
ISSUES ARISING FROM FINANCE AND PROCEDURES OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE – 23 JULY 2002

1. PARISH PARTNERSHIP FUND (Minute 358/02)

- 1.1 This item of business was referred by the Finance and Procedures Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 23 July to Council, with a recommendation that the £20,000 allocation for 2001/2002 and the allocation for 2002/2003 and 2003/2004 be returned to the Capital Programme for reconsideration as part of the 2003/2004 budget debate. A copy of the Officers report is attached at Appendix 1.
- 1.2 The Finance and Procedures Overview and Scrutiny Committee have noted the background to the establishment of the Parish Partnership Fund and the position relating to current projects. The residual monies left over from the 2001/2002 Budget had provided grant funding for Hockley Parish Council as part of the transfer of the Laburnum Grove Playspace and refurbishment of that area. The Committee noted that whilst all parishes had been contacted there had been a lack of bid submissions and it was, therefore, considered there would not be any value in repeating the exercise. Parishes could still write in to the Council and request funding assistance for projects they had initiated.

RECOMMENDATION

It is proposed that Council **RESOLVES** that the remainder of the £20,000 allocation for 2001/2002 and the allocation for 2002/2003 and 2003/2004 be returned to the Capital Programme for reconsideration as part of the 2003/2004 Budget debate. (CE)

2. IS/ICT AND E-GOVERNMENT STRATEGIES (Minute 360/02)

- 2.1 This item of business was referred by the Finance and Procedures Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 23 July to Council with recommendations for adopting and implementing a programme of projects. A copy of the Officers report is attached at Appendix 2.

The Committee noted that:-

- the capital grant of £200,000 had been received and would be used to set up various projects. Members were pleased to note that all the items listed as priority projects and proposed for implementation in 2002/03 should be achieved.

- a separate report on options for electronic communication by Members would be submitted to a future meeting for detailed consideration.
- projects had been selected to ensure that if future funding ceased to be available, the on-going costs to this Council would not be excessive.
- e-government provided an alternative method by which residents of the district might communicate with the Council with the intention of improving the overall service delivery but it was necessary to ensure no sections of the community were excluded.

RECOMMENDATION

It is proposed that Council **RESOLVES**:-

- (1) That the proposals in the report be agreed as the basis of the Council's IS/ICT and e-government implementation plans for 2002/03.
- (2) That a further report on options for electronic communication by Members be submitted to the Finance and Procedures Overview and Scrutiny Committee in the next cycle of meetings.
- (3) That the differential pricing proposed for land charge searches received via the National Land Information Service system be approved.
- (4) That the proposals in the report be approved as the basis for the submission of the Council's IEG 2 Statement. (HAMS)

3 SINGLE CAPITAL POT- CAPITAL STRATEGY AND ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN (Minute 362/02)

- 3.1 This item of business was referred by the Finance and Procedures Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 23 July to Council with the recommendation that the Capital Strategy and Asset Plan 2002 be approved and submitted for inclusion in the Single Capital Part – Round Two. A copy of the Officers report is attached at Appendix 3.

RECOMMENDATION

It is proposed that Council **RESOLVES** that the Capital Strategy and Asset Management Plan 2002 be approved and submitted for inclusion in the Single Capital Part – Round 2. (CD(LP&A))

4 CHAMBERS OF TRADE – BIDS FOR TOWN CENTRE INITIATIVES FOR 2002/03 (Minute 364/01)

- 4.1 This item of business was referred by the Finance and Procedures Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 23 July to Council with the recommendation that the bids be accepted in principle with Officers further working with the Chambers to explore other funding sources that would ensure projects proceed and a further report brought back to the next Meeting so a final recommendation can be made. A copy of the Officers report is attached at Appendix 4.
- 4.2 The Committee noted that an annual provision of £5000 was made in respect of initiatives which would improve the economic environment of the town centres and that the funds will be used to support initiatives put forward by the Chambers of Trade.

RECOMMENDATION

It is proposed that Council **RESOLVES**: -

- (1) To note the support of all three bids, in principle, by the Finance and Procedures Overview and Scrutiny Committee.
- (2) That Officers work with the Chambers to explore other funding sources that could ensure that all projects proceed.
- (3) That a further report be brought to the next meeting of the Finance and Procedures Overview and Scrutiny Committee so that a final recommendation can be made. (CEX)

Sarah Fowler

Head of Administrative and Member Services

For further information please contact John Bostock on:-

Tel:- 01702 318140
E-Mail:- john.bostock@rochford.gov.uk

PARISH PARTNERSHIP FUND

1 SUMMARY

- 1.1 This report reviews the success of the Parish Partnership Funding Initiative established in 2001/2002.

2 INTRODUCTION

- 2.1 As part of the 2001/2002 budget making process, Council decided to establish a Parish Partnership Fund of £20,000 from the capital programme, with further allocations of £20,000 in the capital programme for 2002/2003 and 2003/2004. The fund was established to aid the smaller parishes in particular and was focussed around issues relating to Crime and Disorder and especially matters relating to younger people.
- 2.2 Council agreed that the effectiveness of the Partnership Fund should be reviewed after its first year of operation, hence this report.

3 DETAILED CONSIDERATIONS

Projects Funded

- 3.1 As a result of the fund being established, 5 bids were received from the Parish/Town Councils within the District. Those from Barling, Foulness, Ashingdon and Hullbridge were approved, whilst that from Rayleigh Town Council was refused as it was considered, given the size and resources available to that Council, it could fund the project itself. The bid submission from Hullbridge relating to additional CCTV provision was actually funded from specific grant funding given by the Home Office under the 'Communities Against Drugs' initiative. Thus, in effect, only three projects were specifically approved under this initiative as follows:-

<u>Parish</u>	<u>Total Cost of Project</u>	<u>Description of Project</u>	<u>Grant Given</u>
Barling	£10,000	New play equipment	£5,000
Foulness	£7,086	Play area improvements	£3,543
Ashingdon	£14,234	Skateboard Park	£7,117

-
- 3.2 Of the three projects, two have been/are being implemented at the time of writing this report. The Ashingdon project, relating to the provision of a skateboard ramp, has encountered some local objection as to its siting and the Parish Council met earlier this month and decided not to proceed. Nonetheless, they wished to convey their thanks to the District Council for the funding support offered.
- 3.3 At its meeting in February, Council agreed that the residual of monies left over from the £20,000 in 2001/2002 should provide grant funding for Hockley Parish Council as part of the transfer of the Laburnum Grove Play space and refurbishment of that area (approximately £4,000)

Assessment of Success

- 3.4 The Parish Partnership Fund has undoubtedly helped some Parish Councils fund projects which would not otherwise have taken place. The successful Councils have advised that, without the grant being offered by the District Council, their project would not have progressed at all. The presence of District Council grant monies has also helped attract other sources of grant funding. In this sense, therefore, the initiative has been both welcome and successful.
- 3.5 It is apparent however, that the fund was not oversubscribed with bid submissions. It may be that the themes chosen or the criteria laid down limited the number of submissions, although it is interesting that no Parish has commented that it did have a project which it wished to submit, but was discouraged from doing so on account of the themes chosen/criteria laid down by the District Council.
- 3.6 On this basis therefore, there seems little value in simply repeating the 2001/2002 exercise. The options available for the District Council would appear as follows:
- Retain the Fund but change the theme and/or criteria for bid submissions, e.g. environmental enhancements, street furniture, IT links.
 - Return the £20,000 annual allocation to the capital programme for reconsideration as part of the 2003/2004 budget debate.
 - Retain the Fund to assist Parishes, but use it more specifically in relation to the progression of District Council Initiatives, e.g. transference of play areas/local open spaces to the Parishes (similar to the decision taken earlier this year to use the residue of the 2001/2002 allocation to facilitate the transference of Laburnum

Grove to Hockley Parish), work in connection with the District Council's Community Strategy (Parish studies/surveys) etc.

- 3.7 On the basis of this Committee's deliberations, a recommendation can be made to full Council on 30th July 2002.

4 RECOMMENDATION

- 4.1 That the Committee determines how it considers the Council should proceed in connection with the Parish Partnership Initiative Fund and to recommend to full Council accordingly. (CEX)

Background Papers:

Letter from Foulness Parish Council – 1st July 2002

Letters from Ashingdon Parish Council – 28th June 2002 and 4th July 2002

For further information please contact Paul Warren on:-

Tel:- 01702 318199

E-Mail:- paul.warren@rochford.gov.uk

IS/ICT AND e-GOVERNMENT STRATEGIES

1 SUMMARY

- 1.1 This report updates Members on the Council's IS/ICT and e-Government strategies and proposes the programme of projects to be funded in 2002/03.

