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**Recommendation**

It is recommended that the Minutes of the meeting of the Mayor and Cabinet, held on 8 July 2002 be confirmed and signed (copy attached).

---
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MINUTES of the meeting of the MAYOR AND CABINET, which was open to the press and public, held on MONDAY, 8 JULY 2002 at 5.30 p.m. at LEWISHAM TOWN HALL, CATFORD, SE6 4RU.

Present

The Mayor (Steve Bullock); Councillor Moore (Vice-Chair); Councillors Donnelly, Garcha, Holder, Whiting and Wise.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Best.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minute No.</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MINUTES (page RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting of the Mayor and Cabinet, held on 19 June 2002, be confirmed and signed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS (page None was declared.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>BUDGET ISSUES – UPDATE ON 2001/02 OUTFLOW, CURRENT YEAR (2002/03) MATTERS AND PREPARING THE BUDGET STRATEGY FOR 2003/04 (page and Appendix page</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Having reconsidered the decision in respect of the report on Budget Issues following the Overview and Scrutiny Business Panel’s request it was:-

RESOLVED that the original decision be reaffirmed and the Overview and Scrutiny Business Panel be informed as follows:-

(i) it is within your remit to ask the Executive Director for Social Care & Health to attend a meeting of the Panel to give an explanation of how the overspend occurred, what action is planned to prevent this recurring and what mechanisms there are for tracking expenditure;

(ii) we confirm our intention that for the time being the £800k held in working balances for Education will remain
uncommitted until details of the full impact and deliverability of in-year savings are known;

(iii) the Mayor would be happy to explain the lobbying measures he is taking to acquire funding for Lewisham bearing in mind the poor settlement the authority has received;

(iv) the Executive Director for Resources will make the decision to hand back financial responsibility to the Social Care & Health Directorate when he is satisfied that improvements have been made;

(v) the Panel are welcome to be involved in the proposed review of the Capital Programme before any decision is made; and

(vi) that the Panel wish to discuss the issue of drawing down on reserves at a later meeting has been noted.

4 IMPLEMENTATION OF THE FAIRER CHARGING REGIME IN SOCIAL CARE AND HEALTH (page and Appendixes page

RESOLVED that

(i) the Council continues to charge for DSC & H day care, meals on wheels, domiciliary care and transport;

(ii) no charge be made for services to carers;

(iii) a charge be made for non-residential rehabilitation services provided through the intermediate care service for periods after 6 weeks;

(iv) a charge be made for day care and domiciliary care for substance abuse clients
where Social Care & Health has contracted for the service;

(v) no charge be made for mental health day centres;

(vi) the maximum charge be £150 per week;

(vii) up to 50% of clients' disposable income be taken into account;

(viii) 80% of the full cost of the service be charged;

(ix) the same capital limits as used for residential/nursing home placements be applied; and

(x) clients be allowed to set up standing orders for payments or be invoiced every 4 weeks.

5 TACKLING ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR ON THE SELDEN ESTATE

RESOLVED that the following works be carried out on the Selden Estate:

- install 3 CCTV cameras at a cost of £42,000; and

- improve lighting in the area at a cost of £8,220.

6 6th WAVE SURE START PROGRAMME

RESOLVED that

(i) the participation of the Council in the preparation of a bid for a Sure Start Programme in the 6th Wave of the Government’s National Sure Start Programme be approved;
Minute No. Action

(ii) the submission of an Expression of Interest and Progress Report to the Sure Start Unit be approved;

(iii) the area defined as “The Downham Estate” be the area to be designated as a Sure Start area in the 6th Wave of the National Programme; and

(iv) the programme be led and developed by the Early Years Service and Lewisham be the Accountable Body.

7 HRA BUSINESS PLAN AND HOUSING STRATEGY 2002/03 (page and Appendices page

RESOLVED (i) to recommend the Council that HCB

(a) the Housing Business Plan for 2002/03 be approved and submitted to the Government Office for London and the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister; and

(b) the Housing Strategy document for 2002/03 be approved and submitted to GOL and the ODPM;

(ii) delegated authority be given to the Head of Housing to make any minor changes to both the Business Plan and the Housing Strategy Document between now and the Council meeting.

The meeting ended at 6.50 p.m.

Chair
**Recommendation**

It is recommended that under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraphs 3 and 9 of Part 1 of Schedule 12(A) of the Act:

101 Disposal of 21 Peak Hill Gardens to Hyde Housing Association
1. Summary

The report details proposed changes to the Silwood Partnership SRB Board and sets out the decisions made by officers in accordance with delegated authority.

2. Purpose of the Report

2.1 This report seeks:
   a) approval of changes in the membership of the Silwood Partnership SRB Board (Appendix 1); and
   b) to report back on decisions made, expenditure incurred and projects awarded under such delegated powers (Appendix 2) over the past six months.

3. Policy Context

The Council seeks to maximise inward investment and external funding to secure the physical renewal of the Borough. The Council seeks to work in partnership with the community, public, private and voluntary sector agencies to secure regeneration and neighbourhood renewal.

4. Recommendations

4.1 To approve changes in the membership of the Silwood SRB Partnership. (Appendix 1)

4.2 To note the decisions taken by officers in accordance with authority delegated by the former Executive Committee in respect of the Silwood SRB (Appendix 2).
5. **Background**

5.1 The Silwood SRB is a round 5 SRB scheme approved in July 1999 for a total of £72,000,000 of public and private funding of which £24,000,000 is SRB (Single Regeneration Budget). The project will last for 7 years and is currently in its 4th year. This is an extremely high profile project and the Silwood SRB board is a vital part of the success of the project. The original terms of reference and constitution of the SRB board were approved as part of the approved Delivery plan.

5.2 In line with the ongoing development of the Silwood SRB Programme a series of amendments to the Terms of Reference have been agreed by the Board. However, these are subject to amendment in line with the new constitution and will be resubmitted to the SRB Board later this year. They will then be subject to a later report to the Mayor for ratification. This report deals only with the changes in membership.

6. **Changes to membership**

6.1 In line with the development of the Silwood SRB Programme there have been some proposed changes to the membership of the SRB Partnership Board. The changes were agreed by the Board on 10 June 2002 and a list of the current voting members is attached as Appendix 1. This is an extract from the Board terms of reference. The changes are highlighted in bold text.

6.2 The proposed main changes in Board membership are:

- The seat formerly occupied by the Lewisham Challenge Partnership passes to Millwall Football Club.
- The seat formerly occupied by the Learning + Skills Council representative passes to Goldsmiths as a local body dedicated to education.

6.3 Millwall is proposed as a new member to the Board as a 'good neighbour' to the new housing development on the Silwood site. Millwall have the potential to contribute to the overall programme through their youth facilities and community programmes. They are on the doorstep of the new development and along with other 'good neighbours', such as Spacia, offer an opportunity to engage with the local and wider community through the SRB scheme. They do not currently receive any SRB funding and would, as any other partner need to declare an interest in any application put to the Board.

6.4 The current Silwood SRB Partnership Board consists of 13 members. The Silwood SRB Partnership Board will consider further strengthening of the Board membership following the year 4 review.
7. **Delegated Decisions**

Appendix 2 lists all the projects approved by the Board over the last 6 months and which have been submitted to the Director for Regeneration under delegated authority.

8. **Programme Management Implications**

This project/programme falls within the Council’s formal project management requirements as set out in Financial Regulations and will be reported to the directorate Project Review Group and the Corporate Project Board.

9. **Financial Implications**

9.1 There are no immediate financial implications to this report with respect to changes to the membership.

9.2 With respect to the decisions made by the Board that have incurred costs, all have been carried out within the delegated powers and all expenditure above £500,000 has been reported to the Mayor (formerly executive committee) for approval as required.

10. **Legal Implications**

10.1 On 20 December 2000 the former Executive Committee delegated authority to the Executive Director for Regeneration to approve projects and release funding and other expenditure in accordance with agreed delivery plans where the expenditure does not exceed £500,000. Decisions involving expenditure in excess of £100,000 must be made in consultation with the Executive Director for Resources and Deputy Chief Executive. Expenditure above £250,000 also requires the approval of the LDA. Officers are required to report back every 6 months with details of decisions made under delegated powers.

10.2 As accountable body and a member of the SRB partnership board any changes to the membership of the Board require the Council’s approval.

11. **Equality Implications**

Any improvements to the running of the Silwood SRB Board in terms of the constitution and terms of reference will assist in ensuring that the Silwood SRB represents the widest possible interest in the community.
If there are any queries on this report, please contact Jo Rowlands, Head of Strategic Development, extension 47071 or Jan Mackey, Silwood SRB Manager, extension 49487
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APPENDIX 1
ITEM NO. 4

SILWOOD BOARD - CURRENT VOTING MEMBERS

Mr. Dave Gannicott - RSL Partner
Regional Director - South East Thames Region, London and Quadrant Housing Association, 36-38 Artillery Place, London, SE18 4AB.

Mr. Mohni Gujral - RSL Partner
Chief Executive, Presentation Housing Association, Biko House, 16 Bromell’s Road, Clapham Common, London, SW4 0BL

Mr. Akber Mohammed Ali - Primary Care Group Partner
Chair, North Lewisham Primary Care Group (now Lewisham Primary Care Trust), 26 Admiralty Close, London, SE8 4SS.

Insp. Chris Smith - The Metropolitan Police
Deptford Police Station, 114 - 116 Amersham Vale, London SE16 6LG

Cllr. Crada Onuegbu - Lewisham Nominees
c/o Members Services, Lewisham Town Hall

Cllr. Alicia Chater - Lewisham Nominees
c/o Members Services, Lewisham Town Hall

Cllr. Jeffrey Hook - Southwark Nominees
c/o Members Support

Ms Stella Hutton - The Community
Silwood Estate, London SE16 2QT

Ms Uzo McGarry - The Community
Silwood Estate, London, SE16 2QT

Ms Debbie Brooks - The Community
Silwood Estate, London SE16 2RA

Mr. Gavin Wood - Railtrack
Portfolio Manager (South), Spacia, West Wing, The Hop Exchange, 26 Southwark Street, London, SE1 1TU.

Mr. Theo Paphitis - Millwall Football & Athletic Club (1985) Limited
Chairman, The New Den, Zampa Road, London, SE16 3LN.
Vacancy – Education representative
Derek Hilyer, Goldsmiths College – proposed as full voting member

ADVISORS AND OBSERVERS

Advisors:

Ms. Jan Mackey - Silwood SRB Manager (LBL)
Silwood SRB, 68-70 Reculver Road, Silwood Estate, London SE16 2RF

Ms Adeshola Ojo - Silwood Finance Manager
Silwood SRB, 68-70 Reculver Road, Silwood Estate, London SE16 2RF

Ms Emma Peters - Head of Development, Regeneration (LBL)
5th Floor, Lawrence House, 1 Catford Road, London, SE6 4RU

Ms Jo Rowlands - Head of Urban Renewal Services (LBL)
5th Floor, Lawrence House, 1 Catford Road, London SE6 4RU

Ms Aileen Buckton - Head of Community Services (LBL)
3rd Floor, Lawrence House, 1 Catford Road, London, SE6 4RU

Observers

Mr Dave Shiress
Housing Regeneration Initiatives, Southwark Housing Municipal Offices,
9 Larcom Street, London, SE17 1RX (LBS).
Silwood SRB Board Decisions April – December 2001

Silwood SRB Board Decisions since April 2001 approved by the Head of Development as delegated by the Mayor and Cabinet:

- **Board Meeting date: 2nd April, 2001**
  
  No approvals made.

- **Board Meeting date: 4th June, 2001**
  
  Cockpit Arts: In principle agreement to 50-90% funding and match funding.

- **Board Meeting date: 6th August, 2001**
  
  Positive Mental Attitude - £19,480 Year 3 Revenue
  
  Cockpit Arts £173,500 Capital to be spent in 2001/2 plus £132,700 Revenue over 5 years. (£14,750 in Year 3)
  
  Deptford Churches Crypt Club £20,000 Revenue Year 3 (Qtrs 2-4)
  
  Silwood SRB Conferences/Fun Day/Youth Programme £6,645 Revenue Year 3 (Qtrs 2-4)
  
  Community Advice & Wellbeing Scheme £800 Capital & £8,514 Revenue (Total £9,314) Year 3 (Qtrs 2-4)
  
  Training for Effective Management in the Voluntary Sector £15,000 Revenue Year 3 (Qtrs 2-4)
  
  Silwood Playgroup £1,057 Revenue Year 3 (Qtrs 2-4)

- **Board Meeting date: 1st October 2001**
  
  No approvals made.

- **Board Meeting Date: 18th December 2001**
  
  London and Quadrant Cybercentre £80,675 Revenue Years 3-4
Health Impact Assessment £5,400 Revenue Year 3 (Qtr 4)

Extended Projects
Alternative Lifestyles £48,000 Revenue Year 4
Loop £35,000 Revenue Year 4
Job Link £10,000 Revenue Year 4
Roots & Wings £17,671 Revenue Year 4
Positive Mental Attitude £24,830 Revenue Year 4

Alternative Healthy Lifestyles - Funding regularisation
Cockpit Arts - Outputs Re-profiling

• **Board Meeting Date: 4th February 2002**
Groundwork £61,489 Revenue Year 4
£11,000 Capital Year 4

Silwood Employment and Training Co-ordinator

£20,320 Revenue Year 4

Community Safety (Neighbourhood £28,000 Revenue Year 4 (Decision delegated
Wardens) to the Chair)

• **Board Meeting Date: 8th April 2002**
Year 4 Building Programme £1,165,604 Capital (Mayor and Cabinet 19th June)

• **Board Meeting Date: 10th June 2002**
No approvals made
1. Summary of the HIMP

1.1 The HIMP provides a coherent programme for partnership action on local priorities for improving health and wellbeing, reducing health inequalities and modernising health and social services. It is the vehicle for the local implementation of the NHS Plan, which is focused on reforming and investing in the NHS around the needs and preferences of patients and the wider public. However, guiding local modernisation is only one of three main themes of the Lewisham HIMP.

1.2 Health Improvement, (adding years to life and life to years) for local people is another main theme. The HIMP adopts the social model of health, which regards good health as being much more than the absence of disease and disability. It is concerned with all the factors that determine people’s individual and collective health and wellbeing and how these factors interact and impact on health.

1.3 The third main theme of the HIMP is protecting the health and wellbeing and promoting the independence of vulnerable people. This relates to the Council’s lead role in the strategic planning of community care and children’s services. The HIMP incorporates the programme of partnership action formerly described in the joint Community Care Plan. A new Children and Young People’s Strategic Plan (currently being developed) will set the direction and specify partnership action to improve health and well-being, the life chances of looked after children and modernise health and social services.

2. Purpose of Report

2.1 In accordance with Department of Health requirements, The Lewisham Health Partnership Board has completed the final draft Lewisham HIMP (attached). The HIMP relates to the period April 2002 to March 2005 and has to be formally approved before it can be implemented.
2.2 This report seeks the approval of the Mayor to the content of the HIMP (particularly the Council’s contribution to the stated Vision, priorities and actions). Further, approval is sought to commit to continued partnership working to implement the HIMP and, to regard the HIMP as a key supporting strategy to the social well being theme of the Community Strategy (currently being developed).

2.3 The Social Care and Health Select Committee considered this report and the final draft HIMP document on 2nd July. It supports the 5 recommendations made in this report, supports Councillor involvement in the proposed HIMP workshop and has the following views on the draft HIMP:

- The Council could influence people’s diet and nutrition by shaping local food markets and their accessibility
- Partnership actions on mental health promotion should include women’s health
- The shared local Vision on substance misuse should have an all population focus but the information should highlight young people as being at highest risk
- The meaning of technical terms such as ‘polypharmacy’ need to be given
- The Council could improve local facilities for young people in areas where there are health and social issues e.g. teenage conceptions (as a prevention measure)
- Accessibility to primary care services outside 9-5 and ‘Walk-in’ facilities needs to be a focus of attention
- In future years, the funding of the HIMP actions need to be more explicit and linked to the budgets of the PCT, Social Care and Health and the wider Council
- The published HIMP would be an invaluable reference resource to Councillors in their constituency role and in their overview and scrutiny of the local NHS

2.4 The views of the Social Care & Health Select Committee are set out in the report attached as Appendix E.

3. The Council’s HIMP role

3.1 The Council’s Vision for Lewisham and the HIMP Vision are mutually supportive. The majority of the Council’s mainstream functions support both Visions. The HIMP identifies those mainstream functions of the Council, which significantly contribute towards tackling the root causes of ill health and provide opportunity for disadvantaged or vulnerable people to participate in cultural, economic, political and social life.
3.2 The Council is a major contributor to the work of the Lewisham Health Partnership. Now that the HIMP is focused at Borough level there is an opportunity to integrate the themes, priorities and actions of the HIMP with those of other strategies and operational plans of the Council. National HIMP guidance for 2002/03 emphasizes the importance of aligning plans and planning processes at Borough level, particularly with regard to the national health inequalities strategy (yet to be published) and that for Neighbourhood Renewal.

3.3 The Council’s Community Leadership role and its health overview and scrutiny role have and will continue to influence the Council’s contribution to the development and implementation of the HIMP.

4. Recommendations

The Mayor is requested to:

4.1 Endorse the HIMP as the strategic plan for the modernisation of social services and the commissioning of community care services in Lewisham and to recommend to the Council accordingly.

4.2 Endorse the content of the HIMP (particularly the Council’s contribution to the stated Vision, priorities and actions).

4.3 Commit to continued partnership working to implement the HIMP (through the Lewisham Health Partnership, other established partnerships and corporately).

4.4 Endorse the HIMP as a key supporting strategy to the social well being theme of the Community Strategy.

4.5 Endorse the HIMP as the lead strategy for addressing health inequalities and as a key supporting strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal in Lewisham.

5. Background

5.1 Health Improvement Programmes (HImPs) were introduced under the New NHS: Modern and Dependable White Paper in 1997. Health Authorities held lead statutory responsibility to develop HImPs as local strategic frameworks for partnership action on health improvement and health service priorities.

5.2 The Health Act 1999 placed new duties of co-operation with NHS Agencies and between the NHS and Local Authorities to work together to improve the health of their populations. The Act also introduced new Flexibilities for the NHS and local government to determine lead commissioning arrangements, pool budgets and integrate service providers.
5.3 In July 2000 the NHS Plan introduced a 10 year programme of reform underpinned by a 3 year investment programme primarily for the NHS but involving social services and other local government functions and proposing a new one, that of the overview and scrutiny of the local NHS. In December 2000 a national programme for Local Modernisation Reviews (LMRs) was announced.

5.4 With the national restructuring of the NHS as announced in ‘Shifting the Balance of Power’ in 2001/02 Borough Health Partnerships were required to develop Health Improvement and Modernisation Plans (HIMPs) to bring together partnership working on health improvement (including health inequalities) with the NHS modernisation agenda. The outcome of the Lewisham LMR has been taken account of in the HIMP.

5.5 The final draft HIMP document (attached as a separate document) has been prepared by a Sub-Group of the Lewisham Health Partnership chaired by Jill Lockett, Director of Commissioning in the Lewisham Primary Care Trust. The document is concurrently being submitted to the Board of the Lewisham Health Partnership (LHP) and the Board of the Lewisham Primary Care Trust (PCT) for formal approval. Subject to formal approval, the document will then be widely distributed for implementation throughout the LHP and the PCT. The Sub-Group has arranged for the document to be published in July and to be well communicated locally, including holding a partnership workshop in October.

6. Financial Implications

6.1 Whilst the HIMP identifies priorities and actions for partnership working towards health improvement and modernisation, its function is not to identify anticipated expenditures, investments, financial performance and financial risk areas over its lifetime. The HIMP is not and should not be regarded as a fully funded partnership strategy. The extent to which the programmed priorities and actions can be implemented is governed by the extent to which partners annual business and service plans financially underpin the HIMP or its associated Joint Investment Plans and Local Implementation Plans. The HIMP provides a summary of the overall availability of funding and its allocation by the Council and Lewisham PCT but not a partnership statement of sources and application of funds specific to HIMP priorities and actions. Lewisham PCT’s 2002/03 Business Plan is closely associated with funding the HIMP and will be published in tandem with it.

6.2 The financial implications of implementing the HIMP (including maximising the ‘added value’ of working in partnership) will be closely monitored by the Lewisham Health Partnership Board. This Board will ensure that financial issues relevant to HIMP implementation are raised with the host funding agency at the right stage in the planning/commissioning cycle.
and that any actions with cost implications that have not been budgeted for do not proceed. No one funding agency, (including the Council) is expected to act as ‘funder of last resort’. Indeed, even with the welcomed additional NHS allocations for 2002/03 the Lewisham PCT has had to restrict the funding of local health priorities and targets to key NHS Plan targets as set out in the national Priorities and Planning Framework.

6.3 The implementation of the HIMP at Borough level (both as a partnership action plan and as a strategic planning process) will generate financial implications for the Council (both corporately and for individual directorates). It is not possible at this stage in introducing the HIMP to be specific or accurately assess these financial implications. However, of the priorities and actions identified in the HIMP there are none which relate to a Council function which is not already funded through either mainstream funding or earmarked funding such as the Children’s Fund, Sure Start, Quality Protects, Neighbourhood Renewal, Building Care Capacity and Promoting Independence. Any identified cost pressures or additional costs will have been taken into account in developing balanced mainstream or earmarked Council budgets for 2002/03. The Council is also joint funding posts specific to HIMP priorities and actions such as the staff of Healthier Lewisham who focus on the Council’s contribution towards promoting good health and reducing health inequalities. The implementation of the HIMP will therefore not involve significant unforeseen and unexpected areas of expenditure in 2002/03.

6.4 Local arrangements for restructuring partnership planning on HIMP themes and to apply the Flexibilities of the 1999 Health Act (including joint commissioning and integrating health and social care services) are referred to in the HIMP but the financial implications for the Council of these actions over the lifetime of the HIMP have not yet been identified.

6.5 The Health Action Zone funded £45,000 to meet the costs of co-ordinating the development of the first HIMP document and its publication and subsequent launch across the Lewisham Health Partnership and beyond. This funding is non-recurrent and the future requirements of the HIMP are likely to involve modest cost implications for the Council. These have not yet been identified nor have any current Council resources been allocated towards the future requirements of the HIMP.

6.6 With the implementation of the HIMP there may be the need for more events and meetings to be held in Council premises to raise awareness and maintain the involvement of Councillors, Officers and key front line staff after the ‘Time to Deliver’ event in October. This would involve modest additional costs but would ensure that the HIMP is mainstreamed into the thinking, budget setting and wider work of the Council.

6.7 There may be financial implications for the Council in the second and third years of the HIMP. The in-year performance management review of
implementing the HIMP will inform partner and Council budget setting and commissioning in 2003/04.

6.8 As the Lewisham PCT holds the statutory lead for the HIMP and was only established in April 2002 it is not yet known whether existing arrangements for funding the costs of accommodation, catering and staffing to maintain the HIMP function will continue or will need to be changed. It is possible that the Council may be requested to increase its financial support for the upkeep of the HIMP function.

7. **Legal Implications**

7.1 The HIMP embodies the statutory duties placed on Lewisham Council by the 1999 Health Act, to co-operate with local NHS agencies and other stakeholders to improve health and health services. These duties will continue to be discharged through the Council’s involvement in the Lewisham Health Partnership. The Council has also co-operated in applying the Act’s Flexibilities in local arrangements for joint commissioning.

7.2 The HIMP is also associated with the statutory duties placed on Lewisham Council by the 2000 Local Government Act, to develop a Community Strategy to promote the economic, environmental and social wellbeing of Lewisham. The HIMP fully supports the promotion of social wellbeing.

7.3 The HIMP incorporates the joint planning of community care as required by the 1990 NHS and Community Care Act. The DoH has consulted on removing the statutory requirement for local authorities to prepare Community Care Plans using the Local Government Act 2000. No further national announcement on this has been made.

8. **Crime and Disorder Implications**

The HIMP identifies Community Safety and Substance Misuse issues and partnership action to address the links between fear of crime, domestic violence, youth crime and hate crime on people’s health and wellbeing. These partnership actions should underpin the Council’s mainstream functions of Community Leadership and Safety and Social Inclusion.

9. **Equalities Implications**

The HIMP identifies specific priorities and partnership actions to reduce health inequalities and to promote social inclusion and equality of opportunity, particularly in those communities and groups known to be experiencing high levels of material and social deprivation. It also confirms partners actions in response to the Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000.
10. **Environmental Implications**

The HIMP identifies the link between the Council’s environmental conservation, health and protection functions to the wider determinants of good health and wellbeing and the specific priorities and partnership actions to improve and protect public health and reduce health inequalities.

11. **Conclusion**

Lewisham Council’s Vision is to work with local partners to make Lewisham the best place in London to live, work and learn. The HIMP has great potential to help realize this Vision. If this potential is to be exploited to the full, the HIMP should inform the Council’s policy and decision making and should be robustly linked (both as a strategic plan and a strategic/action planning process) to other strategies and action plans that will:

- Impact and/or promote the health and wellbeing of people who live, work and learn in Lewisham
- Modernise local public services to make them more accessible, convenient and responsive to the needs and preferences of people who depend upon them.

If there are any queries on this report please contact John Chapman, Health Partnerships Development Officer, Lewisham Social Care and Health, on 020-8314-3524

### BACKGROUND PAPERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short title of Document</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>File Location</th>
<th>File Ref</th>
<th>Contact Officer</th>
<th>Exempt Inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Report to SC &amp; H Select Ctte</td>
<td>2.7.02</td>
<td>Gov. Support</td>
<td>Minute Book</td>
<td>M Brown</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Modemisation - The local partnership action plan

Modemisation underpins all actions taken by Lewisham Council and local NHS agencies. Modernising local health and social services is one of the 3 core themes of the HIMP. This appendix should be read alongside sub section 1.6 and section 3. It provides summary information on the wide range of actions local partners have programmed over the lifetime of the HIMP. These actions cover:

• improving patient access,
• bringing services closer together for reducing the blockages in the patient care pathway improving electronic links between services
• enabling electronic patient referrals
• close working between health and social care teams
• improving access to social care and ensuring appropriate and timely responses to the needs of vulnerable people
• Maintaining high quality care and services across the local health and social care community

These actions will be driven and led by the Lewisham Health Partnership Board and its 6 Sub-Groups (see sub-section 1.5). These actions support the local implementation of the NHS Plan and the national strategy for Social Services and take account of the outcome of the Local Modernisation Review.

This appendix also provides summary detail of arrangements made for Lewisham Council’s scrutiny of the local NHS

A.1 Faster and easier access to local NHS services

A.1.1 Planned hospital assessment and admission (Secondary care)

Policy context and partnership working
Reducing all waiting for planned treatment is a priority for 2002/03. Improving access also involves ensuring that local NHS services are located conveniently for patients and communities and appropriately serve their needs, especially in deprived areas.

Local hospital consultants and GPs use the PCT’s Clinical Panels to solve common problems and agree means of improving the management of
demand such that the most appropriate care is given at the most appropriate point.

The Demand Management Steering Group oversees modernisation of the whole outpatient system from referral to discharge or treatment with PCTs and UHL.

The Booked Admissions Steering Group implements the Booked Admissions Project in phases with input from GPs, consultants and managers.

Shared local Vision

| That people in non urgent need of care wait no longer to access appropriate, convenient and clinical effective treatment centred on their individual needs within the maximum waiting times specified in the NHS Plan |

Achievements

- UHL and the PCT are working closely together to modernise the whole outpatient system from the point at which GPs refer patients for more specialised care to the way in which outpatient clinics are organised
- A range of health panels are working on the main clinical areas to which patients are referred and will be developing services to include GP specialists and reducing queues in clinics
- The 2002/03 discharge summary and radiology notes transfer has been set up in 2001/02. Radiology reports are available in electronic format for all GPs
- Phase III of the booked admissions project will exceed its original target plan, Phase IV is on target to succeed
- Increasing numbers of GPs are using the electronic solution to send referrals to consultants and this will expand further when GPs can contact all local NHS Trusts

Strategic direction and local action plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By 2002/03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• See all outpatients within a maximum waiting time of 5 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reduce the number of out-patient waiters over 13 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Admit all inpatients within a maximum waiting time of 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reduce the number of in-patient waiters over 9 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reduce overall waiting list size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adopt best practice in waiting time management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• NHS Direct ensures local people have access to local NHS dentists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Attain 80% booking of day cases. Increase booking from and within general practice and significantly increase booking for inpatient elective admissions and outpatient appointments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Admit patients whose operation is cancelled on the day for non-clinical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
reasons within 28 days or offer them the option of treatment at a hospital of their choice

- All specialties within UHL will be available to receive electronic referrals from GPs
- Patients will receive treatment at a time that suits them in accordance with their clinical need*
- All specialties including day care will be using electronic discharge summaries

By 2003/04
- See all outpatients within a maximum waiting time of 4 months #
- Admit all inpatients within a maximum waiting time of 9 months #
- Adopt best practice in waiting time management #
- Pre-book 66% of all outpatient appointments
- Pre-book 66% of all elective inpatient admissions
- Implement electronic booking systems within local NHS Trusts
- Attain 75 minute average waiting time in Accident & Emergency departments #
- Attain 4 hour maximum waiting time in Accident & Emergency departments #
- Attain 1 hour maximum waiting time for admission once decision to admit has been made
- Achieve 30% increase in adult critical care capacity
- Area wide GP referrals to selected specialties in local hospitals made possible

By 2004/05
- Pre-book all outpatient appointments and inpatient elective admissions*

By 2005/06
- See all outpatients within a maximum waiting time of 3 months by December*
- Admit all inpatients within a maximum waiting time of 6 months by December*
- All specialties available for area wide booking

NB Asterisked target(s) signify inclusion in the core targets of the NHS Plan

The Local Modernisation Review recommended that the scope for achieving the NHS Plan targets locally be fully exploited within existing resources through innovation and change (systems re-design) identified above thus #

Projected outcomes

- Waiting times at UHL will achieve national targets and waiting time management will accord to best practice
- The overall waiting list size at UHL will be reduced year on year
- The booking of day and inpatient admissions at UHL will be within national targets and volumes increased year on year
• All operations cancelled on the day for non clinical reasons at UHL will be managed within the national target
• The whole outpatient system at UHL will be modernised
• 50% of GPs will use the electronic referral system in 2002/03 and 100% in 2003/04

A.1.2 Improving access to emergency care

Policy context and partnership working
Prompt, effective and qualitative emergency care provision, 24 hours a day, 365 days a year is a core requirement of the NHS Plan and a priority for 2002/03

The Reforming Emergency Care Steering Group oversees the modernisation of the whole emergency care system including IDEA with NHS Direct, the Lewisham Community Health Council, the London Ambulance Service, intermediate care and primary and secondary care.

