



London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham

Cabinet

7 NOVEMBER 2011

**CABINET MEMBER
FOR HOUSING**

*Councillor Andrew
Johnson*

**OUTCOME OF CONSULTATION ON THE
HOUSING ESTATE INVESTMENT PLAN**

**Wards:
All**

This report details the outcome of the consultation process on the Housing Estates Investment Plan and the next steps planned in bringing forward the first estate to be considered under this new programme

CONTRIBUTORS

EDFCG
ADLDS

Recommendations:

- 1. That the outcome of the consultation exercise on the Housing Estate Investment Plan be noted.**
- 2. That approval be given for officers to undertake an assessment, using the selection criteria under the Housing Estate Investment Plan selection criteria, and to report back to Cabinet with a recommended estate to be the first to benefit from the Housing Estate Investment Plan.**

**HAS A EIA BEEN
COMPLETED?
N/A**

**HAS THE REPORT
CONTENT BEEN
RISK ASSESSED?
YES**

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 On 18 April 2011 Cabinet approved consultation on the Housing Estate Investment Plan (HEIP). The report set out a borough wide process by which Council estates of more than 100 units would be considered for wider estate improvements, the type of improvements that would be considered, how the improvements would be funded and the selection criteria that would be used to decide which estates would be brought forward.
- 1.2 The Council is committed to improving the lives of residents across the borough, and to making neighbourhoods and housing estates in the borough attractive places with good reputations where people want to live, both now and in the future.
- 1.3 The Council recognises that in some parts of the borough there are lower levels of satisfaction with the local area and public services, problems with crime and anti social behaviour and where there are worse outcomes for some residents and their families, with, for instance, poorer health, poorer educational outcomes, higher levels of overcrowding, unemployment, and lower than average incomes.
- 1.4 Methods for improving neighbourhoods are numerous. Where it is appropriate and viable comprehensive regeneration, involving demolition and rebuilding, is being taken forward by the Council. However, for most neighbourhoods in the borough comprehensive regeneration is not an appropriate solution. Achieving positive change will require alternative approaches.
- 1.5 There is a body of independent research (set out in the April Cabinet report) to guide the Council on what methods work best to improve neighbourhoods. Independent research indicates that proactive intervention into neighbourhoods can have positive and lasting effects, particularly in relation to place-based gains. In addition, methods such as tenure and income mix can achieve both place- and people-based improvements.
- 1.6 In broad terms priority for assistance would be given to neighbourhoods evidenced as having:
 - High levels of unemployment and benefit dependency, low incomes and high levels of debt relative to income.
 - High levels of overcrowding and housing need
 - High levels of unemployment and benefit dependency.
 - Low educational attainment
 - High incidences of crime and ASB
 - High proportion of lets to first-time tenants and a high incidence of arrears and other tenancy breaches
 - Poor health outcomes
 - Low levels of home ownership

- High reliance on statutory and acute services
- Low residents satisfaction with services and the area
- Low area popularity

1.7 Appendix A sets out sample of methods that may be potentially used to improve neighbourhoods.

2. CONSULTATION

2.1 At the April Cabinet it was agreed that statutory consultation with all the borough's Council tenants on the HEIP policy framework would be conducted, including consultation on the selection and assessment process and the various potential improvement methods. In particular consultation would take place through the Borough Forum which was to be supplemented by consultation through tenant newsletters to ensure all tenants have the opportunity and the time to learn about the proposals and air their views.

Borough Forum

2.2 Following April Cabinet officers undertook the first stage of consultation with the Borough Forum, which is attended by representatives of Tenant and Resident Associations across the borough as well as Hammersmith and Fulham Federation of Tenants and Resident Associations (HAFFFTRA), the Cabinet Member for Housing and LBHF Housing and Regeneration officers.

2.3 The Borough Forum meeting was held on 2nd June 2011, attended by eleven Tenant and Resident Associations, HAFFFTRA, HAFNEP, the Cabinet Member for Housing and officers from the Housing and Regeneration Department. On 23rd May 2011, all TRAs were sent a copy of the report prior to the meeting and officers gave a presentation on the main details of the HEIP.