2 INTRODUCTION

- 2.1 The Council's IS/ICT strategy 2001/02 to 2005/06 was noted at Full Council on 24 April 2001. Section 5 of the strategy was submitted to the then Department of Transport, Local Government and the Regions as the Council's Implementing Electronic Government (IEG) Statement in May 2001.
- 2.2 The IEG Statement was assessed by the Government as being satisfactory subject to two areas where improvements were required. These related to a need for greater detail on implementation of the strategy and information about participation in national projects.
- 2.3 As a result of the satisfactory assessment, a £200,000 capital grant for e-government projects has now been received. This report sets out proposals for the utilisation for this funding, together with proposals for use of the Council's IS/ICT budget for 2002/03.

3 DETAILED CONSIDERATIONS

- 3.1 The Council has made considerable strides in the implementation of its IEG statement. In respect of national projects, the Council has made progress in implementing both the National Land and Property Gazetteer and the National Land Information Service.
- 3.2 The implementation of the uniform/CAPS system for planning and land charges scheduled for August 2002 will bring on-line planning and land charges a step nearer. The website and intranet has also been relaunched during this year.
- 3.3 The Authority has also participated in the Essex Online partnership bid for Local Government Online Funding. The partnership has recently been awarded £300,000 for shared delivery initiatives with a further £50,000 to assist in developing and supporting the partnership. There is the potential for a further £300,000 in 2003/04. The Council will be working with other authorities in Essex to identify suitable projects to be implemented with this funding.

-
- 3.4 At the previous meeting of this Committee on 20 June 2002, a response to the e-gov@local consultation was agreed and this has been submitted to the government. Again, this shows that the Council is participating and responding to national projects.
- 3.5 The Council's Corporate Plan and Best Value Performance Plan, which was approved by the Council on 27 June 2002, contains clear targets for the delivery of IS/ICT systems. The Plan commits the Council to use new technology to develop the following in 2002/03:-
- Improve the website to provide information about Council services
 - A one stop notification process to enable the residents to inform change of contact details once rather than telling each department.
 - Links to the National Land Information System enabling local land charge searches to be made electronically .
 - Linking planning applications to the GIS (Geographical Information System) so that residents can look at planning applications on line.
 - Setting up systems to enable residents to pay Council Tax on line.
 - Setting up document imaging to store more information electronically.
 -
- 3.6 In addition, the Plan commits the Council to achieving in 2003:-
- Access to Committee agendas, reports and minutes on line.
 - e-procurement across the Authority.
- 3.7 The Corporate Plan and Best Value Performance Plan also commits the Council to achieving by 2005 the delivery of services electronically, wherever possible, to those who wish to access them in this manner, in line with central government targets.
- 3.8 On the basis of the projects identified in the Corporate Plan and Best Value Performance Plan, the requirements of the IEG funding, and the needs of individual services, the following list of priority projects is proposed for implementation in 2002/03:-
- Planning and Land Charges on line
 - Council Tax/National Non-Domestic Rate/Benefits on line
 - Auddis (Paperless Direct Debit System)
 - Environmental Health replacement system

-
- Housing – system upgrade or replacement
 - Virtual private network (to enable quicker, more effective links between the Civic Suite, Council Offices and other sites)
 - Members PCs
(including fax machines for Group Leaders and Committee Chairmen)
 - Document Image Processing (to store information electronically)
 - Customer feedback project/management software
 - PRROMPT software (to record letters/complaints)
 - Internet/Website development

3.9 Other initiatives which have been identified for implementation, funding permitting, include:-

- E-procurement
(possible County-wide initiative)
- Homelessness package
- Academy decision support (to enable reports to be more easily produced)

3.10 It is suggested that a separate report on options for electronic communication by Members is submitted in the next cycle of meetings for detailed consideration.

4 LOCAL LAND CHARGES

4.1 To enable the Council to progress further in implementing the National Land Information Service requirements, the Authority is required to implement a differential fee to ensure that the electronic land charge service offered by the National Land Information Service is attractive to users, rather than using the traditional means of submitting searches. The Government suggests that a minimum 18% differential is set with the over the counter, or non-NLIS searches being more expensive. This matter was highlighted in the report to the previous meeting of this Committee on the review of fees and charges.

4.2 To maintain income levels while providing an 18% differential the government propose that search fees should be increased by 3.75%. This figure is based on a projected figure of 20% of searches made through NLIS in the coming year. For Rochford this means an increase in the standard search fee of £5 from £135 to £140. NLIS searches would then be charged at £114.80 (£140 less 18%).

5 IEG 2 STATEMENT

- 5.1 There is a requirement for the Council to produce its second IEG Statement by 7 October 2002. This must demonstrate progress in implementation of the first Statement together with a list of projects for achievement in 2003/04. A further allocation of £200,000 of e-Government funding will depend on its successful submission. However, at the time of writing this report, the Government guidance on the production of IEG 2 Statements had not yet been produced.
- 5.2 Members are therefore asked in considering the proposals in this report to also agree them as the basis for the submission of the IEG 2 Statement by 7 October 2002.

6 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 The total funding available for IS/ICT and e-Government initiatives in 2002/03 is as follows:-
- £200,000 e-Government capital grant from the government
 - £70,000 within the Council's existing revenue estimates
 - £30,000 within the Council's existing capital programme
 - £20,000 provision for website and intranet development within the existing revenue estimates.
- 6.2 Both the Council's existing requirements and the funding for implementing electronic government will be used together to ensure effective implementation of the proposals in the report.

7 RECOMMENDATION

It is proposed that the Committee **RESOLVES** to recommend to Council -

- (1) That the proposals in the report be adopted as the basis of the Council's IS/ICT and E-government implementation plans for 2002/03.
- (2) That a further report on options for electronic communication by Members be submitted in the next cycle of meetings.
- (3) That the differential pricing proposed for land charge searches received via the NLIS system be approved.
- (4) That the proposals in the report be approved as the basis for the submission of the Council's IEG 2 Statement.

7.17.10

Sarah Fowler

Head of Administrative and Member Services

Background Papers:

IS/ICT Strategy 2001/2002.

e-Government Strategy Update report to the Corporate Resources Sub-Committee on 13 November 2001.

For further information please contact Sarah Fowler on:-

Tel:- 01702 546366 (Ext 3800)

E-Mail:- sarah.fowler@rochford.gov.uk

7.17.11

SINGLE CAPITAL POT – CAPITAL STRATEGY AND ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN

1 SUMMARY

- 1.1 This report explains the requirement to submit Capital Strategy and Asset Management Plans to the Government as part of the arrangements for capital allocations under the Single Capital Pot initiative, and sets out for Members' approval the Capital Strategy and Asset Management Plans for 2002/03.

2 SINGLE CAPITAL POT – SECOND ROUND

- 2.1 A "single capital pot" for the allocation of Central Government capital support to local authorities was implemented for the 2002/03 financial year. Following a "dry run" in 2000/01 the first allocations using the new system were made in December 2001.
- 2.2 The allocation provides a single Basic Credit Approval (BCA) for each authority rather than separate or 'ring fenced amounts' for specific service areas. The majority of the 'pot' is allocated on a needs basis derived from Government statistics and indicators. The remainder is based upon an assessment of local authorities' Capital Strategy and Asset Management Plans and of performance in service delivery.
- 2.3 The statements are judged against pre-set assessment criteria based on a range of primary and secondary requirements. Capital Strategy and Asset Management Plans assessed as 'good' each earn £50,000 of discretionary capital resources; a satisfactory rating will earn £25,000.
- 2.4 Rochford's Capital Strategy and Asset Management Plans were formally submitted for the first round in July 2001 and achieved £75,000 of additional capital resource. They must be revised and re-submitted by 31 July 2002 for consideration in the current financial year.
- 2.5 The revised Capital Strategy and Asset Management Plan 2002 are appended to this report for consideration and approval.

3 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

- 3.1 Other than as outlined in the strategy, the direct financial implications from the approval of the submission of these statements are the potential to receive up to £100,000 discretionary capital resource allocation for 2003/04 financial year.

4 RECOMMENDATION

That the Capital Strategy and Asset Management Plan 2002 be approved and submitted for inclusion in the Single Capital Pot – Round 2. (CD(LPA))

John Honey

Corporate Director (Law, Planning & Administration)

Background Papers:

Single Capital Pot Guidance - 2002
Go-East Letter - 27 June 2002

For further information please contact John Honey on:-

Tel:- 01702318004
E-Mail:- john.honey@rochford.gov.uk

7.17.13

ROCHFORD DISTRICT COUNCIL -CAPITAL STRATEGY STATEMENT

The capital strategy bring together all the needs and priorities within the District of Rochford that have an influence on the capital investment plans for the Authority. The main influences on the capital strategy are -

- **The Corporate plan and strategies of the Council** – which identifies in detail the priorities of the Council/**The Best Value Performance Plan** – which assesses performance
- **The Asset Management Plan** – which looks in detail at the condition and use of the Council's assets
- **The Housing Investment Programme** – which identifies the priorities for Housing within the District
- **The IS/ICT strategy** – which looks at the requirements and developments of new technologies, used to deliver services and progress towards e-government.
- **The community strategy** will bring together the views of local communities, the requirements of the Council and it's partner bodies.