Shared local Vision

That people in need of emergency care receive a rapid and appropriate response based on clinical effectiveness and standards regardless of the time and way they contact local services

Achievements

• The IDEA programme (Ideal Design of Emergency Access) is being successfully implemented at UHL. It is designed to improve access across the whole spectrum of emergency care. It aims to significantly reduce overall waiting time through the system, reduce service variability and improve patient, carer and staff experience. The programme is analysing and improving the way in which people who attend A&E with a range of conditions receive care, and also to reduce delays in which patients are found a bed and discharged to their homes or into other types of non-hospital care.

Strategic direction and local action plan

By 2002/03

• Primary Care Trusts to have implementation plans in place for single telephone access, through NHS Direct, by patients to GP out-of-hours care and for 40% of PCTs to have operational systems
• 90% of patients to spend no more than 4 hours in A&E from arrival to admission, transfer or discharge
• The IDEA programme will deliver proven new ways of working designed
to support the achievement of the NHS Plan targets

- The London Ambulance Service NHS Trust achieves all Category A calls within 8 minutes by December

By 2003/04
- Single call access for everyone through NHS Direct to integrated out-of-hours care. Emergency episodes will be completed within 1 hour and urgent episodes within 2 hours
- No patient to spend more than 4 hours in A&E from arrival to admission, transfer or discharge

Projected outcomes

- Waiting times in the A&E department at UHL will achieve the national target
- New ways of working across the whole spectrum of emergency care at UHL will be achieved through the further implementation of the IDEA programme
- Single telephone access will be achieved

A.1.3. Primary care

Policy context and partnership working
Improving access to primary care is a priority for the Lewisham Primary Care Trust. Its Business Plan for 2002/03 includes a Delivery and Operating Plan that sets out actions and a Primary Care Access Plan that sets out proposals for using earmarked investment to address access, capacity and workforce issues.

Future work on this priority will be developed in partnership through the PCT Neighbourhoods supported by the PCT’s Board and Professional Executive Committee

Shared local Vision

That people are registered with NHS contractors and have equal and timely access to general practice and community health services, which are capable of responding to individual needs and preferences. That these services are well integrated with NHS Local Authority and Independent Sector services and reflect identified neighbourhood priorities, best practice and national standards

Achievements

- A single point of access to physiotherapy services is being established together with a set of referral and assessment protocols
Community health services have been reviewed to ensure that services are structured and developed in ways that are accessible acceptable and appropriate to black and minority ethnic communities

Strategic direction and local action plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By 2002/03</th>
<th>By 2003/04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Reduce GP workloads</td>
<td>• Implement medicines management schemes so people get more help from pharmacists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improve access to local services</td>
<td>• Implement repeat dispensing schemes so people find it easier to obtain the right medicines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increase booking from within general practice</td>
<td>• Contribute towards delivery of national NHS prescribing targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Implementation of electronic booking systems across local general practice</td>
<td>• Every GP desktop to have a national standard appointment booking facility linked to booking and scheduling systems in every NHS Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 90% of patients to see a GP within 2 working days</td>
<td>• All patients to see their GP within 48 hours*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 90% of patients to see a Primary Care professional (other than GP) within 1 working day</td>
<td>• All patients to see Primary Care professionals (other than GPs) within 24 hours*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Primary care teams to identify and assess common mental health needs and refer on to specialist services</td>
<td>• Provide tests in primary care centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• People with common mental health needs able to make 24hr contact with local services and use NHS Direct</td>
<td>• Specialist GPs taking referrals from colleagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Employ more community mental health staff to work with GPs. Primary Care Teams, NHS Direct and A&amp;E Departments</td>
<td>• Implement outpatient consultations in primary/community care settings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conduct an evaluation of the Primary Care Suite at University Hospital Lewisham</td>
<td>• New outpatient consultations held in primary/community care settings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Address service access for those people whose first language is not English</td>
<td>• Invest in primary care facilities (including NHS LIFT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Implement medicines management schemes so people get more help from pharmacists</td>
<td>• Refurbish or replace local GP premises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Implement repeat dispensing schemes so people find it easier to obtain the right medicines</td>
<td>• Establish one-stop primary care centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Contribute towards delivery of national NHS prescribing targets</td>
<td>• Employ new graduate primary care mental workers to help GPs manage and treat people with common mental health needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Every GP desktop to have a national standard appointment booking facility linked to booking and scheduling systems in every NHS Trust</td>
<td>• Employ community mental health staff to help treat people with common mental health needs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Develop training in mental health care for all primary care staff  
**NB Asterisked target(s) signify inclusion in the core targets of the NHS Plan**

**Projected outcomes**
- Improved access to general practice and community health services
- Improved responsiveness and sensitivity of services to individual needs and preferences
- Improved range of services available in general practice and community health premises
- Primary care services more integrated with other local NHS, Lewisham Council and Independent Sector services

**A.2 Modernising Lewisham’s Social Services**

See also Lewisham Council’s directorate of Social Care and Health Service Plan and Budget for 2002/03 and section 9 of Lewisham Council’s 2002/03 Performance Plan

**Policy context and partnership working**

Lewisham’s social services priorities and actions are centred on 3 priorities: protecting, supporting and promoting the independence of vulnerable people, ensuring children and young people looked after by the Council have the same life opportunities as their peers and, working with partners to improve local people’s health and well-being.

**Shared local Vision**

That the most vulnerable adults and children in Lewisham are protected from harm and are helped to maintain fulfilling and independent lives. That social services in Lewisham provide effective, equitable and timely responses to the needs and preferences of individuals and their carers. That social services reflect best practice and best value and are integrated as far as possible with the local NHS, other services of the Council and the local Independent Sector.

**Achievements**
- **Care Homes 2000.** A partnership venture with a Housing Association to provide 80 sheltered housing places
- **New Start.** A programme of initiatives to improve the quality of children’s services, including organisational restructuring of the whole service for children and families
- **Working in close partnership with local NHS agencies** on maximising the use of the flexibilities provided under the 1999 Health Act and with other Directorates in the Local Authority on health improvement and social well-being plans
- **Best Value Reviews** (BVRs) Implementing the outcome of the 2000/01 BVRs of Learning Disability services
• **Health Scrutiny Panel Pilot** Leading the health scrutiny into local partnership provision of services to children with special needs up to the age of eight
• **Social Services Procedures** Revising and piloting practice procedures for adult social work teams

**Strategic direction and local action plan**

- Provide high quality pre-admission and rehabilitation care to older people to help them live as independently as possible by reducing preventable hospitalisation and ensuring year-on-year reductions in delays in moving people older 75 on from hospital
- Increase the participation of problem drug users in drug treatment programmes by 55% by 2004 and 100% by 2008
- Improve the life chances for children in care by:
  - Ensuring that education, employment and training outcomes for care leavers aged 19 are at least 75% of the level achieved by all local young people locally in 2003/04
  - Ensure at least 15% of children in care achieve five grade A*-C GCSEs by 2004
  - Ensure children in care get the care and guidance they need to narrow the gap between them and their peers who are cautioned or convicted by 2004
  - Maximise the contribution adoption can make to providing permanent families for children

**NB** Asterisked target(s) signify inclusion in the core targets of the NHS Plan

**Improving access to Social Care**
Currently people access Social Services for adult services through one of four district teams. These are being re-organised into whole borough services for younger and older adults with corresponding whole borough duty arrangements. District teams were established to meet the requirements of the Community Care Act. With the establishment of Community Mental Health Teams and the separate social work team for people with learning disabilities there has been inconsistencies and inequities in service delivery in the district teams. Whole borough services will address these issues by making better use of available resources. Also, whole borough services will be closely linked to primary care and GP surgeries will provide a local focus.

**Single Assessment Process (SAP)**
Implementation of the SAP in Lewisham is co-ordinated by the Multi-Agency Procedures Project Management Group, which reports to the Older Adults Sub Board. Following a review of existing assessment procedures in the Borough and initial consultation with local stakeholders, an action plan has been devised with the involvement of a multi-disciplinary group of practitioners and a multi-agency training group. It is envisaged that the SAP will be implemented incrementally over the next two years, accompanied by
a programme of multi-disciplinary training for staff in partner agencies. The first phase will focus on the development of local implementation networks within the new PCT neighbourhood structure. Later work will focus on involving specialist services and Lewisham Hospital. A series of reviews have been built into the action plan, along with ongoing service user consultation and staff feedback.

Modemising Care Provision
The redesign of services towards specialist teams accords with the recommendations of ‘Fair Access to Care’ in that staff who are competent in multi-disciplinary working and the circumstances of specific user groups should carry out assessments and related care planning. Work is in hand to move quite quickly to an integrated and specialist service for older people with mental health problems which will provide a service which is complementary to that provided by Primary care and the mainstream social services provision. This integrated team will provide a specialist assessment using the Single Assessment Framework and will be jointly funded and managed by Lewisham Council and the local NHS. It is expected that the shift to a specialist team will greatly improve the service to younger people with physical disability.

For those for whom rehabilitation is not an option, the 2001/02 Best Value Review of Home Care will ensure that the service is provided in the most effective way, depending on local circumstances.

Extending Direct Payments
The extension of the Direct Payments scheme and its local implementation is regarded as the key to enhancing the independence of people with learning and physical disabilities.

Protecting Vulnerable Adults from Abuse
The ‘No Secrets’ DoH/HO guidance (2000) requires Local Authorities to lead the development of ‘A framework for action within which all responsible agencies work together to ensure a coherent policy for the protection of all vulnerable adults at risk of abuse’ Lewisham Interagency Adult Protection Committee is responsible for ensuring that the requirements of ‘No Secrets’ are met. The Adult Protection Committee produces an Annual Report and has developed an Interagency Adult Protection Strategy. This sets out all the actions that will need to be undertaken in 2002/03.

The Social Care and Health directorate assumed responsibility for the newly created Crime Reduction Service from January 2002.

Social Services to protect and support Children and Young People and their families
Please refer to the Lewisham Strategic Plan for Children & Young People (April 2002 – March 2005) for details of identified needs, priorities and actions to modernise these services.

### Joint Review of Social Services

During the autumn of 2002, the Social Services Inspectorate and the Audit Commission will undertake a Joint Review of Lewisham’s Social Care and Health directorate. The purpose of the Joint Review is to provide an objective assessment of how well the social care needs of local people are served by the directorate. The Joint Review Team will take a broad overview of all aspects of the directorate’s work including putting users and carers at the centre of service delivery, achieving Best Value and working in partnership.

The Joint Review team also examines progress in meeting the Government’s Modernisation agenda, including arrangements for the joint commissioning and provision of NHS and social care services. The directorate has prepared a Position Statement for the Joint Review team which sets out the directorate’s own assessment of its performance.

Following the production of the Joint Review report, the Social Care and Health Directorate will draw up an action plan for approval by the Council. This will set out, with timescales, how it intends to respond to any issues raised in the report.

### Projected outcomes

- Improved social service access to children, young people and families
- Improved life chances and health status of children looked after
- More vulnerable adults helped to live independently and fewer admitted to residential or nursing homes
- Greater benefits to service users and their carers through joint implementation of Health Act flexibilities, Best Value Reviews, the new Single Assessment Process, linking social services to primary care, and integrated Specialist Teams

### A.3. Quality assurance

Local HIMP partners are committed to maintaining the highest standards of clinical care and services, ensuring services are centred on service users and their carers needs and preferences, protecting people from poorly performing practitioners and, minimising the risk of untoward incidents.

#### A.3.1 User representation and satisfaction
Policy context and partnership working

The NHS Plan includes a number of reforms designed to improve people’s experience of health and social services and give them new rights and roles.

Each local NHS Trust, Lewisham Social Care and Health and Lewisham Primary Care Trust have systems in place to consult with service users and address their concerns and complaints. The feedback gained has informed the planning and commissioning of local services.

Shared local Vision

That local health and social care services are shaped by people’s experience of using them and their needs and preferences. That people have a greater role in the delivery and design of services and have greater access to information relevant to their needs, accessing services, and receiving care and treatment.

Achievements

• Minimum standards to assure the quality of service provided in primary care are currently being implemented

• An audit of Lewisham Council’s Social Care and Health directorate’s consultation initiatives was completed. It recommended a more systematic approach to co-ordinating approaches and information and, the development of a performance assessment framework for consultation and participation. An action plan related to this work is being implemented

• University Hospital Lewisham developed and consulted upon its User Involvement Strategy

• Each local NHS Trust is preparing to develop and implement a consent policy in accordance with guidance to be published in 2002.

• Each local NHS Trust is making progress on the right of individual patients to have made available to them copies of all letters between clinicians relating to their care plan

• UHL has plans in place to achieve the single sex accommodation target by December 2002 and the backlog maintenance clearance target by 2005

• The layout of wards in the Ladywell Unit will be reconfigured by March 2003 to improve the therapeutic environment and will comply with single sex standards by December 2003 (MHNSFs3) The Ladywell Unit includes a vulnerable women’s unit

• All mental health day centres have women only sessions

Strategic direction and local action plan

• All local NHS Trusts are to ensure high levels of patient satisfaction throughout their organisations and that where patients are dissatisfied year on year improvements are made as measured by independently audited surveys*
• All local NHS Trusts are to ensure high standards throughout their organisations and that where standards are not met year on year improvements are made as measured by independently audited surveys
• The standard of provision of hospital food is to include hot meals on a 24-hour basis and menu variety in accordance with the national dish selector
• All local hospitals are planning to introduce ward housekeepers. These services must be fully implemented across all local hospitals by December 2004

Projected outcomes
• That people express high levels of satisfaction with their involvement in and understanding of their health and their care and treatment
• That people express high levels of satisfaction with the standards of facilities and non-clinical services provided
• That people recognise their care and treatment has benefited from improved level of integration in local services
• That the majority of people progress along their care pathway as determined by their needs and not by capacity shortfalls within certain parts of the local ‘whole system’

A.3.2 Clinical Governance

Policy context and partnership working
A First Class Service: Quality in the new NHS sets out a framework for quality improvement and fair access in the NHS, one key component being including local delivery of high quality health care, through clinical governance underpinned by modernised professional self-regulation and extended lifelong learning. Clinical governance involves supporting staff and developing systems to ensure high quality care is delivered to patients. Its aim is to continually improve the quality of NHS services and safeguard high standards of care.

Lewisham PCT has a Clinical Governance Committee (CGC) that reports to the PCT’s Professional Executive Committee. All local NHS Trusts have CGCs responsible for Clinical Governance programmes and reporting on their work to Trust Boards.

Shared local Vision
That the quality of local NHS services and clinical practice is of the highest standard and the incidence of adverse events is minimal

Achievements
• The clinical governance review by the national Commission for Health Improvement (CHI) was performed in UHL in November 2001 UHL was very
pleased that CHI highlighted a number of examples of good practice. The hospital has developed an action plan for the areas that require improvement

- Robust clinical governance processes and structures are in place in each local NHS Trust
- Lewisham PCT's interim clinical governance framework ensures that clinical risk is minimised and high standards of patient care are provided through best practice and professional development from 1st April 2002
- Improvements in the quality of prescribing within general practice have been achieved whilst managing the prescribing budget
- UHL is currently implementing its action plan related to the CHI report in order to continue to make improvements for patients
- Each local NHS Trust develops and implements its own annual development plan and reports upon the performance it achieved in the previous year in its Annual Report
- All local NHS Trusts provide information to the national reporting system and plan to double the level of information they provide by December 2002
- UHL is working towards the national target for providers of obstetric and gynaecology services to reduce the number of medical negligence claims by 25% by December 2005

Strategic direction statement and local action plan

- All local NHS Trusts are working towards the national target of reducing the number of serious errors in the use of prescribed drugs

A.4 Lewisham Council's overview and scrutiny of the local NHS

Policy context and partnership working
Local Authority Overview and Scrutiny Committees (OSCs) are a major reform of the NHS Plan to represent democratically local views on the quality, performance and development of health services to local NHS bodies. This scrutiny function is to be conducted as part of Lewisham Council’s responsibility to seek health improvements and reduce health inequalities for people who live, work and learn in Lewisham.

The DoH consulted on OSCs in January 2002. In its detailed response Lewisham Council welcomed the new role for Local Authorities of overview and scrutiny of health and identified the need for adequate support to fulfil this role. The outcome of the national consultation will inform secondary legislation and guidance to be developed in 2002.

Lewisham Council established a pilot Health Scrutiny Panel in March 2001. Its focus has been on children with special needs up to the age of eight. The
scrutiny took the form of a review of local authority and health services rather than a scrutiny of the local NHS.

Shared local Vision

| That through local health scrutiny, the health needs and wishes of local people are identified towards achieving local health improvements. Those local services that impact on people’s health are assessed by and are accessible to local people. That the outcomes of interventions are equitable. |

Achievements

- The scrutiny identified a number of issues requiring action on a variety of fronts to improve services
- The recommended actions have been presented to the Council’s Executive Committee, Assembly Committee and the Lewisham Health Partnership Board for implementation.

Strategic direction and local action plan

- Lewisham’s approach to scrutiny of the NHS will include holding local health bodies to account and exercising a policy development role
- The Council will review the implementation of the Health Scrutiny Panel’s recommendations and will further develop its health scrutiny role based on the experience of the pilot and the key lessons learnt from the process
- Communication and sharing of information with boroughs within the new strategic health authority boundaries will be explored
- Dialogue will be continued with health partners and local patient groups on health issues
- Attention will be paid to training members on health service structures and procedures as part of the scrutiny process

NB Future areas of local health scrutiny had not been identified at the time of developing the Lewisham HIMP

Projected outcomes

Further to the implementation of the 25 recommendations specified in the report of Lewisham’s Special Health Select Sub-Committee, over the lifetime of the HIMP there should be:

- Measurable improvement in the organisation and delivery of health and social care services
- Demonstrable increase in citizen’s satisfaction
- Demonstrable close working between local public and voluntary sector services
• Demonstrable transparency in policy decisions and resource allocation
## Signposts to other key strategies and plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Economic, environmental and social well being     | Lewisham Community Strategy (due September 2002)                      | Raj Singh
|                                                   |                                                                      | 020-8314-8631
|                                                   |                                                                      | raj.singh@lewisham.gov.uk                                              |
| Best Value performance                            | Lewisham Council’s annual performance plan                          |                                                                      |
| Citizens centred services                         | Citizens First Strategy                                              |                                                                      |
| Progress review and risk assessment of implementing the NHS Plan targets | Local Modernisation Review                                           |                                                                      |
| The health of Lewisham 2001                       | Everybody’s Business                                                 | Lorna Jonas-Tinson                                                     |
| The 2002 Report of the Director of Public Health  | Some are more equal than others                                      |                                                                      |
| Neighbourhood renewal                             | Lewisham Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy 2002-2004                    |                                                                      |
| Cultural and urban development linked to economic prosperity | Creative Lewisham                                                  | Rachel Morris
|                                                   |                                                                      | 020-8314-9001
<p>|                                                   |                                                                      | <a href="mailto:rachel.morris@lewisham.gov.uk">rachel.morris@lewisham.gov.uk</a>                                         |
| Lifelong learning                                 | Lewisham LEA Education Development Plan 2002-2007                   |                                                                      |
|                                                   | Lewisham Annual Early Years Development and Childcare Implementation Plan |                                                                      |
|                                                   | Lewisham Adult Learning Plan                                         |                                                                      |
|                                                   | Ethnic Minority Achievement Strategy                                 |                                                                      |
|                                                   | Lewisham Behaviour Support Plan                                      |                                                                      |
| Environmental development                         | Lewisham Sustainable Development Strategy                            |                                                                      |
|                                                   | Lewisham Parks and Open Spaces Strategy                             |                                                                      |
| Housing                                           | Lewisham Housing Strategy                                            |                                                                      |
|                                                   | Annual HRA Business Plan                                            |                                                                      |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Safety</th>
<th>Lewisham Crime and Disorder Safety Plan 2002-2005</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lewisham Annual Youth Justice Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>Lewisham Interim Local Implementation Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lewisham Green Travel Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Inequalities</td>
<td>Lewisham Inequalities Conference Report</td>
<td>Lorna Jonas-Tinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lewisham Teenage Pregnancy, Parenthood and Sexual Health Strategy</td>
<td>Denise Burgess 020-8314-9940</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saving Lives</td>
<td>Coronary Heart Disease NSF Implementation Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stroke Older People’s NSF Implementation Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cancer SE London Cancer Network Service Delivery Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suicide and undetermined injury Mental Health NSF Implementation Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diabetes NSF Implementation Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting and protecting good health and well being</td>
<td>Communicable Diseases LSL Communicable Disease Team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Smoking Cessation             | Lewisham Smoking Cessation Programme                                  | Peter Carpenter  
Peter.Carpenter@lewishampct.nhs.uk. |
# Distribution List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnership/Partner</th>
<th>Addressee</th>
<th>Copies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Health Partnership Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Executive Board</td>
<td>Members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Improvement &amp; Modernisation Sub-Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Action Zone (Devolved to Lewisham)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults Partnership Board</td>
<td>Members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults with Physical Disabilities and Sensory Impairment Service Development Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-Agency Adult Protection Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Careers Working Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palliative Care Sub Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV &amp; AIDS Sub Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Misuse Sub-Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare to Work Steering Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults with Learning Disabilities Partnership Board</td>
<td>Members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Commissioning Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Mental Health Partnership Board</td>
<td>Members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional details on Sub-Groups to be included</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Adults Partnership Board</td>
<td>Members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate Care Services Sub-Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of Adult Therapies Sub-Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Equipment Store Sub-Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health in Older Adults Network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity Planning Sub-Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Care Sub-Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transforming Discharge Management Sub-Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Adults JIP Implementation Sub-Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Adults NSF Implementation Sub-Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children &amp; Young People’s Partnership Board</td>
<td>Members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child &amp; Adolescent Mental Health Steering Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looked After Children Development Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children with Disabilities and Special Health Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Group</td>
<td>Members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Area Child Protection Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Early Years Partnership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Children’s Fund Executive Steering Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Healthier Lewisham Partnership Board</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Health Improvement Programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sustainability Programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Health &amp; Regeneration Programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Children &amp; Young People, Teenage Pregnancy, Sexual Health and Parenthood Programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Health Inequalities Programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnership/Partner</th>
<th>Addressee</th>
<th>Copies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race and Diversity Board</td>
<td>Members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional details on Sub-Groups to be included</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Lewisham Primary Care Trust Board |         |        |
| Lewisham Primary Care Trust Professional Executive Committee |         |        |
| Lewisham Primary Care Trust Senior Management Team |         |        |
| Lewisham Council Executive Committee |         |        |
| Lewisham Overview and Scrutiny Committee |         |        |
| Lewisham Citizens Panel |         |        |
| University Hospital Lewisham NHS Trust |         |        |
| South London and Maudsley NHS Trust |         |        |
| Guys and St. Thomas’ NHS Trust |         |        |
| London Ambulance Service NHS Trust | Chief Executive |        |
| South East London Strategic Health Authority | Chief Executive |        |
| London Regional Office of Social Care and Health | Director |        |
| Lambeth Primary Care Trust |         |        |
| Southwark Primary Care Trust |         |        |
| Bromley Primary Care Trust |         |        |
| Greenwich Primary Care Trust |         |        |
| Bexley Primary Care Trust |         |        |
| London Borough of Bromley |         |        |
| London Borough of Southwark |         |        |
| London Borough of Greenwich |         |        |
| Metropolitan Police | Borough Commander |        |
| Inner London Probation Service | Director |        |
| Lewisham Community Health Council | Chair |        |
| Lewisham Race Equality Council | Chair |        |
1. **Purpose of the Report**

   To present the views of the Social Care and Health Select Committee on the Lewisham’s first Health Improvement and Modernisation Plan (HIMP) 2002.

2. **Recommendation**

   (i) To take into consideration the views of the Social Care and Health Select Committee outlined in section 4 in this report in relation to the HIMP.

   (ii) To respond to the Select Committee at their next meeting in September.

3. **Background**

   On 2 July 2002, the Social Care and Health Select Committee considered the HIMP document, and members of the committee raised some comments that they would like brought to the attention of Mayor and Cabinet.

4. **Lewisham’s first Health Improvement and Modernisation Plan 2002**

   **Promoting & Protecting good health and well being**

   The committee would like to see plans for the pilots around diet and nutrition to be expanded borough wide and seek to include the whole population.

   **Patients Packs for the elderly (the Polypharmacy project)**

   The committee welcomed the work in progress with local practices and pharmacists to pilot ‘patients packs’ for the elderly as a very important
initiative, and hoped that these will be widely available in the near future. The packs are designed to make it easier for the elderly to administer their prescribed drugs by themselves.

Terminology

The committee would like to ensure that the language used is comprehensible, and where it would assist understanding, explain terminology, for example the polypharmacy project.

The committee welcomed the reassurance that there will be an executive summary that will be as accessible as possible.

Young People’s Health and Well Being

The committee welcomed the planned Downham PFI scheme, as an excellent example of joint working. They believe that it could be an important contributor to improving the health and well being of young people in the area. However, they were concerned that owing to the long timescale to completion, interim measures should be sought to ensure that young people had services they could call on.

Services for women

Look at increasing services for women across the borough, and hope that the forthcoming Government Health Strategy for women will act as a guide.

Substance Misuse

The committee would like to see the vision in the section on substance misuse edited so that it is clear that our concern is for all groups misusing illegal drugs. They felt that characterising this as a young person’s issue, while understandable in service terms, nevertheless went some way towards unnecessarily demonising this group.

Cross-referencing

The committee noted that the cross-referencing in the report should be checked to ensure that particular client groups have not been excluded, for example the “active elderly”.

Accessibility - out of hours access to GP practices, medical help
There are some facilities already available in the borough, for example, the Primary Care Suite in Lewisham Hospital. The committee suggested that these facilities should be actively publicised.

General points

- The need to link the HIMP to the community strategy, and the broader corporate agenda.
- Adequate funding needs to be assured for the success of the HIMP. The planned conference in the autumn to tie the plan to delivery will be an important indicator of how the ambitions set out in the HIMP will be met.
- Particular attention needs to be given to the quality of primary care across the borough to ensure equality of access and care.
1. Summary

1.1 Following the recommendations of the Home Care best value review team which were accepted by the Social Services committee on the 13th of March 2002, this implementation plan sets out the tasks that the implementation team will undertake to achieve the objectives of the review. The tasks are set out under the headings of the four main recommendations, which are

- The creation of a “Lewisham home care partnership” offering a badged service irrespective of service provider, to ensure a seamless high quality service for clients;

- The targeting of services more effectively for all Lewisham communities through improved eligibility criteria and the increased provision of specialist services;

- Increased monitoring including the introduction of an electronic recording system to improve and assure service performance;

- The re-focusing and restructuring of the in-house service to ensure maximum efficiency and the development of a robust local home care provider market in the future.

1.2 To ensure the smooth running of the plan and co-ordination of tasks, a full time project manager will be appointed to manage the programme of tasks and undertake any spin-off projects that have arisen as a result of the review. The project manager will also be responsible for monitoring progress on each of the tasks and reporting to management as required.
2. **Purpose of the Report**

To present the improvement plan for the Home Care best value review.

3. **Policy context**

3.1 In accordance with the provisions of the Local Government Act 1999, the council is required to undertake a best value review of all of its services over a five-year period commencing in April 2000.

3.2 Home Care best value review was one of the nine reviews carried out in 2001/2002.

3.3 The principle of best value is to ensure that council delivery continues to improve over the range of services provided by the council. The key purpose of this review is to implement a significant ‘step’ improvement in the delivery of services to residents.

4. **Recommendation**

That the improvement plan outlined in appendix 1 be agreed and the best value review process brought to a formal conclusion.

5. **Progress on the plan to date**

5.1 The temporary one-year post of project manager is in the process of being advertised. It is hoped that recruitment will take place quickly by securing an internal secondment arrangement. Once appointed, the project manager will lead on all actions not covered in paragraphs 5.2 to 5.6 set out below.

5.2 On the award of contracts, the Social Services Committee agreed on 14 November 2001 to the award of 4 X 1000 hours per week contracts, following the tender for domiciliary care ‘cost and volume’ contracts. The contracts were to be awarded for one year from whatever dates each contractor achieved the 1000-hour per week target. The 1000 hours to be achieved includes work already being provided by these contractors.

5.3 One of the contractors has achieved the 1000-hour level, thereby placing it within the ‘cost and volume’ contract. It is anticipated that others will build up in July 2002. Fulfilling the contracts is proving slower than expected, especially since all care packages are now being scrutinised by the Community Care Panel. The Panel acts as a monitoring tool, ensuring that care packages are being placed appropriately.
5.4 An action plan has been developed to take forward the review of the in-house evening and specialist service. Once complete at the end of July 2002, the re-organisation of the in-house service will commence.