2.4 The Forum had a wide ranging discussion with recognition of both the benefits and concerns of the HEIP. Details of the questions and answers raised at the Forum are contained in Appendix B of this report. The main issues discussed were around

- who would be able to buy any vacant or new build properties on the selected estates
- how residents on selected estates would be involved in determining what estate improvements would be undertaken
- if there was any intention to demolish buildings on estates
- concerns on subletting on estates

During the discussion officers advised that the Council was keen for local residents to benefit from any properties that were developed/refurbished for low cost home ownership and that the only

buildings that may be demolished were derelict buildings that no longer had any function in delivering estate services. Any properties sold for low cost home ownership would have detailed lease agreements to prevent illegal subletting.

The Forum agreed that the HEIP was a positive step forward in identifying resources to continue estate improvements in an environment where financial resources were restricted. Many TRA representatives would be interested in working with officers to identify what improvements would be appropriate for their estates. The Forum was reassured that the policy was not about “parachuting” improvements onto estates and was very much intended to be working with residents on the selected estates and bringing forward bespoke action plans.

- 2.5 At the meeting officers advised they would welcome further comments on the report and that these should be sent to the relevant Council officer responsible for the HEIP. Officers advised that the report would be uploaded onto the Council’s website and that if any TRA would like officers to visit their estate to discuss the HEIP, they would be happy to arrange this.
- 2.6 No further comments have been received from the Borough Forum by officers since the meeting. Appendix B sets out the main summary discussion points from the Borough Forum meeting.

“Your Borough” Magazine

- 2.7 Following the Borough Forum, officers submitted an article in the July edition of “Your Borough” magazine, which is delivered to every residential and business address in the borough. The article covered the main points of the HEIP, advised the full report was available on the Council’s website and gave the contact details for officers to discuss the report or give any comments.
- 2.8 To date officers have not received any comments in response to the article or the Cabinet report.

3. NEXT STEPS

- 3.1 It is officers’ view that following the consultation undertaken over the past three months, there is no material change required to the report as presented to Cabinet on 18th April 2011 resulting from the consultation exercise. The HEIP policy advocated in the report should now be approved and officers be tasked with assessing the estates and recommend back to Cabinet the first estate to be brought forward.
- 3.2 Smaller neighbourhoods will be selected first to pilot and refine models before moving onto larger project.

- 3.3 Decisions on which areas to bring forward as action areas for improvement would be evidence-based. Wide-ranging profile data will be used to inform decision making in this regard. Appendix C details the assessment and selection criteria (agreed by the Cabinet in April), which will be applied in identifying the first estate to be brought forward.
- 3.4 For the selected neighbourhoods a detailed action plan would be developed in consultation with local residents and will require Cabinet approval. Resident involvement is crucial to improving neighbourhoods. All improvement programmes will include consultation with local residents in programme design. The Council and its partners will support those living in designated neighbourhoods to take wherever possible an active part in shaping and delivering improvement for their own areas.

4. RISK MANAGEMENT

- 4.1. The department is committed to delivering each project within the agreed council project management approach. This includes the need to record, review and report risk. The programme has not been recorded on the corporate risk register at this time since the initial report advised Members of a consultation process which they are now being asked to consider. The report also asks that Officers report back to Cabinet at a future date with a recommended estate to be the first to benefit from the Housing Estate Investment Plan. At that point the risks associated with the project would be assessed and if significant recorded on the councils risk register.

5. COMMENTS OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF FINANCE AND CORPORATE GOVERNANCE

- 5.1 The latest capital monitoring report for the Decent Neighbourhoods programme includes anticipated receipts from the void disposals some of which are intended to fund the Housing Estates Investment Plan. This indicates that a surplus of £10.5m is expected in 2011/12. The cumulative surplus is projected to increase in each of the following four years based on current expenditure projections. Therefore, funding is currently available to meet the needs of the HEIP for capital expenditure.
- 5.2 Expenditure is likely only to be classified as capital after each individual case for investment has been approved therefore any costs involved in pulling together such a case would be classified as revenue expenditure, these would have to be met from HRA balances. This should be considered as part of the preparation of the estimates for next and subsequent years.

