

CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

**Venue: Town Hall, Moorgate
Street, Rotherham.**

Date: Monday, 11 October 2004

Time: 9.30 a.m.

A G E N D A

1. To determine if the following matters are to be considered under the categories suggested in accordance with the Local Government Act 1972.
2. To determine any item which the Chairman is of the opinion should be considered as a matter of urgency.
3. Minutes of Meetings held on 19th and 30th July, 6th August and 6th September, 2004
(pages 1C-29C of Orange Delegated Powers Book dated 17th July-17th September, 2004)
4. Performance Management Models and Improvement Tools (Pages 1 - 13)
- to approve Housing Services applying for external quality accreditation
5. Housing Disrepair Claims (Pages 14 - 27)
- to note the report
6. Regeneration of Void Flats, Wath upon Dearne (Pages 28 - 30)
- to approve the demolition of flats and incorporation into the existing land development brief

The following item will be considered as an urgent item with the Chair's agreement

7. Proposals to pilot the installation of Solar Powered Heating in Council Properties (Pages 31 - 36)
- to accept the proposal
8. Exclusion of the press and public
Resolved:- That, under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in those paragraphs indicated below of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972:-

9. Void Property Security (Pages 37 - 38)
(Exempt under Paragraphs 8 and 9 of the Act – supply of goods/services and negotiation of terms)
10. Extra Care Housing Fund (Pages 39 - 48)
(Exempt under Paragraphs 3 and 8 of the Act – accommodation provided by the Council/supply of goods or services)
11. Damp Proofing and Timber Treatments Contract (Pages 49 - 50)
(Exempt under Paragraph 8 and 9 of the Act – expenditure proposed to be incurred by the Authority/terms negotiated for the supply of goods or services)

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS
--

1.	Meeting:	Cabinet Member for Housing and Environmental Services
2.	Date:	4th October 2004
3.	Title:	Performance Management Models and Improvement Tools (All Wards)
4.	Programme Area:	Housing and Environmental Services

5. Summary

This report identifies the performance improvement models available to improve customer satisfaction and efficiency of the Housing Service, now and throughout the development of the ALMO.

6. Recommendations

That Cabinet Member agrees that Housing Services applies for external quality accreditation in (subject to a more detailed financial breakdown):

- ISO 9001 for the Repairs and Maintenance Service by September 2005.
- Charter Mark for the Landlord Service by April 2006.

7. Proposals and Details

Many local authorities and ALMOs have chosen to adopt performance improvement tools to help them manage strategically and deliver against the national modernisation agenda. The Government's 'modernisation agenda' encourages all public sector organisations to make use of one of four main quality models (EFQM Excellence Model, Charter Mark, Investors in People and ISO 9001).

The Council achieved the Investors in People award in June 2003 recognising significant improvements that we put in place to develop people, skills and learning. The Council and the Programme Area has successfully implemented continuous improvement programmes recently through the use of the European Foundation for Quality Management (EFQM) business excellence model.

However, a performance management approach that recognises people and improvement measures alone are not sufficient, and we need a more holistic, balanced set of measures (customer relationships and internal processes) that reflect the different drivers that contribute to superior performance.

An analysis of the IdeA paper (report attached) and best practice benchmarks has identified that the service considers applying for external accreditation using Charter Mark (customers) and ISO9001 (processes) to be able to quantify and evidence performance improvement, quality and customer care. These 'quality marks' have been selected because they fit best with our business and they are currently held by the 'excellent' housing organisations.

Private sector construction companies often have "ISO9001 series" quality assurance systems. The Housing Service currently holds the accreditation at our uPVC window manufacturing plant but there is a business need to expand this to the remaining parts of the repairs and maintenance service. With a recognised quality accreditation, for customer interface and quality assurance mechanisms, will place the service in a better position to explore new business ventures under the ALMO.

8. Finance

The costs involved will be broken down when we submit our applications to both assessment centres during the next two years. It is not clear at this stage how much this will be but it is expected to be in the region of £21k for ISO9001 plus £2k annual audits and £2k for a Charter Mark assessment. Because of these financial uncertainties a more detailed breakdown of costs will be submitted during 2005-06.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

The implementation of Charter Mark and ISO9001 requires additional resources (primarily people) and may have an impact on other improvements within the ALMO Excellence Plan and Repairs and Maintenance Service Improvement Plan. These improvements have already been agreed and prioritised by the Housing Futures Group. The impact of this risk is potentially damaging to the set up of the ALMO (1 April 2005 'Going Live' date) and subsequently impacting on service delivery, reputation and our legal position (Section 27 application). This risk is being managed through our 'SMART' performance management framework ensuring improvements are achievable. The projects will be timed to commence following the successful

completion of the 'quick win' tasks within the improvement plans. The quality projects will be project managed by two project teams supported by the Strategic Services Team (currently the Performance and Quality Unit) and reporting to the Housing Futures Group (ALMO Board post April 2005).

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

The development of the proposed quality systems within Housing Services has a potential positive impact on regeneration, equality, sustainability and performance. Our approach to quality has strong connections with Housing and Environmental Services mission of 'building sustainable neighbourhoods'. These quality models provide a framework to deliver high quality neighbourhoods.

We have developed a culture of continuous improvement and are redesigning services to provide a customer focus and modern means of access. These quality systems will help with this process by improving our practices and service delivery to our customers now and in the future. Our four pronged approach to quality ensures that policies and practices are sustainable, and that the needs and participation of customers remain at the heart of decision making.

CharterMark will make a positive contribution to the Council's general duty under the Race Relations (Amendment) Act to promoting equality. The CharterMark accreditation will mean that we have improved both the quality and equality of Council policy and practice (improving customer access, satisfaction and complaint handling for example).

The quality models will also make a positive contribution to the Council's performance management framework and the Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA). By improving service delivery for our customers we will be improving the 'housing service block' and 'corporate assessment' scores within the new CPA framework for 2005.

There are potential benefits for both 'Corporate Health' Best Value Performance Indicators (accessibility, diversity, complaints, e-government) and service owned key performance indicators (customer satisfaction, relet times, repairs).

The successful implementation of both Charter Mark and ISO9001 will make a positive contribution to the ALMO 'Proper' Inspection in November 2005.

11. Background Papers and Consultation

Performance Management Models for Improvement, IdeA February 2004

Best Value Performance Plan 2004-05

Housing and Environmental Services' Performance Plan 2004-07

ALMO Excellence Plan August 2004

Repairs and Maintenance Service Improvement Plan August 2004

Consultation internally with Chief Executive's, Economic and Development Services Performance and Quality Teams.

Consultation externally with Ashfield Homes, Derby Homes, Leicester City Council and Carrick Housing.