5.5 A reduction of 350 hours from the in-house service has been achieved and the budgets transferred to care managers, enabling them to purchase services from the independent sector. A further 150 hours will be transferred by the end of September 2002, thus meeting the 2002/2003 financial year target for reduction of in-house provision.

5.6 A review of eligibility criteria has commenced, and the Mayor and Cabinet approved a set of draft criteria on 19 June 2002 that are now going out for consultation. A further report on proposed new criteria will be presented to the Mayor and Cabinet in September 2002.

6. **Financial Implications**

The net savings over the next three years were estimated in the recommendation report to be £144.5K.

7. **Legal Implications**

7.1 The Best Value Review has been carried out in accordance with the Local Government's Act 1999 and associated guidance which require the Council to conduct reviews of all of its services over a five year timetable.

7.2 Members should satisfy themselves that the service options identified will provide best value services in accordance with the requirement to ensure year on year service improvement.

7.3 Homecare services are provided pursuant to powers and duties provided by s29 National Assistance Act 1948, s45 Health Service and Public Health Act 1968, s2 Chronically Sick and Disabled Act 1970, s21 and sch 8 National Health Services Act 1977.

7.4 All redundancy procedures must be carried out in accordance with the Councils' Personnel procedures.

7.5 All procurement will be undertaken in accordance with Standing Orders.
8. Equalities implications

Equality issues are an integral part of the best value review process and have been incorporated into the improvement plan. The development of specialist providers for black and ethnic minority communities would address some of the concerns around the concentration of ethnic minority groups in certain parts of the borough.

9. Crime and Disorder Implications

There are no specific crime and disorder implications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Title of report</strong></th>
<th><strong>Committee</strong></th>
<th><strong>Date</strong></th>
<th><strong>File location</strong></th>
<th><strong>Contact Officer</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best value review of home care</td>
<td>Social services</td>
<td>13 March 2002</td>
<td>Governance Support</td>
<td>Eliane Haydon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tender for domiciliary care cost and volume contracts</td>
<td>Social Services</td>
<td>14 Nov. 2001</td>
<td>Governance Support</td>
<td>Eliane Haydon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For further information on this report please contact Lesley Moore, Head of Adults’ Services on 020 8314 8670.
Improvement Plan

Home Care Best Value Review

June 2002

Social Care & Health Directorate
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>REVIEW OBJECTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>To promote Independence at Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Consider future needs based on demographic information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Ensure resources are targeted to those most in need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Examine balance of provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Ensure services of the highest quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Maximise Efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Ensure flexible, sensitive and responsive services to all communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>To promote a local home support economy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1: Creation of a Lewisham “Home Care Partnership” to provide uniformity of service irrespective of provider
   a) A badged, quality assured Lewisham service to be promoted through key home care providers
   b) Uniformity of service providers identity as being an LBL provided service, irrespective of origin (i.e. in-house or external)
   c) Communality of service culture within/from all providers
   d) Creation of a home care partnership advisor to support partners
   e) Development of a workforce and training consortium
   f) Partnership sponsored awards development
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASKS/ACTIONS</th>
<th>START</th>
<th>FINISH</th>
<th>HOW WILL THIS BE ACHIEVED?</th>
<th>WHO WILL ENSURE THIS HAPPENS?</th>
<th>LINKED TO OBJECTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1a. Working with key partners     | June 02 | ongoing | • Work to achieve 1 year cost & volume contracts  
                                 |                                                   | S. Curran/Care Management Commissioning          | D, F, H, A          |
| 1b. Badged Service                | June 02 | Mar 03 | • Development of Partnership Standards  
                                 |                                                   | BVR Project Manager                               | E, A, F, G, H       |
                                 |       |       | • Development of Partnership identity  
<p>| | | |
|                                                   |                                                   |                     |
|       |       | • Adoption and publicity for Partnership identity                                         |                                                   |                     |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASKS/ACTIONS</th>
<th>START</th>
<th>FINISH</th>
<th>HOW WILL THIS BE ACHIEVED?</th>
<th>WHO WILL ENSURE THIS HAPPENS?</th>
<th>LINKED TO OBJECTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1c. Communality of service culture</td>
<td>April 03</td>
<td>May 03</td>
<td>• Establishment of Regular Partnership Meetings and Info System</td>
<td>Homecare Partnership Advisor</td>
<td>A, E, F, G, H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1d. Creation of a Home Care Project Manager and Partnership Advisor to support Partners | April 02   | April 03 | • Appointment of Project Manager   
|                                                                                 | Sept 02    |        | • Funding Identified   
|                                                                                 | Oct 02     |        | • Recruitment to post   
|                                                                                 | Apr 02     |        | • Post operational      
|                                                                                 | Sept 02    |        | • Identify aims and scope   
|                                                                                 | Dec 02     |        | • Remit and legalities established   
<p>|                                                                                 | April 03   |        | • Operational            | Head of QS BV Project Manager                                                               | G, E, A             |
| 1e. Development of a workforce and training consortium                        |            |        |                                                                                           | BVR Project Manager/Sue Bunt                                                               | H, E, F             |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASKS/ACTIONS</th>
<th>START</th>
<th>FINISH</th>
<th>HOW WILL THIS BE ACHIEVED?</th>
<th>WHO WILL ENSURE THIS HAPPENS?</th>
<th>LINKED TO OBJECTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Partnership Sponsored awards developed | June 02 | Nov 02 | • Feasibility and range (e.g. unpaid carers) to be identified  
• Consultation  
• First Awards | BVR PM / Valerie Hill / Hilary Johnston | G, A |

2. Enhanced Monitoring Capacity to ensure quality

a) Both in-house and external providers perform to a common set of monitored service standards/service level agreement and ensure National Care Standards to be met  
b) The Directorate increases its human resource capacity for monitoring  
c) Introduction of electronic monitoring system for care staff
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASKS/ACTIONS</th>
<th>START</th>
<th>FINISH</th>
<th>HOW WILL THIS BE ACHIEVED?</th>
<th>WHO WILL ENSURE THIS HAPPENS?</th>
<th>LINKED TO OBJECTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2a. The Directorate increases its human resource capacity for monitoring | Sept 02 Oct 02 Feb 03 | Sept 02 Oct 02 Feb 03 | • SLA finalisation  
• Assessment of staffing needs  
• Recruitment operational  
• Reassessment of options  
• Recommendations to DMT  
• Consultation with Service Users and Partners  
• Pilot System  
• System implementation | GM Commissioning  
“  
BVR Project Manager  
BVR PM/Peter Harrison  
D. Moss/BVR PM/Human Resources  
BVR PM  
BVR PM | E, F, A |
| 2b. Introduction of electronic monitoring system for care staff | July 02 Aug 02 Sept 02 Jan 03 April 03 | July 02 Aug 02 Dec 02 | GM Commissioning  
“  
BVR Project Manager  
BVR PM/Peter Harrison  
D. Moss/BVR PM/Human Resources  
BVR PM  
BVR PM | E, F  
E, F, G |

3. The Refocusing and Restructuring of Current Provision to Maximise Efficiency

a) Restructuring of the in-house service to include updated job descriptions for all staff to reduce duplication & maximise efficiencies
b) Reconfigure current cost and volume contracts to develop key partners building and local agency capacity as well as inviting national interest
c) Reduction in the current in-house service level of 5500 hours per week to 4000 hours by 2004/05
d) The feasibility of the spring cleaning service to be examined
e) The exploration of the options for future provision of the special duty service
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASKS/ACTIONS</th>
<th>START</th>
<th>FINISH</th>
<th>HOW WILL THIS BE ACHIEVED?</th>
<th>WHO WILL ENSURE THIS HAPPENS?</th>
<th>LINKED TO OBJECTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3a. Review current service provision of the HC evening service, and link proposals to the reorganisation of the Home Care Service | May 02| July 02| • Information collection  
• Consultation with staff  
• Draw out proposals  
• Feedback to staff  
• Make final recommendations | J Loh/Barbara Ren/David Reid/Janet Higgins | A, C, D, E, F |
| 3b. Reorganisation of the in-house service to include updated job descriptions for all staff to reduce duplication & maximise efficiencies | July 02| Nov 02| • Drafting of consultation document  
• Consultation Period  
• Interviews/Assimilation  
• New structure in place  
• Procurement/Commissioning process  
• Re-negotiate rates previously submitted  
• Assessment of volume size for contracts  
• Monitoring to ensure contractual obligations are met | J Loh/Barbara Ren/Jannet Higgins/Program Manager | A, C, D, E, F |
<p>| 3c. Develop key partners from existing framework, include other local providers newly accredited | Sept 02| Mar 03|  | S Curren | D, F, H, B |
| 3d. Award of contracts (external) Service Level                               | Sept 02| Apr 03|  | Commissioning/ | H, C, E, F |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASKS/ACTIONS</th>
<th>START</th>
<th>FINISH</th>
<th>HOW WILL THIS BE ACHIEVED?</th>
<th>WHO WILL ENSURE THIS HAPPENS?</th>
<th>LINKED TO OBJECTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agreement (internal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3e. Ensure key partners registered and National Care Standards are met.</td>
<td>July 02 &amp; Apr 02 - Apr 04</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>• Monitoring to ensure National Care Standards are maintained</td>
<td>Care Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3f. Reduction in the current in-house service level of 5500 hours per week to</td>
<td>Sept 02 - Mar 03</td>
<td></td>
<td>Monitoring to ensure:</td>
<td>Commissioning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000 hours by 2004/05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 5000 hours rationalised to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3g. Explore the feasibility of extending the Spring Cleaning Service</td>
<td>Sept 02 - Oct 02</td>
<td></td>
<td>• 4500 hours</td>
<td>Commission/Care services/care management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3h. Conduct an evaluation of the Spring Cleaning Service</td>
<td>Sept 02</td>
<td>Mar 03</td>
<td>• Options to be considered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Enter into negotiation with potential providers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Enter into negotiations with Regeneration to provide this service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Consider whether externalising the Spring Cleaning Service is an option</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BVR Project Manager / S. Curren / Janet Higgins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BVR PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Monitoring to ensure: 5000 hours rationalised to: 4500 hours 4000 hours Options to be considered Enter into negotiation with potential providers Enter into negotiations with Regeneration to provide this service Consider whether externalising the Spring Cleaning Service is an option
1. Summary

This report gives detail on the small scale traffic schemes carried out last year. In addition it proposes a priority list of schemes to be implemented this year for a budget of £30,000.

2. Purpose of the Report

To report on a priority list of traffic management and pedestrian facilities of which the top 15 schemes are proposed to be implemented this financial year.

3. Policy Context

The Council’s current UDP policies for transport include:

TRN 20 Improving Road Safety: The Council will take measures to reduce the number and severity of road accidents in the Borough.

4. Recommendations

That the Mayor agrees:

4.1 the priority list for small scale traffic management measures in Appendix B, but notes the limited funding for this area of work and therefore the limited ability of officers to be able to respond to requests for action;

4.2 that £30K of the highways’ budget be allocated for small scale traffic management and pedestrian facilities;
4.3 that if any funding is identified via S106 or other external sources, items from the priority list are investigated and treated, even if this results in schemes being addressed out of priority;

4.4 that officers report back next year on additional requests received and action taken in respect of this year’s priority list; and

4.5 to note the schemes carried out in 2001/2 listed in paragraph 5.3.

5. Narrative

5.1 On 25 July 2001 the Executive Committee agreed:

(1) the priority assessment criteria for traffic management measures;

(2) the criteria for the assessment of formal Pedestrian crossings; and

(3) that officers report next year on additional requests received and action taken in respect of this year’s priority list.

5.2 This report deals with requests for action that are not dealt with under the Parking, Area Studies or the Accident Investigation and Prevention Programmes. These schemes are dealt with under separate policies and programmes. Requests for minor traffic schemes are registered, assessed and prioritised as listed in Appendix B. It is intended that the proposed prioritised list is reviewed regularly and reported to Mayor.

5.3 Schemes implemented last year

5.3.1 Only a limited number of schemes have been implemented in the last few years. In the last financial year schemes were implemented in accordance with the current policy of prioritising. All the schemes proposed last year, as listed in the Executive Committee report on 25 July 2001, were carried out.

5.3.2 Previously schemes were implemented using a priority road listing that incorporated traffic calming. The list below shows the schemes that have been implemented in the last year (schemes that are primarily traffic calming and AIP schemes have not been listed as these are dealt with in the other two Committee reports elsewhere on this agenda pertaining to these areas):

- Eliot Hill Review of one way
- Brockley Cross dropped kerbs and tactiles
- Manor Mount/Honor Oak Road alteration to no entry
- 333 Sydenham Rd pedestrian refuge
- Culverley Rd/Thornsbeach Rd pedestrian refuge
Bargery Rd/Thomsbeach Rd pedestrian refuge  
Belmont Hill bollards, lining and signing by  
Our Lady of Lourdes School  
Camden Row one way  
Goffers Rd removal of parking bays

Priority Listing 2002/03

5.4 The number of requests for Traffic Management and Pedestrian Facilities to control and facilitate safer and easier movement by traffic, cyclists and pedestrians has continued to increase. All requests are registered and reviewed by Engineers. However, some of the requests are found not to be viable. Most of the measures requested are on the main road network and include measures such as banned turns, road islands, mini roundabouts, one-way working and pedestrian crossing facilities. A priority listing has been devised to ensure that schemes are implemented where there are specific safety concerns or an acute traffic/pedestrian problem and that can be contained within the budget. Where possible, measures off the main road network will be dealt with as part of the area studies programme.

5.5 A list of sites where requests have been received from either residents, Members or via petitions and where a prima facie case for treatment exists has been compiled. The priority list together with the approximate cost of each scheme is shown as Appendix B to this report. The top 15 schemes can be carried out this financial year as they generally fall within the agreed budget. The total estimated funding required to implement all the schemes is £511,400. In order to introduce as many schemes as possible every avenue of potential funding will be explored e.g. Transport Programmes, Capital bids, S106 from new developments, Regeneration and Renewal programmes.

5.6 If finance can be identified from any other source for specific schemes from the priority list, then these will be pursued following consultation with the relevant Ward Members, even if this results in treating schemes lower down the priority ranking than currently being worked on. In this way the benefits of any opportunistic funding will not be lost whilst still ensuring a data based approach is applied to any Council funding available.

5.7 The Department of Transport issued Local Transport Notes 1/95 and 2/95 in April 1995, provided up-to-date guidance on the assessment and design (respectively) of pedestrian crossings. Based on this guidance the criteria for the assessment of pedestrian crossings was agreed by the Executive Committee on 25 July 2001. The assessment is somewhat involved and Members are asked to acknowledge that a wide range of factors are
now taken into consideration in determining whether a pedestrian crossing is provided and can be used to rank the provision of pedestrian crossings in terms of priority.

6. **Financial Implications**

The Traffic Management Schemes revenue budget for 2002/03 is £250,000. The key priority of implementing area traffic calming in the Evelyn area, covered elsewhere on the Agenda, requires spending £200,000 of this budget. £20,000 of this budget will be spent on minor parking schemes such as yellow lines at junctions and footway parking. It is proposed that the balance of £30,000 is set aside to meet the cost of Traffic Management and Pedestrian Facilities set out in Appendix B.

7. **Legal Implications**

The Council has a broad duty to maintain those highways for which it is responsible. The Council can also take pro-active steps in improving highways, by virtue of various powers given to it under the Highways Act 1980. The Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 gives the Council the ability to provide pedestrian crossings, and introduce other measures that complement physical alterations to the roads themselves, such as speed limits or one-way restrictions. Both Acts give the Council implicit powers to incur expenditure to achieving those ends.

8. **Prevention of Crime & Disorder Implications**

There are no implications for the prevention of crime & disorder.

9. **Equalities Implications**

The proposed schemes should reduce hazards for blind and partially sighted people and for people with impaired mobility.

10. **Environmental Implications**

The proposed schemes will reduce hazards and make the road environment more attractive for pedestrians and cyclists.

11. **Conclusion**

The proposed list of minor schemes have been assessed by officers and prioritised in accordance with a scoring system that generally favours the viable and low cost schemes. As a consequence 15 minor schemes are proposed from this years budget.
### BACKGROUND PAPERS

<table>
<thead>
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<th>Date</th>
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<td>Wearside Depot</td>
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<td>Tom Henry</td>
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If there are any queries on this report, please contact Tom Henry, Transport and Engineering, Traffic Design on 020 8314 2562.
**Procedure for Assessment and Priority Rating for Traffic Management and Pedestrian Facilities**

The schemes were prioritised using a weighted assessment criteria. The criteria and weighting is listed in the following:

- Pedestrian Safety - Weighting 30
- Prevention of Rat Running – Weighting 10
- Prevention of Traffic Violations - Weighting 10
- Perceived Accident Risks - Weighting 30
- Scheme Viability – Weighting 20
- Scheme Cost

Schemes were assessed by Engineers to give a weighting value to each criteria listed above. The weighted values were added and divided by the estimated cost to give a total value, thus allowing a priority ranking to be made as in **Appendix B**.
Notes on Appendix B

1. The schemes are prioritised. All schemes and costings are subject to detail design. The costs are only budget estimates to give Members an indication of possible costs and these costs could vary. Following analysis it may not be possible to progress some schemes for engineering, cost or safety reasons.

2. Road Safety Schemes are not included in the above list and will be dealt with under the AIP programme.

3. Traffic Calming Schemes are not included in the above list and will be dealt with under the area based traffic calming programme.

(i) Larger more expensive schemes above £50,000 are not included in the list and where appropriate will be dealt with via the Borough Spending Plan submission.
1. Summary

During 2001 a number of key Transport policies were agreed by the Executive Committee. One of these policies introduced the principle of “Area Based Traffic Calming and Safer Routes to Schools”. For this the Borough was split up into 28 “discrete” traffic areas that were prioritised for investigation and treatment. Where funding has allowed the priority areas have been subjected to a process of local consultation with residents, businesses, schools etc. regarding measures to be taken to civilise the traffic in these mainly residential roads. These measures are designed, where possible, to allow the areas to be designated as 20mph Zones. The agreed policy required that the priority list should be reviewed at least once every two years and preferably annually. This report presents the new area priority list based on the most up to date accident data available. This list, if agreed, will be used to investigate and treat further areas. It should be noted that to date five areas have been treated in full, 3 areas have been partially treated (due to opportunistic funding) and one further area is at an advanced stage in the consultation process.

2. Purpose of the Report

To inform Members of further work carried out on a strategy for future area traffic calming work throughout the Borough and to seek approval of a priority list of areas to be investigated.
3. Policy Context

The Council’s current UDP policies for transport include:

**TRN 20 Improving Road Safety** - The Council will take measures to reduce the number and severity of road accidents in the Borough.

**TRN 21 Traffic Management** - The Council will introduce traffic calming schemes and measures on the road network and in adjoining areas so as to:

- reduce traffic to achieve the role assigned to roads in the hierarchy;
- allocate road space to essential traffic and environmentally friendly modes of transport;
- reflect the requirements of land uses along the road, in terms of access, essential movement and environmental needs;
- in residential areas reduce motorised traffic and improve the environment for residents;
- take account of the needs of public transport operators.

**TRN 22 Home Zones** - The Council supports the principle of Home Zones and 20 MPH zones and will investigate the introduction of experimental introduction of such and similar traffic management schemes such as “home Zones” so that optimum solutions can be found.

4. Recommendations

4.1 To approve the latest prioritised list of areas to be treated as laid out in Appendix A.

4.2 To approve the continuing use of the underlying methodology of area studies including its use to co-ordinate the street scene within residential areas, and bring about environmental and road safety improvements.

5. Background

5.1 A report was presented to the Executive Committee on 24 January 2001 that explained the proposed approach to deal with requests for action associated with traffic management, traffic calming and accidents. Principally this set up the Area Traffic Calming and Safer
Routes to Schools Programme (Area Studies), the Accident Investigation and Prevention Programme (AIP) and a priority list for Traffic Management and Pedestrian Facilities. A further report to the Executive Committee on 21 March 2001 discussed the Area Studies programme in more detail and sought to explain the proposed prioritised data led approach to address traffic problems in residential areas by traffic calming measures.

5.2 Requests for traffic calming and Safer Routes to Schools continue to increase placing greater pressure on the limited staff and financial resources. The requests are generally for measures to be introduced in residential areas or close to schools or other community facilities. There is a need to continue to prioritise this area of work due to the existing high demand for measures and the limited staff and financial resources available to match the demand. To operate efficiently and effectively, it is vital that priorities are determined in order to ensure that the Council’s resources are used to best effect at all times.

5.3 On 21 March 2001, the Executive Committee agreed that:-

(a) officers should formulate an interdisciplinary team in order to divide the borough into areas for traffic calming and to prioritise these against the criteria approved by Committee;

(b) the proposed areas and their rankings should be presented to Members for approval; and

(c) £200,000 of the Traffic Management budget be allocated for Traffic Calming.

Identification of areas and priority ranking criteria

5.4 In order to formulate the Priority List, an initial meeting was held with a multi-disciplinary team for the first time on 25 April 2001. Representatives from Planning, London Buses, TfL Bus Priority Unit, Metropolitan Police, Pedestrian Association and various sections of the Regeneration Directorate attended the meeting. This approach was the same as that proposed in the report to the Executive Committee on 21 March 2001. At the initial meeting it was felt that an ‘area’ based approach for the design and implementation of traffic calming in residential areas would be the most appropriate. It was agreed that the areas should consist of discrete areas bounded by either 'principal' roads which are considered acceptable for carrying through traffic, or other features such as railways and rivers which would not easily allow traffic to transfer into an adjoining area once treatment of a particular...
area began. It was felt that such an approach would ease local pressure from individual roads, make it easier to deal with such requests, and less likely to result in merely transferring a problem from one road to another as measures were implemented. In total 28 different areas were identified.

5.5 Using the team’s experience and local knowledge combined with existing data, the effects of traffic and environmental impact on each of the areas were assessed with respect to:

(a) Accidents; total number and broken down by type;
(b) ‘Rat-running’ - volume and speed;
(c) Parking problems, e.g. insufficient kerbside space for residents due to nature of road or external intrusion such as commuter parking around a railway station;
(d) General impact of traffic-intrusion, vibration, above average HGV numbers particularly with respect to the nature of the road e.g. narrow roads with properties close to the carriageway;
(e) Number and location of community attractions - e.g. schools, shopping parades, elderly peoples centres, sports and social clubs; and

5.6 As proposed in the Executive Committee report on 21 March 2001 the above items, (b) to (e), were assessed by each individual member of the team for each area and points awarded according to the level of severity of the problem. The items (b) to (e) were marked between 0 (no problem) and 5 (severe problem). At the meeting it was agreed that accidents were the single most important traffic related problem and that they should be given a heavier weighting (0 to 10). It was also felt that Child Pedestrian accidents and accidents involving vulnerable road users (pedestrians and cyclists) should be given a higher weighting than other accidents. These accidents were given a double weighting. It was considered that the accident data would provide the most objective of all the assessments and that accidents are often symptomatic of other problems. A particularly high accident level in an area would also allow the possibility of a successful bid within the Interim Local Implementation Plan / Borough Spending Plan thus providing additional finance for the project.

5.7 The points awarded by each member of the team for each area were then averaged and then totalled to place the areas in priority order according to the overall rating of each area.
5.8 After this, accident data was obtained for each of the 28 identified areas. The length of roads in each area was also taken into account when assessing the accident problems, as areas with greater road lengths were likely to have more accidents than areas with less length of roads. This then produced a Priority List for area investigation and treatment that was agreed by the Executive Committee on 25 July 2001.

5.9 It was agreed that the priority list would be reviewed and reported to the Mayor at least once every two years and if possible annually. A review has recently been carried out and the new priority list is shown on Appendix A.

5.10 From Appendix A it can be seen that the top five areas, in order of priority, are as follows:

(a) New Cross West (formerly “Marlowe”)
(b) Telegraph Hill (formerly “Pepys”)
(c) Brockley & Ladywell (formerly “Drake & Ladywell”)
(d) Blackheath North (formerly “Blackheath”)
(e) Sydenham East

5.11 When the prioritised list for Area Traffic Calming has been approved, the rate of investigation and implementation of the zones depends on political will, money and the staff resources available. Within reason the ‘cloth can be cut to fit’ e.g. one area treated a year or several according to the resources available.

5.12 The area studies programme will incorporate recommendations of the Lewisham Culture and Urban Development Commission Report. It is also hoped to incorporate the Home Zones and Safer Routes to Schools initiatives to encourage environmentally friendly modes of transport by making walking and cycling safer and more attractive. By encouraging more walking and cycling, greater health benefits should also be obtained. It is also hoped, in consultation with other departments, to co-ordinate the street scene as part of this programme of work thereby enhancing the environment. The process of area based traffic calming could then act as a vehicle for change within discrete residential areas by addressing a number of issues such as general maintenance (highway, footway, street lighting and signs), environmental maintenance (grass, cleansing and planted areas), urban design, accessibility to public transport and housing issues, as well as actual and perceived safety problems. This would show the Council in a good light by co-ordinating services in an area in consultation with
local residents, to deliver a safer and more pleasant environment in which to live. Such an area based approach may also offer maximum opportunities for levering in external funding e.g. SRB, NDC, Section 106 etc.

5.13 The listing of areas for study in priority order is not completely inflexible and where circumstances arise (e.g. opportunistic funding from say S106, SRB, NDC etc.) areas further down the list have and will be treated in advance. Examples where this has occurred include “Rushey Green East” (Funded by Rushey Green Renewal Area Programme) and “Honor Oak Estate” (Funded through 15% receipts monies as part of overall Estate improvements)

Implementation of Schemes

Initial consultation

5.14 The methods used are designed to make the project as interactive with the local community as possible, such that the needs and desires of the local community can be designed into the scheme wherever possible. Road Safety officers involve the local school children in the process and at the same time use the project as a means to draw attention to road safety issues. This is particularly important as the child pedestrian and cyclist groups are two of the areas where a much better accident reduction is required.

5.15 A staffed public exhibition is held in the area to be treated, advertised by posters and a leaflet drop to all houses. The leaflet outlines the process that is being adopted, explains traffic calming and Safer Routes to Schools and includes a pre-paid questionnaire where residents can identify particular problems. The exhibition is advertised as ‘Preliminary Consultations’ and no proposals are initially put forward. The exhibition includes accident plots and survey data collected to identify possible problems in the area. A stand also shows different types of traffic calming and Safer Routes to Schools measures that could be used and highlights their advantages and disadvantages. Visitors speak to staff and identify problems that they know about in their roads and area and are encouraged to suggest possible solutions to these problems. The exhibition also provides a focus for the public to raise other types of problems in the area as discussed previously e.g. maintenance etc. that can then be addressed via other sections/departments during the process.

5.16 Throughout this early process local Ward Members are kept informed of what is going on so that if local people approach them they can
explain the process and present situation. Ward Members are also invited to the exhibition to allow information to be disseminated and to gain Members views. During this time consultation takes place with other Council Departments to try and ensure the co-ordination of the street scene and environment as part of this programme of work.

**Design process**

5.17 The design process then commences using the results of the first round of consultations plus feedback received from our Road Safety Officers, correspondence received from the area over the previous three or four years, internal surveys and investigations, and the designs and ideas put forward by the school children, teachers and governors.

5.18 The basic concept of the design is not only to improve the environment by the removal or ‘civilising’ of traffic but also to ensure that the design of the individual elements of the overall scheme are of a high quality and generally improve the environment in themselves. To this end the design team where possible comprises people from different disciplines.

5.19 The results of the initial consultation are reported to the relevant Planning Committee along with the proposed measures that will form the basis of the second consultation.

**Second consultation**

5.20 The second consultation consists of a leaflet with questionnaire, together with a staffed exhibition showing the design proposals. Posters advertising the exhibition and consultation as “Consultation on Proposals” are displayed and leaflets distributed to every household, school, business etc. Draft design proposals are shown in this second consultation leaflet. Local Ward Members are also supplied with copies of the leaflets to keep them informed of progress.

5.21 The above process has now been successfully used in seven areas (Rushey Green west, North Downham, Glenbow Road, Manor Lee, Rushey Green east, St. John’s and Honor Oak Estate). This interactive approach is receiving positive comments from the community, staff and Members.

**Detailed design and implementation**

5.22 The results of the second consultation are stated in a report. The action taken after this depends on the results of the consultation namely:
(a) If the results of the consultation show a “clear cut” result the decision whether or not to proceed will be taken by the Head of Transport and Engineering.

(b) If the results of the consultation do not show a “clear cut” result the matter will be referred to the relevant Planning Committee for a decision.

**Funding**

5.23 From experience it has been found that the minimum required for even the most basic scheme in any “area” is £200K. It is acknowledged that there is only ever likely to be a limited amount of funding for such work and therefore every potential avenue for funding is explored e.g. Section 106 monies, Single Regeneration Bids, Capital Challenge, combining with planned maintenance works etc. By the areas being ranked with a weighting towards the level of accidents within the areas it means that the first areas to be treated are also likely to be eligible for SCA as accident reduction schemes.

**Work Programme for 2002/2003**

5.24 The top area that the Mayor is asked to approve is the Evelyn area. As agreed the initial consultation for this area was carried out during the year 2001/02 and a preliminary design will shortly be presented to the Planning Committee (Deptford). It is therefore proposed that the second stage consultation and implementation be carried out during the current financial year. This area is very large and the finance available will limit the amount of work that can be carried out in the area and “the cloth will have to be cut to fit”. A lack of funding may also result in a staged implementation programme. As with other programmes increased funding would allow further areas to be treated. Every opportunity will be taken to work in partnership with others to either secure additional funding or work jointly to maximise the effect of the limited budget.

5.25 In order to assist in the 2003/04 programme it is proposed that the initial consultation for “New Cross West” area is carried out during 2002/03. This way if further monies become available it will help to ensure full implementation and spend on the schemes.

