

# **BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

## **CABINET**

**4 JUNE 2008**

### **HOUNDSFIELD LANE CARAVAN SITE**

Responsible Portfolio Holder	Cllr Peter Whittaker
Responsible Head of Service	Dave Hammond
Key Decision - Yes	

#### **1. SUMMARY**

- 1.1 Faced with the challenge of addressing management, maintenance and refurbishment issues, and with the objective of securing the future provision and continuation of site facilities for Gypsies and Travellers in the District, the report provides members with alternative options for the future management and ownership of the Council owned Gypsy and Travellers site at Houndsfield Lane, Wythall.
- 1.2 The report sets out the small amount of additional site provision that is identified for this district over the next 5 years, in the recent Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment. Options are provided within the report for the Council to consider that would enable existing site facilities to be improved and extended through application for Government grant and by exploring the possibilities for alternative ownership and management arrangements that could be put in place.

#### **2. RECOMMENDATION**

- 2.1 Members are asked to consider the options set out at section 10 of the report.
- 2.2 Officers be authorised to further investigate options 3 and 4 and report back to the Executive Cabinet on the potential terms that could be negotiated for the transfer of the Houndsfield Lane Caravan Site to an alternative organisation.

#### **3. BACKGROUND**

- 3.1 Houndsfield Lane Caravan site is situated in the Wythall area of the district adjacent to the boundary with Solihull. The site which provides caravan / mobile home site facilities for use by the Gypsy and Traveller community consists of eighteen pitches for permanent residential occupation and seven pitches for occupation by persons in transit.

- 3.2 The local authority has been owned the site since 1964 when it provided 6 pitches. In the early 1980's government grant was acquired and the site was extensively extended and modernised to provide 12 concrete hard standings and utility blocks on each pitch consisting of a small kitchen, bathroom and storage area. At the same time the transit pitches were provided with the basic provision of electricity points and water supply.
- 3.3 In 1994, with the aid of additional government grant the site was further extended with the addition of 6 additional permanent pitches now providing a total of 18 permanent pitches.
- 3.4 Electricity is sub metered to residents by means of card meters with cards being purchased from an officer. Water is also sub metered and a weekly water charge is due in addition to the weekly pitch rent. There is a small office on site which houses all the electricity meters for the site.
- 3.5 Prior to Large Scale Voluntary Transfer, the site was managed by the Housing Section of the Council's Treasurer's Department. From the early 1980's, the site was managed by a full time residential warden. In June 2000 the Housing Committee approved a Treasurers report that recommended removing the requirement for the site warden to be resident and amalgamating the post with the Homelessness Hostel Warden's post and from then on the site was managed by an off site officer who visited daily.
- 3.6 BDC is the only District Council in Worcestershire that has retained ownership of a Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Site; all other sites are owned and managed by the County Council.
- 3.7 The Government currently has grant available to help fund the provision of additional Gypsy and Traveller residential pitches (100%) and to assist in the refurbishment of existing sites to current day standards (50% – 75%). The application process for grant assistance is extremely onerous and requires a high degree of technical ability.

#### 4.0 **MANAGEMENT ISSUES ASSOCIATED WITH CONTINUING OWNERSHIP BY THE COUNCIL**

- 4.1 When the Council transferred its housing stock to BDHT in 2004, the site remained in the ownership of the Council and the management was outsourced to Bromsgrove District Housing Trust under a service level agreement as there was no longer the infrastructure e.g. repairs, rents and tenant management services to enable it to be managed effectively 'in house'.
- 4.2 Whilst BDHT continues to provide a site management service to the Council, it is recognised that the visiting warden arrangements are

under resourced and at times of difficulty, require back up from the Council's Strategic Housing Staff. BDHT have expressed a desire to withdraw from providing the management service to the Council as it is not cost effective for them and is incompatible with their housing management role.