Contact Name : John Mansergh, Performance and Development Officer, 01709 (82)2220, john.mansergh@rotherham.gov.uk

Review of Performance Management Models and Improvement Tools

Prepared for:
Simon Bunker
Head of Housing Service
Housing and Environmental Service
Rotherham Borough Council

Prepared by:
John Mansergh, Performance
& Quality, Housing and
Environmental Services.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction.....	3
2. Summary of key findings.....	4
• Analysis of performance models.....	4
• Current activity and accreditation.....	4
• Future commitments.....	4
• Impact of the Arms Length Management Organisation.....	4
• Competition, quality and value for money.....	5
3. Conclusions and recommendations.....	9
4. Appendix.....	10

1 Introduction

The ALMO Excellence Plan has been designed to shape the ALMO structure in 2005 and reorganise our service to deliver an excellent customer service through Neighbourhood Management. A key objective within the plan is to deliver a continuously improving, high performing, customer focused service. This objective will continue to be high on the agenda for the ALMO, the Council and for Central Government.

This report identifies the performance improvement options available to improve the efficiency of the service, now and throughout the development of the ALMO. It uses the IdeA report by Amanda Davies (PMMI Report – February 2004) as the framework for selecting the appropriate performance improvement tool for the service. The report identifies:

- The activity currently under way within the service in order to avoid unnecessary duplication;
- The best option(s) out there providing an appropriate level of resources is allocated;
- The potential benefits for competition, procurement and value for money.

Our service plans identify the strategic objectives, priorities and aims of the service for the planning period 2004/07. Several themes run through the changes being made and have influenced the final recommendations within this report to reinforce the “golden thread”. These are:

- reshaping services to provide a customer focus and modern means of access
- aligning and integrating with the activities of other programme areas
- leading and delivering on cross cutting initiatives.
- developing a culture of continuous improvement and promoting innovation
- placing customer aspiration at the heart of all decision making through consultation and involvement

Many local authorities and ALMOs have chosen to adopt an off the shelf performance improvement tool in order to help them manage strategically and deliver against the national modernisation agenda. The Modernising Government White Paper, published in March 1999, encouraged all public sector organisations to make use of one of the four main quality approaches. These are the EFQM Excellence Model, Charter Mark, Investors in People and ISO 9001. The PMMI Project raises the awareness and understanding of some of the other tools on the market.

The best performing ALMOs and housing organisations use all four models to be able to demonstrate that they are good employers (Investors in People), they have good internal processes (ISO 9001), good customer care standards (CharterMark) and a strong culture of continuous improvement (EFQM).

This research explored the benefits of using the improvement tools in our local context.

2 Summary of key findings

Analysis of performance models

This report does not attempt to replicate the analysis within the PMMI Project Report. Instead it has been designed to apply the analysis within Rotherham's context, taking into account our current and planned activity, the challenges we face and our business objectives for 2004/07. The table can be viewed in the appendix section.

Current activity and accreditation

The Housing Service currently holds accreditation awards for Investors in People, ISO 9001 series and kite marks (Barbot Hall uPVC factory only).

The service has recently undertaken a series of review and improvement activity involving Best Value Reviews, self-assessments involving the Audit Commission KLOEs, two peer reviews (Housing Quality Network, HouseMark) and an external inspection within the last twelve months. Our ALMO bid was successful and was underpinned by robust information and analysis. A project plan is currently underway to go live in April 2005. The recommendations of this report are designed to reduce duplication with these activities.

Future commitments

In addition to this, a number of critical reviews, self-assessments and improvement exercises are planned for the service within the next twelve months.

- Business Process Re-engineering exercise to streamline the delivery of customer focused services All key processes are tackled through BPR (Sep 04) with BPR being rolled out- excluding technology (Dec 04).
- The Indicative ALMO inspection
- Best Value Review of Retained Housing Functions
- Best Value Review of Neighbourhood Management
- Service Review of Waste Management, the Regulatory Function and Community Safety.

The improvement tools recommended within this report are intended to dovetail with these activities rather than duplicate this important work. The benefits of Kaizen Blitz, Six Sigma and Value Management could be useful tools but neither the service nor the Council currently has the capacity to deliver these. It is recommended that we utilise our experience of EFQM that has already brought about efficiency savings within the Best Value Review of Housing Management in 2003.

Impact of the Arms Length Management Organisation

Setting up the ALMO in April 2005 will impact on our existing accreditation models (Investors in People, ISO9001, Kite marks) and this means that we may need an additional assessment as an ALMO. This needs to be captured within the ALMO Business Plan and allocated the appropriate resources. Any decisions taken on further accreditation between now and the ALMO start date will need to take this into account.

Competition, quality and value for money

The research attempted to identify the potential benefits of holding an accreditation that the service would have in terms of competing with the market place. An analysis of the Audit Commission, Housing Quality Network and HouseMark websites has concluded that it would be beneficial for the service to achieve a "badge" to be able to quantify and evidence performance improvement, quality and customer focus. The Institute of Internal Auditors believes that "...quality is the key to competitiveness". Contractors often have "ISO900 series" quality assurance systems (with audit). This suggests that with a recognised quality accreditation, for customer interface and quality assurance mechanisms, then this is one step that we can take to help the service to compete.

Local housing authorities are under increasing pressure not only to demonstrate that they are delivering continuous improvement in their delivery of services but to demonstrate that they are going to do so. The process of auditing and accountability in service delivery is of great importance and this research puts forward a method by which this can be achieved, "The Two Pronged Attack".

3 Conclusions and Recommendations

Our approach to quality provides a clearly structured framework for assessing the most effective way of delivering services and provides a means of assessing quality against benchmarks. Using this process would provide everyone involved and affected by the ALMO delivery vehicle with a means of assessing progress towards key objectives within our planning framework, the ALMO Excellence Plan and the ALMO Delivery Plan. This approach supports the four C's of Best Value and our aim of placing customers at the heart of our business.

The approach consists of adopting two additional improvement tools – Charter Mark and ISO9001. The appendix section of this report has identified the benefits of both of these options and they represent the best available options for the service. All of our plans and people competencies can be described in two simple words – quality and customer. This is at the heart of everything we do and the two improvement tools recommended epitomise these core values – Charter Mark (is about the customer) and ISO9001 (quality assurance).

These improvement tools have been selected to best reflect the themes within the Programme Area Performance Plan (PAPP). This means that by selecting these models it will place us in a better position to achieve our strategic objectives.

Why Charter Mark?

This will help us to achieve the following key themes within the PAPP:

- reshaping services to provide a customer focus and modern means of access.
- aligning and integrating with the activities of other programme areas.
- leading and delivering on cross cutting initiatives.

Why ISO9000?

This will help us to achieve the following key themes within the PAPP:

- developing a culture of continuous improvement and promoting innovation.
- placing customer aspiration at the heart of all decision making through consultation and involvement.

Risk Assessment

A decision is required on which parts of the service are deemed priorities in order to resource the quality marks. It is recommended that the remaining parts of the R+M service (both the management and manual side) are brought up to the ISO standard as a priority. An ISO 9001 assessment centre suggests that the size of our operation would require a small project team of 6 officers working full time for approximately 9 months. Organisations of 60/70 people will normally be expected to pay approximately £3000 of the assessment and £1600 a year for audits. An analysis of training needs will also be required so that those involved within the process understand how to audit processes to the standard. A full financial breakdown will need to be evaluated in more detail if the recommendation is agreed in principle.