**6. Financial Implications**

The sum of £200,000 has been assigned from the traffic management revenue budget for this work. The data led area approach is cost...
effective as it means that whole areas are considered and a complete set of measures applied at one time rather than over a number of studies of individual roads.

7. Legal Implications

The Council has a legal duty under S39 of the Road Traffic Act 1988 to prepare and carry out a programme of measures designed to promote road safety; it must carry out studies into accidents arising out of the use of vehicles on its roads; and in the light of such studies it must take such measures as appear to it appropriate to prevent such accidents. The Council, as well as having a duty to undertake safety improvements to highways in locations where it is aware there is danger, also has various powers under the Highways Act 1980 to take pro-active steps in improving highway safety. The Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 gives the Council other powers that complement physical alterations to the roads themselves, such as speed limits or one-way restrictions.

8. Crime and Disorder Implications

There are no implications for the prevention of crime & disorder

9. Implications for Cyclists and Pedestrians

Any measures introduced within this programme will generally result in a reduction in traffic speeds and make the road environment more attractive for pedestrians and cyclists. Specific measures at known high accident locations should further reduce dangers to pedestrians and cyclists.

10. Implications for People with Disabilities

An overall reduction in traffic speeds in the area concerned should make crossing the road less hazardous for blind and partially sighted people and for people with impaired mobility. The use of raised junctions and similar measures for traffic calming also result in providing a near level crossing point, which should help people with impaired mobility.

11. Equalities Implications

The data led approach will ensure that the highest priority areas will be treated first.
12. Environmental Implications

As previously stated it is also hoped to incorporate the Home Zones and Safe Routes to Schools initiatives to encourage environmentally friendly modes of transport by making walking and cycling safer and more attractive. It is also hoped to co-ordinate the street scene as part of this programme of work thereby further enhancing the environment.

13. Conclusion

13.1 The priority list shown in Appendix A has been revised to reflect the latest available accident figures and has been produced in accordance with the agreed policy.

13.1 Much positive feedback has been received regarding the methodology used to investigate and treat the areas (including the two stage public consultation process). This feedback comes from both the participating public and the Council engineers involved. It is therefore proposed that the existing methodology should continue to be used.
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1. **Summary**

1.1 The production of the Streetscape Guide marks an important step in our continuing programme for improving Lewisham’s streetscene, whose quality and condition affect us all.

1.2 We aim to help make Lewisham the best place to live, work and learn, by using a more holistic approach to future streetscape improvements. This will involve identifying principles of good design; examples of good and bad practice and a preferred range of street furniture, all of which will make a major contribution to the vision of Lewisham as an exciting, attractive, safe and accessible place to be.

2. **Purpose**

To outline the history of the guide, describe its aims and content and how it might be used, with a view to it being approved by the Mayor.

3. **Recommendations**

The Mayor is asked to approve the Streetscene Guide as a reference manual for future highway schemes, traffic schemes, private development and maintenance works.

4. **Narrative**

4.1 As a Highway Authority, the Council is responsible for 405km of roads, their associated footways, lighting, drainage, bridges (selected), trees and other highway structures. In the past, highways’ design and maintenance works and traffic schemes have been carried out using a variety of street
furniture and paving materials. It is not uncommon to see an assortment of different bollards, guard railing and other street furniture in the same street. This, combined with a lack of adequate care and co-ordination in the siting of such furniture, has resulted in an often chaotic and depressing streetscene.

4.2 Lewisham has grasped the nettle and recognised that there is a need for a co-ordinated approach to maintaining and enhancing Lewisham’s streets. It developed and presented a draft “Streetscape Guide” to the Environmental Sustainability Sub-Committee, which was approved in November 2001. The catalyst for the creation of the guide was the creation of the new Transport and Engineering Division and the identified need to have a much firmer policy led approach to the service which included the development of a complete set of new policy documents to drive forward and set the scene for the Division’s approach to transport, maintenance and the way the highway is managed. The creation of the guide was given added impetus by the publication of the English Heritage ‘Streets for All’ guide. The purpose of the guide was to make the streets of London attractive, safe and enjoyable spaces for people and in particular to protect the character and appearance of conservation areas.

4.3 The Engineering and Transport division has worked with colleagues in the Planning Service, Environment and other Directorates to produce the guide. Further consultation has taken place over the past year with the Culture Commission, Transport for London, other London Boroughs, conservation societies, residents, the Conservation Advisory Panel and Town Centre Managers. The consultation process has involved meetings to engage groups in discussion, exploring the options available and seeking feedback on proposals.

In the guide Lewisham demonstrates that it intends to adopt an enlightened approach to environmental design and maintenance through:-

- The reduction of street clutter.
- The co-ordination of street furniture and paving.
- The co-ordination of works, activities and programmes.
- The promotion of quality, accessibility and sustainability.
- The reinforcement of local character.
- The identification of good and bad practice.
- The involvement of the local community.

4.4.1 When approval has been obtained for the guide and prior to any highway work taking place, consultation will be carried out, so that
local knowledge, views and aspirations can be obtained. An audit of street furniture will take place, to identify any problems, maintenance issues and to remove any unnecessary furniture, signing and clutter. Even where urgent maintenance is required or programmed for an area, this preparatory work can provide a great deal of added value. Although there are insufficient funds available to change everything immediately, the process will be based on long term goals and will gradually implement the changes, so that the pieces of the jig-saw fit together.

4.4.2 The guide is not just about providing a specified item or material. Such an approach would quickly result in the document and the outcome being out of date. The guide builds strongly on the process of scheme development to ensure that the views of local people and specialists are included within the development of any proposals. In so doing the Guide remains a living document with far greater chance of achieving the results required over a sustained period.

4.6 A copy of the Streetscene Guide, which has been widely distributed both within and outside of the Council, will be available for viewing at the meeting. It is hoped that both Council and developers will adopt it as ‘best practice’.

5. Financial Implications

Although there are no specific financial implications arising from this report it is possible that some schemes will cost more in the short term but this will be offset by reduced maintenance costs. Any additional costs will be met from within existing budget provisions.

6. Legal Implications

There are no specific legal implications arising from this report

7. Crime and Disorder Implications

The new streetscene, with improved lighting and absence of clutter will help to reduce the opportunity for street crime and disorder. Well-designed and co-ordinated schemes, which are well managed and maintained, can enhance personal security and well-being, creating streets to enjoy by night and day.
8. **Equalities Implications**

The guide sets out a way to make Lewisham’s streets more accessible, safe and attractive for everyone- Streets For All.

9. **Environmental Implications**

This holistic approach to design and maintenance will bring benefits for the environment, by promoting and enhancing alternative methods of travel; encouraging the use of durable, recyclable, quality materials and design; and integrating its townscape management.

10. **Conclusion**

Streets are seen by many people as dreary and chaotic places, as simply routes to destinations, dominated by traffic and its infrastructure. This view needs to be challenged and changed and streets seen as destinations in their own right, attractive and vibrant and valuable. The Streetscape Guide has been created to bring coherence, creativity and quality to Lewisham for those who live, work and learn therein.

11. **Reason for Urgency**

This matter has not been included in the Council’s Forward Plan. However, the decision must be taken by 17 July as the document is needed in support of the Borough Spending Plan to Transport for London as a bid for funding. It is therefore impracticable to defer it until after it has been included in the next Forward Plan and until the start of the period to which the next Forward Plan relates. In accordance with the provisions of Regulation 15 Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Access to Information) Regulations 2000, written notice has been given to the Chair of the Business Panel and made publicly available by posting at the Town Hall for 3 clear days.

**BACKGROUND PAPERS**

Environmental Sustainability Committee Report –

If there are any queries on this report, please contact Bob Quatresols, Transport & Engineering, tel 020 8314 2036 or Shirley Broughton, tel. 8314 2592.
1. **Summary**

1.1 This report gives details on the Accident Investigation and Prevention (AIP) Programme. It presents a list of AIP schemes carried out in the last 5 years and the priority list of sites to be investigated for accident schemes in the current financial year.

1.2 The list of accident sites to be investigated are at locations with the highest number of recorded accidents and in accordance with the policy agreed by the Executive Committee in April 2001.

2. **Purpose of the Report**

2.1 To confirm that the Council employs a data-led, prioritised approach to achieving a reduction in the numbers of personal injury accidents occurring in the borough as agreed by Executive Committee on 4 April 2001.

2.2 To present a list of Accident Investigation and Prevention schemes to be investigated for potential implementation during 2002/03 and to inform Members of recently introduced schemes.

3 **Policy Context**

3.1 The Council’s current draft UDP policies for Sustainable Transport and Parking include an undertaking in TRN 20 where “The Council will take measures to reduce the number and severity of road accidents in the Borough.”
3.2 National targets have been set by the Government to reduce road casualties. These targets are to be achieved by 2010 compared with the average for 1994 to 1998. The interpretations of these targets and the reported casualties for 2001 for Lewisham’s **borough** roads are included in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Casualty Category</th>
<th>Reduction (% on Base)</th>
<th>Base (Average 1994/98)</th>
<th>Target (by 2010)</th>
<th>2001 Reported Casualties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Numbers of people killed or seriously injured</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbers of children killed or seriously injured</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbers of people slightly injured (*per 100 million vehicle kilometres)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>648</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* there is no government guidance on how to measure the numbers per 100 million vehicle kilometres. Therefore the total number of people slightly injured is reported.

3.3 Specific London-wide targets have been set by Transport for London (TfL). The interpretations of these targets and the reported casualties for 2001 for Lewisham’s **borough** roads are included in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Casualty Category</th>
<th>Reduction (% on Base)</th>
<th>Base (Average 1994/98)</th>
<th>Target (by 2010)</th>
<th>2001 Reported Casualties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrians killed or seriously injured</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclists killed or seriously injured</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcyclists killed or seriously injured</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4 The above targets have been adopted by Lewisham and are incorporated into the Road Safety Plan.

4. Recommendation

4.1 That the Mayor agrees:

(i) that the Borough Spending Plan capital allocation for 2002/3 of £531,000 be allocated to the implementation of accident remedial schemes as listed in the priority lists in Appendices C and D;

(ii) that officers report back next year on the action taken in respect of this year’s priority list; and

(iii) to note the schemes carried out in 2001/02

5. Narrative

5.1 The Executive Committee considered a report on 4 April 2001 that:

(i) agreed a data-led, prioritised approach to achieving a reduction in the numbers of personal injury accidents in the borough;

(ii) approved the implementation of the accident remedial programme for 2001/2;

(iii) agreed to adopt the Government’s and Transport for London’s road safety programme;

(iv) agreed the proposed implementation and consultation procedure for AIP schemes.

5.2 This report deals with the AIP programme and seeks to explain the proposed prioritised data-led approach to reduce road accidents in the borough. It is intended that the proposed prioritised list is reviewed and reported to Committee annually.

5.3 Lewisham’s AIP programme is aimed at obtaining the greatest accident reduction for the money available. The proposed accident priority listing is based on the reported personal injury records for the preceding three years and deals with the identification, design and implementation of accident remedial schemes. This structured approach for accident investigation
ensures that the Council adopts the most positive way to achieving the Government's target for the reduction of accidents. The approach also ensures that the Council achieves the best rate of return on the money invested in each new scheme by treating the worst sites first.

5.4 Most traffic uses the main road network, with the majority of accidents tending to be restricted to this network of roads and junctions. A priority list showing the numbers of accidents occurring at junctions (nodes) and on lengths of road (links) on the main road network is produced each month by the London Accident Analysis Unit (LAAU), with a time lag of 2 to 6 months from the date of the accident to the report. Roads not on the main road network will be treated under the area traffic calming programme, or after a substantial number of sites from this priority list have been treated with accident remedial measures.

5.5 The worst accident sites will be investigated each year with a view to designing remedial schemes as appropriate. It is important that resources for engineering measures are directed to locations where a higher than average incidence of accidents is evident. From London Research Centre data, typical accident rates per year for Inner London are; 3.43 for a signal junction, 1.63 for a pelican crossing, 1.09 for a zebra crossing and 0.73 for a mini roundabout.

5.6 In some cases it will be found that there are no common accident problems which can be 'engineered out'. Others may have commonly occurring accident factors, which can be addressed by the use of tried and tested engineering measures. Of these sites, where remedial measures can be designed, some will be 'low' cost schemes of up to about £10,000, whilst others are likely to require extensive works e.g. junction re-design, costing in excess of £50,000. The intention is to maximise the reduction in accidents from the money available by designing, where possible, low cost schemes. Members need to be aware that this task is becoming increasingly more difficult. Engineering methods have already been carried out at many of the most hazardous locations in the borough. Our intention is to investigate 10 accident sites on borough roads per year and thereby identify and compile a priority list of sites. Where the investigation indicates that a substantial scheme is required, it is probable that the implementation will be delayed until sufficient funding is available. Due to their nature, large schemes would normally require a year or more to prepare and every opportunity will be taken to seek funding from other sources.
5.7 Members should be aware that the above process becomes increasingly more difficult for each site, the further down the list we go and this will have a significant drain on resources both in terms of staff time and scheme cost. The proposed structured approach has been praised by the Department for Transport (DfT) and suggested as a model for good practice. As a result the borough’s grant for accident remedial schemes has increased from £250,000 in 2001/2 to £531,000 this financial year.

5.8 From the latest LAAU top 20 ranked accidents in Lewisham, for the 36 months prior to December 2001, it is evident that a majority of high accident sites occur on Greater London Authority (GLA) roads. TfL are the highway authority for these roads and therefore will carry out any accident reduction schemes.

5.9 This report seeks to inform Members of schemes that have been recently implemented and to provide Members with an initial list of sites, on borough roads, for investigation this year.

**Implemented schemes and monitoring of schemes**

5.10 In the five years to December 2001 the Council carried out 18 accident remedial schemes. A list of these schemes is shown in Appendix A. All accident remedial schemes are closely monitored to assess their effects. Only schemes for which full three-year ‘after’ data is available can be properly assessed. There are 9 schemes for which full, three year ‘after’ data is currently available. When compared with the three year, ‘before’ period it can be seen that accidents have been reduced at those sites from 105 to 53 (61% saving). Using a DETR economic assessment model, this gives estimated savings of £2,343,038 to the community.

**Borough-wide accident trends**

5.11 It can be seen from the tables in items 3.2 and 3.3 that casualty reductions were achieved in 2001 when compared against the base figures. Only motor-cyclist casualties have increased but this must be viewed against the national increasing trend.

5.12 It is clear that longer-term additional resources and effort will be required if the borough is to achieve the accident reduction targets set by the Government in their road safety strategy document, ‘Tomorrow’s Roads – Safer for Everyone’ March 2000. The latest Government targets are to achieve reductions compared with the average for 1994-98. The targets
are set out in item 3.2. of this report and will require extensive road safety improvements to be made, together with greater enforcement and education.

5.12 A list of recently completed AIP schemes, funded from the capital works, local safety schemes budget is included in Appendix B

List of likely sites for future accident investigation

5.13 An initial list of nodes and links on borough roads, with the highest rank from LAAU statistics, is included in Appendix C. Nodes are ranked in order of the number of accidents at each site and links by accident rates per kilometre. Investigation and detailed design will be undertaken on some of these sites to produce schemes to be carried out in the next financial year. The incidence of accidents, occurring off the main road network (cell accidents), will also be investigated. Any clusters or high concentrations of accidents found off the main network, will be the subject of detailed analysis and, wherever possible, accident remedial treatment.

5.14 Appendix D lists the sites currently being investigated for AIP schemes from this year’s programme. These sites were identified from last year’s priority list and are at locations with the highest number of accidents where viable engineering solutions are likely to be found.

5.15 If, during the course of the accident investigation process, it becomes apparent that accident reductions can be achieved within the area studies programme (subject of another report on this agenda), then there will be scope for diverting funding from the AIP budget to those projects.

5.16 Where alterations to the road layout are made, resulting in changes to local traffic patterns, engineers will closely monitor the effects of those changes on the numbers of road accidents, thus enabling appropriate, responsive, remedial action to be taken quickly.

5.17 Safety Audits will be carried out on all accident reduction schemes and monitoring will be continued to ensure that these physical measures have been effective in reducing the accident numbers.

Public Consultation
5.18 It is proposed that schemes will be implemented in line with the procedure as agreed at the Executive Committee in April 2001 and detailed below:

i. Details of each scheme will be sent to the Deputy Mayor and relevant Ward Councillors.

ii. Residents/frontagers to the highway will be consulted by letter, with an attached plan, where they are physically affected by proposals such as traffic islands, pedestrian guard railing etc. The consultation letter will explain that the proposed measures are aimed at reducing accidents and will give residents time to object, should they have good reason. Where proposals consist only of lining schemes, high skid resistant surfacing or the like and have little effects on residential amenity, residents will be informed of the situation beforehand with an apology for any temporary disruption.

iii. If any objections or comments are received with regard to the proposal, which cannot be readily resolved by Officers in consultation with the Chair and Ward Councillors, if appropriate, the details will be reported to the Planning Committee for further guidance. The final decision will be taken by the Head of Engineering and Transport using delegated powers.

iv. If no comments are received the scheme will proceed to implementation.

6. **Financial Implications**

6.1 Any works expenditure will have to be contained within the budgets set for the purpose.

6.2 The Capital budget as detailed in the Borough Spending Plan for 2002/03 is £531,000 for Local Safety Schemes (which is an increase from £250,000 in 2001/2).

6.3 Where possible, every opportunity will be taken to fund schemes from other sources such as; S106's from nearby developments, leverage from other authorities and regeneration bids.

7. **Legal Implications**

The Council has a legal duty under S39 of the Road Traffic Act 1988 to prepare and carry out a programme of measures designed to promote road safety; it must carry out studies into accidents arising out of the use of vehicles on its roads; and in the light of such studies it must take such measures as appear to it appropriate to prevent such accidents. The Highways Act 1980
imposes a broad duty on the Council to maintain those highways for which it is responsible, which includes taking steps to remove dangers of which it becomes aware. The Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 gives the Council other powers that complement physical alterations to the roads themselves, such as speed limits or one-way restrictions.

8. Prevention of Crime & Disorder Implications

There are no implications for the prevention of crime & disorder.

9. Equalities Implications

A reduction in hazards resulting from accident remedial schemes will help people with impaired mobility. The use of tactile paving and dropped kerbs will help people with impaired vision.

10. Environmental Implications

10.1 The proposed schemes will reduce hazards and where possible make the road environment more attractive for pedestrians and cyclists.

10.2 Each scheme in the programme will result in different measures aimed at reducing accidents. The type of schemes chosen for implementation will include measures to meet the London targets for the reduction in pedestrian and cycling casualties.

11. Conclusion

11.1 In accordance with agreed policy at the Executive Committee in April 2001, AIP work will be carried out at sites with the highest number of recorded accidents as prioritised in Appendix C. Sites that are currently being investigated are listed in Appendix D.

11.2 Recently treated accident sites are listed in Appendices A and B.

11.3 The capital budget for the AIP programme in 2002/03 is £531,000.
If there are any queries on this report or you require further information, please contact Tom Henry, Traffic Design, Wearside Service Centre, Telephone 020 8314 2562
Personal Injury Accident (PIA) sites treated between 1997 and 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>No of PIAs (Pre-scheme)</th>
<th>No of PIAs (Post-scheme)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baring Road</td>
<td>Pedestrian Refuge</td>
<td>April 1997</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camplin St</td>
<td>Traffic calming</td>
<td>April 1997</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanford St</td>
<td>Link improvements</td>
<td>November 1997</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northover</td>
<td>Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td>March 1998</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honor Oak Park/ Standon Pk</td>
<td>Red Light cameras</td>
<td>March 1998</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolstone Rd/ Cranstone Rd</td>
<td>Speed Table</td>
<td>March 1998</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baring Rd/Downham Way</td>
<td>Signal Improvements</td>
<td>April 1998</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malpas Rd/ Florence Rd</td>
<td>Traffic Calming scheme</td>
<td>June 1998</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torridon Rd/ Hither Green Lane</td>
<td>Signals</td>
<td>September 1998</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hither Green Lane</td>
<td>Traffic calming</td>
<td>May 1999</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliot Hill</td>
<td>Traffic Management</td>
<td>February 2000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avignon Rd</td>
<td>Traffic calming and junction improvements</td>
<td>June 2000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordmill Rd</td>
<td>Traffic calming</td>
<td>March 2000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookhowse Rd</td>
<td>Traffic calving</td>
<td>December 2000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shroffold Rd/ Moorside Rd</td>
<td>Speed Table</td>
<td>July 2000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn Street Pelican</td>
<td>Crossing near Magnolia House</td>
<td>July 2001</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Downham Estate</td>
<td>Area traffic calming and “Safe Routes to Schools” initiatives</td>
<td>December 2001</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenbow Road Are</td>
<td>Area traffic calming and “Safe Routes to Schools” initiatives</td>
<td>December 2001</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: accident comparisons given in the table above are based upon data recorded by the Metropolitan Police during a 36 months pre and post-scheme study period
## Personal Injury Accident Schemes in 2001/2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Budget Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Downham Estate</td>
<td>Area traffic calming and “Safe Routes to Schools” initiatives</td>
<td>£142,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenbow Road area</td>
<td>Area traffic calming and “Safe Routes to Schools” initiatives</td>
<td>£91,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn Street</td>
<td>Pelican crossing near Magnolia House</td>
<td>£42,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravensbourne Park/Manwood Road</td>
<td>Traffic calming</td>
<td>£29,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drakefell Road</td>
<td>Traffic calming and resurfacing</td>
<td>£40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackheath Village</td>
<td>Pelican crossing improvements/entry treatment</td>
<td>£127,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Crossings</td>
<td>Improvements including tactiles, lighting and anti-skid surfacing</td>
<td>£44,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>£515,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## LINKS Accident remedial investigation sites (links on Borough roads)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>No of PIAs</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Deptford High Street / Evelyn Street / Creek Road</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Toucan crossing installed March 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Verdant Lane / Whitefoot Lane</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Stondon Park / Honor Oak Park</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Red light cameras installed March 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Southend Lane / Bell Green</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Brockley Road / Adelaide Avenue</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Baring Road / Chinbrook Road</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Evelyn Street / Grinstead Road</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Hump-backed bridge over former canal obscures drivers' visibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Lewisham High Street / Lewis Grove</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Town centre improvements completed December 1995. Will be investigated under another programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Brockley Cross</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Minor pedestrian works in 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Westwood Hill / Crystal Palace Park Road</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Local safety scheme April 1994. Traffic scheme undertaken by LB Bromley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Southend Lane/Elfrida Crescent</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Downham Way / Northover</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Local safety scheme May 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Sydenham Road / Stanton Way</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Anti-skid surfacing June 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Southend Lane/Stanton Way</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Westwood Hill/Kirkdale</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Bell Green / Perry Rise</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Baring Road/Downham Way</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Alterations to signals in 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Evelyn Street/Bestwood Street</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Prince Charles Road/Montpelier Row</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Accident remedial investigation sites (junctions on borough roads)

Note: Junctions are ranked in the above table by numbers of PIAs occurring during the 36 months period to the end of December 2001 (Source: London Accident Analysis Unit)
## APPENDIX C
(Links)

**LINKS Accident remedial investigation sites (links on Borough roads)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>PIAs</th>
<th>PIAs per kilometre</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Evelyn Street (between Grinstead Road and Bestwood Street)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lewisham High Street (between Lewis Grove and Molesworth)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Town centre improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sydenham Road. (between Newlands Park and Kent House)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Local safety scheme Nov 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Brockley Rise and Stondon Park</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Evelyn Street (between Grove Street and Deptford High Street)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Brockley Road (between Mamock Road and Adelaide Road)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Local safety scheme May 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lewisham Road (between Morden Hill and Lewisham High Street)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Evelyn Street (between Grove Street and Grinstead Road)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Blackheath Village</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Southend Lane (between Stanton Way and Effraida Crescent)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Sydenham Road (between Kirkdale and Newlands Park)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ladywell Road (between Lewisham High Street and)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Lewisham High Street (between Lewis Grove and Lee Bridge)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Town centre improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Burnt Ash Hill/Burnt Ash Road (between Fitham Road and St)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Kirkdale (between Dartmouth Road and Westwood Hill)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Local safety scheme Feb 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Chinbrook Road</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Stondon Park – Brockley Road (between Honor Oak Park and)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Local safety scheme October 1996. Anti-skid surfacing Mar 01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Perry Hill – Catford Hill</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Brockley Road (between Wickham Road and Brockley Cross)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Royal Parade/Tranquil Vale</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*Note: Links are ranked in the above table by the rate of PIAs per kilometre occurring during the 36 months period to the end of December 2001 (Source: London Accident Analysis Unit)*
## Sites Currently being investigated for AIP Schemes 2002/3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Nos. of Personal Injury Accidents in the last 3 years</th>
<th>Estimated cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn Street</td>
<td>Safety improvements along the length of the link</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>£50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junction of Evelyn Street and Oxestalls Road</td>
<td>Introduction of traffic signals and removal of pelican crossing</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>£100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junction of Evelyn Street/Deptford High Street and Creek Road</td>
<td>Introduction of traffic signals and removal of 2 pelican crossings</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>£100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junction of Honor Oak Park/Stondon Park</td>
<td>Signals modifications</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>£30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brockley Road</td>
<td>Pedestrian improvements around Crofton Park station</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>£50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackheath Village</td>
<td>Improvements to crossing facilities. Completion of 2001/2 scheme</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>£30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn St/Abinger Grove</td>
<td>Mini-roundabout</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>£40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northover/Dowham Way</td>
<td>Mini-roundabout</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>£30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry Vale/Mayow Road</td>
<td>Mini roundabout</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>£30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development of future schemes</td>
<td>£71,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2003 local safety schemes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>£531,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **Summary**

This report sets out the council’s capital strategy for managing the council’s assets together with the associated Asset Management Plan (AMP) for managing the council’s property portfolio.

2. **Purpose of this Report**

The purpose of this report is for the Mayor to:

2.1 agree the content of both the Capital Strategy and Asset Management Plan (AMP) for approval by the Council (attached as Appendices) prior to their submission to GOL and OPDM by 31 July 2002 in accordance with Guidance on submissions for the Single Capital Pot issued by the ODPM

2.2 note the property mission statement, goals and objectives, the strategic action plan and the use of ODPM and local performance indicators

3. **Policy Context**

3.1 The 1998 White paper “Modern Local Government – In touch with the People” promised a new cross-service allocation for the bulk of central government capital support to local authorities – a single capital pot.

3.2 The Single Capital Pot (SCP) is to enable Government to see a clear and transparent process which rewards strategic planning and good
performance and strikes a balance between local decision making and the need to meet national priorities.

3.3 The objectives of the SCP are the delivery of improved outcomes and better services through:-

- Better planning, by giving greater predictability in funding levels and allowing greater flexibility
- More autonomy and accountability and greater responsibility for local authorities in making their spending decisions
- Better corporate and strategic working and more effective tackling of cross cutting issues
- Better use and management of assets

3.4 The government now requires all councils to prepare capital strategies and Asset Management Plans that determine the process and procedures for managing all the council’s assets and for making resource allocation decisions.

3.5 For the first year of the SCP the amount distributed represented just under half of the total that could potentially have been directed through the pot. The Government will use the performance assessment framework outlined in the White paper (December 2001 Strong Local Leadership – Quality Public Services) to identify those local authorities that have demonstrated their capacity to deliver on national priorities. For these authorities the proportion of capital provided through the pot (and thus not ringfenced) will be substantially increased. This will apply to those councils assessed as high performing or striving under the performance assessment framework, though it will be subject to the judgement of the sponsoring government department as to whether the broader assessment is reflected in performance in the relevant service area.

3.6 The government allocated 5% in 2002/03 (based on 2001 Capital Strategy and AMP submissions) and this will rise to 20% in future years of capital resources based on its assessment of the quality of individual authorities’ Capital Strategies, Asset Management Plans and performance in service delivery. The council received approximately £800k for 2002/03 as the discretionary element of its capital allocations (both Housing and Other Services). The remaining 95% was allocated on a “needs” basis. A good Capital Strategy earned a lump sum reward of £50,000 as did a good AMP. A rating of satisfactory received a reward of £25,000 for each.
3.7 A similar process on AMP’s has already been undertaken for schools with the DfES and officers have been working corporately to share feedback and best practice.

3.8 The mechanism of using RTIA’s (receipts taken into account) has ended now before the introduction of the new prudential capital finance system. There will therefore be no new RTIA calculations but an adjustment will still be made for up to three prior years.

3.9 In line with a broader initiative to ease the plan burden on local authorities, the requirement to submit Capital Strategies and Asset Management Plans to Government offices will be relaxed for those authorities whose submissions in 2002 are assessed as “good”.

3.10 Once the new prudential system of capital finance is introduced the Capital Strategy will become part of the annual budget setting process.

3.11 The report is set out in the following sections:-

Section 4 Recommendations
Section 5 Background
Section 6 Feedback on 2001 Capital Strategy and AMP Run
Section 7 Financial Implications
Section 8 Legal Implications

Appendix 1 Capital Strategy
Appendix 2 AMP
Appendix 3 Report to FAMG on the results and analysis of the property performance indicators.

4. Recommendations

The Mayor is requested to agree:-

4.1 the content of the authority’s proposed Capital Strategy and AMP as attached to this report and to request officers to submit them to the Council for approval prior to submission to OPDM and GOL by 31 July 2002 and to delegate to the Executive Director for Resources and Deputy Chief Executive authority to amend and complete the documents as necessary before final submission.