- 5.3 Applications for investment under the HEIP will need to be reported to Cabinet and approved in line with the Council's constitution. Each proposal should include detailed financial and investment appraisal.
- 5.4 All void disposals will be subject to existing regulations governing capital receipts.

6. COMMENTS OF THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR (LEGAL AND DEMOCRATIC SERVICES)

- 6.1 The Council has been obliged to consult with secure tenants in accordance with Section 105 of the Housing Act 1985, as indicated in the report to Cabinet of 18th April 2011.
- 6.2 The consultation had to conform with the Council's published consultation arrangements (being arrangements considered by the Council to be appropriate to enable those secure tenants likely to be substantially affected to be informed of the authority's proposals and to make their views known within a specified period).
- 6.3 All representations received have to be conscientiously considered before any decision is taken.
- 6.4 Officers will need decide what, (if any) further consultations will be required before any estate is selected and on the improvements to be undertaken to the selected estate. Unlike on the introduction of the policy itself, consultation in those cases may be confined to particular estates substantially affected by the proposed decision at that stage,

7. EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 Consultation on the area based improvement policy will be designed to ensure tenants are able to participate fully and have the opportunity to learn of the proposals and air their views. For example, where disabled residents require materials in accessible formats, we will provide these, and we will ensure that the venues are accessible, and that any needs highlighted by disabled people to access the meeting are taken into account.
- 7.2 An equality assessment of the policy was undertaken in relation to the Housing Estate Investment Plan and other policies for the Cabinet Report of 18th April 2011. This is available electronically for background information. It has found impact to be varied in relation to age, race, sex, and disability. Provisional investigation suggests there are some adverse impacts in relation to disability and access to low-cost home ownership, and ethnicity and increased disposals and initial mitigation proposals have been considered.

- 7.3 When an estate has been selected under the HEIP criteria, a full equality impact assessment will be undertaken to take account of feedback from residents in proposing an estate action plan for the selected estate.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 2000
LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS

No.	Description of Background Papers	Name/Ext of holder of file/copy	Department/ Location
1.	Housing Estate Improvement Plan File	Ian Ruegg/Ext 1722	Housing Strategy & Regeneration Unit/ 3 rd Floor, Hammersmith Town Hall Extension
CONTACT OFFICER: Ian Ruegg / Angela O'Connor		NAME: Ian Ruegg / Angela O'Connor EXT. 1722 /1951	

APPENDIX A

TOOLS FOR AREA-BASED IMPROVEMENT

The following tools for improvement may be combined by the Council and its partners to deliver a bespoke flexible solution for an estate by engaging with, providing support to and enhancing the lives of residents. This sample of methods, some validated by the independent research, is by no means an exhaustive list of those that may be potentially used:

i. – Physical and Environmental improvements

Such improvements can take a range of forms. These might include installing more advanced CCTV, improved landscaping, refurbishing or providing new community buildings, providing new housing for sale, extensions and conversions to relieve overcrowding, removing physical barriers that enclose and segregate neighbourhoods from surrounding streets, and changing the layout to deter crime and anti-social behaviour.

ii. - Local Lettings Plans

Local Lettings Plans allow more control over allocations in particular areas with higher levels of economic and social problems. They can be used, for example, to set aside rented properties for working households if thought beneficial to improve an area's income mix, or as shown by the research a neighbourhood's standing on people-based indicators such as health, or can be used to prioritise allocations to tenants with proven household skills where there is a high incidence of tenancy breakdown. Neighbourhood based outreach for places marked by a high incidence of overcrowding and housing need could be developed to complement this method.

iii. – Improving tenure diversity

As indicated in the independent research mixing tenure has been shown to have positive impacts for neighbourhoods, improving resident satisfaction and area popularity, with fewer reported crimes and incidents of ASB. Therefore, in neighbourhoods with low levels of owner-occupation the Council would look to promote a tenure balance approaching the borough average, though remaining in proportion to other improvement goals and consistent with discharging the Council's main housing duties. A number of properties either newly built or within the existing Council housing stock would be ringfenced for sale to households on low incomes who have an aspiration to move into home ownership. They would be sold on a shared ownership basis maybe via a housing association (Registered provider) making them affordable. Preference would be given to residents already living in the neighbourhood and those on the housing list with a recognised housing need, and thereafter to residents or those who work in the borough registered on the Council's Home Buy register.

