

Item No. 12	Classification: Open	Date: 24 April 2007	Meeting Name: Executive
Report title:		Cleaner Greener Safer Capital Programme 2007/08	
Ward(s) or groups affected:		Borough-Wide	
From:		Strategic Director of Environment & Housing	

RECOMMENDATION(S)

1. That the Executive confirm a capital allocation of £3.25 million to Community Councils for the Cleaner Greener Safer programme for 2007/8.
2. That capital resource allocations be made to Community Councils for *Cleaner, Greener, Safer* expenditure within their own Community Council boundaries in the manner set out in this report.
3. That the Executive authorise Community Councils to jointly fund projects at their boundaries.
4. In light of the executive decision to increase the overall allocation by £250,000 to take account of professional fees of projects, executive requests officers to ensure that each Community Council are able to allow for professional fees before making its allocations to projects.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

5. 2007/08 will be the fifth year of the Cleaner Greener Safer programme.
6. For the previous three years a formula was agreed that gave a basic allocation to each Community Council topped up by a percentage based on the number of 2003/04 Priority Neighbourhoods in each area. Following the move away from delivery on priority neighbourhoods the formula has been updated to reflect the 2004 Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) scores as a proportion of the Southwark total for each Community Council area, weighted by each area's population.
7. The increase of £250,000 in the overall allocation for 2007/8 recognises the cost of professional fees on some projects.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

8. In the first four years of the Cleaner Greener Safer programme £11,753,000 was allocated, leading to 504 projects being approved by the eight Community Councils.

9. The roles and functions of Community Councils include the promotion of involvement of local people in the democratic process and taking decision-making closer to local people. Community Councils take decisions on local matters including environmental improvement and community safety as well as consultation on a wide range of policies and strategies that affect the area.
10. Other funding regimes may exist for the broad range of projects developed at Community Councils. Subject to appropriate application and approval, otherwise unsuccessful projects may be eligible to alternative council or external funding.
11. Capital funding proposals through Community Councils provide an opportunity to make use of Council resources at a local level. Any allocation will need to recognise the areas of greatest need. Allocations from 2004/05 through to 2006/07 were set on a base allocation to all Community Councils (£250,000) with an additional allocation of £1 million targeted to the borough's 16 Priority Neighbourhoods (as determined in 2003/04). This allocation formula recognised the link between Community Council areas and deprivation and need identified in the Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy.
12. The Council and Southwark Alliance have now moved to a quadrant approach for tackling deprivation (with two Community Councils covered by each area) and the formula for dividing the money between the areas has been updated to take account of the 2004 Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) score of each Community Council area.
13. The IMD provides a robust assessment of the relative deprivation of an area, and is calculated for each census 'Super Output Area' (SOA) in England. The IMD itself is an aggregate of seven other 'domain' indices: Income Deprivation, Employment Deprivation, Health Deprivation and Disability, Education, Skills and Training Deprivation, Barriers to Housing and Services, Living Environment Deprivation and Crime. Every SOA, ward and local authority in England has both an IMD score, and an IMD rank. The scores are relative – a lower score indicates less deprivation while a higher score indicates more. Southwark's overall score is 34.8, which ranks the borough as the 17th most deprived out of 354 local authority areas. Of Southwark's 21 wards, Village ward is the least deprived - with a score of 18.1, while Livesey is the most deprived - with a score of 46.2. Scores for Community Council areas are shown in the table below.
14. Due to the increase in the overall programme (from £3m to £3.25m) it is recommended to increase the base allocation for each Community Council from £250,000 to £300,000. This then leaves a balance (£850,000) which is allocated based on the extent of each area's deprivation, and weighted to reflect the size of the population. The populations, IMD scores and recommended allocations for each Community Council are:

Community Council	Population (2001)	2004 IMD weighted by population	Base Share of CGS allocation	Share of IMD-adjusted balance	CGS allocation (rounded)
Bermondsey	36,289	35.7	£300,000	£106,131	£406,000
Borough & Bankside	27,394	32.9	£300,000	£97,668	£398,000
Camberwell	36,786	38.2	£300,000	£113,288	£413,000
Dulwich	32,968	23.5	£300,000	£69,695	£370,000
Nunhead & Peckham Rye	35,329	36.7	£300,000	£109,071	£409,000
Peckham	20,524	46.3	£300,000	£137,519	£437,000
Rotherhithe	28,290	33.3	£300,000	£98,767	£399,000
Walworth	39,131	39.7	£300,000	£117,861	£418,000
Total	256,712	-	£2,400,000	£850,000	£3,250,000

15. The additional allocation of £250,000 to the CGS programme as a whole reflects the cost of professional fees associated with project delivery. The principle of cost recovery has been applied to the CGS programme – whereas internal costs for landscape design and other professional services are charged direct to each project. In 2005/06 £190,913 was charged in this manner; in 2006/07 £171,195 was charged. Each year the number of CGS projects being approved has increased (2003/04: 89; 2004/05: 100; 2005/06: 146; 2006/07: 169), though with limited extra resources for delivery. The additional funds from 2007/08 onwards will help to ensure both that enhanced staff and professional resources are available to deliver the programme, and that the amounts spent directly on works are maximised. This does not reflect the entire amount of fees which will be charged to project budgets.
16. The launch publicity for this year's CGS programme will mirror the highly successful programme of last year (2006/07), which resulted in a record number of applications: over 600. Publicity included direct mail or email or the CGS application form to virtually all known stakeholder groups in the borough (such as tenants and residents associations, faith groups, health practices, schools, community centres, sports clubs, youth clubs, advice centres and day centres), as well as other interested persons. In addition, forms were made available in public buildings such as leisure centres, libraries, one-stop shops and major Council office buildings. Advertisements were placed in *Southwark News* and a feature highlighting CGS was included in *Southwark Life*. Posters about the programme were displayed in prominent locations such as surgeries and public buildings.
17. It is envisaged that the 2007-08 CGS programme will be formally launched with publicity in early May 2007. Each Community Council is open to determine its own application deadline, and bespoke approaches to the consultation process and the development of ideas – whatever is most appropriate to each area. The programme for what happens between launch and the start of project delivery is as follows:
- a) Publicity launch

- b) Workshops by Community Involvement and Development Unit (CIDU) and Public Realm Projects team to develop community ideas and make contact with hard-to-reach communities
- c) Forms returned to the Public Realm Projects team in Environment & Housing
- d) Initial contacts made with proposers; initial feasibility analysis and costings; inter-departmental review meeting
- e) Community Councils meet to consider proposals and agree allocations
- f) Project consultation and implementation by Environment & Housing's Public Realm Projects Team

Policy implications

18. The Council's five strategic objectives include three that can be positively addressed through the proposed devolved and biddable capital resources:
 - Making Southwark cleaner and greener
 - Cutting crime and fear of crime
 - Improving the health of the borough

19. The *Cleaner, Greener, Safer* programme directly supports the first two strategic objectives by making improvements to public realm where site will become cleaner, greener and/or safer. The programme indirectly supports the 'Improving Health' objective by encouraging people to make greater use of their local environment and take part in a range of physical activities.

20. Examples of the types of projects that have been funded include:
 - Parks, community gardens, landscaping, tree planting and wildlife areas.
 - Children's playgrounds, youth facilities, ball courts and cycle tracks.
 - Lighting, security measures, pavements, streets, and tackling 'grot spots'.

Community Impact Statement

21. An explicit objective within Community Councils is that they be used to actively engage as widely as possible with, and bring together, Southwark's diverse local communities on issues of shared or mutual interest. The Cleaner Greener Safer programme is an important tool in achieving community participation.

22. Separate reports are being prepared for each Community Council highlighting the number and location of projects approved and completed during the first four years of the CGS programme. This information will be presented together with maps detailing the overall ratings as well as the crime ratings for the Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) for each Super Output Area (SOA). Maps showing approved CGS projects in relation to the locations of housing estates and regeneration areas will also be available. These reports will be presented to Community Councils in April and May 2007. It is envisaged that this information will facilitate members' discussion on how to prioritise proposals and make informed decisions on funding allocations for CGS.

23. All ideas for CGS project come directly from the local community, via a simple project nomination form. Specific schemes will then be agreed at Community

Councils with further input from the community, and will reflect local needs and priorities.

Resource implications

24. The publicity and implementation costs of the programme can be met within existing resources.

Consultation

25. Consultation will be an integral part of the process to identify schemes through Community Councils following extensive publicity. No further consultation is deemed necessary for this decision although extensive consultation will be part of the work undertaken to develop scheme ideas and determine the viability of individual schemes.

SUPPLEMENTARY ADVICE FROM OTHER OFFICERS

Finance Director

26. The cost of the proposals equals the allocation of funds for the CGS programme approved by the Executive for 2007/8. The expenditure against this allocation will be monitored and reported on as part of the overall Capital Programme

Legal Implications

27. The Executive has the authority for allocating the capital funding. There are no other legal implications arising from this decision.

Reasons for Urgency

28. In order to achieve a timely launch of the 2007/08 CGS programme, approval by Executive at April 24 meeting is required. Further deferment of the decision would delay the programme, and ultimately delay the expenditure of capital resources. Three Community Councils with meetings in early May (Bermondsey and Walworth: 9 May; Camberwell: 10 May) could miss the opportunity to launch the programme at that time. Additionally, Nunhead and Peckham Rye Community Council are meeting on April 25 and includes an agenda item on CGS including process for bids for 2007/8, with the clear expectation of this item having been considered by Executive April 24 meeting. Subsequent meetings in June are likely to fall very close to the application deadlines, which are expected to be in July.

Reasons for Lateness

29. Further consultation and research was required in order to develop the Index of Multiple Deprivation-based formula for the allocation of funding.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Executive report – CGS Capital Programme 2003/04 (20 th May 2003)	Town Hall	Everton Roberts
Executive report - Capital Proposals (2 nd March 2004)		
Executive Report - Capital Budget Proposals 2005-2008 (8 February 2005)		
Executive Report - Improving Southwark's Community Councils (8 th March 2005)		
Executive Report - Community Council capital Programme (11 September 2006)		

APPENDICES

No.	Title
None	

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Gill Davies (Environment & Housing)	
Report Author	Julian Bassham & Todd Strehlow	
Version	Final	
Dated	23 April 2007	
Key Decision?	Yes	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / EXECUTIVE MEMBER		
Officer Title	Comments Sought	Comments included
Director of Legal & Democratic Services	YES	YES
Finance Director	YES	YES
Executive Member	YES	YES
Date final report sent to Constitutional Team		23 rd April 2007