The Mayor is requested to note:

4.2 the property mission statement, goals and objectives (AMP section 1)
4.3 the strategic action plan for the property function (AMP section 5)

4.4 The use of the five ODPM performance indicators as outlined in the AMP (section 6) and the use of local performance indicators detailed in the AMP (section 6) and to note the results and analysis of the property performance indicators as detailed in the attached report to the Finance and Asset Management officer group (FAMG)

5. Background

5.1 The council submitted its draft Capital Strategy to DETR in July 000 and its draft AMP in November 2000 as part of the Single Capital Pot “Dry Run” arrangements. It then submitted its first Capital Strategy to DTLR in July 2001 for assessment by a team which comprised of the Government Office (GO), the LEA support division and the Social Services Inspectorate. Lewisham’s Capital Strategy was given an assessment of satisfactory (middle rating of three) and the feedback identified some areas for improvement which are detailed below in paragraphs 6.1

5.2 Lewisham’s AMP was given an assessment of good (top rating of three) and received feedback on its AMP which is summarised in paragraph 6.2.

5.3 ODPM have issued additional guidance for councils as part of the preparation for the 2002/03 Capital Strategy process.

5.4 The likely assessment process for 2002/03 resource allocations has been issued to authorities and will consist of a similar assessment of Capital Strategy and AMP undertaken by a similar team of staff and representatives of the DfES and the DoH. The relevant government department and GO staff will also assess the performance of each council, in terms of service delivery in those areas covered by the single pot ie. transport, housing, education and social services. The latter assessment will be based on service specific plans submitted by local authorities and will include Housing strategy, local transport plans, and schools’ AMP’s. The DoH will base its assessment on the social services aspects of local authorities’ capital strategies.

5.5 The SCP allocations will be made in December 2002 for 2003/04. The allocations received will be reported back as part of the budget report for 2003/04. A fixed proportion (the majority) will be allocated on a needs basis and the balance by ministerial discretion.
6. **Feedback on the Capital Strategy and the AMP for 2001**

**Capital Strategy**

6.1 The Capital Strategy met all the primary requirements and addressed all the main requirements of the guidance. Some further development should be possible in the following areas (direct quotes from letter from GOL):

“There is a corporate commitment to the Capital Strategy and its content. “

“Progress for prioritisation of investment could be explained in more detail”

“Corporate performance measures need to be more explicit”

“Further explanation of consultation on the Capital Strategy and the implication of this for its further development would be useful”

“The links between capital and revenue (a mechanism does exist to consider this) need to be made more explicit in the submission”

**AMP**

6.2 All the primary requirements were met by the AMP. Some development required in the following areas (direct quotes from GOL):

“Although stakeholder consultation is referred to in the AMP it seemed to us to be restricted to lead officers only. We would have expected others outside the council, including tenants and building occupiers, to be included”

“There does not appear to be a mechanism for rigorously collecting and feeding back on stakeholder satisfaction information”

“The AMP was not absolutely clear about any programme of necessary improvements in data management”

**7. Financial Implications**

The authority needs to aim for a good assessment of both its Capital Strategy and AMP. This should then result in a more favourable
allocation of that part of capital resources that form the discretionary element of the “single capital pot” for 2003/04.

8. **Scrutiny by Public Accounts Committee**

Public Accounts Committee have not reviewed this year’s submission but did review the submission in 2001 before it was agreed at Executive Committee in July 2001.

They made some observations on the strategy and AMP that have been considered in completing the 2002 Strategy and AMP. Their main comment was a wish to see prioritisation needs better linking resources to policy objectives. Work is ongoing on this as described in the capital strategy document.

9. **Legal Implications**

The Guidance issued by the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister on the Single Capital Pot requires authorities to submit their Capital Strategies and Asset Management Plan by 31 July failing which they will not be eligible for the discretionary rewards available to authorities whose submissions in 2002 are assessed by GOL as being good.

Article 4 paragraph 2 (d) the Council’s constitution states that a decision involving agreeing the budget and any plan or strategy for the control of the Council’s borrowing or capital expenditure are decisions which are reserved to Council. This reflects requirements of the Local Authorities (Functions and Responsibilities) Regulations 2000 and Government Guidance. It is the responsibility of the Executive to prepare proposals for the budget and policy framework for approval by the Council.

10. **Crime & Disorder Implications**

There are none directly arising from this report.

11. **Equality Implications**

There are none directly arising from this report.

12. **Environmental Implications**

There are none directly arising from this report.
13. Conclusions

The capital strategy sets out the council’s current approach to managing its capital assets. The AMP sets out the council’s approach to managing its property portfolio (excluding Housing). Both documents have been improved and are developing into a set of policies, systems and procedures that will ensure capital resources are spent wisely in meeting corporate objectives.

For further information on this report please contact Julie Bennett, Head of Financial Management on 020 8314 8736 (Capital Strategy) or John Comish, Head of Property & Development on 020 8314 8616 (Asset Management Plan).
London Borough of Lewisham  

Capital Strategy

Introduction
This paper outlines the Capital Strategy for the London Borough of Lewisham (“Lewisham”). It attempts to demonstrate the work that is underway (called “the Golden thread”) to further develop the current strategic planning framework, revise corporate priorities and enable budgets to be more clearly linked to priorities. It identifies processes that are in place to support resource allocation decisions, including a method of prioritisation linked to council priorities. It highlights how capital expenditure is controlled and monitored both operationally and financially and the methodology used to evaluate and review capital investment post completion. The strategy is an overarching document with the clear objective of ensuring capital resources are used for the best interests of the citizens of Lewisham.

1. Council’s Key Priorities and Targets
In 1998 The council agreed a vision and seven strategic priorities which the Council has worked with its partners to achieve. They covered areas of most concern to Lewisham residents but also included priorities around new governance and technology arrangements.
The 1998-2002 administration also placed growing emphasis on developing a “creative agenda” for the borough; improving cultural opportunities for residents and fostering creative and arts based enterprises locally. The council has also developed a sharper focus around the regeneration of the borough through development and transport.

In May 2002 Lewisham elected its first directly elected Mayor who wishes to review these priorities and may over time propose amendments to them. To support his review the Mayor will be able to call upon a wide range of public input gathered through annual residents surveys, Citizen’s panel and focus groups. Once agreed the new priorities will form the basis of the corporate strategy, a short document setting out Lewisham’s medium term priorities together with their rationale. The corporate strategy would form a reference point for all plans and strategies produced during the period of the Mayoral administration, including the BVPP.

The proposed Golden Thread framework is illustrated in Appendix A and links the corporate objectives to the Community strategy and to individual staff objectives. It makes a clearer distinction than previously between annual plans, concerned with action planning and reporting performance, and longer term strategic plans/objectives. Individual service strategies will identify the need for capital investment to support the corporate objectives either departmentally specific or as a contribution towards cross cutting issues. The overall objective of the new framework is to ensure that service planning, financial planning (both revenue and capital) and performance
management are aligned to best serve the organisation’s strategic objectives/priorities. However for the purposes of this capital strategy the overarching framework remains the seven strategic priorities (detailed in Appendix B).

**Schools organisation plan, EDP and AMP**
The authority recognises that capital investment plays a key role in the drive to raise standards and to ensure that school places are sufficient, suitable and provided in the areas that parents want them. Within the context of the schools organisation plan and the Education development plan is the schools AMP. Capital proposals arising from the schools AMP are fed into the Council’s Asset management group for consideration.

**Health Improvement programme (HIMP)**
The HIMP provides a coherent programme for partnership action on local priorities for improving health and wellbeing, reducing health inequalities and modernising health and social services. As such, it is the ‘top level’ strategic plan that informs and drives the Council’s work with its health partners in Lewisham. It is the vehicle for the local implementation of the NHS Plan, which is focused on reforming and investing in the NHS around the needs and preferences of patients and the wider public. However guiding local modernisation is only one of three main themes of the Lewisham HIMP – the others being Health Improvement (adding years to life and life to years) and the third main theme is protecting the health and wellbeing and promoting the independence of vulnerable people.

**Housing Business Plan**
The strategy for Housing aims to maximise the value of holdings whilst also taking full advantage of private sector options such as PFI for the benefit of our residents. The approach to capital investment is to undertake comprehensive works in priority locations rather than dealing with issues on a piecemeal basis.

**Local transport plan**
The Council submitted the Borough spending plan for 2003/04 to Transport for London in June 2002 which sought funding totalling £8.2m. The bid aligns with the Mayor for London’s Transport strategy and targets work on road and bridge maintenance, reducing congestion, area based programmes and bus priority measures. Recognising the need to increase spending on local roads the Council’s capital programme includes a new allocation for resurfacing high priority roads of £0.9m.

2. **Partnership Working**
Lewisham’s Local Strategic Partnership, accredited this year by the Government Office for London, builds on a long history of partnership working
and collaboration between the public, private, voluntary and community sectors in Lewisham. The partnership is working to a common vision and is currently developing in consultation a community strategy and neighbourhood renewal strategy to support the work of the partners. The Lewisham LSP gives considerable importance to the sharing and integration of information. The 2002/03 work-programme includes actions to identify possible areas of alignment between the LSP and partner organisations in Lewisham, particularly the potential to influence partners mainstream budgets.

Well established partnerships supporting the work of the LSP include the Health Partnership Board, the Community Safety Partnership and a range of regeneration partnerships. In particular work between the council and our health partners continued to develop over 2001/2002. During the year the two local Primary Care Groups were reorganised into a single new Primary Care Trust operating across the whole Borough. This reorganisation has strengthened local health partnership arrangements by locating health service commissioning at a Borough level. The Social Care and Health Directorate has established a number of joint commissioning posts with the PCT and has moved towards fully integrated services in a number of areas with the aim of delivering better outcomes for local people. Underpinning this service integration, we are working closely with our health partners to develop joint approaches to include ICT and property ownership. For example, we are currently improving cost effectiveness by developing a joint Occupational Therapy equipment store with the Primary care Trust and our integrated community mental health health teams are based both in Council accommodation and that owned by University Hospital Lewisham.

Building on our experience with health, similar arrangements are under discussion with the Police Authority and it is intended to extend this joint work to the Fire Brigade. Fresh initiatives for joint working have also been initiated with our partners in the New Deal for Communities area. Partnership arrangements are gradually and systematically being put in place in publicly owned premises including devolved local delivery. For example agreements have been reached in principal with the Police service over the joint marketing of adjoining surplus property to encourage more integrated local regeneration. Also, the Borough’s Youth Offending Team, a cross-cutting multi-agency seamless service will open shortly and operate out of a centrally located Council building. Further, we are working with Greater London Enterprises on property investment arrangements to provide premises options for service and community partner organisations.

These activities have been underpinned by the relaunch this summer of Lewisham’s Public Management Forum (PMF). Endorsed by the LSP, the PMF has been re-established to evaluate good management practice and to
share learning across the local public sector. This body provides a sound foundation for ensuring that partnership work continues to provide the most positive outcomes for Lewisham residents. The PMF has established a small number of themed working groups to improve collaborative working and front line service provision including a group to better manage our mutual corporate property assets & service procurement. With these arrangements we will build on existing joint property initiatives and provide the foundation for a property strategy and investment policy on a network and horizontally integrated basis across all partner agencies for housing and education, culture, public safety and community.

Our partnerships with the private sector range from those focussed on land assembly and skills development (Lewisham town centre) to those seeking to foster enterprise (the creative sector work) and to those securing service improvements (new contract for ICT services and business process reengineering leading to some options for joint funding of infrastructure developments on a risk/reward basis). A recent partnership with a private contractor for Parks management included investment of £1.5m over three years and has led to a significant improvement (4%) in public satisfaction rating. The partner is also positively undertaking consultation as part of their commitment to Best value and improving services.

3. Lewisham’s approach to deliver cross cutting outcomes
The Finance and Asset Management group (FAMG) is a group of 2nd and 3rd tier officers (mainly finance and property specialists together with Heads of Development and Policy) from across the authority reporting to Executive Management team. Included in their terms of reference is both the overall coordination and prioritisation of the capital resource allocation process, overall monitoring of the capital programme including disposals, and responsibility for the strategic management of the council’s property assets.

The group meet on a regular basis and take forward action plans relating to improving the current performance levels of the property estate. Issues recently discussed include sharing knowledge and experiences on PFI’s as 3 more PFI’s are in progress delivering some joined up working eg Downham leisure, library, community sector and health provision. (This scheme is a good example of specifying an urban design brief that reflects the Creative Lewishan strategy). FAMG also discuss the property disposal programme as well as options around surplus properties being used for other purposes.

The Council has recently been able to influence the levels of inward investment into the authority by working in partnership with others and using its own capital resources. The following are examples of this.
• Working in partnership with the Laban Centre and Heritage Lottery fund a landmark building has been developed that is acting as a catalyst for the regeneration of the Creekside area, attracting major commercial investment in the north of the borough.

• By combining the surplus Silver Road depot with the Sundermead Estate renewal development it has been possible to unlock difficult to develop back land, create an improved urban design form and generate much higher capital receipts over the redevelopment programme period.

• The Council are undertaking a major regeneration project on the Kender Estate in New Cross. This is a 10 year programme that will deliver refurbishment of 350 homes and the new construction of 434 homes, 127 of which will be for share ownership or sale. The total cost of the scheme is £71m with £23m (33%) provided via the Local Authority Social Housing Grant to our Registered Social Landlord partners.

• Working in partnership with Housing 21, the Council has closed its residential care homes and replaced them with two new very sheltered housing schemes, incorporating day care provision. The schemes, developed and managed by Housing 21, provide state of the art accommodation that promotes independence and better meets the aspirations of older people in Lewisham.

4. Investment Strategy

The level of investment outlined in the AMP and detailed in the attached context sheet shows needs of over £600m. A significant amount of this (£554m) represents the cost of bringing all homes up to the Decent Homes Standard (65% of homes have been assessed as failing to meet this standard). An estimate of funds available, based on current Housing BCA, MRA and SCA’s allocations, up to 2010 is £350m to meet the investment needs of £554m – a significant investment gap of £200m for Housing only.

One of the main drivers in Lewisham’s approach to asset management is its inability to satisfy all of its investment needs resulting in a working assumption that unless there are compelling reasons the Council will use its own resources to fund projects only as a last resort. Lewisham therefore looks to exploit external investment options to improve assets eg PFI supported by PFI credits (as in existing catering contract and three proposed PFI’s; one proposed to refurbish and build where necessary facilities for 9 schools and the provision of a facilities management contract (contract value £255m – PFI credits £60.6m), another proposed to refurbish and manage 2,000 Housing properties in the Brockley area (contract value of over £110m - £44.6m relates to PFI credits), and the third for the design, build and operation of a Leisure, library, community service and health facility provision at Downham (contract value...
£45m – PFI credits of £10.6m), or PFTeg parks (discussed earlier in section 2) and the leisure centre contract to help tackle the need for investment to councils assets.

In terms of prioritising the limited resources that are available the current procedure is as follows:-

Housing
Housing schemes are assessed via an internal bidding process using three categories:-

- Essential works needed to avoid major health and safety risks to avoid properties becoming uninhabitable and to maintain existing services or basic amenities
- Comprehensive regeneration work intended to provide a full range of repairs and improvements to properties that have previously suffered from a lack of investment.
- Continuation and extension of priority area regeneration involving complex schemes which need to be programmed over 3-7 years.

Other Services
Larger schemes will come forward as bids for capital as a result of service strategies linked to property needs. Current schemes in the programme include the following:-

- relocating and increasing the capacity of a primary special needs school (using the Egan principles of construction through partnership)
- pupil referral unit – to ensure compliance with statutory legislation for September 2002
- new resource centre for disabled children and young people to include overnight respite care
- improving voice/data network infrastructure – recognising the need to support other ICT developments such as connected community initiatives in schools, libraries and the flexible working project and the electronic service agenda
- highways programme of resurfacing

The council’s contribution to the ELX (East London Line extension) in the next few years is still a firm commitment and it is hoped this will bring visible benefits in terms of the regeneration of Lewisham, as the Docklands Light Railway has done over the last few years.

Members have continued to allocate £2m per annum to support the bottom up approach to AMP. Through the condition surveys and desktop reviews, as part of the AMP process for schools and all other non housing property assets, a cross directorate officer group put forward a prioritised list (ranking urgency and risk associated with not doing the works) of schemes to the FAMG for
consideration as funds become available and also annually as part of the budget setting process.

**Proposed Resource allocation methodology**
The current process is being reviewed and officers from FAMG are currently developing an improved methodology to support resource allocation decisions in an ever competing environment. This is outlined in Appendix C.

**Prudential Guidelines**
From April 2004 the government intend to change the rules regarding Council’s powers to borrow. The key constraint is that Council’s must satisfy themselves that any borrowing they enter into is affordable. To take advantage of the new powers, the Council will need to build on its current investment appraisal processes to ensure that any borrowing undertaken is self financing. Where the Council wishes to pursue schemes which are not self financing it will need to ensure that it can identify revenue budget provision that will be available over the long term to fund the financing and debt repayment costs.

**Disposal strategy - capital receipts**
The Council will continue to identify assets for disposal through a wide variety of mechanisms predicated on the Asset Management Plan processes. Our disposal strategy reflects a balance between the efficacy of disposing of unproductive or surplus assets for financial returns or for regenerative and other service objectives. The Council has a high level of commitment to proactive stimulation of urban renaissance and regenerative opportunities through its land and property ownerships. When undertaking our reviews of property potential an analysis is done on both the regenerative and capital receipts options to enable the Council to take balanced decisions to achieve its overall corporate objectives.

For major disposal strategy options the Council has piloted financial modelling of options and risks alongside the respective regenerative and service benefits as a cost/benefit analysis enabling recommendations by the Finance and Asset management officer group to Executive Management team/Mayor and Cabinet for fully informed choices and decisions to be made. All proposed disposals for sale at less than best consideration with significant policy issues, extending beyond a single ward or of substantial value are referred with reasoned justification as key decisions to Mayor & Cabinet.

In our Capital Strategy submission last year we indicated the challenge the authority faced to deliver a more consistent outcome for the level of receipts from year to year. This remains a difficulty for a number of reasons, including
market opportunity, RSL funding regimes, and not least the increasing complexity of property transactions many of which involve large scale and wholesale regenerative redevelopment schemes. However, with improved accuracy and monitoring corporately of the disposals programme the council is now better placed to influence the pace and commitment of sales within the programme. Coupled with the relaxation allowing capital receipts to roll forward from one year to the next and to earn interest the problem of ‘lumpy’ receipts has been largely ameliorated.

Recently three of the sites that were elderly persons homes have been considered for alternative use before agreeing to their disposal. One is being used in the short term for homelessness, a second is being considered as a site for decant space in support of the schools PFI and the third site now has member agreement to use for a Pupil referral unit (and funding for this has been granted via the DfES with an additional SCA) to meet one of the key Education targets for excluded children.

**Best Value Procurement**

Lewisham is committed to embracing good practice in procurement in line with “Rethinking Construction”. The LEA has embarked on a PFI for the rebuilding and remodelling of 9 schools (detailed earlier in this section) and is currently on site in the construction of a new special needs school which is being procured using the PPC (Partnered procurement contract). This is an exciting pilot for Lewisham which will be reviewed on completion to ensure that lessons are learnt across the organisation. The “Client project Toolkit” is being piloted to this end in the Education & Culture directorate and is attached as appendix D for reference.

**Corporate Asset Review**

The Council has for several years progressed a comprehensive but largely service based review of its assets. It is timely to revisit these reviews but more positively to undertake area based reviews, linking corporate and community asset opportunities. Initially, these will concentrate on areas of the Borough where intensive property activity is already apparent in the market allied to significant opportunities for change due to substantial local authority or other public ownerships i.e where significant regeneration and urban renaissance is feasible.

The review will thus significantly improve the prospects for and ability to organise and enable the cross cutting service provision referred to elsewhere in this submission between the council and other public service partners to become reality whilst delivery further capital receipt and revenue saving opportunities. The Mayor and Cabinet has formally endorsed the Corporate
Asset Review proceeding as one of 4 key strands to address current revenue budget pressures over the medium term.

5. Monitoring and evaluation of the Capital programme
The capital programme itself is monitored by each of the 4 main service directorates, Education & Culture, Social Care & Health, Regeneration and Resources with the Resources directorate monitoring the whole. Monitoring reports are submitted to Mayor & Cabinet on a quarterly basis once having been agreed through FAMG (see section 3).

The Council’s disposal programme identifies and forecasts capital receipts for a period of 3-5 years. A core team of property, finance and legal officers with service representatives meet regularly throughout the year to review the accuracy of the forecasts with particular emphasis on the immediate 3 year programme and note any agreed variations to the programme which may arise due to changing circumstances or approved key decisions.

During the last 2-3 years Lewisham has developed a standard for programme management which all large projects, regardless of whether capital or revenue funded, are monitored against. A project initiation document (PID) is produced for each project and reviewed and endorsed by the appropriate directorate project review group (PRG) chaired by a 2nd tier officer, usually the directorate Head of Resources (who is also a member of FAMG). The PID outlines the project timescales, profile of spend, details the risks identified within the project and the project management arrangements proposed. Programme management officers in the resources directorate provide advice to project managers from the project initiation stage, through implementation and at project closure/final review. The role of the directorate PRG is that of monitoring the directorate capital schemes within the overall programme, ensuring its programme stays within budget and to agree to delays, bring forward and amend schemes. Project managers attend the PRG’s. The role of the Corporate Project Board (CPB), represented by PRG chairs and senior officers from corporate finance, legal and property is that of overall stewardship of the programme, reviewing progress on all projects of over £ 500k and those of over £ 100k of a high risk, high impact nature. It monitors these schemes against time and cost indicators, reviews risk exposure and recommends appropriate action to resolve issues. The CPB also takes corporate responsibility for ensuring that programme management arrangements conform to the standard.

A key part of the programme management standard is the post completion review, carried out by an independent officer, which evaluates the programme in both service, quality and finance outcomes against the original objectives. These in depth reviews involve consultation with service
users and will help to inform future programmes and strategies. A programme of reviews is being developed for this year.

**Conclusion**
The Capital strategy as it stands now has been improved and is developing into a set of policies, systems and procedures that ensure capital resources will be spent wisely in meeting corporate objectives. Further developments are underway in terms of the “Golden Thread” and an improved methodology for resource allocation decisions.

Attachments with Capital Strategy submission
July 2002
Appendix 1: Context Sheet to Capital Strategy
Appendix A: Council’s seven priorities
Appendix B: Proposed methodology for capital resource allocation
Appendix C: The Golden Thread framework – performance management
Appendix D: Client Project Toolkit

**Performance Management Framework**

---

Performance Management Framework Appendix A
LOCAL STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP

COMMUNITY STRATEGY

- Education Development Plan
- Health Improvement Plan
- Community Safety Plan
- Local Agenda 21 Plan
- Transport Plan
- Other Plans

VISION

CORPORATE PRIORITIES

- Regeneration
- Social Care & Health
- Education & Culture
- Resources

VALUES

- Service Objectives
- Service Objectives
- Service Objectives
- Service Objectives

REVENUE BUDGET & ASSET MANAGEMENT PLANNING

BEST VALUE PERFORMANCE PLAN

BEST VALUE REVIEWS

OPERATIONAL PLANNING, DEPLOYMENT, DELIVERY & MONITORING

PERSONAL PERFORMANCE & EVALUATION (PES)
Client Project Toolkit

The development of a corporate client project toolkit is a means to addressing one of the key issues raised by ‘Re-Thinking Construction’. i.e. the need to be an expert client when engaging with the other partners in the construction process. A major criticism of the client function within the ‘Re-thinking Construction report produced by Sir John Egan’s task force was the lack of leadership, expertise and focus provided by clients when engaging with their project partners. This has particular emphasis with a public body such as a local authority where the client function is frequently diverse and often fragmented in its approach.

The concept of the toolkit is to capture best practice in managing the key stages of a construction project from a client’s perspective, to ensure consistency in that standard of clienting across the organisation and to bring maximum value to projects when engaging with project partners who are stakeholders, users, designers, constructors, etc. The objective is to ensure that the client is able to fully engage with their partners to bring about a project that addresses the complete life cycle of a construction project whilst dramatically improving the likelihood of delivering our capital projects to time, cost, quality and to the expectations of all of the project partners.

The fully developed toolkit will be a part of, and complementary to, the Council’s corporate project management process. It will provide a corporate and consistent framework for all aspects of the client’s role in the development and delivery of the Council’s construction projects with particular emphasis upon the client project manager. The toolkit is a cradle to grave approach that starts with the inception of the project at feasibility/options appraisal stage and follows through brief development, budget and programme construction, procurement and commissioning of design and construction teams, managing the construction phase, capturing key performance indicators and benchmarking to practical completion, hand over and final account.

A crucial aspect of the development of the toolkit will be to provide this in electronic corporate web based format across the Council as a whole and to the partners involved in the development and delivery of our construction projects.

Key component parts of the toolkit have been developed and we have introduced these as a pilot within our Education and Culture Directorate to allow us to inform, evaluate and improve these component parts. Introducing the toolkit as a pilot ensures that the standards developed by the corporate client team incorporate the practical needs and requirements of
the client project managers in the Directorates such that overall best practice is developed that can be then rolled out across the Council.

The key parts that are currently being piloted are :-

- Budget construction
- Project brief construction
- Risk management
- Standard terms of reference for consultants services
- Commissioning consultants/design team
- Contract pro-forma templates
- Tender appraisal
- Cost and programme monitoring
- Project inception meetings
- Project review meetings
- Key performance indicators and software
- Client project management software

The successful delivery of capital projects is clearly one of the outputs that demonstrate a successful capital strategy and the client project toolkit is considered to be a means of ensuring that project delivery within Lewisham continues to improve such that best value in this crucial area can be demonstrated, measured and benchmarked.
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Lewisham - The Borough

Lewisham is an inner South East Borough. It has an area of approximately 13.4 sq miles and a boundary of almost 23 miles in length, making it the second largest inner London borough. It is characterised by a reasonably sizeable economy, driven significantly by the public sector but supported by many businesses and voluntary organisations. Lewisham is a borough where people choose to live but generally export their labour to other parts of London and the South East. Only one third of the workforce work in the Borough and Lewisham’s economy is ranked 30th out of the 33 London Boroughs.

With a population of 242,000, the residents of Lewisham speak over 100 languages, have an above average proportion with low levels of literacy and numeracy, face the highest levels of teenage pregnancy and can live in significantly deprived areas. Among adults aged 18 - 64, seven percent live with physical disabilities or sensory loss and almost a quarter of households are pensioner only.

The Council spends around £700 million annually, equivalent to almost £3,000 for every individual living in the Borough.

In May 2002 Lewisham elected its first directly elected Mayor. New governance arrangements include a Mayor and Cabinet (formal executive), each cabinet member having responsibility for a particular area. The executive committee is held accountable via a system of scrutiny committees drawn from the Assembly of other Councillors.

The organisational structure is as before with 4 Directorates together with a Chief Executive’s division (part of Resources directorate) and their main areas of responsibility are shown below.

- Education & Culture – school effectiveness; pupil services; culture; and community services.
- Social Care & Health – social services; joint commissioning; joint services provision; and health liaison.
- Regeneration – housing; planning & economic development; environmental health & regulation; and environmental maintenance.
- Resources – property; people management; finance & budget; public services; legal services; and E Government/ICT.
Investment Needs
Lewisham, like many authorities, is confronted with the short term realities of addressing immediate investment needs whilst developing a longer term strategy for improving service delivery. The table below shows the current value and the repairs backlog to make the assets “fit for purpose”.

### Table of Investment Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset type</th>
<th>Includes</th>
<th>Current value (draft accounts as at 31.3.02)</th>
<th>Estimated Investment reqd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Council Housing</td>
<td>£1,114m</td>
<td>£554m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Council Assets</td>
<td>Schools, admin bldgs, roads, parks, leisure, other community centres, roads and vehicles</td>
<td>£544m</td>
<td>£152m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>£1,658m</td>
<td>£706m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Resources Available
The following table shows the level of actual/possible resources for 2002/03, 2003/04, and 2004/05 and the level of actual/projected expenditure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 2002/03 £’000’s</th>
<th>Estimated 2003/04 £’000’s</th>
<th>Estimated 2004/05 £’000’s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing BCA,SCA,MRA &amp; disabled facilities grant</td>
<td>37,333</td>
<td>35,647</td>
<td>37,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital receipts/revenue</td>
<td>6,235</td>
<td>9,484</td>
<td>8,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub total</td>
<td>43,568</td>
<td>45,131</td>
<td>46,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services BCA,SCA and capital grants</td>
<td>8,040</td>
<td>3,640</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital receipts/revenue</td>
<td>17,723</td>
<td>3,657</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub total</td>
<td>25,763</td>
<td>7,297</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total possible resources</strong></td>
<td><strong>69,331</strong></td>
<td><strong>52,428</strong></td>
<td><strong>49,241</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Expenditure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2002/03</th>
<th>2003/04</th>
<th>2004/05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Culture</td>
<td>10,980</td>
<td>3,580</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Care &amp; Health</td>
<td>1,304</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regeneration</td>
<td>3,554</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>2,306**</td>
<td>2,000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modernising Lewisham</td>
<td>8,804</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing (allocated)</td>
<td>46,198</td>
<td>13,143</td>
<td>8,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing (to be allocated)</td>
<td>9,328</td>
<td>31,988</td>
<td>37,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total expenditure</strong></td>
<td>1,143</td>
<td>3,217</td>
<td>49,186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In reality the Housing programme includes an element of overprogramming of some £12m.

** Resources directorate is showing £2m in 2003/04 and 2004/05 that requires allocating out through the AMP process once further condition survey works are completed.
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The Council has seven priorities for action, working with partners, to:

- Improve the educational achievement of young people and create access to "lifelong learning" for all
- Challenge the traditions of service provision to secure best value services
- Support and protect vulnerable children and adults
- Connect Lewisham, its people and businesses to the opportunities of the 21st century through ICT
- Improve the health of local people and the wider environment
- Reduce crime levels and make Lewisham a safer place
- Modernise the governance of the Council to meet the aspirations of the people of Lewisham
Proposed Resource Allocation Methodology (1) Appendix C

Capital Bids - 2002/03

All capital bids must be made using template set out below. All sections should be completed.

