

## STROUD DISTRICT COUNCIL

AGENDA

## HOUSING COMMITTEE

ITEM NO

26 SEPTEMBER 2017

9

<b>Report Title</b>	<b>REFURBISHMENT AND REGENERATION OF COUNCIL OWNED PROPERTIES AND ENVIRONMENT</b>
<b>Purpose of Report</b>	To inform Committee members of the potential (including financial risk) to invest in our estates over a number of years.
<b>Decisions</b>	<b>Committee resolves that:</b> A phased approach in line with the HRA's aspirational goals to enhance the external aspects of our properties over a number of future years to improve the aesthetics of our tenants homes.
<b>Consultation and Feedback</b>	Chair and Vice Chair of Housing Committee Appropriate officers linked to the project Corporate Team, Housing Review Panel
<b>Financial Implications and Risk Assessment</b>	<p>The Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) for the HRA includes an amount of £1.17m for estate refurbishment over a five year period. Any funding allocated over this amount would require savings to be made in other areas of housing, and should be considered against the wider priorities of service delivery.</p> <p>If the regeneration delivered benefits the community as a whole, and not just tenants, a contribution should be made from the General Fund to reflect the wider community benefit in line with the Local Government and Housing Act 1989. This is not funded and would be an additional cost to the General Fund.</p> <p>Lucy Clothier, Principal Accountant Tel: 01453 754343 Email: <a href="mailto:lucy.clothier@stroud.gov.uk">lucy.clothier@stroud.gov.uk</a></p> <p><b>Risk assessment by the report author</b> The availability of suitable financial resource post 2020 will determine the viability of this programme. Planning for such significant investment (potentially £1</p>

	million per year) will need to be sourced from existing budgets including the building of reserves over a number of years. This would affect the delivery of existing programmes.
<b>Legal Implications</b>	This is a significant strategic risk (CCR5) and is linked to the Council's more general corporate budget risk (CCR1). The Risk Register needs to be updated by the responsible officers in any event and controls reviewed in view of the committee's decisions. (Ref: r07/09c11/09d12/09) Karen Trickey, Legal Services Manager Email: <a href="mailto:karen.trickey@stroud.gov.uk">karen.trickey@stroud.gov.uk</a>
<b>Report Author</b>	Kevin Topping, Head of Housing Services Tel: 01453 754196 Email: <a href="mailto:Kevin.topping@stroud.gov.uk">Kevin.topping@stroud.gov.uk</a>
<b>Options</b>	Not to agree due to financial risk or agree elements of the decisions
<b>Performance Management Follow Up</b>	12 month review via briefing note to members on status and effectiveness of the programme if agreed
<b>Background Papers/ Appendices</b>	Appendix A – Types of works to be considered Appendix B – Demographic data

## **1.0. Background**

- 1.1. This report follows directly from the Corporate Asset Management Strategy and Action Plan which was presented to Housing Committee in September 2016.
- 1.2. Stroud District Council is one of the few authorities nationally which still retains its stock of social housing, which stands at 5187 at the time of writing this report. A number of our estates identified in this report were built between 1952 and 1978 and other than planned and cyclical maintenance on our properties, they have not been subject to significant investment. A number of our estates have also had significant losses of stock due to the Right to Buy scheme introduced in the 1980's which may have a bearing on committee's view of prioritising investment (see Appendix B). The projected amount of cost associated with works are expected to be up to £1 million per estate per year. Where available, grant funding would be applied to reduce the cost to the HRA.

## **2.0. Current position**

- 2.1. A number of estates have been identified by officers in terms of regeneration and refurbishment to improve the aesthetics and kerb

appeal of our stock. Locations, if agreed, would be phased and prioritised by Housing Committee with works to commence after 2021 with areas actioned subject to financial resource being available, and consideration of the local community priorities.

## 2.2. Not in Priority Order

- Mathews Way/Allen Drive/Duderstadt Close/Archway Gardens (Paganhill Estate)
- Woodcock Lane/Juniper way (Stonehouse)
- Hinton Court (Sharpness)
- Acre Street/Oak Drive (Kingshill estate, Dursley)
- Bearlands (Wotton-under-Edge)

## 2.3. Impacts from other work streams

A stock condition programme has been in place for over a year and we continue to accumulate intelligence regarding our stock. In addition, a validation programme appraising our non traditional stock and making suitable decisions regarding sustainability will also feed into this programme of refurbishment. The garage rationalisation programme linking to potential development opportunities will ensure we are suitably joined up in our approach to all works in, on and around our estates.

## 2.4. Affected work streams

In order that sufficient funding is set aside, budgets would need to be realigned for major external programmes such as roofing, and smaller internal programmes such as kitchens and bathrooms, where all components would be surveyed and re-assessed in terms of their life cycle. This is an area of risk and may lead to increased costs on the responsive maintenance budget.

## 2.5. Financial risk

Due to the uncertain climate which includes a lack of clarity over the 1% rent reduction currently in place, the potential impacts of other aspects of the Housing and Planning Act and the borrowing cap limits, there must remain a degree of caution when looking at this project some of which is aspirational.