These are all corporate documents that have been constructed by both Corporate Management Board and Operational Management Team and approved by Members. Members approve the final capital programme within the annual budget process so that competing priorities can be evaluated.

For 2002/03, rather than produce two similar but separate documents, the Council has amalgamated its Corporate Plan and Best Value Performance Plan into one. That document "Our performance over the Past Year; Our Future Work Programme", was approved in June 2002.

The Capital Strategy has not been submitted for consultation this year. In 2001 extensive consultation was undertaken to which we received only 2 questions on the document.

Corporate Plan/Best Value Performance Plan

The key objectives of the Council are

- To provide quality, cost effective services
- To work towards a safer and more caring community

- To promote a green and sustainable environment
 - To encourage a thriving local economy
 - To improve the quality of life for people in our District
 - To maintain and enhance our local heritage and culture

The main issues identified in the combined Corporate Plan/Best Value Performance Plan that affect the capital strategy are as follows.

- Moving towards a balanced budget
- The implementation of the Council's IS/ICT strategy and E-Government strategy
- The Best Value Review of key services
- The implications of the new Leisure contract
- The implementation of the town centre enhancement programmes for Hockley, Rochford and Hullbridge
- The implementation and rollout of the Council's recycling initiatives
- The implementation of the Crime and Disorder strategy
- The refurbishment of the run down properties in West Street, Rochford
- The development of the Hardwick House site in Rayleigh and the upgrading of other sheltered housing schemes
- The creation of a new country park in the east of the district
- The renovation of the historic windmill
- Review and changes to the Council's office accommodation over the next three years in response to the Disabilities Discrimination Act, the role of IS/IT and the improvement to customer access.

Asset Management Plan

The Council will work systematically through its assets to verify the current usage and ensure that options on the future of those assets are identified. Where surplus assets are sold they will produce capital receipts. These will be made available for the Capital Strategy. Capital requirements from the asset management plan will be built into the capital strategy. From the work undertaken to date, which includes a public consultation exercise, the key issues have been identified as

- More investment in the condition of public open spaces
- The future needs of public buildings (see above)
- Issues that flow from the Council's best value programme.
- The review of assets following developments in new technologies(see above)

Housing Investment Plan

The Housing Investment plan for 2002/03 is under preparation.

The majority of expenditure in respect of Council housing is met from the Major Repairs Reserve. This is based on funds made available from the Government. These are concentrated on bringing council housing up to modern standards and undertaking large scale repairs and improvements.

Priorities are determined chiefly by technical officers on the requirements of the properties, however all items are discussed by the tenants groups prior to decisions by Members. Tenants have also been requested to identify their priorities and following this there is now a programme for the replacement of front and back doors.

For private housing within the district the Council will continue with its policy of making available grants for essential improvements and repairs for owners who qualify for financial help. The adaptation of homes for the disabled will also continue.

The Council has undertaken many partnerships with Housing Associations and will consider providing assistance for future schemes where resources allow. Associations working in the District have been approached on three major issues. Firstly the Council has a number of small sites for disposal, which are part of or adjoining to existing Council housing. Associations have made submitted ideas for their development. The Council is reviewing the future of one of its sheltered housing schemes, as there are significant costs for improvements. Associations have developed schemes, which have led to bids for funding from the Housing Corporation. The council agreed to provide funds to assist homelessness. Associations have submitted proposals for this funding and the selected partner is now in the process of purchasing properties.

IS/ICT strategy

The Government has accepted the strategy for this Council. Grant is now available of £200,000 for both 2002/03 and 2003/04. The first year programme will be determined on the following

- The priorities already identified from the above
- The scale of contribution to e-government
- The ability to implement quickly

Control and Monitoring Process for the Capital Strategy Statement

The Council needs to ensure that the capital investment, required to achieve the Council's objectives, is properly identified, members will agree the prioritised capital programme covering a three-year period matching priorities with resources available. All capital expenditure comes under the requirements of contract standing orders and financial regulations. The Council has already set up an officer working party to monitor the implementation of the capital

programme. Members receive reports on the monitoring of the capital programme.

Procurement

Most of the proposals shown in the current capital programme involve partnership working. These include Essex County Council and the relevant Parishes on the Town centre developments, with the contract let by the County Council. Our contractors with regard the repair and improvement of leisure buildings and IS/IT strategy. Funding bodies regarding the new Country Park at Blatches Farm and the renovation of the historic windmill in Rayleigh. Other bodies for items like the restoration of derelict properties in West Street, Rochford and Housing Associations in relation to non HRA housing.

Prioritisation of Capital Investment

In the light of the above Members have to decide on priorities and balance the competing demands of services and the community. Members will look at not only what is required but also what is achievable within a programme. The Council has therefore set the following key priorities and targets for the three year programme.

- **Investment in statutory and priority services** to ensure the continuation and improvement of essential services and value for money
- **Ensure that landlord and owner responsibilities are undertaken** including priority items identified through the asset management plan these include works under the Disabilities Discrimination Act.
- **Improve infrastructure** that has an influence on economic activity and the well being of the Authority. This mainly relates to the improvement of town and village centres. These schemes are in partnership with Essex County Council, the local Parish Councils and local businesses.
- **Priority items flowing from key strategy documents** including the Corporate Plan/Best Value Performance Plan and Community Plan. Emphasis is given to funding of schemes, which generates external funding. Examples are the Country Park where grant support of over £100,000 has already been received and Rayleigh Windmill, where resources have been authorised in order to attract Lottery funding.

CAPITAL STRATEGY STATEMENT – 2002 – BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- The District Council is within the County of Essex and has an area of 17,094 hectares and a population of 79,220.
- Police services are provided by Essex Police and the Health Services are provided by South Essex Health Authority
- Within the District there are 13 Parish Councils and 1 Town Council. These cover the whole District
- As at March 2002 the Council had

Type of asset	Area Sq. M	Outside Sq. M	Balance Sheet Valuation £m
1871 Council Dwellings	-	-	83.18
HRA – Miscellaneous property	-	-	1.89
3 Administration centres	4,378	1,528	1.95
5 Leisure Buildings	10,038	17,491	12.65
7 Public Conveniences	188	-	0.2
7 Fee paying Car Parks		27,287	3.01
280 acres of open spaces which includes 28 playgrounds and 30 football pitches	1699	1266 *	0.8
Miscellaneous	358	241	0.4
* Hard surfaces only			

- The Council discharges its main functions through external contractors. These contracts reduce the need for capital expenditure in the delivery of these services and with the new contract covering the leisure buildings passes the responsibility for repairs, maintenance and improvements to the contractor.
- The Council employs approximately 200 whole time equivalent staff for services other than housing and 40 in respect of Council Housing.
- Except for sheltered housing the Council has no significant backlog of works outstanding to its buildings which cannot be contained in the current level of on-going programme. In sheltered housing the Council has a significant volume of work outstanding with regards the improvement of stock and the removal of shared facilities. This is currently estimated at £1.5 m.
- The Council has significant problems in relation to its revenue account. Continuous pressure has been mounted on the Government to seek better

grant support for Rochford. We currently receive the lowest grant per head of population in Essex and the 9th lowest in England. One implication of this is that capital schemes that have significant revenue implications are extremely difficult to include within the programme and capital support from revenue is extremely limited.

- Apart from the leisure contract the Council has attracted funding for the new Country Park and its IS/ICT strategy. The Council is unlikely to enter into any private finance initiatives due to the size of the Authority and the revenue implications
- Privately owned properties account for 92 % of the housing stock within the District. This reduces the need for direct support from the Council
- There is a healthy number of voluntary, community and religious groups within the District- Village and Community Halls tend to be locally funded.
- The Council is the owner of Housing and General Fund properties and has landlord and owner responsibilities in relation to them
- The District has strong links with the Essex County Council covering many services.
- The Council has partnership arrangements and partnership agreements with the Town and Parish Councils throughout the district.
- The Council supports a number of voluntary and community organisations, usually by small scale revenue support. Some of these organisations provide and maintain their own premises
- The Council regularly consults with tenant representatives regarding Council housing.
- The Council consults with the local Chambers of Trade and other organisations promoting economic activity. The Council is now a partner authority in the recently extended Thames Gateway to include south Essex and with other local partners and the private sector is developing a strategy for the Thames Gateway Partnership – South Essex.
- The Council has partnership arrangements with a number of Registered Social Landlords. Here the Council is involved in both the strategic issues and individual schemes. The Council regularly consults with them on their future plans.