Section 1 Corporate Priorities
Identify the corporate priorities if any that the capital scheme would help to achieve. Corporate Priorities are set out in the attached Appendix.

Section 2 Directorate Service Priorities
Identify the service priority set out in your directorate service plan that the capital scheme would help to achieve.

Section 3 Asset Management Plans
Has the capital scheme been identified as a priority in the Council’s asset management plan. If so please refer to the relevant section of the AMP.

Section 4a Proposed Option - Costs and Service Outputs
Include details of the revenue and capital costs of the project on the attached pro-forma. Include details of the years in which it is anticipated capital funds will be spent.

What are the projected ongoing revenue costs of the service should the scheme go ahead.

What are the projected service outputs that will be delivered should the scheme go ahead.

Section 4b Current Position - Costs and Service Outputs
What are the current projected revenue and capital costs of the service should the scheme not go ahead.

What service outputs will not be delivered should the scheme not go ahead. Does the current position satisfy the Councils Health & Safety, DDA and other statutory service obligations.

Section 4c Alternative Options- Costs and Service Outputs
What are the projected revenue and capital costs of any alternative options considered.
What are the projected service outputs of any service options that have been considered.

Please add further sections if more than one alternative was considered.

**Section 5 Health and Safety**

Is the scheme necessary for the Council to comply with its Health and Safety obligations. If so please provide details.

**Section 6 Disability and Discrimination Act (DDA)**

Is the scheme necessary for the Council to comply with its DDA obligations. If so please provide details.

**Section 7 Other Legal Obligations**

Is the scheme necessary to comply with any statutory service or other legal obligations of the Council. If so please provide details.

**Proposed Capital Resource Allocation Methodology (2)**

An officer group consisting of the Head of Property and Development, the Head of Property Services and the Group Manager Capital and Treasury will initially rank the schemes according to weighting criteria. The balance of weightings are currently under discussion. The weighting criteria will be applied to the following categories.

- Matched against a commitment in the Corporate Plan
- Matched against a commitment in a Directorate Service Plan
- Matched against a commitment in the Asset Management Plan
- Priority as determined by the Directorate Proposing the scheme
- Priority as determined by the Head of Property and Development
- Capital Cost
- Revenue Cost Savings
- Net Present Value of the Scheme
- Required to meet Health and Safety Obligations
- Required to meet Disability and Discrimination Act Obligations
- Required to meet other statutory/legal obligations

The results will be benchmarked against the “do nothing option” with only those generating a positive score progressing to the next stage.
The rankings generated will then be subject to review in a second stage evaluation. This is intended to recognise that any formulaic approach cannot effectively consider or rank all the relevant resource allocation and service delivery issues. The second stage approach will depend on the nature of the scheme.

All capital property improvement schemes under £200,000 will be ranked by the Head of Property and Development, the Head of Property Services, the Group Manager Capital and Treasury and a property representative from each directorate.

All other schemes will be ranked by the Executive Director for Resources and Deputy Chief Executive, the Head of Property and Development and the directorates Heads of Resources (through FAMG). Each officer will allocate 100 points across schemes and provide reasons for the allocation. The Executive Director for Resources and Deputy Chief Executive and the Head of Property and Development will allocate points across any scheme they choose. The Directorate Heads of Resources will allocate points across all schemes other than their own. The resultant rankings will be discussed with the view to gaining a consensus. The decision of the Executive Director for Resources and Deputy Chief Executive will be final.

The total budget for property improvement schemes under £200,000 will be set by the Mayor. The Mayor’s decision will be informed by advice from the Executive Director for Resources and Deputy Chief Executive based on investment need as set out in the Council’s Asset Management Plan.

The resultant rankings will be reported to the Mayor in a written report with supporting evidence as to how the rankings have been arrived at. This will normally be an annual budget report or quarterly capital monitoring report. The Mayor may then change the rankings and the reasons for the changes will be recorded.
1. Organisational arrangements for Corporate Asset Management

1.1 Lewisham was pleased to receive a “good” assessment for its 2001 AMP. This does not mean we are complacent, rather over the last year we have continued to develop our corporate approach to the management of property and property services.

1.2 We are grateful for the constructive feedback from GOL and the points made to us have been addressed as part of this year’s submission. The Council has also carefully considered the latest guidance from ODPM and the Baseline Report produced by York Consulting for ODPM on the development and implementation of corporate strategies and asset management plans.

1.3 Our journey in developing a corporate property framework began in earnest in 1996 when the Council appointed DTZ Debenham Thorpe (now DTZ Pieda Consulting). The report they produced was given operational effect from 1 October 1998, which means this is our fifth year of producing an AMP. To a large extent the framework adopted in 1998 anticipated the ODPM’s own guidance on asset management planning.

1.4 The framework:

- Established the corporate property function with a Corporate Property Officer (CPO) given specific responsibility for strategic property management.
- Defined a property mission statement and property goals (that are periodically reviewed).
- Introduced the Corporate Property Plan process – a statement of the overall intentions for the corporate management of the Council’s property over a number of timeframes. This is now the asset management plan.
- This is complimented by the Corporate Property Manual that sets out the policies and procedures that govern property decision-making, the roles and responsibilities of decision-makers and other guidelines and statements relating to corporate property management.
- Outlined the approach to the corporate co-ordination and management of the capital programme.

1.5 During the last year the Council has continued to develop property policies and procedures and much progress can be reported.

1.6 A key event came in May 2002 when we became one of only seven authorities nationally to adopt the constitutional model including a directly elected Mayor. In anticipation of this in 2000 we had reviewed our organisational structure.

1.7 That process created a reduced number of larger multi-functional directorates based on service delivery rather than “heads of profession”. The Council now has a senior executive management team (EMT) of just five officers (chief executive plus four executive directors). A number of officer groups have been established as sub-groups of EMT and for asset management purposes the key one is the Finance and Asset Management Group (FAMG).

1.8 Lewisham operates a devolved management structure and within this environment each directorate has a Head of Resources who is a member of the directorate’s management team. This officer also has a reporting relationship and responsibility to the Executive Director of Resources and Deputy Chief Executive (EDR/DCE) to enable him to discharge his statutory duties.

1.9 To facilitate this, towards the end of 2001 a review of corporate officer groups saw the creation of the FAMG. This group meets every two weeks, has formal terms of reference and it absorbed the functions of the old Corporate Property Board.

1.10 FAMG is chaired by the Head of Financial Management (HFM) and its membership includes; the EDR/DCE; the CPO; the Heads of Resources from each Directorate; and, the Head of Corporate Policy (HCP), who has responsibility for producing the community plan. The full terms of reference are produced in annex A and include:
• To co-ordinate the budget strategy and revenue budget process.
• To co-ordinate and prioritise the capital allocation process.
• Monitoring of the capital programme.
• Establishing and monitoring the disposal programme.
• Responsibility for the strategic management of Council’s property assets.
• Co-ordinate and oversee the production of the capital strategy (CS) and AMP.
• Promote the shared use and/or co-location of property within the Council and with other organisations.

1.11  This arrangement means that the CPO is included in the preparation of the capital strategy and inputs to the budget process.

1.12  A number of officer groups report to FAMG and two of these are of particular relevance to property management.

• The moves team is an informal group chaired by the CPO and made up of the officers from around the Council who have responsibility for the facilities management of office accommodation. The group’s purpose is to deliver the office rationalisation strategy by undertaking staff consultation and organising office moves.
• The Asset Management Planning Group (AMPG) is a cross directorate group chaired by the Head of Property Services. Membership is taken from officers who have responsibility for construction related services and its remit is to develop the Re-thinking Construction agenda and to integrate it into asset management planning. The group also prioritise major maintenance, repair and refurbishment bids to the capital programme.

1.13  To support the FAMG the CPO is responsible on an annual basis for producing a number of reports:

• In conjunction with the appropriate head of resources, a directorate property plan (DPP). This is the principle tool for establishing service need for property and is prepared by interrogating relevant best value reviews; service and business plans; statutory guidance; relevant performance information, property review exercises and the results of consultation. The DPP sets out key property pressures over a number of time frames.
• The draft AMP – that complies with guidance and in effect summaries the main action points from the DPPs.
• A report on the performance of the property portfolio (excluding schools and the housing stock) and property services, to include the outcome of stakeholder consultation.
• Based on all of the above, a draft work plan for the corporate property function including a programme of property reviews.

1.14  Recent best value reviews and best value performance plans have identified:

• The need to invest in refurbishing Lewisham Theatre.
• The transfer of ownership on a number of outdoor activity centres to a charity that is better placed to access funding to refurbish the facilities.
• The need to establish a site to house critical IT systems to ensure business continuity.
• To provide homecare services that enable an increasing number of vulnerable people to be supported in the community rather than in residential care.

1.15  The outputs from a number of recent review exercises are outlined in section 5 and some examples of where consultation has led to plan changes are given in section 2. For the coming year it has been agreed to undertake a series of area based property reviews looking at the opportunities for using operational property to support physical regeneration. This will also consider funding opportunities to facilitate rationalisation of operational property.

1.16  At the operational level the CPO is responsible for preparation of the individual DPPs and the AMP. This is delivered by officers from her service in conjunction with officers nominated by the
resource ADs from each directorate. There is also input throughout the process from the HFM, the HCP (which includes the best value performance plan and the community plan) and corporate officers who have responsibility for the capital programme and programme management.

1.17 These operational arrangements are mirrored for preparation of the CS, which is the responsibility of the HFM. Officers from her service in conjunction with officers nominated by the resource ADs from each directorate, the CPO, HCP and corporate officers with responsibility for programme management deliver this.

1.18 In a practical sense this means that the same pool of officers prepare both the CS and AMP ensuring a high degree of consistency between them. As a result we effectively operate what York Consulting in their report describe as the “vertical” management model for production of the AMP and CS.

Management of the capital strategy and asset management planning

1.19 Since his election the Mayor has appointed a cabinet including a member who has specific responsibility to oversee property issues.

1.20 The strategic framework that the Council is developing is outlined below. This provides the context within which the future development work on the AMP will proceed.

1.21 To date the CPO has considered Lewisham’s vision statement and key corporate priorities, along with the common principles taken from our Community Strategy. From these a property mission statement has been produced and developed into a set of 12 property goals and further developed into a set of 42 property objectives (shown in annex B).

1.22 The activities identified as part of the property function’s work programme during the DPP and AMP process are cross-referenced against these goals and objectives. In this way all property related activity is driven by our vision for the borough and our corporate priorities and benefits from the extensive public consultation that shapes our strategic and business planning processes.

Lewisham’s vision statement:

Together we will make Lewisham the best place in London to live, work and learn.

Key corporate priorities:

P.1. To improve the educational achievement of young people and create access to lifelong learning for all.

P.2. To challenge the traditions of service provision to secure best value services.

P.3. To support and protect vulnerable children and adults.

P.4. To connect Lewisham, its people and its businesses, to the opportunities of the 21st century through information and communications technology.

P.5. To improve the health of local people and the wider environment.
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P.6. To reduce crime levels and make Lewisham a safer place.
P.7. To modernise the governance of the Council to meet the aspirations of Lewisham people.

1.23 Following extensive discussion and consultation, seventeen of Lewisham’s key and strategic partners signed and published the first draft of the Community Plan in June 2000. The plan was born out of marrying the issues faced by the borough with the priorities expressed by those connected with it during the consultation. The community plan saw action within seven key themes as driving Lewisham towards its vision:

Community themes:

T.1. A healthy community – promoting health and well being of all residents.
T.2. A place to learn – provide quality education and learning throughout life.
T.3. A cleaner, greener Lewisham – improving the environment.
T.4. A diverse community – including everyone and celebrating different cultures.
T.5. A place you can feel safe in – reducing crime in Lewisham.
T.7. A place to work, live and relax – creating good economic, housing and recreation prospects.

1.24 Fundamental to the community plan are the common principles that the Council shares with its partners involved in its implementation:

CP.1. People first – meeting people’s aspirations and need for a safe, healthy and prosperous borough is at the heart of the community strategy. This means that the Council and its partners will be consulting local people on a regular basis to ensure that the direction of our work is right and delivering the results people want.

CP.2. Equalities – discrimination and prejudice will be challenged. The commitment of partners to the strategy is to ensure that initiatives are inclusive and serve to enhance the rich diversity of the borough.

CP.3. Partnership – the commitment is to work together to better co-ordinate existing resources as well as access new funds to show greater efficiency and effectiveness in delivery.

CP.4. Aspiring to excellence – the very best future for Lewisham rests on an commitment by all partners to excellence in all that we will do to deliver on our vision. We will constantly strive for the very best services, the best environment and the best social and economic opportunities.

1.25 From this has been derived by the CPO and endorsed by members, a property mission statement and set of property goals for the authority.

Property mission statement:

To optimise the use of property assets balancing service benefits and cost to help promote Lewisham’s values and deliver its priorities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Property goal</th>
<th>Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PG1</td>
<td>Deliver best value by demonstrating continuous improvement in the utilisation of property assets.</td>
<td>P2, P7, T3, T7, CP4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG2</td>
<td>Deliver best value by demonstrating continuous improvement in the delivery of property advisory and management services.</td>
<td>P2, P7, CP4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG3</td>
<td>Manage property so as to balance corporate priorities with local priorities for service improvement.</td>
<td>P2, P7, CP1 CP4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG4</td>
<td>Use the Council’s property assets to help secure funding to meet corporate priorities.</td>
<td>P1, P3, P4, P5, P6, P7, CP3, CP4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG5</td>
<td>Make Lewisham a safer and more pleasant place through the design and management of property.</td>
<td>P5, P6, T3, T5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG6</td>
<td>Manage Council property to promote social inclusion, foster independent living and greater access to public services.</td>
<td>P1, P3, P4, P5, P6, T2, T4, T6, T7, CP2, CP3, CP4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG7</td>
<td>Design and manage Council property to maximise the opportunities offered by information and communication technology and to meet the demands of e-government.</td>
<td>P2, P4, P7, CP2, CP3, CP4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG8</td>
<td>Increase participation of local people in the property decision-making processes.</td>
<td>P2, P7, CP1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ref. | Property goal | Link
--- | --- | ---
PG9 | Support local businesses and the creating of new enterprises to benefit Lewisham through the use of property where appropriate. | T7, CP3
PG10 | Use property assets to support the physical regeneration of the Borough. | P5, T3, T5, T7, CP3
PG11 | Exploit opportunities to share property with other public agencies. | P1, P2, P3, P5, P7, CP3
PG12 | Inform and involve members and executive officers as appropriate in the corporate property management process. | P2, P7, CP4

1.26 Partnership is a key component of Lewisham’s overall approach to service delivery and the use of valuable property assets. This is evidenced in our pragmatic mixed economy model of service provision and our specific partnerships with other service providers in the public, private and voluntary sectors:

- We have increased usage of our leisure centres by offering attractive and exciting venues and activities and secured investment using an innovative financing arrangement with the private sector. Lewisham leisure centres are benefiting from an investment of approximately £3.5 million.
- The Youth Offending Team is a cross agency partnership that includes the Council, the Police and the Probation Service that operates out of Council accommodation.
- In 2000 we closed our remaining five residential care homes and diverted resources into independent sector placements and the development of 80 new very sheltered housing places in partnership with a local housing association. Through this initiative the Council has saved at least £2 million over 3 years to invest in improving services for older people and promoting independence.
- Our green service partnership with Glendales has significantly increased investment in parks and has resulted in a 4% improvement in public satisfaction ratings.
- Long standing work is continuing with the South London and Maudsley NHS Trust to deliver integrated community mental health services. This includes the commissioning, jointly with our health partners, of Family Health ISIS to provide services to people of African and African Caribbean heritage with severe mental health needs.

1.27 Within the Council it is the responsibility of the FAMG to encourage shared use of property where appropriate. This is achieved by challenging the use of property when receiving reports on property review exercises and as part of the DPP process.

1.28 As an example our office accommodation is treated as a corporate resource and in a number of cases the use of neighbourhood housing offices is now shared with social care.

2. Consultation

2.1 Public consultation and its twin discipline of partner working are ingrained in the culture of Lewisham. Therefore in producing our various property plans the issue is not necessarily the need to undertake specific consultation but rather how to gather and make sense of the extensive data that is already available.

2.2 The methodology that we use to achieve this is to integrate property planning within our rigorous strategic and business planning processes. In this way business planning decisions and resource allocation flow from the same source and reflect a common set of themes and priorities. The link between our corporate themes and the use and management of property services are described above in section 1.
2.3 In this way the use of our property is shaped through extensive consultation; at a corporate level; as part of directorate and service strategy and business planning; and, where appropriate as part of local decision making.

2.4 The conduits for this consultation are many and various and the AMP process takes advantage of all of them. For example:

- Following the election of our Mayor the Council has begun the process of revising the current set of corporate priorities and the business planning process. As this work progresses it will be used to inform the review of our property goals and objectives.
- The Local Strategic Partnership (LSP) established in 2001 has 20 members from the public, private, voluntary and community sectors and currently meets monthly. It has been accredited by GOL and is drafting both the community strategy and neighbourhood renewal strategy.
- Since 1997 a Citizen’s Panel of 1,000 local residents has been regularly consulted by telephone survey or consultation events. The panel is jointly commissioned with the University Hospital Lewisham (and independently facilitated) and it seeks actively to engage citizens on service delivery issues. Recent examples of consultation topics include:
  - Proposals for secondary school places in the borough and a new sixth form centre.
  - Modernisation of the library service (the panel rejected proposals for a small number of ‘super libraries’ in favour of a two tier service with local libraries remaining open).
- As part of the office rationalisation implementation, the moves team carries out consultation with staff on individual office moves. This has resulted in a number of changes to the programme to support service requirements. For example the decision to relocate the children and family service into Laurence House and the reprogramming of refurbishment work to Capital House.

2.5 As social care and health services become increasingly integrated a joint approach to asset management with our health partners has been identified as a central component of our future investment plans and priorities. To this end we have established a joint working group of relevant officers to explore the opportunities for exploiting property.

2.6 To take this further, building on our existing partnership with the local PCT the Police have now expressed an interest in joining the group. We are also in discussion with the Fire Brigade about joining the initiative.

2.7 An early success for this joint approach is the decision, in principle, with the Police, to jointly market adjoining properties in Ladywell that will shortly become surplus. It is intended that this will support out regenerative objectives for the area.

2.8 This consultation is reinforced by use of the Council standards and guidance. For example:

- Our standard for carrying out best value reviews requires that appropriate consultation be undertaken and that the review includes an options appraisal that identifies resource implications – hence creating a direct link between consultation and the use of property.
- The bidding criteria for the capital programme requires that individual projects are linked to a service strategy; that an options appraisal has been carried out; and that the property implications were identified in the appropriate DPP.

2.9 The principle tool for picking up the property implications from this consultation is the DPP/AMP process that interrogates relevant best value reviews, service and business plans, relevant performance information, property review exercises and the outcome of relevant public consultation not already covered.

2.10 To ensure continuous improvement in the way we manage property, during May the EDR/DCE convened an away day for the members of FAMG and other officers with responsibility for property and project management. The purpose of the day was to consider how to further develop asset management planning in Lewisham.

2.11 The outputs from the day were:
• Agreement to a model for developing the asset management discipline that places property within a wider resource planning framework.
• Establishment of a programme of projects to deliver that model.
• That FAMG should act as the reporting body for this programme.

2.12 Work on delivery plans for individual projects is now underway and these will be actioned over the coming months as a part of our strategic action plan for the coming year and progress will be reported in future AMPs.

2.13 One of the key objectives for this review is to examine present arrangements for public consultation within the AMP process and to consider options for making more explicit the links between consultation and the use of property.

3. Data management

3.1 Basic and core data for all Council owned property with the exception of the housing stock are held on a property database system called Landmaster. The system has now been live for 18 months and has been used for asset management purposes since 2001/02. The system was procured following corporate project management procedures involving a tendering process using an output based specification. This specification was based on an assessment of future data requirements. Landmaster did not fit all of the criteria and an additional system, Establish Enterprise, has been purchased which records and manages property condition information.

3.2 The original data capture exercise used manual records and ad hoc computerised records as a source. It was recognised at the time that there were gaps in this information, both in regard to the extent of ownership and corporate responsibility. Over the past two years the data has been validated and corrected as a result of the following exercises:

• Annual revaluations for capital accounting purposes with cross referencing to the capital accounting system.
• Collection of performance information from departments for the annual AMPs

3.3 Further validation is now taking place as the records are both digitally mapped using the Council’s Geographical Information System (GIS), and cross referenced to the local land and property gazetteer. This exercise is key to using the data in connection with e-Government. It is planned to use this referencing as a means to link different data sets.

3.4 The Corporate ICT Board (a cross directorate officer group chaired by the Executive Director of Resources overseeing ICT strategy and investment) confirmed on 12th December 2000 that the existing referencing used for the GIS property polygons satisfied the requirements for the corporate UPRN in AMP terms, subject to the planned review when the NLPG is complete. This referencing has been incorporated into Landmaster as a secondary reference. The Board also agreed to centralise property data management along with the GIS in the Property and Development section. This section is accountable to the CPO. Integration of this data with financial information remains outstanding and has been identified as an issue in the Discovery Project. It now forms part of one of bids for funding resulting from this project.

3.5 Since its introduction, the Landmaster system, has been adapted, in consultation with property managers, so as to maintain a record of all the data required to measure the performance of the portfolio. This information has been gathered using spreadsheets created by the system.

3.6 Intermediate data relating to property condition is held on a parallel system, Establish Enterprise. This system takes its core data from Landmaster in order to maintain data integrity. Currently data has been gathered for schools following full property surveys while information for the remainder has been derived from existing information on file and is kept in spreadsheet format cross referenced against Establish. The information on the spreadsheet is the fed into the AMP. It is
planned to extend the full surveys to all of the estate as soon as funding is available and then produce all condition and maintenance data from Establish. An analysis of this data is set out in section 6.

3.7 Other intermediate data such as usage and lease details have been captured and entered onto Landmaster.

3.8 The property systems have been reviewed during 2001/2 with a report to the FAMG on 16th November 2001. As part of the programme of necessary improvements it was agreed that construction and property maintenance functionality should use Establish. This will include Health and Safety, Asbestos Register, management of capital projects and works ordering. The implication of this is that a series of smaller systems are being replaced by the larger multi functional Establish. Landmaster is being retained as the core system because of its functionality (including key property management functions not available in Establish), flexibility and ease of use.

3.9 Training requirements have proved to be minimal and have generally centred on day to day usage of Establish and programming of Landmaster's report writing utility.

4. Performance management and monitoring

4.1 The FAMG is responsible for the strategic management of the Council's property assets. As outlined in its terms of reference (annex A) the group comments on standing reports produced by the CPO before they are reported to the Mayor and Cabinet.

4.2 On 28 June 2002 the CPO submitted a report to FAMG on; the results of the national and local performance indicators; property services benchmarking; key issues identified as part of the DPP process; an action plan for the property function and the draft AMP. The report and AMP were then reported to the Mayor and Cabinet on 17 July 2002.

4.3 Section 6 of the AMP shows the results of the national and local performance indicators.

4.4 The FAMG is responsible for high level monitoring of the Council's overall financial position, including matching of the disposal and capital programmes. The performance of the capital programme is reported quarterly to the Mayor and Cabinet.

4.5 The table in section 6 shows the links between our local performance indicators and our property goals and objectives. These in turn have been derived directly from the Council's corporate objectives. Local indicator 2 records space utilisation, local indicator 5 records surplus property and local indicator 9 suitability.

4.6 Lewisham has a mature asset disposal process and over the last few years we have reviewed all major categories of property as part of our asset management processes. This rigour ensures that we have very little surplus property.

4.7 Since 1997 the Council's valuation and estates service has been benchmarked as part of the Association of Chief Estates Surveyors and Property Managers in Local Government (ACES) London branch benchmarking club. This information is reported annually by the CPO to the FAMG.

4.8 In terms of construction services, Lewisham identified a lack of appropriate benchmarking clubs and was instrumental in setting up the London Authorities’ Construction and Property Benchmarking Club. Nick Raynsford MP launched this in January 2002. The club is working in partnership with DTI and Building Software Ltd to develop effective construction performance indicators and these will be incorporated into our established reporting processes as they come on stream.

4.9 As described in section 2 the EDR/DCE convened an away day for the members of FAMG and officers with responsibility for property and project management to further develop asset management planning in Lewisham. One of the key objectives from the day is to consider options for making more explicit the links between consultation and the use of property. An officer group has
been established to look into this issue and one of its tasks is to look at developing performance indicators for consultation.

4.10 The Council’s current estimate of the backlog of property investment needs is shown below. The investment required for housing represents the cost of bringing all homes up to the decent homes standard, which at the moment 35% meet.

- Housing: £554m
- Other property assets: £107m

4.11 In a number of reports over several years members have been informed of the position with the maintenance backlog. Most recently the AMGP submitted a report to the FAMG on 16 November 2001 addressing the maintenance backlog for the non-housing estate. The report outlined the need for updated condition data to better inform the backlog situation. The report recommended a corporate strategy for condition surveys and data capture based upon a rolling 10 year programme. This was reported to Executive Committee on 27 February 2002 as part of the quarterly financial report. Executive committee approved the continuous allocation of funds in 2003/04 in accordance with asset management planning principles, and the rolling subsequent programme subject to assessment of the first year survey results and the other competing priority funding bids.

5. Programme and plan development and implementation

5.1 Lewisham has a rigorous corporate process for identifying its property need and prioritising investment decisions. In overview:

- Asset performance, investment need and opportunities for rationalisation are identified through the DPP and a parallel process of property reviews.
- This information has been used in preparing our three-year capital programme and in the formulation of a disposal programme that identifies potential sales over several years.
- Our systems ensure that decisions to invest are taken corporately based on option appraisals and, if appropriate, feasibility studies and the preparation of a detailed business case.
- Clear links to corporate objectives provide the basis for prioritisation decisions and post implementation reviews.

5.2 A DPP identifies the property implications of departmental service plans and ensures that property planning is linked to service planning. It is prepared from data collected via the service directorates and reflects relevant best value reviews, service and business plans and relevant performance information. In particular it identifies:

- Changes to service delivery giving rise to property implications over three timeframes.
- Decisions to invest in particular buildings.
- Plans for major repairs, redevelopment and PFI schemes.
- Plans to meet corporate property policies and standards, e.g. to undertake asbestos surveys, condition surveys, improving disabled access.
- Specific space and quality standards that relate to the service area.
- Vacant floor space and proposed plans for the space.
- Buildings due to be vacated and proposed plans.
- Buildings shared with partners.

5.3 In parallel with the DPP process, over the last few years the Council has completed a programme of property reviews and identified courses of action for each category of asset. Details of these and our preferred options for the future are given below.

5.4 From these processes we identify investment need, which is then prioritised by the FAMG. There is no delegation of authority on capital projects and both the other services capital programme (OSCP) and the housing investment programme (HIP) have formal bidding processes.
5.5 For the OSCP all projects are corporately vetted by the FAMG before being recommended to the Mayor and Cabinet for approval as part of the budgeting process. All bids are assessed against the following criteria:

- Identification of the service need that is being supported by the project.
- An options appraisal that considers; keeping the status quo; the preferred option; and any other option that reasonably should be considered. Feasibility studies are undertaken by service directorates as part of the options appraisal, as appropriate.
- The revenue, capital, service and property implications of the project.
- That the project has been flagged up in the appropriate DPP

5.6 Bids are ranked against corporate objectives by the FAMG and prioritised accordingly.

5.7 Housing schemes are assessed in two categories: essential works and comprehensive regeneration

5.8 Essential works cover; unavoidable work required to the structure or principle service of a building where there is an immediate, major risk to personal safety; where a building is or may become uninhabitable; to meet statutory minimum safety standards; or the maintenance of essential existing services e.g. water, lifts. Such work, by definition must be attended to and is funded and carried out as it is identified.

5.9 For comprehensive regeneration works, on an annual basis bids are invited for appropriate schemes. Feasibility studies are undertaken and the bids assessed against four criteria:

- Their contribution to achieving the decent homes standard.
- The spending profile – this is to allow better financial management of the programme.
- Evidence that the scheme provides value for money.
- The results of resident consultation.

5.10 The FAMG is responsible for high level monitoring of the Council’s overall financial position on capital funding, for both OSCP and HIP and produces a quarterly budget report to Mayor and Cabinet.

5.11 A report was made to the Council’s then Executive Committee on 27 February 2002 updating the position on the three-year capital programme and earmarking resources to various schemes. The report included a forecast of receipts as follows:

- 2002/3: £16m
- 2003/4: £8.6m
- 2004/5: £6.4m

5.12 The FAMG has the responsibility for matching the disposal and capital programmes. To support it there is an operational team of property, legal, finance, housing and planning officers that meets on a monthly basis. The team reviews and monitors progress on the disposal programme and timing of receipts and its work feeds into the quarterly budget report.

5.13 All large projects are implemented according to the Council’s standard for project management that requires the use of output measures and post completion review. The use of the standard also ensures that resource-needs are identified at the outset of a project, risks are identified, controls are in place and responsibility is allocated to specific officers within a corporate monitoring framework. The project plan is reviewed by the appropriate directorate project review group (PRG), which monitors the directorate capital schemes within the overall programme.

5.14 The Corporate Project Board (CPB), represented by the chairs of the PRG and senior officers from corporate finance, legal and property is responsible for; overall stewardship of the programme; reviewing progress on all projects of over £500k and those of over £100k of a high risk, high impact
nature. It monitors schemes against time and cost indicators and ensures that programme management arrangements conform to the standard.