- 4.3 The low level of management and supervision of the site leaves the Council at risk of not being suitably equipped to manage anti social behaviour, licensee / occupancy management issues and unauthorised entry onto the site. Low level management means that it is difficult to prove whether dilapidation to the site is caused by unlawful damage by residents or has occurred through natural usage. Potentially a situation of unlawful entry onto and occupation of the site could lead to the site becoming unmanageable and existing residents put at risk.

## **5. MAINTANANCE ISSUES ASSOCIATED WITH CONTINUING OWNERSHIP BY THE COUNCIL**

- 5.1 Under the Council's Housing Capital Programme, the utility blocks have recently benefited from PVC door and window replacement. Otherwise there has been little capital investment other than response repairs and repair of amenity units at change of occupation.
- 5.2 Many amenity units still have the original concrete floor, painted concrete block walls and no heating. Others have been extensively improved by the residents themselves
- 5.3 With regard to the condition and facilities on each individual pitch, current recommended standards require higher levels of insulation, better space standards and more modern facilities to be provided within amenity blocks. Direct metering of electricity supply is considered more appropriate than the sub metered arrangements currently in place.
- 5.4 With regard to the communal areas and the overall site itself, there is considerable improvement work ideally requiring upgrading of the perimeter fencing and relaying of the concrete hard standings.
- 5.5 There has been little demand for use of the 7 transit pitches which are therefore a resource that could be converted into use as permanent pitches if upgraded and amenity units provided. National guidance now identifies that permanent and transit patches are incompatible and are best not provided in the same location.

## **6. DEMAND AND SUPPLY ISSUES RELATING TO THE PROVISION OF SITES FOR GYPSY AND TRAVELLERS IN THE DISTRICT**

- 6.1 A Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment has just been completed having been commissioned by the South Housing Market

Area Partnership. The work is designed to meet the requirements of the Department for Communities and Local Government for each Housing Authority to undertake a Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment in accordance with the 2004 Housing Act, Planning Circular 1/2006, and the accompanying Good Practice Guidance.

6.2 The objective of the Assessment was to:

Establish the current numbers, cultural background, location, tenure and family composition of the existing Gypsy and Traveller population.

Estimate their unmet accommodation housing needs, both immediate and over a 5 year timescale, in terms of additional number of pitches required for each category and location of site.

Identify, where possible, aspirations and perceptions, in relation to alternative types of site, the range and quality of facilities, access to services and questions of security, harassment, health and disability.

6.3 This Assessment has concluded that across the South Housing Market Area (Worcestershire, Stratford and Warwick) there is a potential need for 289 additional pitches across the 8 districts. 22 of these are for Travelling Show people, and the rest for Gypsies and Travellers.

6.4 In the draft report, the recommendation for Bromsgrove is that there is no need to identify additional residential sites in Bromsgrove District, but that consideration should be given to the redundant Transit pitches on the Houndsfield Lane Site being used to help meet residential need from the wider area. The report also identified that it is also possible that some of the provision for Emergency Stopping Places described for Redditch Borough might be appropriately located in the part of Bromsgrove District which borders Redditch. This would provide both districts with a shared facility for dealing with future unauthorised encampments.

6.5 The draft report therefore identifies that in the short term (1-2 yrs) the requirement for additional pitches is nil, but in the longer term (2-5yrs) the requirement is for an additional 5 pitches.

## **7. OPTIONS FOR ADDRESSING THE REFURBISHMENT AND STANDARDS ISSUES ON THE SITE**

7.1 **The Capital Cost of carrying out minimum refurbishment to address thermal insulation, internal and electrical improvements and repair of perimeter fencing could be considered as a short term solution.**

Officers have carried out some preliminary enquiries to establish the extent of the capital cost of carrying out the bare minimum of improvements needed.