7.17.19

- The Council has partnership arrangements with all relevant statutory bodies. Where applicable the Council will try to ensure that our policies are incorporated within their strategies.
- The Council works with Castle Point and Rochford Primary Care Trust to identify and address issues that give rise to ill health and health inequalities in the District, and participates in the production of the Local Health Plan. A joint member advisory board has recently been established involving the District Council and the Trust.
- The Council works with the Local Police, the Drug Action Team and other relevant agencies on crime and disorder issues.

The net budget of the Council is around £7.5m for 2002/03

The current capital programme for 2002/03 – 2004/05

	2002/03	2003/04	2004/05
Investment In statutory and priority services			
Information and Communication technologies	247,000	230,000	30,000
Replacement of vehicles and equipment	176,800	71,000	30,000
Landlord and owner responsibilities			
Major repairs and improvements to operational assets including access for the disabled.	440,000	125,000	
Improvements to Infrastructure			
Working with the Parish Council, the County Council and business groups to improve town and village centres.	435,000		
Priority Items – key strategy documents			
Working with the Parish Councils, the County Council and Police on crime disorder and safety issues	160,500	20,000	
Development of open spaces and play facilities	358,000	50,000	50,000

Housing Investment Plan			
Grants for house renovation and disabled adaptations	169,000	170,000	170,000
Partnership schemes with Housing Associations	287,000	167,000	167,000
Major repairs and improvements to Council Housing (Major Repairs Allowance)	1,183,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Total Investment proposed	3,456,300	1,833,000	1,447,000

The funding of the capital programme is as follows

	2002/03	2003/04	2004/05
Credit Approvals from the Government	324,000	306,000	306,000
Use of Capital Receipts	1,125,427	261,000	75,000
Capital Grants	316,000	266,000	66,000
Earmarked reserves	632,873	-	-
Major Repairs Allowance (HRA)	1,058,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Total financing	3,456,300	1,833,000	1,447,000

New Sports centre

In 2003/04 the Council has the intention of borrowing under the new freedom to borrow within prudential guidelines. This will be for an estimated £1m to part fund a replacement leisure centre in partnership with our private sector leisure contractor. This will allow the revenue cost of the scheme to be reduced. This is not shown in the table above.

Further information

Further information regarding this capital strategy can be obtained from

Dave Deeks - Head of Financial Services

dave.deeks@rochford.gov.uk

**Council Offices, South Street, Rochford, Essex, SS4 1BW
01702 318029**

Or visit the Councils website at www.rochford.gov.uk

1. Overview

1.1 INTRODUCTION

This plan is to be read in conjunction with the Capital Strategy 2002. The purpose of the document is to provide a framework for the planning and monitoring of physical assets (land & buildings) during their usefulness to the authority to provide the best possible match of assets with service delivery strategies.

Rochford is a small authority employing less than 220 staff. The Council's asset base is equally small and comprised principally of operational, direct service property. The most significant asset is the Housing stock. However, with the continued success of the Right to Buy, the Council now has less than 1900 properties for rent including 14 sheltered housing schemes. There are approximately 783 acres of open space and children's playgrounds and 8 fee paying car parks. The only commercial property held is 3 shops with flats over held within Housing Revenue Account.

Management and maintenance of the Council's 3 sports centres, swimming pool and 3 public halls has been transferred to Holmes Place Plc as part of the recently tendered Leisure Services Contract.

The Council Offices are situated in South Street, Rochford and comprise a number of former residential buildings converted to office accommodation. The Council Chamber and Committee Rooms are located at the Civic Suite, Rayleigh and accommodation is provided in the premises for Rayleigh Town Council, the Citizens Advice Bureau, the Registrar of Births, Deaths and Marriages and two local charities, Mayday Mobile and Crossroads. The Council is currently considering improvements and redevelopment of the building.

1.2 OVERVIEW OF PROGRESS

Implementation of the Modernising Agenda, with the Council opting for the "fourth option", a streamlined committee structure, combined with all-out elections following a Ward Boundary Review by the Local Government Commission has led to significant change within the authority. The Council now operates three principal policy committees mirrored by three overview and scrutiny committees under a majority party administration.

Following competitive tender a new Leisure Management Company, Holmes Place Plc, have been awarded a 20 year contract to manage the Council's leisure facilities. This contract includes provision for capital investment of £7 million over the term. The company has also taken responsibility for the maintenance of the leisure buildings. One sports centre, currently joint use, is to be replaced with purpose built premises as part of a joint initiative with Essex County Council.

The Council has undertaken a review of office accommodation in accordance with its corporate property strategy. Proposals are now underway to maximise and rationalise use of offices and to achieve a greater presence for the Council within the largest town in its district, Rayleigh.

Agreement has been reached with the County Council on the use of the former Park School which included a joint-use leisure facility. This is to be replaced by a new leisure centre on the site funded in part by redevelopment and in partnership with the new Leisure Management Company

103 acres of land at Blatches Farm, Eastwood have been acquired from Essex County Council for development of a Country Park in accordance with identified need in the County Structure Plan.

35-39 West Street, Rochford have been acquired by compulsory purchase and transferred to the Southend Building Preservation Trust to be restored as part of the Council's initiative to enhance the town.

The Council's programme for refurbishment of public toilets won a national award for work carried out at its facility at Crown Hill, Rayleigh.

A lottery bid of £180,000 has been made for improvement and restoration work to The Windmill, Rayleigh. This building, within the curtilage of Mill Hall, is unusual in that it occupies a town centre site. It is currently licensed to the Rayleigh Antiquarian Society who store and display antiques and memorabilia. The Windmill is opened to the public at weekends.

A more comprehensive survey of Council Housing has been undertaken in accordance with the Decent Homes Action Plan and a programme of improvement identified for Sheltered Housing Schemes.

A full Disability Discrimination survey has been completed and an Action Plan is being prepared to implement necessary improvements to the Council's public buildings by 2004.

In accordance with the Council's E-Government Strategy, software upgrades have been introduced in Estates Management, Local Land Charges, Development and Building Control, GIS and various minor systems to allow web based access to corporate information. This is currently available on the Council's intranet only but provides the ability to move within the coming year to electronic delivery of Land Charge Searches, Planning Applications and payment of Council Tax.

1.3 CORPORATE OBJECTIVES

In recent years the Council has developed a number of linked plans and strategies which draw together to form a 3 year business plan and a 5 year strategy for the improvement of services. The Corporate Plan and Best Value Performance Plan have been combined as a single document for 2002/3. Strategies include:

7.17.23

• Crime and Disorder Reduction Strategy	• Capital Programme
• Food Law Enforcement Service Plan	• Corporate Plan & Best Value Performance Plan
• Housing Strategy	• IS/ICT Strategy
• District Transport Strategy	• Corporate Consultation Strategy
• Leisure Strategy	• Rochford District Local Plan
• LA 21 Strategy	• Community Care Plan
• South East Essex Economic Strategy	•

Other plans and strategies, including a Community Plan and Procurement Strategy are in the course of development. The Asset Management Plan links with these to ensure that assets are considered as a strategic resource supporting effective service delivery and the achievement of the overall business plan.

Table 1. Example of links between Council strategies and property

Corporate Plan Objectives	Key Tasks from Corporate Plan & Best Value Performance Plan	Contribution from Assets
Provide quality, cost effective services	Move towards a balanced budget and maintain an adequate balance in reserves.	Rationalise office accommodation in Rochford and Rayleigh.
	Reduce Fraud	To provide reception and interview facilities for DSS HB Verification Framework
Work towards a safer and more caring community	Reduce incidents of vandallism in District	Rolling programme of playspace refurbishment for infants and seniors
		Information and reporting system to record trends in damage occurring to Council property
Promote a green and sustainable environment	Develop plan for promotion and effective use of woodland areas	Increased public usage of Open Spaces and woodlands. Creation of new Country Park at Blatches Farm

7-17-24

Encourage a thriving local economy	Car Parking	Decide most effective management system and tariffs
	Working with Thames Gateway South Essex	Input of information to aid decision making process
Improve the quality of life for people in our District	Development of a new housing strategy	Revised targets for housing provision
		Reduced waiting time for repairs and maintenance
		Programme of work for refurbishment of all Sheltered Housing Schemes
	Improve access for disabled to public buildings	Complete Disability Discrimination survey of all Council premises
		2 year programme of work to achieve compliance
Maintain and enhance our local heritage and culture	Protection of Listed Buildings	CPO and refurbishment of 25-39 West Street, Rochford
		Lottery Funding Application for Windmill

1.4 Programme of Continuous Improvement.

Rochford's asset base is small and Heads of Service have an intimate knowledge of all property used in connection with service delivery in their own areas and most have a general knowledge of all property owned by the Council. Assets are not perceived to be ring-fenced within any given services with the exception of Housing Revenue Account property. Some services have a clearly defined role as custodian but because the authority is smaller in total than the departments in many larger authorities all property is viewed as a corporate asset and decisions made accordingly.