5.15 A key part of the programme management standard is the post completion review, carried out by an independent officer, who evaluates the programme in both service, quality and finance outcomes against the original objectives. Reviews involve consultation with service users and help to inform future programmes and strategies.

5.16 As a result of the Council’s various reviews a general approach to investment has been developed for each category of property and these are outlined below. Implementation of these is dependent on a number of factors:

- It is expected that our new Mayor will wish to review our corporate priorities and this will influence investment decisions.
- We currently face a particular budget pressure around the area of children’s placements that in the short term will have an impact on capital spend and investment decisions.
- Within the strategy for each property type individual investment decisions are subject to our normal funding regimes. This means feasibility studies, option appraisals and business cases will have to be completed for individual investment decisions.

5.17 For these reasons it is simply not possible to produce a definitive action plan for our portfolio over a three to five year horizon. What the rest of section 5 demonstrates is that we have rigorously examined our portfolio identifying the pressures to invest. For each category of property we have considered our options and have a clear strategy to deliver the required investment. These strategies constitute our strategic action plan and include links to our property goals and objectives.

5.18 **Offices:** The office rationalisation strategy rests on extensive research and consultation:

- In March 1998 a two-stage staff consultation exercise (questionnaire of 1,300 office staff and semi-structured interviews with key managers) examined attitudes to new work methods.
- During 1998 a pilot best value review of the corporate estate looked at likely developments in Council services and the demands on the corporate estate – including funding issues.
- Also during 1998 a second pilot best value review looked into the unification of housing and council tax benefits and the establishment of a second-generation one stop shop (which became known as ACCESSpoint). This involved extensive public consultation on attitudes to the use of new technology in service provision.
- Early in 1999 an occupancy survey tracked the activity at almost 2,000 workstations over a two-week period.

5.19 In early 2000 members agreed a rationalisation programme exploiting a strategy that in broad outline is based on a number of principals:

- Implementation depends on ongoing work to identity and justify investment on a case by case basis and that as a general rule the rationalisation must be self financing. To achieve this we try to link the rationalisation with area regeneration to access funding.
- The integrated workplace strategy – that to fully utilise new work methods it is necessary to consider the workplace in terms of three interconnected domains:
  - The design and layout of work settings.
  - ICT that supports voice and data communication between work settings.
  - Work processes and opportunities for process reengineering.
- Where appropriate public contact should exploit new technology, in particular the development of ACCESSpoint.
- That more sophisticated work methods will tend to require more investment but will tend to result in the release of most property.

5.20 To exploit these links with new work methods the rationalisation strategy was designed to be flexible and to take advantage of investment in new ICT and other initiatives as they came on stream.
One of the key milestones in this programme occurred in 2001 when we established CALLpoint. This involved centralising four telephone centres/switches into a 100-agent call centre that utilises new technology to deliver new access routes to services.

The first phase of the rationalisation has been successfully completed and has released almost 10% of space. This has been done by a general “tidying up” of office use and the introduction in a number of areas of team working environments. Implementation is carried out by the moves team under the direction of the CPO. This group conducts staff consultation on each move.

This process has also supported a number of major re-structuring exercises:

- All children and family services offered by Social Care & Health are now delivered from Laurence House rather than four sites as previously.
- The office rationalisation has facilitated the centralisation of the personnel recruitment unit; payroll; and, accounts payable.

At the same time there has been considerable investment in ICT and related areas that can now be used to introduce more sophisticated work environments and so drive the next phase of rationalisation.

One of the principal tools to deliver this is our partnership with KPMG and ICL/Fujitsu to re-engineer business processes around new technology, both to increase accessibility and to realise efficiency savings.

The ‘Discovery’ phase of the project – involving hundreds of staff in interviews and workshops – generated more than 60 outline business cases for projects to improve the way we deliver services to our customers and partner organisations. Projects selected for implementation include e-learning for staff, improvements in IT to support remote access and flexible working, and information management.

Over the coming few years a number of projects will be pursued to deliver the office rationalisation and associated service and regenerative benefits:

- By the end of 2002 a second ACCESSpoint will be established in Deptford to serve the northern part of the Borough.
- During the next year the office and other staff from Downham Depot will be relocated to allow the site to be sold as part of the Downham Lifestyles Centre PFI.
- Asbestos removal and refurbishment of Capital House will be completed within 18 months. At the same time a final decision will be taken on exercising the lease break-clause in 2006.
- Over the next year, subject to funding, the business cases for the selected discovery projects will be worked up and delivery plans prepared and actioned. These will be co-ordinated through FAMG to ensure property rationalisation opportunities are identified and exploited.
- Catford Centre – negotiations will continue with the owner of the Centre to relocate our main ACCESSpoint and a library out of our preferred back office building. This will support the regeneration of Catford as a commercial centre, make our front line services more accessible and improve the efficiency of the office estate.
- Area regeneration – as the first stage in a series of comprehensive area regeneration projects, design guidance and supplementary planning advise is being prepared for two areas: Forest Hill and Deptford, with a third probably to follow later this year: for Catford. We will then look to rationalise our property holdings as part of the implementation of the emerging regeneration strategies for each area.

Links to the Council’s property goals: PG1, PG3, PG4, PG7, PG8, PG12.

Depots: as part of our programme to review the use of all Council assets, the depots review commenced in 2000.
5.30 Three of the smaller park depots were handed over to the Council’s external parks contractor, leaving 3 principal depots; Downham, Silver Road and Wearside. Downham Depot is due to be released in March 2003 as part of Downham Lifestyles Centre PFI and the functions relocated to a smaller depot in Sydenham. This is possible as a result of changes in the delivery of the building repairs service, with more emphasis on mobile communications and just in time provision of stores. Work to release space at Sydenham to accommodate these functions has commenced and is due to complete this year.

5.31 Silver Road depot is due to be released this year for development of the neighbouring Sundermead housing estate and the transport and engineering functions will be consolidated into the Council’s last main depot at Wearside.

5.32 One of the drivers of the depots review was a long term wish to release the Council’s depot at Wearside for redevelopment as it is centrally located and a possible residential development site. As part of the options appraisal, the Council sent out a questionnaire to all key waste management and environmental service players, and held an open afternoon to present its ideas including that of a possible partnership to develop a depot and provide environmental services from it. The position will be reviewed in the light of the availability of alternative sites and changing values in this part of the borough. An obvious alternative depot site has been identified however it is unlikely to be available in the short to medium term and it is anticipated that land values may rise due to the East London Line Extension, which could make the alternative site a residential development opportunity. It is proposed that Members are advised of the medium term options and asked to comment on their priorities given the potential redevelopment opportunities at both of the sites.

5.33 Links to the Council’s property goals: PG1, PG3, PG4, PG8, PG10, PG12.

5.34 Sports: the sports strategy review arose out of a need to integrate sports into the Council’s Creative Lewisham agenda. In January 2002, the Council held a launch event to identify and discuss issues around sports provision in the borough. This was attended by representative from sports users, clubs, members, coaches and officials, community groups, schools, service providers, contractors and council departments.

5.35 Following the launch, the Council embarked on a comprehensive consultation process entitled Spotlight on Sport. This provided an opportunity to review the existing Sports Development strategy produced in 1999, to assess progress made against it and to identify the way forward to ensure the delivery of effective, accessible and high quality sporting opportunities and services. The process focussed on working in partnership to achieve the Council’s vision, and the service directorate’s three overall objectives. Four main aims were identified.

5.36 Against each of the four aims, the Council, in consultation with stakeholders, has identified a number of objectives, all of which have been broken down into:

- Key activities.
- Outcomes, including the identification of gaps in provision and action to ensure user demands are met.
- Performance indicators to ensure progress is made, e.g. in the case of the above example, the percentage of user needs met.

5.37 A number of the key activities relate directly to assets, examples of which are shown below:

- Audit existing facilities: usage, charges, standards and accessibility.
- Map existing and potential user needs against current provision to identify any gaps.
- Produce a facilities development plan outlining how any gaps may be addressed and the resources required.
- Work in partnership with service providers to ensure facilities are well maintained.
5.38 Cross cutting issues considered include voluntary clubs and agencies, focus sports, training and employment, regeneration, health, schools, coaches and officials, gifted and talented performers, disabled participants, quality standards of service providers and social inclusion.

5.39 The draft five year strategy (2002 – 2007) has now gone back to stakeholders for comments. Implementation of the draft strategy will be subject to the Council’s standard processes for stakeholder consultation, executive and Member endorsement and capital/revenue bidding.

5.40 Links to property goals: PG1, PG3, PG8, PG12.

5.41 **Investment property:** evidence of poor performance prompted a review of the benefits of retaining the industrial estate portfolio. A review of the performance of the estates was undertaken, and the options for their future reported to the appropriate officer group in December 1998.

5.42 The review highlighted the difficulty of retaining the portfolio for what might be seen as a peripheral activity, and the problems experienced in maintaining effective estate management whilst ensuring public accountability. It also identified the positive income effect of property held in the HRA, which holds down residential rents to more affordable levels.

5.43 Advice was sought from inward investment, legal and finance officers and consultation undertaken with key members. Following this recommendations were made for an outright disposal rather than any partnership/equity sharing options.

5.44 The outcomes of the review were

- To sell the portfolio with the exception of income producing HRA property, all HRA estate-based property and property that was part of future site assembly.
- To undertake a review of the remainder of the investment portfolio. This was reported to the relevant corporate group in December 1999 & January 2000.

5.45 To date, the key industrial estates have been successfully sold whilst other assets are being made ready to sell as and when the capital programme needs the receipt.

5.46 Links to property goals: PG1, PG2, PG3, PG4, PG12.

5.47 **Garages:** following resident concern at the condition and under utilisation of a number of blocks of garages, a cross directorate team of officers was set up to survey all garage blocks and identify options for their future.

5.48 The aims of the review were to:

- Reduce the number of garages to meet demand levels.
- Improve the physical environment of the garage blocks.
- Generate capital receipts.

5.49 However, alternative uses were not always easy to identify due to access problems, and the blocks are often located close to residential areas.

5.50 Following consultation with local residents a report was submitted to the then Executive Committee in October 2000 and a portfolio of blocks was declared surplus. These were then divided into:

- Those that can be sold on the open market.
- Those to be sold to a selected RSL.
- Those required as part of an estate renewal scheme.
- Those to be demolished and landscaped.
5.51 A further portfolio is now being considered that have more complex estate management issues, and local residents are now being consulted on this second tranche. Depending on the outcome of the consultation it is hoped that this second tranche could be available for disposal within the next 18 months.

5.52 Links to property goals: PG1, PG3, PG4, PG12.

5.53 **Leisure:** the Council has committed itself to ensuring the best possible use of its leisure facilities, together with improvements in service delivery by increasing community involvement and seeking opportunities for service development, inward investment and innovation.

5.54 In 1998 a best value pilot review resulted in the drafting of the Local Leisure Plan and Arts and Recreation Strategy. This proposed inviting tenders for an investment partner to take on a management contract of our leisure centres under a PFI type deal.

5.55 Following a public consultation exercise members agreed to the transfer of Crofton Leisure Centre (dual use facility) to Crofton School, together with the closure of the Lewisham Lions Centre. It was also agreed to invite tenders from potential investment partners to take a management contract, or a preferred bidder to negotiate a PFI, for the operation of five of our centres.

5.56 **The outcome of the exercise was to:**

- Award a ten year management contract to a leisure partner to operate three facilities. The contract requires the partner to invest significantly in the service and to upgrade the facilities.
- Two other facilities are the subject of shorter, five year management contracts with the same partner but with the Council retaining responsibility for the fabric of the buildings. The long-term future of these facilities is being considered as part of regeneration initiatives for their locations.
- The Downham Lifestyles PFI project will include further wet and dry leisure facilities.

5.57 **Care Homes:** this review arose out of a desire to improve the standard of care to the elderly & reduce running costs. A Best Value review had identified higher than average running costs for the care for the elderly in residential homes and day centres, and this coincided with the need to invest in the portfolio following changes in space standard regulations.

5.58 The investment required was to be funded by savings in running costs by way of a PFI contract, and an officer team was assembled to implement this.

5.59 As the review got underway, changes to the way care is provided, a greater emphasis being placed on domiciliary rather than residential care and changes in local conditions, meant that in fact more homes were closed and the remaining investment was achieved by way of a sale to a RSL.

5.60 Before any decisions were undertaken, detailed consultation took place at regular intervals with the families in care, special interest groups, staff and key members.

5.61 Due to the sensitivity of the subject, members were kept fully advised throughout the project period by way of regular reports/updates.

5.62 The outcomes of the review were:

- Out of seven homes and two separate day centres, five homes have been closed and two rebuilt.
- The two new homes are being built by a new provider with the Council retaining the land and they incorporate two day centres.
- The Council only funds the care element of the costs for clients placed in new homes.
- More specialist care is available from a new charitable provider so an additional replacement home was not required for people with mental health.
- Of the other five homes, one was sold to a RSL for off site provision in connection with an estate renewal, another is in temporary use as a hostel for the homeless, another will be used to
accommodate a new pupil referral unit (which in turn releases an out of borough special school for disposal), another will be used as a new school for children with disabilities (releasing a current site for use as temporary decant space as part of the schools PFI programme) and the last will be divided with part being sold and the other part being incorporated into the adjoining school to increase playground provision.

5.63 Links to property goals: PG1, PG2, PG3, PG4, PG8, PG11, PG12.

5.64 Libraries: following the introduction of the requirement to produce an annual library plan the Council instructed consultants to review the future of the service. This resulted in 1999 with draft proposals to focus investment in a small number of ‘super libraries’, the closure of two libraries and the relocation of a third.

5.65 Following extensive public consultation this plan was amended in favour of a package of investment to retain local libraries as part of a two tier service. This has been funded from the capital programme and so far seven of our twelve libraries have had works carried out. For the remaining five facilities the intentions are as follows:

- Three of the sites are part of comprehensive regeneration initiatives for their location. Work is continuing at the moment on how best to secure investment for each facility within the context of these initiatives. Funding has not at this stage been identified and this is considered to be the key driver.
- A fourth library is housed within a listed building that is the subject of a project to secure investment. From work to date the preferred option that is being pursued is to fund investment through a heritage lottery bid.
- The final library is part of the Downham Lifestyles PFI project.

5.66 Links to property goals: PG1, PG2, PG4, PG6, PG7, PG8, PG10, PG11.

5.67 The final element of our strategic action plan relates to proposals to further develop our approach to asset management planning following the away day convened by the EDR/DCE for members of FAMG.

5.68 As a result of the day a programme of five projects has been established to look at the following issues:

- Business planning – how we can further strengthen the links between asset management and our strategic and business planning processes.
- Property review – how to take forward our programme of property reviews, in particular exploring the links with regeneration initiatives.
- IT strategy.
- Re-thinking Construction – examining how best to develop out response to the Re-Thinking Construction agenda and embedding it into our asset management process.
- Performance indicators – will further develop our range of performance indicators and rationalise the processes for collecting base data.

5.69 An initial scoping exercise for each project will be completed by the end of July and these will be reported to FAMG during August. It is envisaged that the programme will run over several years.

6. Performance Information

6.1 The national Performance Indicators are set out below.

6.2 National Performance Indicators 1A & 1B:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>Operational</th>
<th>Non-operational (general)</th>
<th>Non-operational (surplus property)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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### 6.3 National Performance Indicators 2-5:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>Industrial portfolio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>Retail portfolio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Agricultural portfolio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>£19.06</td>
<td>Operational property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>£28.65</td>
<td>Non-operational property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>£6.68</td>
<td>Repairs and maintenance costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>£7.18</td>
<td>Energy costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>£3.23</td>
<td>Water costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.0572 tonnes per sq. m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO2 emissions. Please see the note at para. 6.4 below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>Cost predictability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>Time predictability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.4 The borough currently reports zero carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions for electricity usage due to its 100% ‘green’ electricity contracts, on which Lewisham is a national leader. As a consequence of the increasing profile of global warming, new government legislation such as the renewables obligation has created immense demand for green electricity over the last two years. Energy suppliers have informed the borough that they are unlikely to be able to supply 100% green electricity from April 2003 and thus CO2 emissions reported are likely to increase, rather than improve in 2003.

### 6.5 Local Performance Indicators:

### 6.6 As described in section 1, the Council’s property goals and objectives have been derived directly from the Council’s vision and key corporate priorities. In this way, they flow directly from corporate objectives. The links shown below between the LPIs and the property goals and objectives therefore illustrate the link to corporate objectives. The property goals and objectives are displayed in full in Annex B.

### 6.7 Definitions for the local performance indicators are provided in Annex C.
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Area per occupant</td>
<td>31.18 sq. metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Running costs per occupant</td>
<td>£2253.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Maintenance &amp; repair costs per metre square</td>
<td>£6.68 per sq. metre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Percentage of vacant floor-space by Directorate:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education and Culture</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Care and Health</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regeneration</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>No of properties shared with other agencies, by Directorate:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education and Culture</td>
<td>66 properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Care and Health</td>
<td>9 properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regeneration</td>
<td>7 properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>3 properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85 properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Property costs for the service as a percentage of NRB</td>
<td>2.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>No of directorate staff involved in property management as a percentage of the number of managed properties:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education and Culture</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Care and Health</td>
<td>0.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regeneration</td>
<td>0.046%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>1.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Asset suitability:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rank A = Good</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rank B = Satisfactory</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rank C= Poor</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rank D = Bad</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Asset sufficiency:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rank A = Good</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rank B = Satisfactory</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank C = Poor</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank D = Bad</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex A
Terms of Reference – Finance and Asset Management Group

REVENUE

- Coordination of Budget strategy and revenue budget process ensuring robust links to the Council’s overarching community strategy/corporate plan and BVPP
- Monitoring of the Resource Allocation review recommendation from PAC
- High Level monitoring of Council’s overall revenue position (GF, HRA and trading areas)
- Develop accounting policies and framework and ensure consistent application eg Best Value accounting, capital accounting, internal market etc
- Develop and implement a financial systems strategy council wide, maximising use of interfaces and reducing manual and duplicated processes, to ensure continuous improvement in services within a reducing resource base

CAPITAL

- Coordination and prioritisation of capital allocation process (OSCP) including bidding where appropriate, ensuring links with Council’s capital strategy and AMP (see below)
- Allocation of corporate funds eg feasibility, match funding and emergency repairs
- High level monitoring of Council’s overall financial position on Capital, both OSCP and HIP,
- Establishment and monitoring of asset disposal programme, including use of Regeneration receipts to lever in external funding

ASSET MANAGEMENT

- To be responsible for the strategic management of the Council’s property assets.
- Co-ordinate and oversee the production of the Capital Strategy and AMP ensuring they appropriately reflect corporate priorities as set out in the community plan and the corporate strategy as it is developed.
- To comment upon the draft ‘standing reports’ to be produced by the Executive Director for Resources and Deputy Chief Executive (EDR & DCE)/Corporate Property Officer (CPO) in relation to strategic property issues before they are reported to EMT and Executive Committee as appropriate.
- Promote the shared use and/or co-location of property within the Council and with other organisations.
- Promote a performance culture in relation to the use of property and the delivery of property services.
- Oversee the implementation of the “BVR of the Corporate Estates” recommendations

RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE CPO

On an annual basis to produce the following ‘standing reports’:

- A Directorate Property Plan for each Directorate.
- A draft AMP.
- A report on the performance of the property portfolio (excluding schools and the housing stock) and property services, to include the outcome of stakeholder consultation.
- A draft work plan for the corporate property function including a programme of property reviews.
OTHER

- Act as the “Audit client group” for agreeing the internal audit work programme on an annual basis and receiving six monthly monitoring and evaluation reports thereafter
- Report to EMT on a six monthly basis on the workings of the group

Membership - Core group

Julie Bennett (Chair)       Janet Senior
Rob Whiteman               Steve Gough
Caroline Mikardo           Pat Parker
Barrie Neal

Supported By:


For Asset Management Planning and Capital discussions:-

Additional members:-

Emma Peters (HIP)
Property - Ken Platt (AMP – Property Services)
Property – John Cornish (AMP – Property & Development)
Property – James Oates (AMP – Property & Development)
Adam Barrett – Group Mgr – Capital and Treasury
## Annex B

### Lewisham’s property objectives alongside the goals to which they relate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property goal</th>
<th>Property objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **PG1** Deliver best value by demonstrating continuous improvement in the utilisation of property assets. | **PO1** Further develop the system of local performance indicators to include all property assets.  
**PO2** Systematically and continuously analyse the performance of the property portfolio.  
**PO3** Set annual performance improvement targets and establish an appropriate monitoring and reporting system for property assets including:  
- cost  
- condition  
- suitability  
- sufficiency  
**PO4** Update and continuously review the corporate property manual and terms of reference of property related officer groups in relation to property utilisation.  
**PO5** Examine alternative forms of core service provision to ensure that the Council’s property costs are minimised, including space sharing, new work methods and PPP.  
**PO6** Reduce property holdings to the minimum necessary to support the Council’s service and financial objectives.  
**PO7** Develop quality systems and tools in relation to the use of property. |
| **PG2** Deliver best value by demonstrating continuous improvement in the delivery of property advisory and management services. | **PO8** Review and develop the system of performance indicators for construction and property management services.  
**PO9** Set annual performance improvement targets for construction and property management services and establish an appropriate monitoring and reporting system.  
**PO10** Update and continuously review the corporate property manual and terms of reference of property related officer groups including roles and responsibilities in relation to construction and property management.  
**PO11** Develop quality systems and tools in relation to construction and property management services. |
<p>| <strong>PG3</strong> Manage property and investment decisions so as to balance corporate priorities with local priorities | <strong>PO12</strong> Maintain an understanding of the property needs of service departments. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property goal</th>
<th>Property objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| for service improvement. | **PO13** Develop appropriate performance measures and decision criteria to inform corporate prioritisation in the use of property.  
**PO14** Update and continuously review the corporate property manual and terms of reference of property related officer groups in relation to the corporate use of property.  
**PO15** Hold property records to support good corporate management of the corporate estate. |
| **PG4** Use the Council’s property assets to help secure funding to meet corporate priorities. | **PO16** Systematically and continuously analyse the performance of the property portfolio to identify disposal opportunities.  
**PO17** Maximise the useable receipts from disposals.  
**PO18** Co-ordinate the timing of sales with allocations under the capital programme.  
**PO19** Use property in support of external funding applications. |
| **PG5** Make Lewisham a safer and more pleasant place through the design and management of property. | **PO20** Comply with all health and safety requirements.  
**PO21** Seek out and exploit every opportunity to improve the environmental sustainability of Council property.  
**PO22** Reduce the Council’s backlog of repair liabilities.  
**PO23** Improve the fabric of buildings and the quality of design, build and refurbishment.  
**PO24** Improve the security and environment provided in and around Council property by the management of property wherever possible. |
| **PG6** Manage Council property to promote social inclusion and greater access to public services. | **PO25** Manage Council property to promote social inclusion.  
**PO26** To design and manage property to be accessible to people with special needs or mobility problems. |
| **PG7** Design and manage Council property to maximise the opportunities offered by information and communication technology and to meet the demands of e-government. | **PO27** Consider the suitability of Council property to support information and communication technology.  
**PO28** So far as practical make property information available electronically and via the intranet.  
**PO29** Update and continuously review the corporate property manual and terms of reference of property related officer groups in relation to the corporate use of property. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property goal</th>
<th>Property objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Property related officer groups to exploit information and communication technology. | PO30 Update and continuously review the corporate property manual and terms of reference of property related officer groups to include stakeholder consultation wherever appropriate.  
PO31 Explicitly consider and report on the outcome of stakeholder consultation as part of the asset management planning process. |
| Increase participation of local people in the property decision-making processes. | PO32 Use site development and refurbishment to attract business.  
PO33 Encourage, wherever feasible, the letting of Council property to local businesses or new enterprises.  
PO34 Maintain information on the availability of commercial property within the Borough, Council and non-Council owned. |
| Support local businesses and the creating of new enterprises to benefit Lewisham through the use of property where appropriate. | PO35 Consider the implications on Council property of all major regeneration projects.  
PO36 Manage and dispose of property to support the physical regeneration of the Borough.  
PO37 Provide appropriate support to the delivery of regeneration projects including the management of consultants. |
| Use property assets to support the physical regeneration of the Borough. | PO38 Develop relationships with public agencies active in the Borough.  
PO39 Identify the property holdings of public agencies.  
PO40 Consider the opportunities for and implications of cross agency working.  
PO41 Identify Council property that is used or might be suitable for use by external partners. |
| Exploit opportunities to share property with other public agencies. | PO38 Develop relationships with public agencies active in the Borough.  
PO39 Identify the property holdings of public agencies.  
PO40 Consider the opportunities for and implications of cross agency working.  
PO41 Identify Council property that is used or might be suitable for use by external partners. |
| Inform and involve members and executive officers as appropriate in the corporate property management process. | PO42 Review, monitor, report and advice members and EMT on progress with delivery of the property objectives. |
Annex C
Local performance indicators - definitions

(1) Occupancy costs per square metre (£)

Occupancy costs – as defined in the OPD Total Occupancy Cost Code, excluding A1 – A3. Include the current asset charge.

The appropriate basis of measurement is in accordance with the RICS Code of Measuring Practice as it relates to Valuation. This differs according to the category of property and is broadly as follows:

Offices: NIA
Shops: NIA
Industrial Buildings: GIA, except for B1 offices
Warehouses: GIA

(2) Area per occupant (m²)

Area as for (1)
Occupants in terms of FTEs

(3) Running costs per occupant (£)

Running costs = occupancy costs as for (1)

(4) Maintenance and repair cost per square metre (£)

Sub category of (1) above. OPD code: (C3 – C5)

(5) Percentage of vacant floorspace as a proportion of total floorspace, by directorate

(6) Number of properties shared with other public agencies, by directorate

(7) Total property costs for the service as a proportion of the net revenue outturn for the service

(8) Number of directorate staff in terms of FTEs directly involved in property management divided by the number of managed properties, by directorate. Excludes contractors.

(9) Asset Suitability ranked A-D, as follows:

A: Good
B: Satisfactory
C: Poor
D: Bad

Example – the property may be in good condition but in the wrong location.

(10) Asset Sufficiency ranked A-D, as for suitability.

Example – is it the right shape and size.
Annex D

Glossary of abbreviations

ACES  Association of Chief Estates Surveyors
AMP   Asset management plan
AMPG  Asset Management Planning Group
CPB   Corporate Project Board
CPO   Corporate Property Officer
CS    Capital strategy
DPP   Directorate property plan
EDR/DCE Executive Director for Resources/Deputy Chief Executive
EMT   Executive Management Team
FAMG  Finance & Asset Management Group
GIS   Geographic information system
GOL   Government Office for London
HCP   Head of Corporate Policy
HFM   Head of Financial Management
HIP   Housing investment programme
LPI   Local performance indicator
OSCP  Other services capital programme
PIs   Performance indicators
PRG   Project Review Group
**Exclusion of Press and Public**

This report does not contain any exempt or confidential information as prescribed by Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972

**Executive Summary**

The Council’s net service expenditure for 2001/02 after taking into account the approved transfers to and from balances was £326.087m against its budget of £322.329m, an overspend of £3.758m, which is £0.324m below the figure of £4.082m reported to the Mayor and Cabinet on 19 June (including Education SSA underspend of £0.540m).

2.2 The final underspend on corporate provisions of £0.953m was in line with forecast and has reduced the overall overspend to £2.805m.

This overspend will be met by means of a further drawdown of £1.005m from corporate reserves in 2001/02, with the remaining £1.800m to be met from the cumulative General Fund balance. This balance will be restored to its recommended figure of £7.8m (2.5% of net revenue budget) by a contribution of £2m from working balances in 2002/03.

2.3 This technical paper does not reiterate the reasons that sums have at times been provided for liabilities, such as redundancies, or planned service improvements which have been discussed in budget reports.

**Purpose**

To report to the Mayor the Council’s final 2001/02 outturn and to note the progress on the production of the pre-audit Statement of Accounts.

**Recommendations**

The Mayor is asked to agree:
Adjustments to and from Directorates’ earmarked reserves in 2001/02 totalling £1.074m and -£4.205m as detailed in paragraph 5.3.1 and Appendix 2.

The Mayor is asked to note:

4.2 The final outturn for all Directorates of £326.087m for 2001/02 as set out in Appendix 1.

To note the use of net corporate underspends of £0.953m, a drawing of £1.005m from earmarked reserves and £1.800m from General Fund balances to meet the net service overspend of £3.758m.

4.4 That action will be taken to restore General Fund balances to 2.5% of the net revenue budget (£7.800m) during 2002/03, in line with District Audit advice (paragraph 7.2).

4.5 School balances of £4.814m at 31st March 2002 (£4.238m at 31st March 2001). This balance is made up of standards fund balances of £1.957m and schools budget balances of £2.857m (paragraph 7.3).

4.6 Housing Revenue Account (HRA) reserves and balances of £12.200m at 31st March 2002 (£12.503m 2000/01) (paragraph 9).

4.7 Approval of the 2001/02 Statement of Accounts, to be compiled following final outturn, by the Mayor as detailed by the Audit Commission Act 1998 is required by 30th September 2002.

5 Directorates’ Final Outturn

5.1 The final outturn for service directorates is summarised in Appendix 1. Before transfers to or from reserves, the overall overspend was £6.313m. After directorate transfers to reserves of £1.074m and drawdowns of £4.205m have taken place, together with net schools transfers to reserves, the net overspend reduces to £3.758m. The final Education SSA underspend was £0.633m (compared to the £0.540m estimate) and has been utilised to support the authority’s overall position. Corporate Provisions recorded a favourable variance of £0.953m, which has been applied to reduce the overall overspend to £2.805m. Action to finance the remaining deficit is detailed in paragraph 7.1.

