

RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL

REPORT TO HEALTH AND HOUSING COMMITTEE

INFORMATION

Agenda Item No

meeting date: 24 MARCH 2011
title: CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2011/12
submitted by: DIRECTOR OF RESOURCES
principal author: NEIL SANDIFORD

1 PURPOSE

- 1.1 To inform members of the new schemes which have been approved for inclusion in the capital programme for this committee for the forthcoming financial year (2011/12).

2 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The original schemes put forward for the council's five-year capital programme exceeded the finance that was available. As a result a capital programme was approved for 2011/12, with the remaining schemes for the 2012/16 period being set aside.
- 2.2 In line with recommendations at Budget Working Group and also at Policy and Finance Committee on 8 February, a capital working group is to be set up to agree a programme for the years 2012/13 to 2015/16 which is affordable and achievable and ties in with the outcomes of service reviews, which are currently underway.
- 2.3 Full Council approved the 2011/12 schemes on 8 March 2011.

3 SCHEMES

- 3.1 There are 2 schemes for this Committee, which total £280,000. Shown below is a list of the schemes that make up this total. These are new schemes for which you will have approved the capital pro-forma completed by the relevant officer, giving details of the project.

Cost Centre	Scheme Title	Approved Budget 2011/12 £
LANGR	Landlord/Tenant Grants	100,000
DISCP	Disabled Facilities Grants (DFG's)	180,000
Total for Health and Housing Committee		280,000

- 3.2 During the closure of our capital accounts there will inevitably be some slippage on schemes in the current year (2010/11). One of the first tasks of the new Capital Working Group will be to review all requests for slippage on capital schemes within the 2010/11 capital programme. A report will be brought to committee at a future meeting giving details of any approved slippage.
- 3.3 Responsible officers will complete and update capital monitoring sheets for each scheme which will be reported quarterly to members to give an indication of progress.

4 RECOMMENDED THAT COMMITTEE

4.1 Note the report.

NEIL SANDIFORD
TECHNICAL ACCOUNTANT

HH3-11/NS/AC
3 MARCH 2011



RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL
Capital Scheme Appraisal Form. Scheme: 1

1 Capital Scheme Title

Landlord/tenant grants

(submitted by: Rachael Stott)

2 Brief Description of the Scheme

The scheme match funds a landlord investment in a property in return for an affordable rental property. Conditions of the grant are nomination rights and a set level in line with LHA. The scheme is crucial for move on accommodation for families in the hostel as the social housing waiting list is so long. The scheme is also used to bring empty properties back into use.

3 Financial Implications – CAPITAL

	2011/2012 £	2012/2013 £	2013/2014 £	2014/2015 £	2015/2016 £
Scheme Cost	100,000				

4 Financial Implications - REVENUE

Annual Revenue Implications

None identified

5 Please indicate the start date and duration of the project including key milestones.

The scheme runs annually from the start of the financial year and has run successfully for over 10 years.

6 If this is a new asset, what is the expected useful economic life of the new asset? If this is a refurbishment scheme what is the current expected useful economic life of the asset, and by how long does this bid increase the functional lifespan?

Not applicable.

7 Please detail any additional information in support of your bid

The scheme has become popular with landlords and the number of properties the council has nomination rights to through the scheme increases annually. These properties are essential in providing a Housing Needs Service.

8 Are there any Government recommendations or guidelines to undertake this scheme (including any legislative Health and Safety requirements etc) and what would be the consequence of not doing the scheme

The Council has a statutory responsibility to find homeless households affordable housing and without this scheme would be reliant on social housing.

9 Link to the Council's Ambitions

To match the supply of homes in our area with the identified housing needs.

10 Performance Management

The scheme improves service performance in that the length of time families' stay in temporary accommodation is reduced. The service is improved in that the Council is able to offer a housing choice through the scheme.

11 In which ways would this scheme improve the efficiency or value for money of the service?

Not applicable

12 Please provide details of any consultation that has taken place with local people, partners, staff or any other stakeholders with regard to this scheme.

Landlords are consulted through a newsletter and discussions about the scheme are held at the Housing Forum.

13 Please detail the measures that would be put in place to minimise the impact that this scheme will have on the environment.

In renovating the property the council ensures that energy savings measures are installed.

14 Risk Assessment – Please detail any risks that you envisage and how they would be mitigated

Political: The scheme has had very positive political support and has been highlighted as good practice by DCLG Homeless Specialist Advisor in 2009

Economic: Encourages investment in properties in the lowest council tax bands.

Sociological: Choice of tenure for low income households is required.

Technological: None.

Legal: Changes to Local Housing Allowance will impact on the scheme any reduction will have a negative impact as landlords will not agree to lower rents.

Environmental: None.



1 Capital Scheme Title

Disabled facilities grants
(submitted by: Rachael Stott)

2 Brief Description of the Scheme

The provision of disabled facilities is a mandatory function of the Council. The grant allows households with a disability to apply for assistance to adapt their home to enable them to remain at home. The grants vary from provision of a stair lift to extending a house with ground floor bedroom and bathroom facilities.

3 Financial Implications – CAPITAL

	2011/2012 £	2012/2013 £	2013/2014 £	2014/2015 £	2015/2016 £
Scheme Cost	180,000				

4 Financial Implications - REVENUE

Annual Revenue Implications	None identified
------------------------------------	-----------------

5 Please indicate the start date and duration of the project including key milestones.

The start date would be from the date the finance was received.

6 If this is a new asset, what is the expected useful economic life of the new asset? If this is a refurbishment scheme what is the current expected useful economic life of the asset, and by how long does this bid increase the functional lifespan?

Not applicable.

7 Please detail any additional information in support of your bid

Although this year's budget is not yet fully spent it is fully committed as a number of large adaptations are being processed. Ribble Valley has been a flagship Council for the delivery of DFG schemes in that we have been able to deal with each request immediately and within budget. Without extra resources this is unlikely to remain the case.

8 Are there any Government recommendations or guidelines to undertake this scheme (including any legislative Health and Safety requirements etc) and what would be the consequence of not doing the scheme

The provision of disabled facilities area mandatory function of the Council.

9 Link to the Council's Ambitions

To make peoples lives safer and healthier.

10 Performance Management

Funding for the scheme would reduce the likelihood of a waiting list developing. Currently applications are dealt with as they are received within the approved budget.

11 In which ways would this scheme improve the efficiency or value for money of the service?

Not applicable

12 Please provide details of any consultation that has taken place with local people, partners, staff or any other stakeholders with regard to this scheme.

The scheme is delivered in partnership with occupational therapists, social services and housing providers.

13 Please detail the measures that would be put in place to minimise the impact that this scheme will have on the environment.

Renewed/recycled equipment is used where possible.

14 Risk Assessment – Please detail any risks that you envisage and how they would be mitigated

Political: Pressure to deliver adaptations on receipt of a request and to not make applicants wait for what is a mandatory service.

Economic: failure to provide adaptations could result in households requesting rehousing.

Sociological: There is an expectation from society that the disabled will receive the assistance required to enable them to remain at home.

Technological: Technology is improving all the time ensuring that new forms of equipment are available to help people.

Legal: None.

Environmental: The economic downturn means that households will expect some reduction in funding but not be informed that they will have to wait for assistance.