## 3.0. Summary

- 3.1. This report is the first stage of a planned process to develop a positive, effective and aesthetically pleasing aspect to our council estates. Regular briefings to members will be presented (subject to this one being agreed) as matters progress. There will be the opportunity once sites have been agreed and suitably prioritised, to consult more widely with the tenants and residents of our estates to establish what matters

to them and their communities. There would also be a timeline for procuring works, which at this level of spend would take approximately 12 to 24 months depending on complexity, which is why the project needs to be planned correctly. The areas would include:

- Initial appraisal, brief report to include photographs and general observations e.g. boundaries, topography, access, trees/buildings etc
- Consultation with residents
- Prepare drawings/designs
- Discuss proposals with SDC's planning department and make an application for outline planning permission (if appropriate)
- Advise on the need for specialist consultants/contractors.

## APPENDIX A

Types of works to be considered and costs (based on current schedule of rates – SOR's).

### **Tarmac Vs Flagstones**

- Tarmacing an area is based on a price of £31.30 to £41.51 per square metre.
- Flagging an area is based on a price of £21.40 to 28.53 per square metre.

### **Concrete Bollards Vs Low level fencing/chains**

- Installing bollards is based on a price of £76.92 to £102.56 per bollard.
- Installing low level fencing (1.2M high) is based on a price of £25.70 to 34.27 per metre.

### **Painting vs. Render/Cladding**

- Painting varies depending on the external facade of the property, e.g. masonry, previously painted masonry, half render/half masonry and full render (painted) the costs vary between £187.00 to £560.00.

Other areas to consider which would be subject to costings outside of our contractors current SOR's may include major landscaping or parking solutions, we could also consider the expansion of some pilot programmes involving creating bicycle racks and bin stores.

**Please note that costs will increase year on year; the current uplift figure is 4%.**

### **Grounds maintenance**

The current contract has the associated costs mentioned below. If works were agreed, which would reduce these costs but still enhance the neighbourhood including the use of the handyperson service for low level maintenance (weed control etc.), then this would be a natural efficiency saving. Further efficiencies could be gained by a more dynamic use of current staff who are delivering site functions to sheltered schemes.

<b>Description</b>	<b>Cost</b>
<b>Park Road/ Park Parade</b>	
Total maintenance cost grass areas	<b>£1,294.33</b>
<b>Juniper Way</b>	
Total maintenance cost grass areas	<b>£96.90</b>
<b>Woodcock Lane</b>	
Total maintenance cost grass areas	<b>£158.96</b>
<b>Acacia Drive</b>	
Total maintenance cost grass areas	£2,239.23
Sweep/ Weed control Hard Standing	£735.06
Hedges	£920.98
<b>Total</b>	<b>£3,895.27</b>
<b>Oak Drive</b>	
Total maintenance cost grass areas	£630.59
Sweep/ Weed control Hard Standing	£459.14
<b>Total</b>	<b>£1,089.73</b>
<b>Hinton Court</b>	
Total maintenance cost grass areas	£133.52
Sweep/ Weed control Hard Standing	£121.48
<b>Total</b>	<b>£255.00</b>
<b>Bearlands</b>	
Total maintenance cost grass areas	£1,088.72
Sweep/ Weed control Hard Standing	£191.33
<b>Total</b>	<b>£1,280.05</b>
<b>Total annual maintenance cost for all the above sites</b>	<b>£8,070.19</b>

## APPENDIX B

### Demographic data

The following information relates to how many properties are retained by the Council. This may help inform the priority list in terms of social value and benefit to our tenants.

<b>Location</b>						
<b>Paganhill Estate</b>						
Council retained numbers	Allen Drive	27	Duderstadt Close	15	Mathews way	94
Private numbers	Allen Drive	3	Duderstadt Close	0	Mathews way	31

<b>Woodcock Lane/ Juniper Way</b>				
Council retained numbers	Woodcock lane	43	Juniper Way	33
Private numbers	Woodcock lane	24	Juniper Way	4

<b>Sharpness</b>		
Council retained numbers	Hinton Court	12
Private numbers	Hinton Court	0

<b>Dursley</b>				
Council retained numbers	Acacia Drive	28	Oak Drive	38
Private numbers	Acacia Drive	7	Oak Drive	22

<b>Wotton-under-Edge</b>		
Council retained numbers	Bearlands	36
Private numbers	Bearlands	11

**Information supplied by Gloucestershire Police involving crimes of Violence/Public Order/Criminal Damage/Arson, where the named suspect/offender was aged U18.**

Parish	2015/16	2016/17
Juniper Way/Woodcock Lane (Stonehouse)	0	6
Oak Drive/Acacia Drive (Dursley)	2	0
Hinton Court (Sharpness)	0	0
Bearlands (Wotton-under-Edge)	0	0
Paganhill Estate	No data	No data

**Information relating to each area showing the level of rent arrears and the number of Anti Social Behaviour (ASB) cases reported to Tenant Services.** *Figures are correct as at June 2017, however, please note that ASB cases are not a snapshot due to their complex nature and some will be cumulative.*

Parish	Rent Arrears over £1K	number of tenants above £1K	ASB Cases
Dursley	32552.52	21	3
Paganhill	13542.21	9	6
Stonehouse	16101.11	11	4
Wotton-under-Edge	5933.88	4	4
Sharpness	1262.94	0	0

It is interesting to note that the level of rent arrears is not necessarily a factor relating to ASB, however, with an environment that residents can enjoy and take ownership for, it would be expected to lead to improved behaviour not only from the aesthetic perspective but also peer pressure for those who do appreciate a more pleasant living environment.