5.2 The final outturn position for each Directorate, in further detail and with explanations for significant variances, is shown in appendices 3 to 6.
5.3 Transfers to and from reserves (Directorates)

5.3.1 Lewisham’s current policy is that Directorates can transfer a budget underspend to an earmarked reserve, subject to the agreement of the Executive Director of Resources and Deputy Chief Executive, for an agreed purpose within the agreed policy and budget framework. A summary of requests from service Directorates to transfer underspends totalling £1.074m to earmarked reserves is shown in Appendix 1, with further detail given in Appendix 2. Often reserves/balances are for once off growth awarded in the Budget strategy which are then reserved in the accounts for that purpose.

5.3.2 The transfer for Resources (£0.107m) will be used for improvements to Accesspoint, whilst Regeneration (£0.108m) and Social Care and Health (£0.073m) are for ICT and to fund future capital expenditure. The transfer for Education and Culture of £0.786m included £0.375m for raising achievement and £0.356m towards capital expenditure. In overall terms, these transfers increase the net overspend for service directorates to £7.963m.

5.3.3 Directorates have made drawings totalling £4.205m from reserves both to support the revenue budget and to finance one-off projects previously agreed by Executive Committee. A summary is shown in appendix 2. The main elements of the Resources drawdown covered ICT and management training. Education and Culture covered a number of areas, including residual costs relating to Telegraph Hill school, sports development and creative Lewisham. The Regeneration drawdown of £0.240m was largely to contribute towards the deficit on trading accounts (see paragraph 8).

5.4 Best Value Accounting Code of Practice

5.4.1 Members were advised in the budget report dated 27 Feb 2002 that following the introduction of a new Accounting Code of Practice on Best Value it has been necessary to review the apportionment of central support costs and the allocations to Corporate and Democratic Core (CDC) costs. The new code also requires that material surpluses and deficits on former DSO trading accounts are recharged back (or re-patriated) to the most appropriate services generating the surplus or deficit.

5.4.2 The effect of the review of central support costs means that control of these particular budgets are removed from the Directorates and budget variations are corporately managed. The results of this exercise are contained in the attached Appendix 3 for Resources.
5.4.3 The requirement to repatriate surpluses has made it necessary to recharge the surplus on Building Works and the deficits on Refuse and Street Cleansing. These are discussed further in paragraph 8 below and in Appendix 4 for Regeneration.

6. CORPORATE PROVISIONS

6.1 Corporate provisions are those items within the Council’s budget which do not fit within controllable expenditure of service directorates, such as the Asset Management Revenue Account and interest on revenue balances.

6.2 The underspend against the revised corporate provisions budget, is £0.953m, largely due to an underspend on debt management expenditure as a result of debt rescheduling and repayment activity during the year.

6.3 Transfers to and from reserves (Corporate Provisions)

6.3.1 Transfers have been made from the corporate provisions budget to support one-off expenditure in 2002/03. This figure includes replenishing to their previous level reserves for ICT and property and asset management plan related costs including regeneration schemes. As discussed in the budget report to Executive Committee on 27 February 2002, £0.378m has been contributed for one-off costs relating to the new constitution, and reserves have been established to carry forward the PSA funding (£0.858m), CCTV revenue funding (£0.400m) and Convoys (£0.045m).

6.3.2 Drawings of £7.103m were made from reserves during the year, the bulk of which (£5.902m) was to finance capital expenditure in the form of CERA (Capital Expenditure Revenue account) for the Council’s OSCP and HIP programmes.

7. SUMMARY OF OVERALL GENERAL FUND POSITION

7.1 Table 1 below summarises the outturn for the General Fund, after taking account of transfers to and from earmarked reserves. Net service expenditure amounts to £326.087m, which is a net overspend of £3.758m. After taking into account the position on the corporate provisions budget, the deficit is reduced to £2.805m. A drawing of
£1.005m from earmarked reserves then leaves a balance of £1.8m to be met from General Fund balances.

### Table 1  Summary outturn for the General Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Fund Outturn</th>
<th>Outturn £'000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service Directorates net expenditure</td>
<td>328,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Recommended Transfer to Reserves-Directorates</td>
<td>1,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to Reserves-Schools</td>
<td>5,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Drawdowns from reserves-Directorates</td>
<td>(4,205)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawdowns from reserves-Schools</td>
<td>(4,510)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Directorate Outturn</td>
<td>326,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service expenditure budget</td>
<td>322,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service overspend</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,758</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Provisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net underspend</td>
<td>(953)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net General Fund outturn after reserve transfers</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,805</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.2 In addition to earmarked reserves, which are available to be used for specific purposes, the Council holds balances to protect itself against potential financial losses or any unforeseen circumstances. As in previous years, the District Auditor advises that the level of balances depends on the circumstances of the individual authority but should normally be a minimum of 2.5% of the current year’s General Fund net revenue budget.

### Table 2  Final Outturn

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£'000</th>
<th>£'000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Directorate Outturn</td>
<td>326,087</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Corporate Provisions Outturn</td>
<td>(21,907)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>304,180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Net General Fund budget</strong></td>
<td><strong>301,375</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawdown from earmarked reserves</td>
<td>(1,005)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overspend for 2001/02</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.3 Schools hold their own balances under the Local Management for Schools arrangements. In total, these balances were £4.814m at 31st March 2002 (£4.238m as at 31 March 2001). For the first time, standards
fund grant balances of £1.956m are included in this figure. The balance held purely resulting from school budget underspends has decreased from £4.238m to £2.858m, as schools have utilised their reserves during the year.

7.4 The reserve to provide revenue funding for capital expenditure (CERA) stands at £1.766m at the year-end, following a loan of £4.028m to Housing. The budget report to the Mayor and Cabinet meeting on 19 June 2002 discussed the possibility of utilising CERA balances to assist with budget pressures in 2002/03. Officers will examine ways of replenishing CERA in 2002/03 by substituting an item being financed from revenue, e.g. ICT, to be capitalised, thus freeing up the revenue resources that have been allocated for that purpose.

8 TRADING ACCOUNTS

The overall deficit for 2001/02 was £0.586m, which has to be financed in the year of account. The remaining ex-DSO reserve of £0.154m was drawndown in order to reduce the net figure to be charged to the General Fund. In order to comply with the Best Value Accounting Code of Practice (see paragraph 5.4), any significant surpluses or deficits have to be “re-patriated” to the service concerned. In 2001/02, Building Services recorded a surplus of £2.038m, of which £1.501m was returned to the Housing Revenue Account. Services that made significant losses were Refuse Collection (£1.515m) and Street Cleansing (£0.509m); these losses were recharged to the relevant service budgets. For 2002/03, trading accounts will be accounted for within service budgets, removing the need for any re-patriation exercise.

9 HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT

For 2001/02 the Housing Revenue Account recorded a surplus of £0.250m. Total HRA balances and reserves at 31 March 2002 amounted to £12.200m (£12.503m 2000/01). The main elements of the reserve are £5.4m to fund capital expenditure and £3.022m for insurance, together with smaller reserves including £0.400m for Building Services ICT and £0.250m to contribute to Blackheath Hill subsidence costs not covered by insurance.

10. 2001/02 STATEMENT OF ACCOUNTS

10.1 The un-audited statement of accounts will be finalised once decisions have been taken on the recommendations in this report.
10.2 Under the Audit Commission Act 1998, the statement has to be approved by the Mayor before the statutory deadline of 30th September. However, it is generally considered a sign of a well managed authority to achieve closing of the accounts well in advance of this deadline.

10.3 In order to meet these timescales the accounts will be handed over to the District Auditor following this report on 2nd August.

11. Financial Implications

The financial implications of this report are included in the Executive Summary (above).

12. Legal Implications

The legal implications are covered in the report.

13. Crime and Disorder Implications

None specifically resulting from this report.

14. Equalities Implications

The efficient and effective use of the Council's resources allows the Council to ensure best use of resources to address inequalities in access to services.

15. Environmental Implications

None specifically resulting from this report.

16. Conclusion

The authority recorded a net deficit on the General Fund of £1.800m for the financial year 2001/02, resulting from an overspend of £5.294m in Social Care and Health, which was reduced by underspends in other directorates and drawings from reserves. The overspend will be charged against General Fund balances for 2001/02. The General Fund balance will be restored to £7.8m in 2002/03, representing 2.5% of net revenue expenditure, by means of a contribution of £2m from working balances in 2002/03.

17. Background Documents and Originator
For further information on this report please contact:

- Rob Whiteman, Executive Director for Resources & Deputy Chief Executive on 0208314 8030,
- Julie Bennett, Head of Financial Management on 020 8314 8736
## Resources & Chief Executive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Net Budget £'000</th>
<th>Service Outturn £'000</th>
<th>Variance £'000</th>
<th>Variance %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central Support Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Chief Executive</td>
<td>4,553</td>
<td>4,101</td>
<td>-452</td>
<td>-9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Executive Office</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>-237</td>
<td>-27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Strategic Resources</td>
<td>1,555</td>
<td>1,451</td>
<td>-104</td>
<td>-6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Personnel &amp; Development</td>
<td>2,434</td>
<td>2,324</td>
<td>-110</td>
<td>-4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Financial Management</td>
<td>8,956</td>
<td>8,717</td>
<td>-239</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Property &amp; Administration</td>
<td>4,897</td>
<td>4,909</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ICT</td>
<td>8,571</td>
<td>8,942</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Legal</td>
<td>2,679</td>
<td>2,361</td>
<td>-318</td>
<td>-11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recharges to Services</strong></td>
<td>-33,898</td>
<td>-33,247</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Net Support Services</strong></td>
<td>597</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>-426</td>
<td>&gt;100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td>11,583</td>
<td>10,948</td>
<td>-635</td>
<td>-10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate &amp; Democratic Core</td>
<td>6,750</td>
<td>6,489</td>
<td>-261</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Estates</td>
<td>-231</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>&gt;100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Direct Services</td>
<td>1,315</td>
<td>1,373</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>20,014</td>
<td>19,227</td>
<td>(787)</td>
<td>-3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers to Reserves</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers from Reserves</td>
<td>(1,957)</td>
<td>(1,850)</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Directorate Outturn</strong></td>
<td>18,057</td>
<td>17,484</td>
<td>(573)</td>
<td>(3.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE AREA</td>
<td>£'000</td>
<td>MAIN VARIANCES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive</td>
<td>-452</td>
<td>Underspends in Policy and Governance of £170k together with savings in once off budgets for Social Inclusion of £223k. Small underspends elsewhere in Governance support of £15k, Chief Executive’s office of £20k and Equalities of £56k..</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Office</td>
<td>-237</td>
<td>Underspend of £108k in salary budget due to holding vacancies in secretariat and marketing/communications support team. Remaining underspend of £129k in non salaries due to effect of spending restriction on non essential spend.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Resources</td>
<td>-104</td>
<td>Underspend due to vacancies held in Strategic Finance for part year £24k and overachievement of income on HESP of £76k.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel &amp; Development</td>
<td>-110</td>
<td>Underspend on management salaries due to vacancies of £93k and underspend on non salaries budgets of £17k largely due to spending restrictions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Management</td>
<td>-239</td>
<td>Underspend largely due to delays in implementing new trainee scheme of £60k, together with underspend of £180k on Oracle implementation budget c/fd into 2002/03 for completion of project. There were other small underspends in most of the divisions activities as a result of vacancies/and the spending restriction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property &amp; Administration</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Overspends on various corporate estate properties.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>Overspend on budget for 1st 6 months before service was outsourced and an overspend for whole year on voice call charges of £90k</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>-318</td>
<td>Over-achievement of income and savings in costs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td>-635</td>
<td>Improved court income of £346k together with subsidies target.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeded by £159k. Underspend of £587k on salaries partially offset by overspend on running costs of £456k including projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDC</td>
<td>-261 Changes as a result of the Best value support service recharging model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial estates</td>
<td>477 Under-achievement of income on commercial properties of £1.167m, partially offset by underspending on commercial premises costs of £693K.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Direct Services</td>
<td>58 Underspend on Community safety, £77K and travellers sites £24K. Overspends on Electoral Services £47K, Public Conveniences £22K, Print &amp; Design £75K and European &amp; International ICT £15K.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 4

#### Regeneration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Net Budget £'000</th>
<th>Service Outturn £'000</th>
<th>Variance £'000</th>
<th>Variance %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development Division</td>
<td>1,996</td>
<td>1,948</td>
<td>(48)</td>
<td>(2.4)%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Division</td>
<td>18,128</td>
<td>19,248</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Division (G F)</td>
<td>1,690</td>
<td>1,777</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources Division</td>
<td>5,070</td>
<td>4,992</td>
<td>(78)</td>
<td>(1.5)%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport Division</td>
<td>10,255</td>
<td>9,583</td>
<td>(672)</td>
<td>(6.6)%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Surplus) / Deficit from Trading Accounts</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(586)</td>
<td>(586)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Service Expenditure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£'000</th>
<th>MAIN VARIANCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service Expenditure</td>
<td>37,139</td>
<td>(177) 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers to Reserves</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers from Reserves</td>
<td>(53)</td>
<td>(240) (187)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Directorate Outturn</td>
<td>37,086</td>
<td>36,830 (256) 0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Service Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Area</th>
<th>£'000</th>
<th>MAIN VARIANCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environment Division</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>This overspend is largely the result of the deficits on the Refuse and Street Cleansing trading accounts being recharged to Regeneration’s General Fund budget. Within Waste Management there were overspends on flytipping (£353k) and Refuse Collection (£134k - mainly lumber), offset by savings on Disposal due to reduced tonnages and lower Civic Amenity site costs (£261k). There were other overspends in Community Hygiene due to reduced Pest Control and Laundry income (£107k) and in Parks (£298k - higher contract costs, tree works and Beckenham Place Park running costs). There were underspends on the Registrar’s service from higher income (£60k) and Policy &amp; Partnerships (£141k - mainly a reduced abandoned vehicle service).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Division (GF)</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>The overspend is due to additional staff in Private Sector Housing (£50k) and increased Private Sector Leasing costs (£119k). There were savings of £74k arising from a reduced recharge from the HRA for Housing Benefit work, plus other miscellaneous underspends totalling £8k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources Division</td>
<td>(78)</td>
<td>There were underspends across the whole range of Regeneration support services due to staff vacancies and other savings; the General Fund share is £103k. There was an overspend of £25k arising from a higher contribution to bad debt provisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport Division</td>
<td>(672)</td>
<td>The underspend includes £486k capitalisation of highway works to assist with the Council's overall financial position. The balance is increased fee income plus the effects of spending restrictions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Surplus) / Deficit from Trading Accounts</td>
<td>(586)</td>
<td>This item is the net surplus arising from some Regeneration trading accounts, after re-allocation of surpluses and deficits in line with BVACOP. The remaining activities include Housing Building Works (non-HRA), Street Lighting, Fleet and Passenger Services. Deficits for Refuse Collection and Street Cleansing have been allocated to the Environment Division (above), whilst the Housing Building Works (HRA) surplus has been repatriated to the HRA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers to and from Reserves</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>Transfers were made to CERA reserves in respect of Highways (£16k) and Fleet (£47k) and to central reserves in relation to the Oracle Project (£45k). Transfers from Regeneration reserves were used during the year to support General Fund expenditure (£86k) and trading account deficits (£154k).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Area</th>
<th>£'000</th>
<th>Main Variances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SSA/Non SSA</td>
<td></td>
<td>The overall underspend of £707k net of transfers to/from reserves can be broken down into £633k SSA and £74k non SSA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual School's Budget</td>
<td>1,313</td>
<td>Variance due to reduction in school balances partially due to increased use of balances by schools for capital expenditure but also overspend at Malory School.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Services Division</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>The main overspends were Creative Lewisham (£316k) met by reserves and Lewisham Theatre (£150k) due to loss of income through closure, overrun in work programme and redundancy costs. The main underspend was on Leisure (£322k) due to staff vacancies prior to transfer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Pupil Services Division         | (520) | Main overspends were Early Years (£91k) partially due to increased recoupment expenditure and Transport (£164k) due to increased...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resources Division</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>The main element of the variance was expenditure of £962k on Telegraph Hill school, the bulk of which has been met from reserves leaving a net overspend of £355k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Effectiveness Division</td>
<td>(2,194)</td>
<td>The underspend was largely due to non-expenditure of Standards Fund allocations. The unspent allocation can be spent up to the end of August 2002 and the unspent balance has therefore been transferred to reserves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy &amp; Performance Review</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>The overspend is mainly due to a School Special Initiatives overspend of £80k on Domex and Marketing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Area</td>
<td>Main Variance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children &amp; Families</td>
<td>The main overspend was on children’s residential services (£3,410k net), due to the increasing cost and numbers of children looked after being placed in residential care and through fostering agencies. There was a £167k overspend on Leaving Care (excluding residential placements) arising from the introduction of the Leaving Care Grant in October 2001, which was insufficient to fully fund existing spend commitments. There were salaries underspends totalling £299k on a number of...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Figures</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>children’s services and the Youth Offending Team</td>
<td>underspent by £158k, largely as a result of the financial controls imposed on non-essential expenditure throughout the year. Expenditure chargeable to the Asylum Seekers grant for management and support services was higher than budgetted. However, this has reduced the charge to other childrens budgets by £163k.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Older People                  | 1,868   | The main overspend was on private sector domiciliary care (+£1,357k) because both the numbers and costs of care packages have risen. This was partially offset by an underspend on in-house homecare services of £198k. Other overspends included: delays in implementing the Fairer Charging policy (+£100k); increase in provision for bad and doubtful debts (+£75k); day centres (+£70k) and passenger transport (+£58k). The travel permits budget underspent by £158k following the recent London-wide reapportionment of transport costs. |

<p>| People with Physical Disabilities | 275     | The demand for residential placements was higher than anticipated, leading to an overspend of £104k. A higher recharge for adults social work teams and Management and support services was made to this service, as a result of the restructuring of the adults teams +£222k. Occupational therapy and sensory services provided |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People with Learning Disabilities</th>
<th>compensating underspends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There was a net underspend of £357k on residential placements and domiciliary care services. The community support team budget overspent by £59k, and day centres by £45k due to slippage in achieving savings from the BVR. Management and support services charged to this client group was £66k less than the budget allocation as these costs are apportioned on the basis of direct service spend, reflecting the underspend.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People with Mental Health Needs</th>
<th>564</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The demand for residential placements was higher than anticipated (+£390k), plus a shortfall of £175k on residential contributions arising from the legal ruling that it was illegal to charge for S117 clients. There was an overspend of £282k on substance misuse services (employees £113k, other budgets £169k), offset by compensating savings of £240k on the hospital team (older people). The reallocation of in-house homecare costs to this area was £291k less than budgeted because there were less clients in this group than originally anticipated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive Summary & Purpose of this Report

In response to the projection that the Council’s approved Budget for 2002/3 is due to overspend by £4m, on the 19th June 2002 the Executive decided a number of corrective actions to seek to balance the budget within the cash limit set by Full Council.

A two stage process was set whereby:

- in the meantime of September/October Executive Directors take short-term measures to seek to balance the Council’s approved budget.
- officers will work up savings proposals to a £10m target for next year and explore whether these can be brought forward in part for this year. These proposals will be brought to the Mayor & Cabinet and Public Accounts Committee in September/October.

With regard to the first action, the Mayor & Cabinet decided that Executive Directors report their plans of action/detailed proposals to Mayor & Cabinet. This report briefs the Mayor & Cabinet on the actions taken as requested.

Members will be aware that the in-year savings/action from Education & Culture, Regeneration & Resources that are briefed in this report, together with part-year savings from the 2003/4 budget strategy (that will be brought to Members for decision later in the year) means that those 3 directorates are planning to underspend by £4m as part of the Executive’s corrective action to contain expenditure within the formal approved Budget for the year.

Mayor & Cabinet are aware that the decision to vire £3.775m into Social Care
& Health Directorate requires the approval of Full Council. If the underspends are not formally vired into that directorate they will be held as a corporate balance against the SC&H overspend in order that the Executive can operate within the budget framework set by Full Council. The proposal to formally vire the sum to SC&H is to establish a more realistic budget for the directorate against which budget holders can be held accountable.

The interim in-year savings briefed in this report are consistent with delivery of the formal statutory plans set by Full Council in its policy framework, and do not constitute a closure or significant reduction in the provision of any Council service covered by this.

Recommendation

The Mayor is asked to note and endorse the in-year savings that have been worked up by Executive Directors as covered in section 6 of this report.

Background

2002/3 Budget Management

The Executive Directors of Education Culture (in relation to non-Education SSA budgets), Regeneration and Resources were asked to take action to impose expenditure controls against a target of £4m as follows:

Education SSA non delegated £ 0k
Education & Culture non SSA £ 1,030k
Regeneration £ 1,410k
Resources/Chief Execs £ 1,560k
£ 4,000k

Additionally, the Executive Director for Education & Culture has been asked to exemplify by September/October the service options/effect should the directorate be asked to make £730k in-year savings from Education SSA areas. In the meantime of a decision on this matter, the £800k held in corporate working balances in respect of Education SSA areas will not be committed by the directorate.

Additionally, the Executive Director for Social Care & Health has been set a target to deliver management action reductions totalling £2.64m against the estimated gross overspend of £6.415m for the directorate (leaving a balance of £3.775m).
Section 6 below sets out the actions taken by Executive Directors to deal with the 3 requirements set out above in paragraphs 3.1 and 3.3.

It should also be noted that beyond these targets, budget holders, mainly at service level, are managing a further £7.851m budget pressures as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Pressures (£m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SC&amp;H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;C – Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;C – Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regeneration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Effect of 2001/2 Outturn on 2002/03 Budget Management

The report on 19th June to Mayor & Cabinet projected an overspend of £3.669m on the 2001/02 budget. The decision to apply the projected £540k underspend on LEA budgets in 2001/02 to cover Council-wide overspends as part of the 2001/02 Outturn, in effect reduced this sum to £3.129m. Members agreed that this will be covered by £2m from 2002/3 corporate working balances, whilst the remaining £1.129m would be a corporate pressure to be managed by the Executive Director for Resources from improved financial performance on corporate provision/technical adjustments this year (for example with regard to interest earned on the Council's cashflow).

In the Final Outturn report to the Mayor & Cabinet elsewhere on this Agenda this £3.129m projection for 2001/2 Outturn is reduced by £324k to £2.805m. This marginally reduces the pressure on corporate provision/technical adjustments this year from £1.129m to £805k.

4 Ongoing Budget Monitoring in 2002/3

4.1 In view of early stage of the financial year it would not be prudent to change the agreed strategy of £4m in-year savings. If the strategy of delivering £4m savings from the £4.73m target set (including the £730k exemplification from Education SSA areas) were successful there may be some scope later in the year to ease off the more difficult items that have been ceased by Executive Directors, for example if:

- corporate provision/technical adjustments this year generate more
than £805k improved financial performance

- £4m in-year savings would generate £225k more than the proposed virement or provision against SC&H of £3.775m
- using Education SSA resources could lower the in-year savings required from other services

4.2 At present there should be no assumption made that some easing off of controls, as suggested by the arithmetic of the numbers, can be delivered. The authority is facing considerable difficulties in managing a Budget that does not reflect the activity levels of the Council, and the present controls being introduced may need to be made even more stringent later in the year.

5 Actions Taken by Officers

5.1 Since the removal of delegated S151 responsibility form SC&H, a mentoring project has been established for accountants from Resources to work with budget holders to improve their financial management expertise.

5.2 The Budget position has been scrutinised with both the Mayor and the Cabinet Member for Resources attending Public Accounts Committee, and the Executive Director for Resources attending the O&S Business Panel.

5.3 A revised protocol for the consistent operation for Departmental Expenditure Panels (DEPs) is attached for information (Appendix A). The new protocol expects directorates to disaggregate their departmental targets into divisional targets. With effect from 15th July 2002 classes of expenditure that are frozen without the express permission of a DEP include:

- Overtime
- Recruitment
- Agency staff and consultants
- Purchase of most supplies and services and equipment
- Learning & Development & external conference facilities
- Design and publication of publicity materials

5.2 The Heads of Resources’ staff record the decisions of DEPs and compliance with the restrictions will be tested by internal audit and available for scrutiny.

6 Directates’ Progress on Short-Term Savings
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Education & Culture

6.1 The Education & Culture directorate has been asked to identify savings options for 2002/3 which total £1.03m from non-Education SSA services. E&C have also been asked to exemplify for September/October £730k savings from the LEA services within the education SSA.

6.2 Savings identified so far contribute up to £300k towards the savings target of £1.03m. This includes:

- an initial assessment of likely savings from the operation of the departmental expenditure panel of £100k which will control/cease expenditure on recruitment, overtime, honoraria, use of consultants, spending on IT and other supplies. It is likely that this figure will increase as more information is gathered about current vacancies and projected expenditure.
- In addition E&C have identified some arts programme which could not be put forward for consideration this year – these include Theatre in the Parks, Pensioners Day, Irish festival, Women’s week and the Blackheath fireworks event. These total £85k.
- Also in order to make savings this year it is planned to not allocate faith grants totalling £50k and also the non-allocation of small grants to the voluntary sector which again total £50k.

6.3 At this stage it would appear that circa £700k is required to be identified in September/October from the part-year effect of savings proposals being worked up for 2003/4. It is not possible at this stage to estimate the extent to which this can be achieved.

Regeneration

6.4 The target for savings in 2002-03 is £1.4m and current budget pressures exceed £0.6m. The directorate has to focus on managing down budget pressures (using the Directorate Expenditure Panel) in order to stay within current budget and then deal with the requirement to identify further savings of £1.4m.

6.5 Regeneration’s approach to this has been to focus on the identification of savings options in 2003-04 and then examine the potential for part-year savings in 2002-03. Assuming decisions are not made until September/October 2002, part year effects of major savings in 2002-03 are almost certain to be inadequate to meet this year’s target. Other options will therefore be required to close the gap.
6.6 In order to reduce any gap the following approach is being implemented:

- First to take action to generate additional income. It is proposed to increase income from land charges (£55k); whilst additional income is expected from volume increases in planning applications (£100k) and the registration service (£20k).
- Secondly, to take action to reduce/cease expenditure on a limited number of volume-based services as follows: reductions to abandoned vehicle collection (£50k); high/footway maintenance (£100k substitution to the capital programme), festive lighting (£50k) and learning & development budgets (£25k).

6.7 Taken together these measures will reduce spending by £400k. At this stage it would appear that circa £1m is required to be identified in September/October from the part-year effect of savings proposals being worked up for 2003/4. It is not possible at this stage to estimate the extent to which this can be achieved.

**Resources**

6.8 The target underspend for the directorate is £1.56m and current budget pressures exist of £720k.

6.9 Through a combination of vacancies across many of the divisions within the directorate, a freeze on part of the corporate management learning and development budget and ICT technology refresh budget, it is currently projected that the directorate could underspend by £750k against the current target of £1.6m for 2002/03. The level of vacancies being carried will vary from division to division but it is proposed that Public Services will hold 5% vacancies for the remainder of this year with other divisions holding vacancies of at least one but up to four vacancies at any one time.

6.10 It is difficult to predict with certainty what effects this level of vacancies might have on the services - in the case of Public Services both the revenues service and Call centre would provide a reduced service which may affect some of the council’s KPIs. This would need careful monitoring.

6.11 All Heads of Service will continue to scrutinise their budgets and as a result of the tightening of the spending restrictions it is possible that the directorate can deliver further savings.

6.12 At this stage it would appear that up to £850k is required to be
identified in September/October from the part-year effect of savings proposals being worked up for 2003/4. It is not possible at this stage to estimate the extent to which this can be achieved.

Social Care & Health - Management Action

6.13 Social Care and Health have a target of £2.64m management action to ensure the Directorate spends to its cash limit in 2002-3. This is based on the assumptions that the overspend in 2001-2 will be met from corporate resources, and that the Directorate manages budget pressures of £2.65m from inflation, and £1.120m from other containable pressures, mostly in the adults placements and homecare budgets. Any additional pressures above these figures will also have to be met from within the Directorate.

6.14 The Directorate has identified some £2m of management action, including £900k chargeable to transitional housing benefit (THB) in respect of Supporting People, and £200k expenditure that can be charged to grants. Management are exploring further charges to THB and grants as well as to the HRA, for example, for estate based activity. Each division is to be given a target underspend and a vacancy freeze has been introduced. This will be monitored at the Directorate Expenditure Panel. We are also looking at cross-Directorate budgets, such as printing and stationery to ensure spend is maintained within budget.

6.15 At this stage the directorate is not on target to fully meet its management action target and further action by budget holders on this is required for September/October.

Summary

6.16 With regard to the targets set by Mayor & Cabinet, the position is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2002/3 Target (£m)</th>
<th>Present Achievement (£m)</th>
<th>To be Identified (£m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;C - Other</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;C - LEA</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regeneration</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC &amp; H</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.17 It should be noted that short-term savings from E&C (non-Education), Resources and Regeneration only total £1.45m against the £4m target set, leaving £2.55m to be found from part-year savings when 2003/4 Budget proposals are brought forward. As covered in the report to Mayor & Cabinet on 19th June, directorates that are not operating within their target underspends once we reach September/October will become subject to a Central Expenditure Panel in replacement of their DEP arrangements in order to seek to safeguard the present (revenue) resources in the capital programme.

6.18 There are no specific policy implications other than covered in the report in terms of Financial, Legal, Crime and Disorder, Equalities, and Environmental advice.

7 Background documents and originator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short Title of Document</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>File Location</th>
<th>Contact Officer</th>
<th>Exempt Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

For further information on this report please contact:

Rob Whiteman, Executive Director for Resources & Deputy Chief Executive on 020 8314 8030,

Julie Bennett, Head of Financial Management on 020 8314 8736 or

Martin Butler, Group Manager Budgets and Financial Planning on 020 8314 6539