There is a commitment corporately for prioritising those parts of the service for Charter Mark accreditation. A project team is leading on a plan to deliver this and ensure that learning is cascading throughout the Council. The Housing Service is currently committed to achieve Charter Mark accreditation by April 2006.

4 Appendix

Improvement Tool	What is it?	Scope	Time	Resource	Staff Involvement	Recommendation Green – approve Amber – in place Red - reject
Balanced Scorecard	A framework for managing strategy by linking objectives, initiatives, targets and performance measures across key corporate perspectives	Holistic model. Can be cascaded down to department, function and team	Four to six months to implement depending on level of measurement in place	Low resource investment – often just facilitation costs and staff time	Inclusive if scorecards are cascaded and widely deployed	Doesn't promote innovation and transformation. Not comparable with our vision or change agenda. Benefits can be seen at team level, e.g. Housing Needs Unit. (RED)
EFQM Excellence Model®	Organisational improvement framework for assessing strengths and areas for improvement across the spectrum of an organisations activities	Holistic model	Approx 35 staff days over six weeks	Can be resource intensive. Costs are estimated to be at least £4000-£5000	Inclusive. Involvement usually through facilitated staff workshops.	Useful self-assessment and action planning tool. CPA now looking at self-assessments similar to EFQM. Council capacity there. (AMBER)
Dolphin EFQM Model™	Improvement framework for conducting self assessments using the EFQM Excellence Model®	Holistic model	Quick – can be undertaken in as little as a week	Relatively low resource investment	Level of inclusion varies depending on time taken.	Similar to EFQM – self-assessments already taking place – need to put improvements in place not re-assess. (RED)
Practical Quality Assurance System for Small Organisations (PQASSO)	Practical Quality Assurance System for Small Organisations, or projects within larger organisations	Holistic model. Can be applied to projects	Designed to be worked through incrementally - anything from 12 months to several years	Low resource investment. The work pack is inexpensive at £73	Inclusive.	Voluntary sector tool – not useful for an organisation. (RED)
Public Service Excellence Model	Organisational improvement framework and diagnostic tool for identifying strengths and	Holistic model. Can be applied to programmes	Approx two to four months	Moderately resource intensive, less for programme	Inclusive.	Similar to EFQM but more complex. Not widely used in public sector. (RED)

Improvement Tool	What is it?	Scope	Time	Resource	Staff Involvement	Recommendation
	weaknesses within an organisation or programme			assessments		
The Big Picture	Organisational development framework and toolbox designed to make you think about every aspect of your organisation and take action to improve it	Holistic model	Depends on the level of use – anything from a week to several months	The work pack costs around £50	Helps identify improvement and action needed	Similar to EFQM. (RED)
Charter Mark	The Governments national standard and quality improvement scheme for customer service.	Customer service in the public sector organisations	Depends on the state of readiness of the organisation	Costs currently being revised	Inclusive	Recognition and positive publicity in addition to customer benefits. Corporate buy in already agreed. Most top performers hold award. (GREEN)
Investors in People (IIP)	National standard for improving organisational performance by training and developing people to achieve organisational goals	Processes supporting employee development	Six months to three years from commitment to achieving IIP	Assessors cost £550/day. Organisations of 50-100 people need three to four assessor days	Fully inclusive	Already achieved and working to sustain award. (AMBER)
ISO9001:2000 quality system	Global standard and approach for quality management systems, The standard focuses on the management of processes and documentation in order to meet customer needs and expectations	Processes and documentation	Implementation to assessment takes approx. six to nine months	Organisations of 60-70 would pay approx £3000 for the assessment and £1600 a year for audits	Fully inclusive of staff in the areas of activity being improved	Recognition and standard common place within the construction industry. Although can be process led task. (GREEN)

Improvement Tool	What is it?	Scope	Time	Resource	Staff Involvement	Recommendation Green – approve Amber – in place Red - reject
Kaizen Blitz	Short term approach to improving business processes, which can achieve rapid results	Processes or functions	Usually two to three months from conception to bedding in of new processes	Consultant costs within the region of £7000-10,000 per blitz event	Fully inclusive of staff in the areas of activity being blitzed	May be useful for set up of the ALMO as immediate improvements seen. No capacity exists currently. (RED)
Local Government Improvement Programme	Performance Improvement approach based on a peer review against a benchmark of an 'ideal' local authority	Holistic approach	Four to six weeks from review to reporting. Six, 12 and 18 months follow up	Fees range from £12,000 to £20,000	Inclusion limited to 'key' officers within the authority	Audit Commission currently renewing – very useful in identifying improvements but information already available within HouseMark and more unlikely to "innovate". (RED)
Six Sigma	A disciplined methodology for process improvement that deploys a wide set of tools.	Processes, functions or services	Black belt projects will normally take three to nine months	Costs vary depending on methods adopted and consultancy requirement	Focused on specific areas and officers	Delivers visible improvements but difficult to communicate to staff and it is too important for us to allow this to happen. (RED)
Value Management	A framework for improvement and a toolbox of proven methods that aim to optimise customer outcomes within the resources available	Processes or functions	Varies depending on the methods adopted	Start up costs vary depending on methods adopted and consultancy requirement	Inclusive in areas under review	Under-used within housing sector, capacity and resource allocation levels required are high. (RED)

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS

1.	Meeting:	Delegated Powers: Cabinet Member, Housing & Environmental Services
2.	Date:	11th October 2004
3.	Title:	HOUSING DISREPAIR CLAIMS
4.	Programme Area:	HOUSING SERVICES

5. Summary:

The report sets out the impact of the current management strategy for dealing with disrepair claims (Section 11.82), in particular, reports on progress with Housing Disrepair Claims for the 12-month period following implementation of a pro-active management approach.

6. Recommendations:

TO NOTE THE REPORT

7. Proposals and Details:

Background:

In common with many Local Authorities, Rotherham in recent years has experienced a dramatic increase in the number of disrepair claims being submitted on behalf of its tenants by solicitors, most of which operate from outside the Borough and sub-region.

In the first 6-months of 2003/04, the number of cases had risen to such an extent that it was having a serious negative effect on the repairs budget. In view of this it was decided to recruit additional specialist legal assistance to support a more assertive approach to the solicitors' involved, whom it was suspected were submitting spurious claims. Rotherham also made clear, by way of publicity material, that tenants should submit repairs issues direct to Council staff and that spurious cases that were submitted would be contested with the utmost vigour. (See Appendix 1).

The current position (at 28/09/04) is that numbers of cases have fallen during that 12 month period from **267** live claims to **161**, despite receiving **67 new claims** during this period.

173 claims have settled, comprising:

- 51 cases where payment is required
- 90 cases where no payment is required
- 32 cases where Rotherham MBC will receive costs

Of the 51 cases where payment is required, the **amount paid to 28.9.04** is: **£197,266.45**.