The council offices consist of a row of converted houses in South Street, Rochford comprising listed Georgian and Victorian buildings and one 14th century Meeting House. All services are based here. Because of their location and design there is little or no requirement for formal arrangements for shared or cross-service use of assets.

Nevertheless, decisions taken in connection with service delivery must include the following guiding principles to be applied to all decisions involving property.

7.17.25

- ◆ assets held by the authority are recognised as service inputs similar to IT, staff resources and finance and are aligned to services in the same way
- ◆ asset management decisions are integrated with strategic planning
- ◆ asset planning decisions are based on evaluation of alternatives which consider acquisition, operation and disposal costs and the benefit and risks of ownership
- ◆ accountability is established for the condition, use and performance of assets
- ◆ disposals are based on analysis of the methods achieving the best net return to the authority taken in the context of the Authority's overall aims and objectives
- ◆ an effective internal control structure has been established for asset policies and procedures
- ◆ use of information systems provide reliable, relevant and timely data with which to make informed decisions

The corporate property strategy is an agenda set by Members in accordance with the Asset Management Plan. This has resulted in a systematic review and disposal or re-allocation of unused and under-used assets over the last two years, the transfer of liability for maintenance of leisure buildings and the ongoing review of all operational assets on the basis of criteria outlined at Appendix 1.

Proposals under consideration for the coming year include;

- (a) review of all Council owned play areas
- (b) the improvement and alteration of the Civic Suite, Rayleigh funded by the disposal of at least one property currently used for offices in South Street.

In the longer term consideration is being given to the possibility of moving all services to cheaper out of town accommodation with improved customer interface through e-government initiatives and the provision of shop-front services in all towns in the district.

1.5 Consultation/User surveys

Extensive user surveys have been undertaken in connection with major services including Planning, Housing, Leisure and Asset Management. These have included information on stakeholder satisfaction. Information gathered has been used in consideration of numerous policies from Dog Fouling in public open spaces to use of Council reception areas, Offices and sports facilities.

Consultation has taken place top down throughout the organisation with regard to office accommodation including discussion with Unison. A physical review of all office accommodation undertaken formally by Corporate Management Board (CMB) during office hours (probably not possible in larger authorities) provided the opportunity for face to face discussion with staff.

In addition, to ensure that every Best Value Review fully understands its obligations with regard to property, each Review Chairman is required to complete, sign and return the following pro forma to the CPO confirming that

Assets have been properly considered. This system may be extended to cover all relevant planning, audit and service reviews considered by CMB.

Table 2 Asset Management: Checklist for Best Value Review Chairman

Action Required	Responsible Officer	Action	
		Required	Achieved
Establish that assets are recognised by the Review Team as service inputs and aligned to the Service in the same way as IT, Staff resources and Finance.			
Identify property from the Asset Register currently used by the Service. (Profile of existing Service)			
Identify property needs arising out of options for the future provision. (Option)			
Consult with Corporate Property Officer on effects on strategic asset plan.			
Base decisions on assets around evaluation of alternatives which consider acquisition, operation and disposal costs and the benefit and risks of ownership.			
Consult with Asset Management Group on implications of final report and recommendations to ensure property decisions are consistent and in line with Corporate Planning objectives.			

2

Structure for Management of Assets

2.1 Corporate Property Officer

John Honey, Corporate Director (Law, Planning & Administration)
Date of appointment: 7 December 2000

2.2 Role & responsibilities

- Strategic overview of asset management
- Preparation and maintenance of the Asset Management Plan
- Maintenance of the Property Register
- Establishment and maintenance of a Performance Measurement system
- Monitoring of Best Value and Process Reviews to ensure consideration is given to the principles of asset planning
- Identification of under-used or surplus assets as part of the rolling review in consultation with Heads of Service
- Arrange meetings of the Asset Management Group on a regular basis and ensure that recommendations are passed on from that Group to Corporate Management Board

2.3 Asset Management Group (Officers)

Corporate Director (Law, Planning & Administration)
Head of Revenue & Housing Services
Head of Administration & Member Services
Head of Planning Services
Property Maintenance & Highway Manager
Date of appointment: 20 December 2000

2.4 Terms of reference

- to ensure that property decisions are consistent with service requirements
- to recommend priorities in line with Corporate Planning objectives
- to identify opportunities for innovation, income generation or to reduce expenditure
- to review acquisitions/disposals
- to co-ordinate and assess maintenance programmes and Capital Programme provision
- to maintain and monitor the property register
- to review and revise performance measurement in line with DETR Good Practice Guidelines
- to undertake a systematic rolling review of existing assets
- to identify unused and underused assets

2.5 Policy & Finance Committee

Councillors P.F.A.Webster (Chairman)
R.S.Allen, K.A.Gibbs, J.E.Grey,
A.J.Humphries, C.A.Hungate, C.C.Langlands,
C.J.Lumley, C.R.Morgan, J.M.Pullen,
P.K.Savill, S.P.Smith, Mrs.M.A.Starke.

Date of appointment: 14 May 2002

2.6 Terms of reference

To exercise the Council's functions in relation to all matters not otherwise reserved to Council or the responsibility of another committee with particular reference to Finance, Council Budget and Support Services including the formulation and implementation of the policy framework and management of the budget in respect of these functions.

2.7 Asset Register

Comprehensive property register available to:

- i) All Managers as Word document in shared directory
G:\shared\LPAAAssetMan\register
- ii) Register is currently being transferred to GIS linked Uniform Spacial 7 Estates Management system available across the intranet via MapAccess

2.8 Reports on Property Performance

Report from	to	frequency
Corporate Property Officer	Asset Management Group (Officers)	Monthly
	Corporate Management Board	Quarterly
	Policy & Finance Committee	As necessary
Asset Management Group (Officers)	Corporate Management Board	Monthly
Corporate Management Board	Policy & Finance Committee	As necessary
	Council	Quarterly
Policy & Finance Committee	Council	As necessary

PART 3 Programme and Plan Development

3. Action Plan

Action	Responsible Officer	Resource/ Financial Information	Timescale	Notes
3.1 Identification of Unused & Underused Assets	AMG	£150,000 Target Income to Gen. Fund 2002/3	Ongoing	Very small asset base. Income in current financial year £145,000 to date.
3.2 Acquisition of Uniform 2000 Estates Management Module	HAMS	5000	September 2001	Installation July 2002. Delayed to allow installation at same time up-grade to GIS, Planning and Local Land Charges system. Training for Users 22-25 July 2002
3.3 Introduction of Aerial Photographic database	HPS	3900	July 2001	Completed. To be linked to GIS Database – August 2002
3.4 Rolling Programme of Condition Survey	AMG		Commencing January 2001	Completed
3.5 Linkage of Asset Register to ESRI Arcview GIS system	HAMS		May 2001	UPRNs assigned to all property in District. Integral to Estate Management Module. (See 3.2 above)
3.6 Interim report on progress of Asset Management Group	CD(LPA)		January 2002	Completed. Further report due September 2002
3.7 Review of Performance Measurement in line with DETR guidelines	AMG		January – June 2001	Completed National pPI's included in reported Quarterly Performance Measures. Local pPI's included for current year.
3.8 Completion of Local Land & Property Gazetteer	HAMS	4750	August - 2002	Licence Agreement completed. Datasets cleaned. UPRN's allocated (See note 3.2). Live data to be installed on CAPS system – August 2002.

Action	Responsible Officer	Resource/ Financial Inf'mation	Timescale	Notes
3.9 Process Review of Data Management	AMG		September 2002	Delayed due to temporary resource deficiency. (Staff vacancies) Revised timetable agreed
3.10 Review of opportunities for Facilities Management, Partnership Working and Competition	AMG		October 2002	Delayed due to temporary resource deficiency. (Staff vacancies) Revised timetable agreed
Review of Office Accommodation	CMB	Self-financing as far as pos.	January 2002 - July 2003	Preliminary review completed. Detailed report for Policy decision October 2002.
Park School Site - Redevelopment	Cex	ECC £500k RDC £228k £1.7m Loan funding	July 2005	Agreement concluded with Essex County Council. Detailed proposals Under consideration.
Cherry Orchard Jubilee Country Park	CD(FES)	£190,000 + Grant Funding	July 2003	Site acquired. Design and Business Plan agreed. Development Proceeding.
Rayleigh Windmill	CD(FES)	Lottery Bid £180k RDC £65k	Spring 2003	Preservation & restoration work allowing public access to upper floors (Including disabled)
Disability Discrimination Act Works	CD(FES)	£440,000	July 2004	Survey completed. Work Programme to Policy Committee, September 2002
Asset Review	AMG		Ongoing	Review of Property Portfolio
Review of Housing Repairs and Improvements	AMG		Ongoing	Overview of HIPS programme