This option would be to carry out a partial refurbishment of the amenity blocks for each pitch and carry out minimal fencing repairs. This work would include improvements as follows:

- Upgrade of electrical installations in amenity blocks to current day standards including extra sockets & energy efficiency lighting
- Altro non slip flooring to entire amenity units
- Dry lining to provide better insulation
- Refitting kitchen & bathroom following work
- Total Estimated cost of works is £4,262.50 per unit a total of £76,725
  
- Minimal repair works to perimeter fencing – £10,000

**Total Cost of minimal works = £86,725**

The cost of carrying out this minimum standard of upgrade is mainly cosmetic, only making the amenity units more habitable and does not address other issues such as major upgrade of perimeter fencing and drainage works and therefore would not be of a sufficient standard to access government grant assistance.

This option:

- Would not extend the number of units on the site to meet current identified need
- Would only provide a short term improvement and thus require future investment
- Would not qualify for government grant assistance.

Accordingly this option is considered to be poor value for money in the longer term.

## **7.2 The estimated capital cost of bringing the site up to Government recommended standard.**

Estimates have been provided by a firm of consultants who have worked with Worcestershire County Council upon site refurbishment and who have successfully applied for government grant for this type of work. The figures are generous estimates based on the worst case scenario and one site visit. The estimated cost therefore allows for a number of currently unknown factors including drainage and hard standing replacement that may prove to be unnecessary.

The cost of refurbishing the existing 18 permanent pitches is estimated to be in the region of £750,000. The cost being made up as follows

External works £199,000. This includes

- £25,000 for the site compound & decanting of client whilst units are refurbished, temporary power & drainage etc.
- £10,000 Road repairs & speed humps
- £80,000 Perimeter site fencing
- £45,000 New drainage to connect units to mains drainage

Services £120,000 This includes

- £50,000 to renew electrics
- £25,000 to connect individual amenity blocks to mains electricity
- £20,000 improve foul & storm drainage
- £20,000 Heating to units

Amenity Block Refurbishment £210,000 This includes

- £200,000 Refurbishment to include new kitchens bathrooms removal of internal walls etc
- £10,000 landlord Office

Preliminaries, contingencies Fees and Costs - £213,800

A full breakdown of estimated costs costs is attached Appendix 1

This option:

- Would bring the site up to Government recommended standards.
- Improve the manageability of the site.
- Provide a longer term solutions to dilapidation
- Potentially qualify for up to 75% government grant.

Accordingly this option is considered to be better value for money.

## **8. OPTION TO ADDRESS THE SHORTFALL IN PERMANENT RESIDENTIAL SITE PROVISION FOR GYPSY AND TRAVELLERS IN THE DISTRICT**

- 8.1 The recommendations of the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment set out in 6.1 of the report above indicate that whilst the current requirement to provide additional residential pitches in the Bromsgrove District is nil, in the longer term (2 – 5 years) there is a

requirement for 5 additional units. In the shorter term the report identifies the potential for the under utilised transit pitches at Houndsfield lane to be converted to provide residential pitches to help meet the wider need.

**8.2 The cost of providing an additional five new permanent pitches with amenity units on the existing and underused transit area of the site is as follows:**

Estimated to be in the region of £430,000 including site clearance, drainage, landscaping, roadways and CCTV security. This is a very generous estimate provided by consultants based upon the provision of six additional new units. It is recommended that only five additional units be included in the scheme.

A full breakdown of costs (based upon provision of 6 units) is set out within Appendix 1.

This option:

- Would address the recommendations set out in the draft Gypsy and Traveller accommodation Assessment to provide additional pitches over 5 years.
- Make best use of the sites potential.
- Populate an area of the transit part of the site that is under used and subject to misuse and vandalism.
- Achieve a total size of site (23 units) that is within the scale generally favoured by tenants.
- Potentially qualify for 100% Government Grant.

**9. THE ABILITY OF THE COUNCIL TO FINANCE THE APPROPRIATE LEVEL OF MANAGEMENT, SUPERVISION AND REPAIR OF THE SITE.**

9.1 So far, this report has identified four key issues that require consideration:

- Management issues
- Maintenance issues
- Refurbishment and Standards Issues
- Issues relating to the ability to address the small shortfall in permanent residential site provision for Gypsy and Travellers in the District.