Of this, the sum of £114,928.45 was paid during the 2003/2004 financial year and the remaining £82,338.00 during 2004/05 so far.

However, costs remain to be paid on 7 of these cases and are likely to be paid during 2004/05. The estimated cost is a further £35,000.

Of the 32 cases where Rotherham will receive costs, the total sum of **£121,101.73** is due, of which £101,578.28 has already been recovered, during the 2004/05 financial year.

8. Finance

Comparison costs for the legal salary against savings on not defending claims are:

Average cost of the 51 claims paid out in this period is £4,555.00 per claim.

Had all 173 settled cases proceeded undefended and cost the same average amount this could have cost, $173 \times £4555.00 = £788,015.00$

The 90 cases settled without payment has potentially saved £409,950.00

In addition, 32 cases have been successfully defended and costs orders obtained in Rotherham's favour, in the total sum of £121,101.73, of which the sum of £101,578.28 has already been received.

Had these 32 cases proceeded undefended and cost the same average amount as above, this could have cost, $32 \times £4555 = £145,760$.

The Council's legal input has easily been covered by the amount of fees expected to be recovered for the 32 cases successfully defended.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

There is no way of knowing whether claims will continue to come in at the same rate, will diminish, or will again be received in similar quantities to those coming in this time last year. However, it is known that at least one firm is actively recruiting "door-knockers" to locate potential claimants. It is considered prudent to retain legal assistance to continue to deal with the existing claims and deal with any new claims as and when they arise as the Programme Area has benefited from having a dedicated specialist legal resource working on the resolution of Housing Disrepair Claims.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

There are no implications.

11. Background Papers and Consultation

Appendix 3 - Case Outcome Schedule – 8.10.03 to 28.09.04

Cases settled – no court proceedings – same dates

Appendix 2 - Breakdown of figures table

.

Contact Name : Roselyn Watson, Temp Law Clerk, 01709 (82)3595
roselyn.watson@rotherham.gov.uk

APPENDIX 1

ADDENDUM TO REPORT RE HOUSING DISREPAIR CLAIMS

BACKGROUND

As Landlords, RMBC are responsible for repairs to the housing stock. The tenants rights and landlords responsibilities are set out in the Tenancy Agreement.

Under S.82 of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 and S.11 of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985, if a tenant advises a landlord of disrepair at the property and the landlord fails to repair this in a reasonable period of time (or at all) the tenant is entitled to financial compensation from the landlord.

Whilst tenants have, therefore, always had a right to compensation if the landlord fails to meet its responsibilities, it is only in the last 2 to 3 years that tenants have been actively encouraged to do so.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

In the same way that Personal Injury Claims have become big business over the last few years, with lawyers advertising widely and certain firms cold calling and canvassing for work, there are now companies who seek Housing Disrepair clients in a similar way.

Teams of canvassers attend housing estates and approach tenants on their doorstep asking if they can make a claim for them. They apparently advise the tenant that it will cost them nothing but will get their repairs done and they will also be awarded compensation. Not unnaturally, many tenants agree to this.

They sign an agreement, and take out an insurance policy to cover legal fees. The house is inspected and a survey report prepared. They then sell the claims on to firms of solicitors.

It is known that at least one such firm is still actively recruiting for "door knockers" – see advert in Daily Mail, 9th September 2004.

Housing estates throughout the country have been targeted and the number of claims being handled by the various local authorities varies in proportion to the size of their housing stock. Leeds has over 900 claims, for example.

DISREPAIR PROTOCOL

On 8th December 2003, the Government brought in a Housing Disrepair Protocol which lays down rules for bringing such claims to Court. It sets out

every step of the procedure, from the initial letter of claim through to the issue of Court proceedings.

Under the Protocol the solicitors cannot now conduct the transaction in the way they have now previously. They should not now, for example, obtain a survey report before attempting to agree a joint surveyor with the landlord.

However, many solicitors are attempting to bend the Protocol rules to suit themselves, and it is important that any local authority seeking to defend such claims has thorough knowledge of the protocol.

KEEPING ABREAST OF DEVELOPMENTS

The Locum, on behalf of RMBC, has forged links with lawyers dealing with Housing Disrepair claims in other local authorities, Barristers specialising in Disrepair Claims, and is also actively involved with the Northern Disrepair Group in order to ensure that RMBC keep up to date with the overall picture of Housing Disrepair in the UK.

She has also attended a Continuing Professional Development course on Disrepair earlier this year and attended the National Disrepair Conference in June 2004.

APPENDIX 2

BREAKDOWN OF FIGURES

	PAYMENT REQUIRED	NO PAYMENT REQUIRED	PAYMENT DUE TO RMBC	TOTAL
UP TO 16.12.03	20	35	--	55
16.12.03 TO 26.3.04	14	39	10	63
25.3.04 to 28.9.04	17	16	22	55
TOTAL	51	90	32	173

APPENDIX 3

HOUSING DISREPAIR CASE OUTCOME SCHEDULE

Property	Hearing date	Outcome	Comments
1	No hearing fixed – settled 14.7.03	£760.00 for both damages and costs	Settled before court proceedings
2	10.09.03	Claim dismissed	Small claim - no order re costs
3	17.10.03	Generals £3000 Interest £40 Costs £10046.48 TOT: £13086.48	Apparently an inexperienced Judge. Accepted Claimants evidence of “notice” but not of £2,000 + specials
4	24.10.03	Claim for damages withdrawn. Costs £2,500	The Claimants costs schedule was almost £15,000
5	24.10.03	Generals £750 Specials £250 Interest £27.50 Costs £5394.96 TOTAL £6422.46	At pre-trial conference Claimant offered to settle for £1500 + £6500 costs = £8000. Costs would have been more but sols couldn't find their CFA risk assessment and the Judge disallowed success fee. (They were claiming 50%).
6	28.10.03	Damages £2500 + costs of £5,000	Settlement out of Court
7	03.11.03	Damages £1250 +costs £3400	Settlement out of Court
8	06.11.03	Damages £900 + costs £5,500	Settlement before Hearing
9	07.11.03	Damages £1000 + costs £3000	Settlement out of court
10	11.11.03	Damages £1000 + £5000 costs	Settlement out of Court
11	14.11.03	Damages £1750 Costs £4112.50	They were seeking £3000 + £6741.75
12	19.6.03 (costs settled 7.11.03)	£800 + costs of £5500	They wanted damages of £2,500, then £1250, settled for £800. Costs claimed were £8,911.11, settled for £5,500
13	27.11.03	£2,500 + costs of £10,300	Settlement out of Court
14	2.12.03	Case Discontinued – Damages £0 Costs £0	Client did Moonlight, owing rent. Pestered solicitors for her new address. They discontinued their claim.
15	25.11.03	Case Discontinued Damages £0	Counsel had advised we offer to settle at £1000 + £3500 costs. Put forward our