PART 4 PERFORMANCE

4.1 Performance Measurement System

Officer	Role	Responsibilities	Action
Corporate Property Officer	Establishment of the system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • implementation and operation of the system • proposing the format for performance reporting • advising Members on timetable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarterly Reports to CMB/Members
CPO	Identifying Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifying authority-wide indicators 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Indicators adopted. Local Indicators developed
CPO	Data Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Defining data • Specifying source data • Collecting and collating data, in conjunction with property services team and service departments • Validation of data, in conjunction with property services team and service departments • Compilation of performance indicators 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed.
CPO	Benchmarking and Target setting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposing performance targets to Members after consultation with property services team and service departments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Included in Quarterly Performance Measures
CPO	Analysis of Performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interpretation of performance, in conjunction with property services team and departments • Monitoring progress towards targets • Informing all parties of progress • Identifying where targets may not be achieved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing

CPO	Reporting on Performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reporting performance results to Members • Publicising performance results to interested parties in the authority • Putting in place procedures that will ensure that performance data is valid • Proposing options for remedial action to Members and service departments if under-performance • Advising Members on opportunities to improve performance • Identifying suitable benchmarking organisations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarterly – QPIs • QPIs circulated to all services. • Audit & Process Review collate and view info. • Report via CMB who undertake overview of all QPIs • Ongoing • Membership of AMP Network.
CPO	Remedial and Continuous Improvement Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommending remedial action to Members • Ensuring agreed improvements are implemented 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Via CMB • Ongoing quarterly review
Head of Service	Identifying Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advising on the practicalities of providing the information for the proposed authority-wide indicators 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing
HOS	Data Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advising on data definitions • Advising on source data • Providing data requested by the corporate property officer • Validation of data provided • Providing information requested by the corporate property officer within statutory and local timetables • Providing assistance to service departments to ensure that statutory and local timetables for performance indicators are met • Following procedures on data validation set out by the corporate property officer 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing • Ongoing • Ongoing • Ongoing • Ongoing • Ongoing • Ongoing
HOS	Benchmarking and Target setting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advising the corporate property officer on achievable targets and scope for improvement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing
HOS	Analysis of Performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assistance to corporate property officer on interpreting performance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing

HOS	Remedial and Continuous Improvement Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Agreeing measures to improve performance• Implementing agreed improvements in conjunction with service departments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ongoing• Ongoing
-----	--	---	---

(PROPERTY MAINTENANCE 2001/02)

4.2 : Operational Property – Condition and Performance Indicators

Property	Area Sq.m.	Notes	Area of Land laid Out as Car parking	Managem nt Costs	Maint. Cat	Repair Costs (resp+ plan'd	CONDITION CATEGORY				Water Costs	Sewer age	Oil	Gas costs	Electricity costs	Total Energy Costs
							A	B	C	D						
OFFICE ACCOM.																
Acacia House	514	Incl.22.5 sq m.ext store	380			0	514			170.19	271.45		0890.81	2377.98		3710.43
3 & 5 South St.	376		630		2	800	630				060.58			2967.92		3028.50
Computer Annexe	192		0			0	192									0
7 South St.	320		0			0	320			303.57	568.76					0872.33
9/11 South Street	254		0			0	254			522.80	790.12					1312.92
C.Tax Bldg	213		0			0	213									0
15 South St	396	Incl. 44 sq.m of attics	0			0	396			051.12						0
17 South St	231		0		1	1000	231			323.92			0860.72	1435.39		2347.23
19 South St	382	Incl. 46 sq.m. of attics	218		1	10200	218			021.30	508.95		1646.80	1951.31		4431.01
57 South St					2	2500				233.25			1100.70			1121.96
Civic suite	842				3	6500	842			305.13	334.16	3311.24	0	2957.18		6836.13
Rochford Depot					2	25000					635.34		1188.30			2128.76
Offices	252					0	252									0
Garages/Refu se veh.	406					0	252									0
Sub Total	4378		1228			46000	405 3909 0 0			1931.30	3169.70	3311.24	5687.30	11689.78		26789.27

7.17.35

				A	B	C	D								
LEISURE PREMISES															
Gt. Wakering Sports Centre	00555	02365		Not incl. for future	3000	555		Energy costs paid by Leisure Contractor							
Clements Hall	06950	10946			2000	6950									
Castle Hall	00159	00430			0	0159									
Mill Hall	01431				0	0715 716									
Freight House	00943	03750			0	943									
Sub Total	10038	17491			5000	7824	2214	0	0						
MISCELLANEOUS BUILDINGS															
Mill Tower (Rayleigh windmill)	124	Subject to a Heritage Lottery Bid for 2002/03		4	27500	124		Paid by Antiquarian Society							
Rochford Day Centre	234				0	234		Paid by CAB							
Sub Total	358	0			27500	0	234	124	0						
PUBLIC CONVENIENCES															
Hockley Wood	014			1	100000	14		0185.87	0309.02	0089.18	0584.07				
Pooles Lane	021			3	060000	14		0373.89	0575.11	0158.64	1107.64				
Crown Hill	039				0	39		0615.51	0918.45	0142.77	1676.73				
Southend Rd.	017			4	060000	17		0314.95	0490.61	0215.23	1020.79				
Back Lane	034				0	34		0099.66	0479.96	0291.41	0871.03				
Old Ship Lane	041			4	080000	41		0104.65	0463.32	0211.23	0779.20				
High St., Gt. Wakering	022			2	060000	22		0017.51	0102.84	0101.19	0221.54				
Sub Total	188	0			360000	73	31	55	22	1712.00	3339.30	0	0	1209.65	6261.00

7.17.36

							A	B	C	D												
CAR PARKS																					1230.72	
Mill Hall	03512						3512															
Back Lane	05008				4	0	5008															
Websters Way	08970					0	8970															
Southend Rd. Hockley	01148					07500	1148															
The Approach, Rayleigh	01697					0	1697															
Castle Rd	04052					0	4052															
Market Place, Rayleigh	02321					0	2321															
Golden Cross Parade	00279	Hard surface only				0																
Old Ship Lane	00300					0																
Sub Total	27287		0			07500	19187 7521 0 0															
OPEN SPACES / BUILDINGS																						
Ashingdon Pavilion	00452		0964			0	0452	Energy costs paid by Grounds Maintenance Contractor.														
Canewdon Pavilion	00035		0			0	0035															
Clements Hall Pavilion	00161		1625		3	10300	0161															
Fairview Pav.	00239		2010		3	05000	0239															
Rochford Recreation Pavilion	00161		1937		3	11000	0161															

7.17.37

Hullbridge Pavilion	00073		0777			0	0073						
King Georges Pavilion	00157		0			0	0157						
Great Wakering Pavilion	00108	Includes access road	2365			0	0108						
St. John Fisher Pavilion	00150		0		3	01500	0150						
Rawreth Pavilion	00128		1583		3	08000	128						
Grove Road Pavilion	00035		1400			0	0035						
Sub Total	01699		12681			35800	128 1571 0 0						

7.17.38

4.3

PROPERTY MAINTENANCE 2001/02

Performance Indicators Calculations

1A - % gross internal floor space in condition categories A – D

		Percentage
Total Internal Area:	16661	
Area in each Category:		
	A	08430
	B	07959
	C	00179
	D	00022
		50.6%
		47.8%
		01.1%
		00.2%

1B – Backlog of maintenance cost expressed i) as total value ii) as a percentage of priority levels 1 – 4

Total Area of offices and included land: 35380 (Include office and leisure buildings car parks)

Backlog Costs

OFFICE ACCOMMODATION:	046000
LEISURE PREMISES – CAR PARKS:	005000
MISCELLANEOUS BUILDINGS:	027500
PUBLIC CONVENIENCES:	360000
CAR PARKS:	007500
OPEN SPACES / BUILDINGS:	035800

i. BACKLOG TOTAL VALUE: 438500

ii. Backlog as percentage in priority levels:

	<u>Value</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
1.	111,200	25%
2.	088,300	20%
3.	102,300	23%
4.	136,700	31%

3A – Total Annual Management costs per sq. m. (GIA) for operational property: £12.61 per square metre

Total area of operational property: 35380 (Include office and leisure buildings car parks)

Management Costs – Operational property: £446,000 Cost / square metre: £12.61

Total Area of Non Operational property: n/a

Management Costs – Non Operational Property: n/a

7.17.40

4B – Energy costs per square metre GIA (gas electricity, oil, solid fuel): £1.31

Total internal area:	16661	Total Cost:	Gas	05687.31
			Oil	03311.24
			Electricity	12899.43
			Solid Fuel:	<u>0.00</u>
			Total	21897.98

4C – Water Costs per square metre: £0.61

Total Internal Area:	16661	Total Cost:	Water	3643.32
			Sewerage	6508.97

4D – CO2 emissions in tonnes of carbon dioxide per square metre

Total Internal Area: 16661

Note: Unable to provide this P1 at this stage as the electricity has been purchased as a 'Bulk Purchase' deal that does not measure consumption.