Disposing to a housing association would have the advantage of residents being able to draw on the considerable experience and specialist expertise housing associations have acquired over many years of constructing, marketing and administering shared ownership accommodation. The Council currently does not hold this expertise in-house and would need to find the finances to staff and develop such a capacity or pay significant agency fees if a housing association were to be appointed to provide this service on the Council's behalf. Housing associations also potentially have access to capital funding from the Homes and Community Agency unavailable to the local authority which can be put to refurbishing properties up to a high standard so as to attract buyers who may not otherwise have chosen to purchase in less popular neighbourhoods.

Disposing units to a housing association also has a number of direct financial advantages for the Council:

- The full value of the dwelling is passed to the Council immediately. In contrast if the Council sells directly to a shared-owner the receipts would be limited to the proportion sold which is frequently only 25% (to ensure affordability). Shared-owners would be under no obligation either at the outset or in the future to buy the unsold share, whether in whole or in part.
- The receipt would not count as a right to buy receipt and if the correct procedures were followed would not be caught by pooling, ensuring the retention of the full receipt by the council.
- Properties could be sold in packages with the sales and marketing risks, (especially significant if pepper potted) including the cost of refurbishment for sale, transferred to the Registered Provider, who would also bear future stair-casing, arrears and repossession risks.

Having properties under different management within a block does present a management risk, especially on issues such as antisocial behaviour, sub-letting and leaks, this would be taken into consideration as part of any proposal.

iv. – Coordinated Housing Management Services and Collaborative Neighbourhood Focussed Services

Neighbourhood and Housing Management Services must be delivered effectively as they have a significant impact on all residents. Poor landlord services are unacceptable and can have a negative effect on residents' day to day lives. It is essential that tenancy management issues are addressed at the first point of call and rent management is maintained and controlled. To maintain effective and efficient services and provide assistance to residents when the need is identified, the Council could introduce as part of area improvements, and in partnership with social landlords, a Coordinated Housing Management Service.

A model for this service would be a Neighbourhood Team where the style of management would shift from a transactional approach to a more relationship based service. Officer objectives would be to develop relationships with residents and community groups, offering a generic service able to respond proactively to situations. The co-ordinated Housing Management Service would enable pooling of resources, knowledge and expertise from a cross section of professionals rather than organisations working in isolation which in turn will avoid duplication and provide value for money. The service should ensure residents receive a tailored person centred package of support, which meets their needs, promotes preventative solutions, assists households to be self reliant, lessening dependence on crisis-based or acute services.

v. - Employment and training

Maximising employment and skills training opportunities is a critical strand of any improvement programme. The aim would be to offer results-driven services which carefully consider the different starting points for residents in their journey off welfare benefits and into work.

The NDC research indicates that improvements in this area can take a long time. A programme including the following could be devised to achieve sustained outcomes:

- practical employment support workshops based on estates and pitched at the level of the residents e.g. people furthest from the labour market or lone parents
- flexible and immediate unpaid work experience places with local employers including key large employers such as the council
- short courses or training programmes targeted at filling current vacancies, particularly industry specific offers, e.g. food hygiene training for restaurant or hospitality work
- apprenticeship and traineeship opportunities aimed at young people including NEETs (i.e. young people not in education, employment or training) and others without formal qualifications
- integrated debt and financial advice/support
- community outreach work with schools, community groups, etc. to update residents on job opportunities coming up locally and training needs
- co-ordinated access to supplementary services, e.g. ESOL, childcare availability.

vi. - Resident involvement

Resident involvement is crucial to improving neighbourhoods. All improvement programmes will include consultation with local residents in programme design. The Council and its partners will support those living in designated neighbourhoods to take wherever possible an active part in shaping and delivering improvement for their own areas.

APPENDIX B

SUMMARY OF MAIN DISCUSSION POINTS FROM BOROUGH FORUM MEETING -

- The Forum queried the source of the funding to maintain stock as described in point 7.3 of the April Cabinet report.

Officers confirmed that the figure referred to in the report was an annual capitalised sum set aside only to maintain the housing stock in its current condition and that the HEIP was a much more tailored approach to specific estates.