APPENDIX 3

HOUSING DISREPAIR CASE OUTCOME SCHEDULE

		Costs £0	submissions and their case folded.
16	03.12.03	Damages £750 Costs £2250	Settlement at door of Court. They were claiming £2500 + £14,000+ costs
17	04.12.03	Damages £750 + £5250 costs	Settlement out of court
18	05.12.03	Damages £500 + Costs £4000	Settlement at door of Court
19	09.12.03 – settled 8.12.03	Damages NIL Costs NIL	Settlement out of Court
20	No hearing fixed – settled 8.12.03	Damages £350 Costs £450	Settlement out of court
21	10.12.03	Damages £690 + costs £10,250	They were asking for £1500 + costs at the door of Court.
22	11.12.03	Damages £1500 + costs £9,900.00	Settled at door of Court. They were seeking £3,500 + costs. Counsel negotiated to £1500 + costs
23	No hearing date : settled 12.12.03	Damages £500 Costs £450	Settlement out of Court
24	22.12.03	Discontinued on 15.12.03 – no damages, no costs.	Settled 1 week before hearing Claimant being persuaded to discontinue.
25	16.01.04	Damages £2,250 + costs of £7,750.00.	Settlement out of Court
26	15.12.03	Damages £2000 + costs £3100	Settlement out of Court (by PI lawyers)
27	No hearing fixed. Settled 9.1.04	Damages £500 + costs £450	Settlement out of Court
28	No hearing fixed. Settled 14.1.04	Damages £550 + costs £450	Settled out of Court
29	23.01.04	Damages £500 +	Settlement out of Court

APPENDIX 3

HOUSING DISREPAIR CASE OUTCOME SCHEDULE

	Settled 19.1.04	costs £3,500.00.	
30	No Hearing Settled 22.1.04	Damages £500 + £450 costs	Settlement out of Court
31	No hearing – struck out 24.10.03	Damages NIL Costs NIL Costs order in our favour	Case struck out for non- compliance. Default costs order in our favour - £3122.24. NOTE: Claimant applying to re- instate
32	28.01.04 Settled 27.01.04	Damages NIL Costs NIL Costs order in our favour	Discontinued the day before hearing. Default costs order in our favour - £4022.33 PAID
33	29.01.04 Settled 27.01.04	Damages NIL Costs NIL Costs order in our favour	Discontinued two days before hearing. Default costs order in our favour - £3943.77 PAID
34	30.01.04 Settled 27.01.04	Damages NIL Costs NIL Costs order in our favour	Discontinued before hearing. Default costs order in our favour - £3890.77 PAID
35	02.02.03 Heard on 23.3.04	Damages £1208.13 (less any rent arrears). Costs £10,038.88	Adjourned in November and again in February. They were asking for damages of £3000 + costs of £15,316.05
36	05.02.04 Settled 27.01.04	Damages NIL Costs NIL Costs order in our favour	Discontinued before hearing. Default costs order in our favour - £5983.51 PAID
37	No hearing – settled 6.2.04	Damages £400 + costs £260	Settled out of court. They were claiming £500 + £140 specials + potential personal injury claim for mother + costs.
38	No Hearing: settled 10.2.04	Damages £1250 + costs of £5,250.00	Reports showed quite a number of defects. They asked for £2250 + costs, we negotiated it down to £1250
39	No hearing. Settled 12.2.04	Damages £550 + costs £450	Settled out of Court. They were claiming £1160 + Fast Track costs. Settled for £550 + Small claims costs.
40	No hearing. Settled 16.2.04	Damages £500 + costs £450	Settled out of Court – they were claiming £2300 + Fast track costs. Settled for £500 + Small Claims costs.

APPENDIX 3

HOUSING DISREPAIR CASE OUTCOME SCHEDULE

41	No Hearing. Settled 20.2.04	Damages NIL Costs NIL COSTS DUE IN OUR FAVOUR	Case Discontinued. Default costs order in our favour - £2328.83 PAID
42	No Hearing. Settled 5.5.04	Damages NIL Costs NIL COSTS DUE IN OUR FAVOUR	Case Discontinued. We will be claiming for costs, to be assessed by the Court if not agreed PAID
43	No Hearing. Settled 5.5.04	Damages NIL Costs NIL COSTS DUE IN OUR FAVOUR	Case Discontinued. We will be claiming for costs, to be assessed by the Court if not agreed PAID
44	No Hearing. Settled 5.5.04	Damages NIL Costs NIL COSTS DUE IN OUR FAVOUR	Case Discontinued. We will be claiming for costs, to be assessed by the Court if not agreed PAID
45	No Hearing. Settled 5.5.04	Damages NIL Costs NIL COSTS DUE IN OUR FAVOUR	Case Discontinued. We will be claiming for costs, to be assessed by the Court if not agreed PAID
46	No Hearing. Settled 5.5.04	Damages NIL Costs NIL COSTS DUE IN OUR FAVOUR	Case Discontinued. We will be claiming for costs, to be assessed by the Court if not agreed PAID
47	No Hearing. Settled 5.5.04	Damages NIL Costs NIL COSTS DUE IN OUR FAVOUR	Case Discontinued. We will be claiming for costs, to be assessed by the Court if not agreed PAID
48	No Hearing. Settled 5.5.04	Damages NIL Costs NIL COSTS DUE IN OUR FAVOUR	Case Discontinued. We will be claiming for costs, to be assessed by the Court if not agreed PAID
49	No Hearing. Settled 5.5.04	Damages NIL Costs NIL COSTS DUE IN OUR FAVOUR	Case Discontinued. We will be claiming for costs, to be assessed by the Court if not agreed PAID
50	No Hearing. Settled 5.5.04	Damages NIL Costs NIL COSTS DUE IN OUR FAVOUR	Case Discontinued. We will be claiming for costs, to be assessed by the Court if not agreed PAID
51	No hearing date – settled 1.3.04	Damages NIL Costs NIL COSTS DUE IN OUR FAVOUR	Case Discontinued. Default costs order in our favour - £2371.17 PAID
52	No hearing date – settled	Damages £700 + costs £450	They had been claiming £1200 + Fast track costs. Settled for £700 and Small Claims track costs.