17.11.11

5A – Cost Predictability

Capital works

1. Public Conveniences:	Original Tender Price:	£125,101
	Final Cost Variation:	£119,814
	Variation:	-4.20%

% of projects where outturn falls within +/- 5% of the estimated outturn = 1
% as a total number of projects – 100

5B – Time predictability

1. Public Conveniences:	Original tender period:	17 weeks
	Outturn time:	21 weeks
	Variation:	24%

% of projects within 5% of estimated timescale:
% as a total number of projects =

0
100

4.4 Quarterly Performance Indicators. January – March 2002 (includes full year cumulative)

Number	Description	Target	Previous Year			Current Year	
			This Quarter	Cum	Full Year	This quarter	Cum
	Statutory Indicators	2001/02					
BVPI 63	Energy efficiency - the average SAP rating of local authority owned dwellings	None set		N/A		56	56
BVPI 71	a) The number of local authority dwellings receiving renovation work (under £5000) during 2001/02 as a proportion of the number needing renovation work as at 1 st April 2001.	36%	17%	21.8%	21.8%	7%	48%
	b) The number of local authority dwellings receiving renovation work (over £5000) during 2001/02 as a proportion of the number needing renovation work as at 1st April 2001.	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
BVPI 72	The percentage of urgent repairs completed within Government time limits	90%	80%	83.3%	83.3%	97%	95.35%
BVPI 73	The average time taken to complete non-urgent responsive repairs	4 days	No Figure Reported	7.75 days	7.75 days	4.08 days	4.89 days

Number	Description	Target	Previous Year			Current Year	
			2001/02	This Quarter	Cum	Full Year	This quarter
RDC 6.1	Percentage of pre-inspections	20%	19.44%	21%	21%	20%	21%
RDC 6.2	Percentage of post inspections	13%	9.67%	10%	10%	15.07%	13.08%
RDC 6.3	Percentage of unplanned works Completed within targets	90%	91%	87%	87%	92%	90.25%

7.17.44

4.5 Local Property Performance Indicators

PROPOSED INDICATORS FOR BUILDINGS

PI Number	Target	Title	Definition
RDC		No of Public Access points to Council Services that are fully accessible for people with Disabilities	<p>Accessibility is defined in the following terms and provides access to cater for all disabilities with dignity Note that wheelchair access provides good access for most mobility issues</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Wheelchair Access 2. An external means of summoning service for someone who is unable to enter the building 3. Public facilities at appropriate levels for wheelchair users 4. That the access route is clearly signed visually, and with tactile signs 5. There is disabled parking within a reasonable distance and an appropriate route to the building 6. Doors have visibility panels at appropriate height 7. Doors controls are easy to operate 8. Doors are at least 800 wide 9. Reception areas are fitted with hearing loops 10. Levels of lighting are sufficient to assist people with visual disabilities
RDC		Number of Public Conveniences that fully meet the requirements of people with disabilities	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Wheelchair Access 2. Full disabled facilities in accordance with Building Regulations Part M 3. An internal means of summoning help for someone who is unable to exit the building 4. Public facilities at appropriate levels for wheelchair users 5. That the access route is clearly signed visually, and with tactile signs 6. There is disabled parking within a reasonable distance and an appropriate route to the building 7. Doors controls are easy to operate 8. Doors are at least 800 wide 9. Levels of lighting are sufficient to assist people with visual disabilities
RDC		To reduce the Energy Costs of Individual Council Buildings	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In the first year to identify the individual energy costs of each individual operational building 2. To compare the unit energy costs for all the Council's operational buildings
RDC		To reduce the building Maintenance costs of individual Council Buildings	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In the first year to identify the individual maintenance costs of each individual operational building 2. To compare the unit maintenance costs for all the Council's operational buildings

DETR AMP Guidance Index 2002.

Primary Requirements

DETR Ref.	Primary Requirement	AMP Ref.
1	<i>Organisational arrangements for corporate asset management</i>	
1.1	Corporate Property Officer (CPO) has been identified with authority to undertake all required developments in asset management.	2.1
1.2	Roles and responsibilities for CPO clearly set out, explicit and have been communicated to all those concerned, in property management and use, throughout the authority.	2.2
1.3	The CPO reports and is accountable to a strategic, decision-making group both at officer and member levels	2.8
1.4	Clear evidence has been provided that a cross-service, senior management forum has been set up which includes the CPO and representatives from major services and the finance directorate, and officers involved in the development of the Capital Strategy and the Community Plan.	2.3
1.5	The forum has formal terms of reference, which includes the strategic management of the council's assets.	2.4
1.6	Evidence that the forum: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Progresses the corporate Asset Management Plan and ensures that it is approved by senior officers and the Council; b. Ensures that the AMP is informed by and supports other key corporate and service plans and objectives; c. Meets regularly. 	2.8

DETR Ref.	Primary Requirement	AMP Ref.
2	<i>Data Management</i>	
2.1	CPO has ensured that a record is held and maintained of basic, core data on all the Council's property	2.7
2.2	The validity of this information has been tested	4.1.3
2.3	CPO can demonstrate a clear understanding of the data required to manage the performance of the property portfolio	4.1.1
2.4	Statistical information on the overall condition of the portfolio (condition categories:A-D/1-4) and the maintenance backlogs are included in the AMP.	4.2

DETR Ref.	Primary Requirement	AMP Ref.
3	<i>Performance Management, Monitoring & Information</i>	
3.1	The CPO submits a formal report to Members & Chief Officers at least annually on the performance of the property portfolio, which now includes performance outcomes in relation to the DTLR National pPIs	2.8
3.2	The AMP includes information showing how the authority is performing in relation to all five national pPIs	4.3
3.3	Members are informed, as part of overall budget and performance monitoring, of the progress and performance of the Capital Programme.	4.1

DETR Ref.	Primary Requirement	AMP Ref.
4	<i>Programme and Plan Development and Implementation</i>	
4.1	The AMP outlines the council's property related requirements and outlines the proposed programme which are intended to meet these requirements. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Acquisition, disposal, investment, development; b. Maintenance; c. Programmes related to surplus and/or under-performing assets; d. Plans enabling shared use and/or co-location. 	3
4.2	CPO has demonstrated that there is a methodology for option appraisal and corporate prioritising between projects.	1.4.3
4.3	A 3 year capital programme is developed including a forecast of the planned capital receipts.	1.1.1 (CS)
4.4	Output/outcome targets are set for programmes and plans requiring capital investment.	1.1.1 (CS)

Secondary Requirements

DETR Ref.	Secondary Requirement	AMP Ref.
1	<i>Organisational arrangements for corporate asset management</i>	
1.1	Evidence that the CPO / Asset Management Forum routinely challenges and reviews the use, provision and performance of the council's assets and its related property services, in order to achieve the most effective management, planning and use of these assets and reports. Key findings and outcomes to Chief Officers and the Council. For example: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The identification and rationalisation of surplus or under performing property; b. The promotion of shared use or co-location; c. The systematic review and challenge of property use, provision and management; and d. Identification of the property implications arising from relevant plans, audits and reviews. 	1.2.3 1.1.4 1.4.3 1.5.2
1.2	Evidence that the CPO / Asset Management Forum takes into account stakeholder satisfaction information relating to property and property services.	1.5.1
1.3	A cabinet member (or lead committee member) holds explicit responsibilities for the authorities property resource on behalf of the council.	2.5
1.4	The CPO is involved in the preparation of the Capital Strategy and is a member of other key corporate and business planning groups.	2.1 & CMB
1.5	There are explicit references to the property asset implications in corporate policies and strategies such as the Best Value Performance Plan, Best Value Reviews, the Capital Strategy, the Community Plan and LPSAs	1.5.2
1.6	There is evidence of cross service use, shared use and/or co-location of property resources within the authority and with other organisations.	1.1.4 & 1.4.1

DETR Ref.	Secondary Requirement	AMP Ref.
2	<i>Consultation</i>	
2.1	Evidence that processes and procedures are being developed obtain feedback from services users and occupiers.	1.5
2.2	Evidence that consultation findings are used to influence the continuous improvement of property and property service performance.	1.5.1

DETR Ref.	Secondary Requirement	AMP Ref.
3	<i>Data Management</i>	
3.1	CPO has undertaken a full survey of future data requirements for the property portfolio.	3.2 3.5
3.2	CPO has identified a programme of necessary improvements.	3.9
3.3	CPO has commenced development of a data system for "intermediate" data (i.e. property data which requires updating from time to time such as condition, rents and user details).	3.2
3.4	CPO has implemented Unique Property Reference number (UPRN) system.	3.5 3.8
3.5	CPO has developed an approach for the centralised co-ordination of property management information and its integration with relevant council financial information.	3.2 3.5
3.6	CPO has undertaken a review of training needs for users of the data and set in place a system for satisfying those needs.	3.2 3.5