- Referring to the first paragraph of the report, the Forum asked if this is to be offered only to people living on the estates and mentioned problems associated with 6 month Short Hold tenancies.

Officers confirmed that properties would be Low Cost Home Ownership (LCHO) built by housing associations, with strictly controlled access and nominations. Officers stated that there was very limited possibility of LCHO tenants being able to sublet, and then only in exceptional circumstances.

- The Forum asked if LCHO properties for sale would only be available to people on LOCATA

Officers replied that the same principal would apply to any sale of vacant home or new build LCHO property. The Council would have 100% nomination rights through its LCHO team H&F Home buy and that the aim is to only sell properties to residents or workers in the Borough.

- A member of the Forum made the point that the scheme involved the sale of council housing and that in her opinion even LCHO in LBHF was relatively “high cost” and that LCHO schemes may be open to abuse.

Officers advised that the Council seek to create a range of affordability for low cost home ownership housing in the borough. The intention would be to create the same range of affordability with any low cost home ownership created under the HEIP.

- A Forum member also stated that in her opinion, lack of investment over the years was the reason for investment being needed now.

Officers replied it was necessary to invest in improvements to estates but also essential in order to help people in the borough to get on the property ladder, and that it was a more effective use of resources to

sell properties in poor repair or which are hard to let. Any receipts raised from disposals would be ringfenced for affordable housing and regeneration purposes.

- The Forum asked if residents had been involved in drawing up the policy.

Officers replied that at this stage the policy was a “work in progress” and that presenting it to Borough Forum was only the first consultation exercise and there would be further consultation, for example in the H&F magazine, before officers reported back to Cabinet on the HEIP. If the HEIP progresses, an estate will be selected using the HEIP criteria and the Council will then consult with residents on the selected estate on what estate improvements they would like to see before submitting a further report to Cabinet on that estate’s improvement action plan .

- The Forum expressed concern over the way estates and properties on them are viewed and observed that some tenants on the estates are vulnerable and wanted to know when and how they will be consulted. It was the Forum’s view that other organisations engage more effectively and tenants view estates in a negative way which causes problems and suggested that a programme of engagement could work to improve estates.

Officers agreed that it was important to engage with as many residents as possible. One of the principle aims of the HEIP is to work with residents on selected estates to agree what improvements would be most beneficial and officers welcomed suggestions from the Forum on how tenant engagement could be improved. Officers emphasised that no improvements will take place on estates without full consultation with residents of the estate.

- The Forum made the point that the sale of council homes would dilute the objectives of the London Plan.

Officers pointed out that the Council had exceeded its housing targets under the London Plan and that people moving out of the borough due to a lack of affordable housing for sale was a big issue.

- The Forum asked whether under the HEIP policy, buildings would be demolished to build new properties on the site?

Officers replied that this was not the intention at this time as the intention was to bring back into use any disused areas of land such as bin store areas, garages, pram sheds and undercrofts to enhance the area and design out possible ASB areas.

- A member of the Forum made a point about what he saw as the unfairness of many private rented tenants living in former council properties on estates, and the issue of illegal subletting.

Officers confirmed that any new build would be controlled by the lease agreement granted to whoever purchased the property. This agreement would not stop legal sub – letting but would require the landlords permission to agree to any subletting.

- Forum representatives stated that estates needed to find a way of finding resources to continually improve them and that the HEIP seemed a good plan to fund estate improvements. The Forum were particularly reassured that under the HEIP proposals the Council would not be looking to “parachute” improvements onto selected estates but working with residents to develop bespoke estate action plans based on residents knowledge of their estates and what improvements would make the biggest differences.
- One Forum representative commented on the excellent relationship built up with residents and officers at Fulham Court in developing the new community and children’s centre as a good example of how the HEIP could work on the ground.
- The Forum asked where the jobs mentioned in the policy were being generated from, and suggested that what was being proposed sounded like a Youth Training Scheme.

Officers cited the example of Westfield where 7000 jobs had been created. Part of the aims in the HEIP was to offer training in education and employment to residents to raise the level of achievement so that local people can access new employment opportunities as they arise

- The Forum asked what would happen if residents are opposed to developments on estates.