APPENDIX 3

HOUSING DISREPAIR CASE OUTCOME SCHEDULE

	3.3.04		
53	No hearing Settled 3.3.04	Damages – NIL Costs NIL	Claim struck out after Claimants solicitors applied to come off the record. No order for costs either way. (NOTE We have paid £381.88 to external surveyor).
54	No hearing Settled 8.3.04	Damages – NIL Costs – NIL COSTS DUE IN OUR FAVOUR	Case Discontinued. Default costs order in our favour - £2472.05 PAID
55	No hearing Settled 15.3.04	Damages – NIL Costs – NIL COSTS DUE IN OUR FAVOUR	Case Discontinued. Default costs order in our favour - £2510.01 PAID
56	No hearing Settled 15.3.04	Damages – NIL Costs – NIL COSTS DUE IN OUR FAVOUR	Case Discontinued. Default costs order in our favour - £2414.96 PAID + Enforcement costs paid
57	No date fixed	Damages NIL Costs NIL COSTS DUE IN OUR FAVOUR	Case Discontinued. Default costs order in our favour - £2549.99 PAID
58	No date fixed	Damages NIL Costs NIL COSTS DUE IN OUR FAVOUR	Case Discontinued. We will be claiming for costs, to be assessed by the Court if not agreed PAID
59	4 th May 2004	Damages NIL Costs NIL COSTS DUE IN OUR FAVOUR	Case Struck Out. We will be claiming for costs, to be assessed by the Court if not agreed
60	Settled 18 th May 2004	Damages £600 Costs £460	Settled by negotiation
61	Settled 24 th May 2004	Damages £1,250 + costs £3,200	Settled by negotiation
62	No date fixed	Damages NIL Costs NIL COSTS DUE IN OUR FAVOUR	Case Discontinued. We will be claiming for costs, to be assessed by the Court if not agreed
63	No date fixed	Damages NIL Costs NIL COSTS DUE IN OUR FAVOUR	Case Discontinued. We will be claiming for costs, to be assessed by the Court if not agreed PAID
64	No date fixed	Damages NIL Costs NIL COSTS DUE IN	Case Discontinued. We will be claiming for costs, to be assessed by the Court if not

APPENDIX 3

HOUSING DISREPAIR CASE OUTCOME SCHEDULE

		OUR FAVOUR	agreed PAID
65	No date fixed	Damages NIL Costs NIL COSTS DUE IN OUR FAVOUR	Case Discontinued. We will be claiming for costs, to be assessed by the Court if not agreed
66	No date fixed	Damages NIL Costs NIL COSTS DUE IN OUR FAVOUR	Case Discontinued. We will be claiming for costs, to be assessed by the Court if not agreed PAID
67	No date fixed	Damages NIL Costs NIL COSTS DUE IN OUR FAVOUR	Case Discontinued. We will be claiming for costs, to be assessed by the Court if not agreed PAID
68	No date fixed	Damages NIL Costs NIL COSTS DUE IN OUR FAVOUR	Case Discontinued. We will be claiming for costs, to be assessed by the Court if not agreed PAID
69	No hearing. Settled 7.6.04	Damages £800.00 + £460.00 costs.	Settled by negotiation
70	Trial window 4.10.04– 22.10.04	Damages NIL Costs NIL COSTS DUE IN OUR FAVOUR	Case Discontinued. We will be claiming for costs, to be assessed by the Court if not agreed PAID
71	Struck out – 7.6.04	Damages NIL Costs NIL COSTS DUE IN OUR FAVOUR	Case Struck out. We will be claiming for costs, to be assessed by the Court if not agreed COSTS PAID
72	14.06.04 (SCC)	Damages £600 + Costs £820.	Settled by negotiation on the morning of the hearing
73	Hearing 17.6.04 Settled 14.6.04	Damages £500 + Costs £820.	Settled by negotiation – 3 days before hearing
74	No Hearing Settled 17.6.04	Damages £500 + Costs £460	Settled by negotiation
75	Hearing 30.06.04 Settled 21.6.04	Damages £2000 + costs £5750	Settled on Counsel's advice to accept their Part 36 offer of £2075. Their costs schedule was originally £11,113.85
76	No hearing. Settled 30.6.04	Damages £550 (including £235.44 to write off rent arrears) + costs £450	Settled by negotiation

APPENDIX 3

HOUSING DISREPAIR CASE OUTCOME SCHEDULE

77	Settled 16.7.04	Damages £1250 Cost £2000	Settled by negotiation
78	Settled 20.7.04	Damages £250 + costs £460	Settled by negotiation. NOTE: On 4 th June 2004 they were seeking £5,000 + costs!
79	30 th July 2004 (SCC)	Damages NIL Costs NIL COSTS DUE IN OUR FAVOUR	Case Struck out. Costs order for £3269.63 against the Claimant
80	8 th Sept. 2004 Settled 31.8.04	Damages £1,000 + costs of £3,500 + VAT	Settled before hearing by negotiation. They were seeking £2,500 damages + £5,000 + VAT for costs
81	Hearing 30.9.04	Damages £500 + Small Claims Costs of £820	Settled 8.9.04 by negotiation, on Counsels advice
82	Hearing 27.10.04 Settled 9.9.04	Damages £1000, costs £3,000 + VAT	Settled by negotiation, on Counsels advice

APPENDIX 3

HOUSING DISREPAIR CASE OUTCOME SCHEDULE

CASES	WITH	COSTS	OUTSTANDING
Property and Tenant	Hearing date	Outcome	Comments
83	11.12.03 – settled 10.12.03	Damages £1250 + costs to be agreed	Counsel had advised making an offer of £2500 + costs to settle.
84	19.12.03 Settled 15.12.03	Damages £800 + costs to be agreed	Settlement out of Court
85	23.01.04 Settled 19.1.04	Damages £500 + costs to be agreed	Settlement out of Court. (They were wanting £1600 + costs. Counsel advised offering £750.00 + costs).
86	Settled 25.5.04	Damages £1000 costs to be agreed	Settled by negotiation
87	No hearing. Settled 1.6.04	Damages £1,200 costs to be agreed	Settled by negotiation
88	Hearing 29.07.04 Settled 8.07.04	Damages £650 + Costs to be agreed	Settled by negotiation
89	Settled 23.8.04	Damages £750 + costs to be agreed	Settled by negotiation

SUMMARY:

51 cases where payment required

32 cases where we are entitled to costs

6 cases where no payment of damages or costs are required.

PLUS:

A further 90 claims have been closed where no hearing was fixed and the claim has been settled on the basis that no damages and costs are to be paid.

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS
--

1.	Meeting:	Cabinet Member for Housing and Environmental Services
2.	Date:	11th October 2004
3.	Title:	The regeneration of 2 void blocks of 3 storey flats, Wath.
4.	Programme Area:	Housing and Environmental Services

5. Summary

The report outlines the recommendation for the regeneration of 2 void blocks of 3 storey flats based on an option appraisal carried out by Turner & Townsend, Project Management.

6. Recommendations

THAT THE 2 VOID BLOCKS OF 3 STOREY FLATS AT WATH BE DEMOLISHED AND THE CLEARED LAND INCORPORATED INTO THE EXISTING LAND DEVELOPMENT BRIEF TO BE MARKETED JANUARY 2005.

7. Proposals and Details

- 7.1 Construction of all the single person flat accommodation within the Wath Scheme dates from approximately 1960, with only minimal alterations/additions/maintenance works carried out since that time. Housing Services have advised that the single person accommodation does not now meet the reasonable expectations of national or local government standards or the needs and aspirations of residents, tenants and other service users who reside on the Wath (White Bear) Estate.
- 7.2 Originally, there were 14 blocks of single person flats but eleven blocks have since been demolished and one refurbished, leaving the remaining two blocks of 12 individual flats per block. The retained and refurbished block proved expensive to refurbish and now, nearly one year since completion, appears to show signs of degradation from abuse, misuse and general vandalism. This has resulted in Housing Services making it clear that it is unsustainable to invest further funding into the refurbishment of such properties.
- 7.3 Taking into account the current situation, and early indications of potential maintenance and minor work costs, this is a concern to Housing Services.