DETR Ref.	Secondary Requirement	AMP Ref.
4	<i>Performance Management, Monitoring and Information</i>	
4.1	Clear evidence that the CPO is using a set of local performance measures in relation to assets that link asset use to corporate objectives.	1.4 4.3
4.2	Clear evidence that the CPO is developing a process to enable the comparison of the performance and competitiveness of property and property services with other similar organisations and other providers.	3.10 4.1.6
4.3	Clear evidence that the development of performance measures and monitoring takes into account stakeholder consultation and user satisfaction findings.	1.5
4.4	Clear evidence that performance measurement feeds into a process of continuous improvement.	1.4
4.5	Local Performance Indicators are in place and being used for measuring and monitoring the amount of surplus property and space utilisation.	4.3
4.6	A written report is produced for Member and Chief Officers on any maintenance backlog recommending appropriate action.	2.8
4.7	The CPO is collecting information on the 'suitability' of the various categories of the portfolio for their current and future use.	3.1

DETR Ref.	Secondary Requirement	AMP Ref.
5	<i>Programme and Plan Development and Implementation</i>	
5.1	The AMP demonstrates that the Council has identified the implications for property, which arise from the Council's objectives.	1.3
5.2	The AMP demonstrates service wide understanding of corporate ownership of assets.	1.4.1 1.4.3
5.3	The AMP demonstrates the Council has undertaken a thorough investigation and analysis of the gaps between future requirements and the current provision and performance of the authority's present property assets.	1.2
5.4	The Council has identified and appraised the options for closing these gaps.	1.2
5.5	The AMP outlines the Council's approved 3-5 year strategic action plan based on this analysis	3.1

APPENDIX

CORPORATE PROPERTY STRATEGY – Criteria for review of property.

Generally:

Address the need to review the sufficiency, suitability, condition and cost of existing property:

- Do we really need all this property?
- What can we do to realise efficiency savings in this area without reducing service quality and effectiveness?
- Do existing arrangements for providing and purchasing property services match up to best value principles?

Non-operational property:

- Why does the council own this?
- Could this capital be better employed?

Administrative property:

- Can we make do with less?
- Could we relocate somewhere cheaper?
- Can we share with other agencies?

Service property:

- Is this building sustainable?
- Would this service be better located elsewhere?
- Are there other (better) means of provision?

Other Issues:

- Take into account advancing technology when considering service delivery methods.
- Establish a database to support effective asset management planning.

Reviewing and challenging non-operational property holdings:

- Do all properties make a rate of return comparable to other commercial lettings in the area?
- Do we have the data to prove this?
- Do the outputs/outcomes justify the inputs, eg: How many new jobs are created?
- Do the objectives of organisations occupying council property (e.g. voluntary bodies) reflect authority priorities?
- Are there other ways to achieve these outputs (e.g. grants, advice, advertising)?

Action Plan:

1. Identify and assess potential alternative uses for this capital.
2. Undertake regular option appraisal of capital and revenue consequences of holding/disposing.
3. Set (measurable) targets and dispose of under-performing properties.

Reviewing the use and management of office space:

- Would open plan be more space efficient than cellular offices?
- It may be more cost effective to demolish existing partition walls than to acquire additional office space.
- Has the authority adopted per capita space standards to guide decisions?
- Staff numbers in particular locations may be constrained by lack of IT connections, toilets or other facilities. Would an upgrade be more cost-effective than acquiring a new building?
- What needs to be stored and for how long?
- Could more use be made of warehousing, electronic storage, or more space-efficient shelving systems?
- Is existing furniture suitable for flexible working methods – for example, wheeled drawer units for hot deskers?
- Does any new furniture acquired make the best use of the space available?
- Do all employees need a desk space?
- Would flexible working hours help free up space?
- What potential is there for sharing space with other departments or with partner organisations?
- Can new staff be accommodated within existing space?
- Can all departments justify their own interview and meeting rooms?
- Are training rooms, canteens, managers' offices etc. used for meetings when not required?
- Are there quantifiable business benefits to retaining dedicated social, sports or catering areas?
- Are there opportunities to use electronic communication to reduce the need for space - for example, using video conferencing to conduct meetings, or allowing staff to work from home using modern links.

What does best value mean for property services?

- Which services do we need to provide in-house?
- Would it be cheaper to buy in some services as and when required?
- Why this departmental structure?
- What do our customers think of our services?
- What do they think we could do better?
- Do we obtain user input when deciding how to procure services?
- Do we benchmark our performance with others, both internally and externally?
- Do we measure outputs and outcomes against inputs?
- What targets can be met to ensure continuous improvement?
- How much do similar services cost elsewhere?
- Have we compared prices with both public and private sector providers?
- Could we still demonstrate competitiveness if services were packaged differently?

CHAMBERS OF TRADE – BIDS FOR TOWN CENTRE INITIATIVES 2002/03

1 SUMMARY

- 1.1. The report outlines the proposals made by Hockley, Rayleigh and Rochford Chambers of Trade and seeks Members' views in respect of which bids should be progressed.

2 INTRODUCTION

- 2.1. An annual provision is made each year of £5,000 in respect of initiatives which would improve the economic environment of the town centres. The funds are used to support initiatives put forward by the Chambers of Trade.
- 2.2. In previous years, funds have been provided to install CCTV cameras in town centres, assistance towards provision of Christmas lights and a map of Hockley Town centre.
- 2.3. In the event of funds not being spent, they are carried forward to the next financial year. With regard to the allocations made last year, the works in Rayleigh have been undertaken and the sum of £2,580 has been paid. The Rochford allocation of £5,080 in respect of CCTV has not yet been spent as the works are to take place after the Town Centre Scheme has been completed. The allocation for Hockley of £3,330 for Town Centre maps has not been requested. In accordance with Council instructions, the three Chambers of Trade were asked to make bids for these funds with a deadline being set of 30 June.
- 2.4. All three Chambers have made bids for funds.

3 HOCKLEY CHAMBER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE

- 3.1. The Chamber has requested funding for additions to the Town Centre Enhancement Scheme in the form of trees (3/4 at a cost of approximately £400 each) waste bins in the Town Centre colour scheme ("several" at a cost of approximately £100 each) and a bench for public use with a suitably engraved plaque. The total amount of their bid is approximately £2,500.
- 3.2. In 2001/02, the Chamber bid included a town map to be partially sponsored by advertising by local traders. This map has never been

erected, and it is unlikely that the project will now go ahead. The funds for the map have not been paid to the Chamber and are included in the amount available for 2002/3.

4 RAYLEIGH AND DISTRICT CHAMBER OF TRADE

- 4.1. Rayleigh and District Chamber has made a bid for £5,000 to undertake a comprehensive survey of the Brook Road Industrial Estate for the purpose of formulating a development strategy. This proposal has arisen as a result of an application for change of use of a unit on the Estate, throwing into doubt the role of the Estate as a whole. The Chamber considers that the survey should be carried out urgently in order for it to be included in the District Plan.
- 4.2. Members will be aware that applications for non-industrial use of units on the Estate have been approved in the past.

5 ROCHFORD AND DISTRICT CHAMBER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE

- 5.1. The Rochford Chamber has made a bid for £4-5,000 for a Market Town Health Check.
- 5.2. The Market Town Health Check scheme is part of DEFRA's remit to the Countryside Agency, administered in Essex by the Essex Rural Development Centre who have outlined the potential benefits to the Chamber.
- 5.3. The scheme should be promoted by a community organisation such as the Chamber and, preferably, supported by the local authority. A steering group of people representing the town and its surrounds would oversee the project which would draw assistance from all types of organisation and business for a wide range of consultation. The questionnaire and responses would be analysed by a paid administrator, with the results bringing to light local needs which could form part of an action plan.

6 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1. There is at present a budget provision of £5,000 for the current year plus £3,330 from last financial year in respect of works not undertaken in Hockley.
- 6.2. As may be seen from the above, the bids are in excess of the budget available.

7 RECOMMENDATION

- 7.1. It is proposed that the Committee **RECOMMENDS** to Council the level of grant to be allocated to each Chamber. (CD(F&ES))

Roger Crofts

Corporate Director Finance External Services)

Background Papers:

Letters from:

Hockley Chamber of Trade and Commerce – 21 June 2002 and 2 July 2002

Rayleigh & District Chamber of Trade – 26 March 2002

Rochford & District Chamber of Trade & Commerce – 20 June 2002.

For further information please contact Lissa Higby on:-

Tel:- 01702 546366 extn. 3006

E-Mail:- lissa.higby@rochford.gov.uk