Officers provided the example of Fulham Court new tenants hall where tenants initially opposed the location, but which was progressed after successful consultation. However if a majority of residents were opposed to estate improvements following consultation on their estate, then those views would be taken into consideration to ensure residents felt involved in any decision making.

APPENDIX C

HEIP ASSESSMENT AND SELECTION CRITERIA

Overarching criteria

1. Neighbourhoods that may be potentially suitable for comprehensive regeneration do not fall within the purview of this policy and are therefore outside the scope of selection.
2. Neighbourhoods may be brought forward for improvement and have their priority increased where they attract resources and a programme of activities outside the frame of this policy, providing there are sound business reasons (of a predominantly housing nature given sources of funding) and the evidence shows Community Strategy goals would be furthered by designating the neighbourhood as an Action Area for Improvement.
3. At the outset officers will not look to initiate an improvement programme on the Council's largest estates (save in wholly exceptional circumstances), given this is a new approach and the Council will seek to move by degrees.
4. In deciding which neighbourhoods to bring forward officers will be mindful of the findings of independent research, insofar as they indicate that proven methods of improvement are contingent on (1) area size and (2) the geographic boundaries of improvement areas equating with the spatial brief of the main delivery agents.

Defining a neighbourhood

5. Neighbourhood boundaries will in all cases encompass Council housing estates and in most cases will be delineated by estate boundaries. There are several reasons for this:
6. working at an area level on housing and the physical environment is known to bring a wide range of benefits
7. deprivation data disproportionately maps onto the borough's social housing estates
8. the main delivery partner for housing and the physical environment is Housing Services whose operational brief, where it is spatial, is in relation to housing estates
9. In relation to size, neighbourhoods will be defined as areas made up of 100 or more dwellings with 100 or more social rent tenants in keeping with the improvement methods which so far have been mainly tested on larger populations.
10. Where a number of small estates are in the selection pool and are in close geographical proximity and all evidence high levels of need, the viability of

them being treated as a single neighbourhood for improvement purposes may be considered.

11. Where high deprivation is mapped onto an estate below 100 units, and that estate is in close geographical proximity to an estate identified for improvement, officers will consider the viability of the former constituting part of the neighbourhood for improvement.
12. As expertise is gathered in the use of estate improvement methods, future reviews will consider the feasibility of extending this policy (1) to estates below 100 units and (2) to neighbourhoods not dominated by Council Estates and Council-owned housing and (3) to the largest estates.

The assessment process

13. Housing estates falling under the scope of this policy will in the first instance be put through a needs analysis. Needs evidence will be compiled to compare and rank housing estates that fall under the scope of the policy.
14. A shortlist will be drawn up from this exercise of the 3 neediest estates.
15. This first stage analysis is conceived as a transparent and rudimentary means of sifting out the estates most obviously requiring support, however it will be rudimentary and by no means an exact science. There will be gaps in the statistical picture as data that is not available for all estates will be excluded. This is particularly the case with sub-ward data which is of limited use once catchments fall below a certain size. Estate-level statistics on the various Community Strategy priorities will also be uneven, with some priorities well-served by data and others less so. Universal indicators while ensuring all estates are judged on the same criteria are also unlikely to capture all the complex circumstances of an individual estate, however well devised. Resource constraints, in addition, will hinder sourcing data for all the estates from databases not configured to extract such reports.
16. The top 3 estates will therefore be subjected to a second-stage analysis, involving examining further data sets which may be easier to source for 3 estates, rather than 22. The size of the estate and its main needs will be considered at this point. This will be in terms of whether the improvement methods proposed are likely to have much purchase, and also, at the outset, whether the estate is of an appropriate size for conducting a trial, i.e. not one of the largest.
17. The selection process will be repeated as and when the Council is ready to bring forward the next neighbourhood for improvement, subject to review of the policy and any amendments arising from that review.

The Assessment Tool

18. The assessment tool to be used is set out below.
19. The estates will be accorded a rank for each of the evidence measures. The placings will be collated and averaged out, with weighting applied.