It is also worth noting that the electrical, gas and water installations may require replacement, as they do not meet the desired lifespan of an additional 25 years usage.

- 7.4 It is apparent that the flats attract groups of youths who cause anti-social behaviour.

Housing Management have advised that there remains a high demand for this type of single person accommodation, but the number of applicants willing to accept this type and standard of accommodation, is nil.

8. Finance

The cost of refurbishment of a single 3 storey block of flats is in excess of £200,000 excluding fees. To demolish the two blocks of flats will cost approximately £100,000, which includes the demolition, removal of potential asbestos and the clearing of the sites, but excludes fees.

The funding is available from the capital programme and the intention is to make funds available from the budget for the Wath Regeneration Scheme. However, should sufficient funding not be available through the Wath Regeneration Scheme, monies can be made available from the budget for the 'demolition of unsustainable properties'.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

It is anticipated that to complete demolition and clear the site will take approximately 4 months. However, no instruction has been placed with Economic Development Services (EDS) and this time period therefore hasn't been confirmed formally.

A decision to retain and refurbish the flats may result in continued anti-social behaviour in the form of vandalism and general abuse and upon refurbishment there is no guarantee that the flats will attract sustainable tenancies.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

A recommendation to demolish the 2 blocks of flats fits within the Council's overall priority 'a place to live' by 'building sustainable neighbourhoods' and will contribute towards the restructuring of the housing market to meet current and future need with the cleared land being included within the Land Development Brief.

11. Background Papers and Consultation

'Option Appraisal – 2 Nr blocks of void flats, Single person Council accommodation'.

Stakeholders have been consulted throughout the concept and implementation stages of the Regeneration Scheme. The condition of the void blocks of flats is of significant concern to all parties involved in the regeneration of the estate. A consultation exercise has determined a majority opinion that the blocks of flats attract vandalism and general abuse, which creates unpleasant living conditions.

Contact Name : Paul Benson, Principal Housing Regeneration Officer, 4354,
paul.benson@rotherham.gov.uk

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS
--

1.	Meeting:	CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES
2.	Date:	11th OCTOBER 2004
3.	Title:	PROPOSAL TO PILOT THE INSTALLATION OF SOLAR POWERED HEATING IN COUNCIL PROPERTIES
4.	Programme Area:	HOUSING AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

5. Summary

This scheme will dovetail with other renewable energy schemes such as wind Farms, in line with other central government energy strategy. It is hoped to use solar power in other areas such as district heating and public buildings when the results of projects such as this are known.

6. Recommendations

IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT THE PROPOSAL BE ACCEPTED.

7. Proposals and Details:

7.1 Rotherham is committed to identifying new and sustainable sources of energy, and to better meet and understand our tenants future energy needs. In support of this, Housing Services propose to install solar heating to 10 properties, ie. two voids at Kiveton Park and eight tenanted properties at Woodsetts. The void installations will commence late September or early October 2004.

7.2 The voids were chosen because this is a new venture and there will be no inconvenience to tenants. These are capitalised voids so are excluded from the indicator for HES 68. The tenanted properties have been chosen for their suitability i.e. facing south, pitch of the roof and an easily adaptable heating system. Woodsetts was chosen as a small, self contained estate, rather than a large estate, as it was deemed to be easier to evaluate results.

7.3 Solar panel's known as collectors will be fitted to the buildings roof; these use the sun's heat to warm glycol which passes through the panel. The glycol is then fed to a hot water tank and helps provide heat and hot water for the building. Typically the installation should take 2 days. The panels work throughout daylight hours, even if the sky is overcast and there is no direct sunshine. The hot water bills for residents who benefit from solar power should be dramatically reduced by up to 50%.

7.4 Housing officers will visit the tenanted properties to discuss the details of the scheme with residents and get their views and permission before starting work. This project is being undertaken with the help of a company called Genersys PLC. Genersys manufacture, market and install solar thermal panels that provide hot water for domestic, industrial and other applications. The solar panels are manufactured to the highest specification out of the best and most durable materials. They are manufactured and assembled to ISO 9806 -1&2. The manufacturing unit at Barbot Hall would not undertake manufacture of small units but should a large district heating site be considered, would be able to make these. The Genersys solar panels have been tested at the University of Freiburg in Germany and awarded the European Community standard BS EN 12975 parts 1 & 2. This is the European standard for thermal solar products adopted by the European Committee for Standardisation. (See attached document for further details of Genersys). The panels are designed to have a life expectancy of at least 35 years and require no maintenance. The associated whole life cycle costs of a Genersys solar system are much lower than any other renewable energy technology.

7.5 Both the Gas Servicing section, and the PVCu manufacturing section at Barbot Hall will achieve Clearskies solar installer accreditation when the scheme is completed. They will then be able to carry out this work for other authorities and organisations. Once accreditation and demand is established, there is potential for the formation of a Solar Installation Section within the Neighbourhood Management Section. The service can become commercially viable through the South Yorkshire Energy Efficiency Advice Centre, Save N Warm discount scheme. This scheme provides a 50% discount for Cavity wall insulation and loft insulation. In October, the scheme will be expanded to take in the Kirklees Simply Solar scheme and when accreditation is achieved, Rotherham could join this scheme. Rotherham

would be well placed to provide solar technology because there are no big suppliers /fitters in the area. The units will be fitted with monitoring units so that over the year an evaluation can be undertaken. However, the average 3 bed mid terrace would expect to achieve a SAP rating of 80.

7.6 Clearskies accreditation is sought because the government has created it as a measure of quality and to give accreditation to suppliers and installers. It forms a guarantee that anyone who has a Clearskies accreditation is a reliable installer with good workmanship, customer relations, service background and after care service. We would evaluate the results of the installations after a period of 12 months which covers a whole heating season.

7.6 Solar thermal technology has also been taken up by other service providers. One of these ('North West' Housing Association) started some years ago with installation of insulation, double glazing and efficient heating systems and followed on by fitting solar heating. Northern Counties Housing Association identified Cherwell Court in Heywood as suitable for a retrofit solar thermal installation. This sheltered accommodation building was built in 1985 and is home to 40 elderly residents in 34 flats, plus communal areas, laundry facilities and kitchens. Khubsuret House run by St. Vincent's Housing Association in Deepdish was also nominated as a suitable building. Khubsuret was built in 1994 and contains 34 flats and communal areas for elderly Asian and English residents. Presently there is one wind turbine generator in South Yorkshire and this is at Thurnscoe, and one small wind farm on the Yorkshire-Derbyshire border. This would effectively make Rotherham a pathfinder authority in South Yorkshire. The average Solar Installation would save nearly a 1 ton of CO₂ being emitted into the atmosphere. Hot water accounts for 27% of the average household energy bill. Over 10% of electricity generated are lost in the transmission process. The United Kingdom has undertaken to reduce carbon emissions to 1990 levels by 2012.