9.2 This section of the report now examines the ability of the Council to address these four key issues (in reverse order) before the next section

of the report considers the alternative options for the future ownership and management of the site.

- 9.3 **The ability to address the shortfall in permanent residential site provision in the district** – is limited by land availability and the lack of capital funding available to purchase additional land for the purpose. Economy of scale in terms of management costs, the under utilisation of the transit pitches on the existing site and its established use for Gypsy and Traveller occupation indicate the proposed conversion to five permanent residential pitches to be a viable proposal.

The capital cost of conversion (estimated to be in the region of £430,000) would be prohibitive to the Council unless Government Grant was sought as part of a larger Refurbishment / Extension Scheme.

- 9.4 **The ability of the Council to finance the refurbishment and improve standards of the site** – is limited by the Council's decreasing balance of capital funding available to fund major renovation work. Whilst there is an approved budget of £110,000 in the 2008/09 capital programme and a carry forward of unspent capital budget of £20,000, it is not considered best value for money to apply these funds to a short term minimum improvement scheme for the site as set out at section 7.1 of this report. The minimum improvement approach would not attract Government grant, would not provide a long term solution and therefore the Council would face a future call on its limited capital funds.

To do nothing is not a viable option as this would lead to tenant dissatisfaction, reduced demand and possibly create voids, dilapidation and declining respect for the site which in turn would lead to increasing management and repair problems.

The most attractive solution would be to carry out a full scale site improvement scheme (that would include the creation of five new permanent residential pitches) that would potentially attract 75% Government Grant.

- 9.5 **The ability to meet maintenance requirements** – is limited by the revenue that is available for the Council to fund repair works.

In 2006/7 the site made a surplus of £8,464 and in 2007/8 the projected outturn is for a surplus of £10,624 (subject to deduction of some drainage and change of tenancy works commissioned and awaiting submission of invoice).

The surplus is only achieved by the unrealistically low level of management that is employed on the scheme (SLA cost paid to BDHT is £14,272pa). Furthermore the turn over in site occupancy over recent years has been low and therefore change of tenancy costs (repairs to



amenity block and clearance of pitch) has also been unrealistically low thus giving a false picture.

An increasing inability to keep the site well maintained could lead to a spiralling decline in the site's popularity, increasing tenant turn over, increase in misuse and damage to facilities and increasing dilapidation. The small surplus on the site accounts could soon develop into a significant deficit. Annual repair costs may however be reduced if the large scale site refurbishment scheme is employed.

- 9.6 **The ability to adequately address the management issues** - is again, as set out in 9.5 above, restricted by the limited revenue budget to provide adequate management and supervision of the site. Section 4 of this report sets out the risks associated with the currently low level of site management and supervision that could lead to increasing management issues. Ideally, a higher level of 'on site' supervision should be provided, which may only become cost effective if the site is enlarged.

Again the small surplus on the site accounts is disguised by abnormally low management costs of employing only a visiting warden service. If BDHT withdraw the service in the future the Council would possibly be faced with difficulty in finding an alternative management provider and significantly inflated management costs.

## 10. **MANAGEMENT AND OWNERSHIP OPTIONS FOR THE COUNCIL TO CONSIDER**

- 10.1 Based upon the recommendations set out in the draft Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment, it is reasonable to assume that Members would wish for the site to remain a facility for use by the Gypsy and Traveller community and be extended to meet the identified shortfall of 5 permanent pitches in the District over the next five years. Accordingly, it is considered that the under utilised transit area of the existing site would be the best option for conversion to meet the shortfall of 5 additional permanent residential pitches. The generously estimated cost of this work is £430,000 for which 100% Government grant could be applied for.
- 10.2 The potential availability of Government grant towards 75% of the cost of major refurbishment works to the existing site would make a large scale upgrading of the site a favourable option over a short term minimal works which would only provide a quick fix.
- 10.3 Because the Council no longer has the capacity and expertise, 'in house' project management of a large scale extension and refurbishment scheme would require the assistance of an alternative organisation.