- 20.** Levels of weighting reflect the differing quality and quantity of data for the various community strategy priorities: higher weighting for priorities well represented by data is to ensure the evidence is given due influence. Higher weighting has also been accorded to priorities that encompass the type of needs the improvement methods are most likely to combat – e.g. poor area satisfaction, high crime and ASB, tenure imbalance, concentrations of unemployment and benefit dependency – bearing in mind the twin goal of targeting assistance where it is most needed and where the methods will have most effect. Low weighted priorities acknowledge the fact that the core improvement approach will not be a principally area-based one, though these will remain as priorities for the Council and its partners and the expectation will be that area-based support complements those core approaches.
- 21.** The theme ‘Promote home ownership and housing opportunities’ will receive the highest weighting. This is for the reasons expressed in the paragraph above i.e. to ensure resources are channelled to neighbourhoods that would benefit most from the methods and to reflect the quality and quantity of the data. Additionally, it is because the biggest cost in any programme will be physical improvement which will be paid for from housing funds, and would, thus, require any Council estate receiving such funds to demonstrate that it is the neediest for housing investment, over and above what other non-housing needs the area or the residents may have.

Community Strategy Priority	Reason to intervene at a neighbourhood-level	1st stage analysis – Evidence Measure	2nd stage analysis – Evidence Measure	Weighting in overall assessment
Provide a top quality education for all	Many children on the estate need support at school	% of pupils on the estate registered as having special educational needs	% of 7 year olds achieving Level 2 or above in reading, writing and maths in local primary schools % of 11 year olds achieving Level 4 or above in Key Stage 2 in English, maths and science in local primary schools	5%
Tackle crime and ASB	The estate has high levels of crime and ASB	Rate of ASB per 100 residents Average incident of crime (i.e ABH, criminal damage, residential burglary, drugs possession) per head of population		20%
	Graffiti is a problem on the estate	Incidence of graffiti per 100 dwellings		
Deliver a cleaner, greener borough	Graffiti is a problem on the estate	Incidence of graffiti per 100 dwellings	% of estate that is green space	15%
	Litter and caretaking are a problem	Caretaking performance on % of tasks raised and inspected		
	There is insufficient green space			

Promote home ownership and housing opportunities	The estate is mainly monotenure social rented with few owner occupiers	% of properties that are leasehold on the estate Capacity to accommodate new infill housing for low cost home ownership	% of properties that are owner-occupied on the estate	25%
	There are high levels of housing need	% of tenants awaiting a transfer in Bands A-C (excluding under-occupiers and beneficial transfers) % of households in Bands A-C (excluding under-occupiers and beneficial transfers) % of residents applying as homeless as an annual average based on figures for last 3 years % of tenants served with a NOSP (Notice of Seeking Possession) % of new lettings annually to first-time tenants or those that have lost homes in the recent past, based on figures for the past 3 years.		
Setting the framework for a healthier borough	Residents suffer more with their health than elsewhere in the borough	% of residents engaged with children social care (per 100 dwellings) % of residents engaged with adult social care (per 100 dwellings) Incidence of hospital admissions per 100 population as an annual average based	Ambulance call outs per 100 dwellings as an annual average based on figures for last 3 years (where sub-ward data can be meaningfully applied) Teenage pregnancy rate per estate	5%

		on figures for the last 3 years (2006-2009)	% of adult working age population on JSA, Income Support, Incapacity Benefit or Employment and Support Allowance (where sub-ward data can be meaningfully applied)	
Delivering high quality, value for money public services	The area is unpopular	% of residents satisfied with the area* % of new lettings to existing tenants annually, based on figures for the past 3 years.	% of leasehold property that appears to be buy-to-let	15%
	Residents are dissatisfied with services	% of tenants satisfied with the general condition of their property* % of tenants satisfied with the estates management service*		
	Residents have a high take up of costly acute services	% of residents applying as homeless % of residents engaged with children social care (per 100 dwellings) % of residents engaged with adult social care (per 100 dwellings) Fire brigade call outs per 100 dwellings as over the last 5 years Incidence of hospital admissions per 100 residents as an annual average based on figures for the last 3 years	Ambulance call outs per 100 dwellings as an annual average based on figures for last 3 years (where sub-ward data can be meaningfully applied)	
Regenerating the most	Many residents subsist on	% of Council tenants on Housing Benefit	% of all tenants on Housing Benefit	15%

deprived parts of the borough	benefits, most people are on a low income, debt is a problem, and many working age residents are not in employment	<p>% of school age children receiving free school meals</p> <p>% of tenants in rent arrears of 4 weeks or more</p> <p>% of households with incomes of £20k or less</p>	<p>% of leaseholders in service charge arrears</p> <p>% of adult working age population on JSA, Income Support and Incapacity Benefit/ Employment and Support Allowance (where sub-ward data can be meaningfully applied)</p> <p>Average household income of a single person household per estate</p> <p>Average household income of a household with a dependent child per estate</p>	
-------------------------------	--	--	--	--

The evidence indicators

19. The measures used to assess need are by and large self-explanatory. The notes below provide more detail on those statistical measures thought to need more explanation.

20. Population data from the 2001 census is the last complete account of the resident population available at a postcode level which is the closest for data coverage of an estate. This data has been used sparingly given its age. Specifically, it has been used as the head count element in proportioning ASB incidence and hospital admissions. Figures from the forthcoming 2011 census will not be available until 2012.

21. Evidence will have more than one use. For example, numbers approaching the Council as homeless have been counted as a measure of housing need as well as to measure levels of engagement with acute, crisis services.

A Top Quality Education

Primary school data is being relied on as most local children (78%) attend primary school in the borough whereas only a third of local secondary school age residents (34%) attend borough secondary schools. For key stage results performance is collected by school, rather than residential location. This will be a 2nd stage analysis given the resource intensity of identifying what the local primary schools are for each of the respective estates in the 1st stage pool.

Deliver a Cleaner, Greener Borough

Improvements to the physical environment has proven benefits, however, there is little overarching data available on which to consider the comparative merits of one estate's needs for physical improvements - for example, in relation to being cut off and unintegrated with the surrounding local area or to spatially design out crime – against another's. For resource reasons, consideration of these factors will be limited to the 2nd stage analysis.

Promoting home ownership and housing opportunities

The number of units owned on an estate are not necessarily identical with the number that are owner-occupied. The distinction is important as independent research indicates that estate improvements gained from more home owners is dependent on them buying-to-live, rather than buying to let. Figures on current owner-occupation levels are derived from leaseholder records and whether the owner's address for service charge correspondence is the same as the property address. Where the two do not match it can be assumed that the property is not owner-occupied. This is time consuming data to collect and therefore will be reserved for 2nd stage analysis.

The main source of data for determining levels of housing need in the borough is the Housing Register, a list recording all requests for housing received by the Council. Once received, applications to the Housing Register are assessed and accorded a band between A-D, defined as follows:

Band A = Emergency and very severe housing need

Band B = High priority or urgent need to move

Band C = Households with an identified housing need to whom the Council is required to give reasonable preference under s.167 Housing Act 1996

Band D = All other applicants

Households to whom the Council is required by law to give reasonable preference include the homeless, those who are overcrowded and those needing to move for health reasons. Given the above, the significant bands for enumeration and analysis of housing need are therefore bands A-C.

Delivering high quality value for money public services

*The results of the annual Tenants Satisfaction Survey on satisfaction with area, property condition, and estate management will be used, however in accordance with the fact that the respondent sample is small these indicators will be given half the weighting they would have ordinarily received were they equal to the other indicators in the group.

The Decent Homes survey which included a questionnaire on tenant satisfaction had a greater number of respondents. It was undertaken, estate by estate across the course of the last 4 years during a period that has seen significant improvement in HFHomes service standards. Therefore survey feedback would differ depending on when it was collected on the improvement curve. The presence of this variable makes the data set unreliable for purposes of comparison.

The proportion of lets to transfer tenants will be used as an indicator of area popularity. Transfer tenants, having the benefit of a high level of security of tenure, are in stable housing, which affords greater opportunity to accumulate favourable waiting time on the Housing Register and exercise options about when and where they move than those in the same Housing Register band who are homeless, or in short-term tenure in the private rented sector or households living with friends or family, whose more precarious circumstances are likely to result in them taking lettings on estates that are less desirable.

Figures for buy-to-let will be derived from comparing the property address with the owner's service charge address. Where the two do not match it will be assumed that the property address is rented. Housing Benefit data may be used to provide further verification