802	£347,781	£234,759	£311,338	£207,276	£396,826	£225,409	£481,828	£373,342	£566,693.00	£-33,937	-9.1%	£-172,466,745	£-227,288.00	-40.1%	£-1,155,077,616
Income per search (standard)	£229	£163	£102	£120	£116	£139	£119	£64	£101	£115	£107	£152	£117	£148	£127.93	£229.00	£-12.37	-9.7%	£-36,324.66	£-113.44	-49.5%	£-293,473.60
<b>Ratio of income to expenditure</b>	<b>2.11</b>	<b>1.28</b>	<b>1.13</b>	<b>1.16</b>	<b>1.14</b>	<b>1.09</b>	<b>1.37</b>	<b>1.30</b>	<b>1.13</b>	<b>1.16</b>	<b>1.08</b>	<b>1.05</b>	<b>2.01</b>	<b>1.54</b>	<b>1.32</b>	<b>£76.73</b>	<b>-0.2</b>	<b>-14.1%</b>	<b>£-67,526.70</b>	<b>1.14</b>		<b>£413,068.97</b>
Income per hour worked	£72.30	£129.43	£52.99	£95.82	£50.68	£86.34	£85.50	£79.43	£44.35	£42.45	£44.29	£90.10	£82.66	£86.63	£74.50		£-23.82	-32.0%	£-170,625.29	£50.68		£363,000.00
<b>Proportion of searches that are personal searches</b>																						
2006/07	26.2%	27.5%	30.1%	30.4%	26.6%	26.9%	48.1%	20.6%	27.2%	25.8%	27.4%	25.9%	0.0%	25.3%	26.28%		0.30%	1.1%				
2007/08	42.4%	45.8%	52.7%	46.1%	42.2%	43.9%	43.8%	35.2%	45.4%	45.3%	49.3%	41.2%	48.0%	33.7%	43.93%		-1.72%	-3.9%				
2008/09	58.3%	58.4%	61.4%	58.2%	62.4%	45.2%	58.1%	40.8%	64.6%	62.9%	56.7%	60.2%	73.5%	59.3%	58.57%		3.83%	6.5%				
<b>Income for personal searches</b>	<b>£18,689</b>	<b>£32,307</b>	<b>£38,676</b>	<b>£31,031</b>	<b>£23,595</b>	<b>£34,936</b>	<b>£22,198</b>	<b>£32,219</b>	<b>£21,241</b>	<b>£24,662</b>	<b>£20,724</b>	<b>£20,174</b>	<b>£19,591</b>	<b>£18,172</b>								
Proportion of income from personal searches (07/08)	3.5%	5.7%	12.0%	7.9%	7.0%	6.2%	7.2%	9.3%	9.0%	7.9%	10.0%	5.1%	8.7%	3.8%	7.38%		-0.42%	-5.8%		£0.07		
Expenditure on personal searches (07/08)	£109,845.48	£213,974.88	£168,106.12	£169,711.95	£134,642.86	£239,987.84	£105,172.64	£103,111.50	£103,089.60	£131,470.88	£104,447.70	£164,478.76	£58,598.17	£109,392.83						£134,642.86		
Cost recovery fee for personal searches	£64.65	£72.85	£47.81	£60.16	£62.77	£75.56	£52.12	£35.20	£53.39	£58.64	£55.44	£89.68	£32.90	£66.22						£62.77		
08/09 searches as propn of 07/08	79.0%	76.3%	70.4%	74.1%	76.3%	56.9%	71.6%	72.8%	83.0%	76.2%	68.0%	74.2%	102.5%	61.2%	74.45%		1.81%	2.4%		£0.00		£0.76