- 10.4 The identified management and maintenance issues set out earlier in the report may only be addressed by alternative ownership and management arrangements being put in place. There appears to be developing four main options that are available for the Council to consider of which only two have the potential to overcome these issues.
- 10.5 Members are therefore asked to consider the four options that are set out below that may be more appropriate in enabling the Council to address both the ongoing management and maintenance difficulties of running the site and the need to further improve and extend the facilities to meet the identified need for 5 more permanent pitches in the district.
- 10.6 Options 1 and 2 continue with the ownership of the site remaining with the Council and both carry a risk of the site revenue budget falling into deficit.
- 10.7 Options 3 offers the opportunity of the site being transferred into County Council ownership, but would require this first Council bringing the site up to current day standards before transfer would take place, a task that the Council does not have the staff resources to project manage 'in house'.
- 10.8 Option 4 is possibly a more attractive solution. RSL involvement and interest in the sector of housing for Gypsy and Travellers is limited. However, Rooftop Housing (a Worcestershire RSL) has undertaken a substantial amount of research into the needs of this client group and has opened up dialogue with the GOWM who are eager for RSLs to play a more active role in the provision of services to the travelling community. Rooftop has expressed an interest in acquiring the site and is prepared to consider a number of ways in which this could take place including the possibility of managing the grant application for and project managing site upgrade and extension. Rooftop are currently in negotiation with Wychavon DC to second a specialist officer to build on their current activities and to expand Rooftop's range of services to the travelling community.

**OPTION 1. - NO ACTION – BDC CONTINUING WITH OWNERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT OF THE SITE.**

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No immediate cost to the Council</li> <li>• Continued receipt of income currently generating small surplus.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Long term the site will deteriorate necessitating even larger sums of Capital to maintain.</li> <li>• Depreciation of an asset</li> <li>• Risk being challenged in the courts for disrepair.</li> <li>• Does not comply with Council</li> </ul>

	<p>equality &amp; diversity policy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BDHT may terminate the SLA. Unlikely to find another RSL or organisation to manage the site.</li> <li>• Increasing cost of management by alternative organisation.</li> <li>• Potential for spiralling repair costs.</li> <li>• Continuing low level of management and supervision may lead to tenant dissatisfaction, reducing occupancy, higher turn over of tenants and increasing risk of ASB and unauthorised occupation.</li> <li>• Risk that Government Refurbishment grant funding will not be available in the future</li> <li>• Risk of revenue budget falling into deficit.</li> </ul>
--	---

**OPTION 2 - FULLY REFURBISH AND EXTEND SITE TO MODERN DAY STANDARD, ACCESSING GOVERNMENT GRANT – BDC RETAINING OWNERSHIP**

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continued receipt of income from the site</li> <li>• Increased income from creation of new pitches.</li> <li>• Full scale refurbishment would reduce long term maintenance costs</li> <li>• Extension of site meets identified needs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional units would necessitate higher level of management.</li> <li>• BDHT may withdraw from management service. Difficulty in finding another management provider - higher management costs</li> <li>• No longer 'in house' capacity or expertise at BDC to project manage refurbishment/ extension scheme.</li> <li>• Employment of outside consultants to project manage improvement work expensive. e.g. 10% of scheme cost.</li> <li>• Would require capital funds to meet the requirement for 25% match funding for refurbishment works</li> <li>• Risk of revenue budget falling into deficit</li> </ul>

**OPTION 3 - FULLY REFURBISH AND EXTEND SITE TO MODERN DAY STANDARD, ACCESSING GOVERNMENT GRANT AND TRANSFER OVER TO COUNTY COUNCIL TO RUN IN LINE WITH ALL OTHER SITES IN THE COUNTY**

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No longer any risk to BDC of site falling into revenue account deficit</li> <li>• Increased capacity from the new pitches on the transit site would assist in meeting housing need for this client group</li> <li>• Agreement could be made for site provision in perpetuity</li> <li>• County would make better use of provision by maintaining waiting list from across Worcestershire thus reducing risk of voids.</li> <li>• County has appropriate expertise to manage site</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• County Council do not have the capacity to run this project &amp; would only consider transfer if the project was completed by BDC before transfer.</li> <li>• No longer 'in house' capacity or expertise at BDC to project manage refurbishment/ extension scheme.</li> <li>• Employment of outside consultants to project manage improvement work expensive. e.g. 10% of scheme cost.</li> <li>• Would require capital funds to meet the requirement for 25% funding for refurbishment works</li> <li>• No capital receipt from County as only willing to consider taking site over at nil cost to them on basis of it being fully refurbished.</li> </ul>

**OPTION 4 - TRANSFER THE SITE TO AN RSL WHO WOULD CARRY OUT THE IMPROVEMENT AND EXTENSION WORK THEMSELVES ACCESSING GOVERNMENT GRANT**

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Responsibility for management of site would transfer to RSL</li> <li>• No longer any risk to BDC of site falling into revenue account deficit</li> <li>• Increased capacity from the new pitches on the transit site would assist in meeting housing need for this client group</li> <li>• Agreement could be made for site provision in perpetuity</li> <li>• RSL would make better use of provision by maintaining a waiting list from across Worcestershire thus reducing risk of voids.</li> <li>• RSL would have appropriate expertise to manage site</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of current small surplus income to BDC</li> <li>• Possible loss of control of who can access the site but this could be covered by the transfer document requiring provision in perpetuity.</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RSL would use their own resources to prepare bid to Government</li> <li>• Reduced costs for financing the project as there is potential for an RSL to consider providing the Council with a capital receipt for the site or funding or part funding the 25% match funding required to access the Government grant.</li> </ul>	
--	--

## **11. CONSULTATION**

11.1 A Customer Satisfaction Survey of residents of the Houndsfield Lane Caravan Site was carried in November 2007. Within the survey, occupants views were sought upon their preferred use for the under utilised transit pitches on the site and given four options. The following results were received in respect of occupants first choice of alternative use:

Social Housing	9.1%
Adapted bungalows for older travellers	9.1%
New permanent residential pitches	54.5%
Transit use	18.2%

11.2 Previous consultation upon the future needs of site occupants carried out 3 years ago indicated a desire amongst older gypsy and traveller occupants to be able to remain on the site in their later years. Accordingly it is considered that upgrading of existing and provision of new pitches and amenity units would be designed to be more accessible for older persons and residents with a disablement.

## **12. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

12.1 The revenue and capital financial implications for the Council in continuing to own the site are set out in section 9 of the report.

12.2 The estimated costs of the minimal works option is £86,725 which would not qualify for Government grant.

12.3 The estimated cost of the full refurbishment of the existing site is £750,000 that would potentially qualify for up to 75% Government Grant.

12.3 The estimated cost of providing an additional 5 permanent residential plots on the site is £ 430,000 that would potentially qualify for up to 100% Government grant.

- 12.4 The financial implications for the Council would be the need to find match funding for any Government Grant that may be received towards a full refurbishment scheme.
- 12.5 100% grant is available for new provision, including new sites, additional pitches on existing sites, and bringing closed sites back into use. 50% is available for refurbishment. However, where schemes provide additional pitches on a site – for example by extending it – as well as refurbishing that site, 75% grant will be available for the refurbishment element of the scheme.
- 12.6 Accordingly the best response to a bid for funding would be that the Council received 100% grant on the new site provision and 75% for the refurbishment of the existing site.
- 12.7 Therefore match funding would be required for 25% of the refurbishment costs which on current estimates of £750,000 would equate to £187,500.
- 12.8 There is currently an approved 2008/9 Capital Budget of £110,000 and a carry forward 2007/8 budget of £20,000 for works on the Gypsy and Traveller site which could be reserved towards the potential match funding required to fully refurbish and extend the site under options 2, 3 and 4. This would leave a potential shortfall of £57,500 un budgeted capital

### **13. CONCLUDING REMARKS**

- 13.1 Members are asked to consider the options set out at section 10 of the report. The recommendation is that officers be authorised to further investigate options 3 and 4 and report back to the Executive Cabinet on the potential terms that could be negotiated for the transfer of the Houndsfield Lane Caravan Site to an alternative organisation.

### **14. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 14.1 From 2008, The Housing Regeneration Act 2008 removes the exemption of local authority sites being licensed which is likely to have implications for the future standards that will be required for local authority owned sites.
- 14.2 In the event of a transfer taking place the Council would impose a covenant requiring the site owner to continue to provide accommodation for the Gypsy and Traveller community unless the Council gave its permission for the site to be used or sold for an alternative use. In circumstances where the Council would give its permission for the site to be sold or used for alternative purposes, then a clause would be included in the conveyance allowing the Council to

claw back funding from the land owner representing an appropriate proportion of the open market value at the time.

## **15. COUNCIL OBJECTIVES**

- 15.1 CO1 Regeneration – Housing  
CO2 Improvement – Customer Service

## **16. RISK MANAGEMENT**

- Loss of outside organisation to manage Houndsfield Lane Site.
- Budget deficit due to repair and management issues.
- Unlawful occupation and anti social behaviour.

- 16.1 Currently the risks identified in the bullet points above are not addressed by any risk register and will be added to the 2008 revision of the risk register.

## **17. CUSTOMER IMPLICATIONS**

- 17.1 It is not considered appropriate for any additional customer consultation to be carried out at this stage for the purposes of the report. However in the event of alternative management and ownership options being pursued, then site residents would be consulted.

## **18. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS**

- 18.1 The report relates to the provision of housing and services to a minority group. Failure to address the needs of this group and to maintain or improve standards may be in breach of the Council's Equality & Diversity policy.
- 18.2 It is important in the event of the site being transferred, that the Council should impose a covenant or other legal undertaking by the new owner that the site would continue to provide accommodation for the Gypsy and Traveller community.

## **20. VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS**

- 20.1 The report addresses value for money issues in considering options for the refurbishment of the site within section 7 of the report.

## **21. OTHER IMPLICATIONS**

Procurement Issues Yes – but report only asks for approval to further investigate options for alternative management and ownership.
Personnel Implications None
Governance/Performance Management None
Community Safety including Section 17 of Crime and Disorder Act 1998 Future management and standards of site impact upon ability to reduce crime and disorder.
Policy Non at present
Environmental Condition and standard of site impact upon environment.

## 22. OTHERS CONSULTED ON THE REPORT

Portfolio Holder	Yes
Chief Executive	Yes
Executive Director - Partnerships and Projects	Yes
Executive Director - Services	Yes
Assistant Chief Executive	Yes
Head of Service	Yes
Head of Financial Services	Yes
Head of Legal, Equalities & Democratic Services	Yes
Head of Organisational Development & HR	Yes
Corporate Procurement Team	Yes



**23. WARDS AFFECTED**

All wards specifically Hollywood and Majors Green within which the Hounsfield Lane site is situated.

**24. APPENDICES**

Appendix 1 Budget costings for Refurbishment of 18 Amenity Units and Budget costings for provision of additional permanent residential pitches.

**BACKGROUND PAPERS**

Draft Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment.

**CONTACT OFFICER**

Name: A.M. Coel – Strategic Housing Manager  
E Mail: a.coel@bromsgrove.gov.uk  
Tel: (01527) 881270