7.7 A scheme to power a district heating site was completed recently in Denmark which is currently supplying heat and hot water to 700 dwellings and the scheme cost 4 million Euro's (approximately 2.8 million pounds). Rotherham's district heating sites are smaller than this, typically one to two hundred dwellings so the initial cost would be less.

8. Finance

Finance for the initial scheme will come from both the energy efficiency section for the purchase of materials, and Building and Renovations Unit for the installation of the systems. Grants of £400 per property are available through Clearskies and there may also be a possibility of European funding in addition to this. Housing Services can purchase the units using carbon trading monies through the energy efficiency section. The total cost of each installation will be in the region of £2500. The payback period for this is currently around 7 – 10 years with an expected lifespan of the project of 30 – 35 years. It is likely that this will be allowable as efficiency savings against the ODPM's efficiency review targets as identified in the Gershon report. Current energy models suggest that fossil fuel will significantly increase in price in real terms over the next decade, renewable energy will therefore become even more cost effective in the medium to long term.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

This is a new venture for Housing Services (and in future the ALMO) and will help us to achieve government targets in reduction of carbon dioxide emissions, when allied to other energy efficiency measures. Renewable energy is one of the most effective ways of reducing these emissions. To ignore the potential of solar heating would be to remove a means of achieving those targets. Tenants and other stakeholders will need to be educated in the potential benefits of renewable energy.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications:

As stated previously it is likely that this will be allowable as efficiency savings against the ODPM's efficiency review targets as identified in the Gershon report. This scheme helps toward meeting local agenda 21 and fits in with Housing and Environmental Services mission statement and our programme area action plan - "To build sustainable neighbourhoods" and also the Council's mission to make "Rotherham a better place to live learn and work".

11. Background Papers and Consultation

Paul Maplethorpe Senior Energy Efficiency Officer Ext 3426
Ron Patrick Energy Efficiency Officer Ext 3393
Paul Ruston DSO Heating manager Ext 2260
Mark Johnson PVCu Manager 01709 820036

Contact Name : Billy Brooks Domestic Heating Programmes Budget Monitoring Officer Ext 2287 E mail billy.brooks@rotherham.gov.uk

Appendix 1

GENERSYS

Genersys manufacture, market and install solar thermal panels that provide hot water or domestic industrial and other applications. The Solar Panels are manufactured to the highest specification out of the best and most durable materials. They are manufactured and assembled to ISO 9806 -1&2.

Genersys Panels

The range of Genersys Panels is produced by their Slovakian partners led by an innovative German environmental Architect Johann Kollmannsberger. Although only 41, Kollmannsberger is one of the leading specialists in this field. The Genersys 1000-4 and 1000-10 solar panels have been tested at the University of Freiburg in Germany and awarded the European Community standard BS EN 12975 parts 1 & 2. This is the European standard for thermal solar products adopted by the European Committee for Standardisation.

The panels are designed to have a life expectancy of at least 35 years and require no maintenance. The associated whole life cycle costs of a genersys solar system are considered much lower than other renewable energy technology. The panels are manufactured to the highest specification using high grade aluminium from one of the World's leading aluminium manufacturers whose product is used in the production of top quality high performance car engines.

These panels are particularly suitable for integrated roof installations where the panel would become an integral part of the building. They have a life expectancy of at least twenty years and require little or no maintenance. Households on average spend between 27% to 35% of their total energy cost on heating water. Panels, which act as a supplement to existing water heating arrangements, will significantly reduce bills and at the same time substantially reduce carbon dioxide emissions.

Genersys have calculated that if half of domestic housing were equipped with solar panels the United Kingdom would achieve all its international obligations in cutting greenhouse gases, carbon dioxide emissions and energy from renewable sources.

Ten years ago, in June 1992, the world's nations sent their leaders to Rio de Janeiro where they debated the issues of how states should develop their own resources in the context of environmental concerns. They proclaimed some 27 statements that became known as the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development. Three fundamental principles emerged.

Principle 2: States have... "the right to exploit their own resources ... and the responsibility to ensure that (their) activities do not cause damage to the environment of other states".

Principle 4: "Environmental protection shall constitute an integral part of the development process".

Principle 8: "States should reduce and eliminate unsustainable patterns of production and consumption". The states attending Rio adopted a series of agendas in order to provide detailed guidance on the implementation of policies to put the principles into practice. Agenda 21 sets out where the states agreed to many differing environmental measures, ranging from managing fragile ecosystems, conserving biological diversity, combating deforestation, to environmentally sound management of hazardous wastes and the protection of the atmosphere.

The problems of pollution and the solutions being addressed by Agenda 21 are founded in local activities. Accordingly, Agenda 21 declared that the participation and co-operation of local authorities would be crucial. It was rightly understood that local authorities construct, operate and maintain environmental infrastructures, oversee planning processes, establish local environmental policies and building regulations. Section 28 of Agenda 21 broke new ground. Section 28 mandated all local authorities to undertake a consultative process with their populations and achieve a consensus on 'a local Agenda 21' for the community. The process of consultation was aimed at increasing household awareness of sustainable development issues. Local authorities were also required to assess and modify policies, laws and regulations to achieve Agenda 21 objectives.

Urban communities containing large populations of less affluent people need to address the needs of their population in environmental terms. If a family is too poor to afford heating and hot water (fuel poverty is a real issue today) they have to find a way to eliminate fuel poverty without increasing pollution or contributing to global warming.

In Southwark, they sought solutions that could both address fuel poverty and operate environmentally sound policies. One part of Southwark, the Bellenden Area, is designated as a renewal area. They decided to install solar water heating and energy efficient gas heating in a block of flats. The block was chosen because its design and construction made any installation difficult and it was felt if a successful installation could be created here it could be repeated. Genersys, whose solar collectors and home energy system was chosen for the project, were confident that their products could be successfully installed.

Households contribute substantially more greenhouse gases than motor cars.

The average Solar Installation would save nearly a 1 ton of CO₂ being emitted into the atmosphere. Hot water accounts for 27% of the average household energy bill. Over 10% of electricity generated is lost in the transmission process. The UK has undertaken to reduce carbon emissions to 1990 levels by 2012. Renewable energy is central to The World Bank's strategy. The solar screens typically recover the energy used in their production after two years. Genersys Solar Systems generate up to 70% of hot water free. Solar thermal technology will:

- produce 4 times more energy than the best photovoltaic system at a given site;
- produce nearly fifty times more energy than the best wind turbines at a given site;
- produce nearly fifty times more energy than the best heat pump at a given site;
- produce energy at a cheaper cost than any other sustainable source

By virtue of paragraph(s) 8, 9 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

Document is Restricted

By virtue of paragraph(s) 8, 9 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted